

## **Family Language Frameworks and Preservation of Indigenous Language**

**Folake Funmilayo Bamimore**

*Department of Information Management,  
Lead City University, Ibadan.  
Bamimore.folakemi@lcu.edu.ng*

&

**Sophia V. Adeyeye**

*Department of Information Management,  
Lead City University, Ibadan.  
Adeyeye.sophia@lcu.edu.ng*

It has become common practice among Nigerian parents to raise their children without teaching them their indigenous languages which is now being seen as inferior to the English language. This has cultural implication as each race is defined by their unique language, the loss of which may mean such tribe has ceased to exist. This is a distinct possibility for indigenous languages in Nigeria unless effort is made to preserve them. In line with this, this study examines the influence of language framework and policy on the preservation of indigenous languages in Nigeria. The study adopts a mixed-method research design. Both questionnaire and interview will be used for the purpose of data collection. The population of the study consist of 150 primary school parents in three selected schools in Nigeria. Questionnaire was used for data collection of which 128 were returned making 85.3% return rate. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics, the hypothesis was tested using inferential statistics. The study found that majority (68%) of the parents were women. Majority 74 (57.8%) of children learnt to speak indigenous language by listening to his /her parents while majority 59 (46.1%) praise their children when they speak indigenous language. Family language frameworks has significant ( $Adj.R^2=0.215, P=0.000$ ) influence on language preservation. The study concluded that homes, parents are the best platforms for inculcating indigenous languages into children. It is there recommended that parents should encourage children in speaking indigenous language at home by speaking to them.

**Keywords:** Indigenous languages, Language preservation, language framework, language policy.

## **Introduction**

Language has been in existence since the creation of the universe. It is of a great importance in human existence. Literally, language is a system of conventional spoken, manual (signed), or written symbols by means of which human beings as members of a social group and participants in its culture, express themselves (Robert, & Crystal, 2020). It is also a system of communication which consists of a set of sounds and written symbols which are used by the people of a particular country or region for talking or writing. Language can either be indigenous or non-indigenous. It is indigenous when it naturally exists in a place or country rather than arriving from another place. It means that anything indigenous is not imported. Rather, it exists and handed over from one generation to another. On the other hand, language is considered non-indigenous when borrowed or imported from other countries or cultures. An indigenous language is a language that is native to a region and spoken by indigenous people, often reduced to the status of a minority language. These languages would be from a linguistically distinct community that has been settled in the area for many generations". Indigenous language is a language of a particular group of people occupying an area uses to communicate within themselves which is passed from generation to another. They are famously known of such language by other communities around them.

Indigenous language is synonymous with native language, mother tongue and first language, a language that is original to a people, native to a locality and part of its culture is considered to be an indigenous language (Ugwu, & Ogunremi, 2019). Globally, there are more than 7000 known indigenous languages (Babinski, Jewell, Haakman, Kim, Lake, Yi, & Bown, 2021). Each one of these languages embodies a culture, a way of thinking and perceiving, a way of organizing and sharing knowledge, and the history of a people and the environment they live in (Radcliffe, & Parissi, 2022). In Africa alone, there are over 3,000 indigenous languages as the continent comprises various cultures and ethnic groups. The most popular spoken indigenous languages in the Africa continent are Arabic, Somali, Berber, Amharic, Oromo, Igbo, Swahili, Hausa, Manding, Fulani, Yoruba, Zulu and Shona which are spoken by about tens of millions of people and are widely used for inter-ethnic communication (Fitzgerald, 2021). The main language spoken in Southwest Nigerian is Yoruba.

Like all other African languages, the Yoruba language is being eroded by the dominance of foreign languages, especially the English language. The Yoruba language is gradually being subsumed by the English language which is seen as superior and the language of the elite. Today, many schools are no longer teaching Yoruba language to their students. This idea is also supported by the parents who are no longer speaking Yoruba language to their children in the home even though they are living in Yoruba dominated communities. In this case, the remaining fluent speakers of the language are generally the older members of the community, and when they pass on, the language may die out with them. The continued erosion of these language by the popularity of 'foreign' languages such as English and French has led to the call for its preservation.

English and French languages are considered as the official languages in Nigeria. The English language is the first official language in Nigeria while French is recognized as the second official language. The emergence of the English language in Nigeria could be traced to the colonization of the Nigerian economy by the British government in the mid-1800s. The Nigeria colonial history has in part shaped the situation in which English language is dominant in the country (Obukadeta, 2019). During the colonization period, Nigerian indigenous languages interacted with the English language (that is, the colonialists language) to an extent that the English language was more favored that it became the language of colonial administration. At independence, the English language was bestowed to Nigeria as a country due to fact that it was the only language used for administration, missionary work and education (Ajepe, & Ademowo, 2016). Besides, after acquiring independence, Nigeria has not been able to have language policies that could create functions for the indigenous languages<sup>18</sup>. Since the colonial era, the use of English language has become conspicuous.

Presently, the language has been seen in Nigeria as language of education, legal system, telecommunication and technology. It is the language of government, commerce and industry and the language of print and electronic media. It is also the language used in religious settings like churches, where sermons are delivered in English language and later interpreted into the local languages. A scholar affirmed the place of English language in Africa holding that “of the entire heritage left behind by the British, at the end of the colonial administration, probably, none is more important than the English language” (Iwuala, 2021).

Due to the significant roles of the English language, it has become expedient for every Nigerian that deems it fit to be socially, economically and politically relevant to learn and acquire some appreciable knowledge of English. This therefore explains the reason both the literate and non-literate have a great respect for anyone who has an admirable proficiency in English (Uwen, Bassey, & Nta, 2020). In fact, educated Nigerians who are deficient in their mastery of English and some of the uneducated lot make frantic efforts through private tuition to learn it. In recent time, communication in English language has gained popularity and wide usage in Nigeria particularly in the urban communities. Over 60 million people in the country speak English language (Uwen, Bassey, & Nta, 2020).

In contrast, majority of the Africa indigenous languages have continued to struggle for survival in the face of the threats from these European languages (that is, English, French, and Portuguese). This does not exclude Nigerian indigenous language such as Yoruba, Igbo and Hausa languages that have been seriously jeopardized and still continue to trudge on. A substantial number of Nigerians passes-on only very elementary understanding of their indigenous languages to their children. It is quite unpleasant that Nigerian cultures (beliefs, ideologies, customs and norms) are deteriorating in recent times. For instance, the Yoruba cultures such as greetings (kneeling down and prostrating for elders), chastity (virginity), dressing (traditional attires such as Aso Oke, Dansiki and others), moonlight

folktales and traditional hairstyles for females are now considered outdated (Olajoke, & Oluwapelumi, 2018).

However, large number of children and youth nowadays cannot fluently speak their mother tongue languages. This is an indication that the family framework are discouraging the use of indigenous language in nurturing their offspring. The attitude of parents to the use of indigenous language has not been encouraging. A plethora of parents considers English language superior to their indigenous language in nurturing their children. Most children are spoken to in the English language from birth. Hence, the English language becomes the first language of most children in Nigeria.

When it comes to indigenous languages, it is just not possible to overlook the cultural elements involved. Indigenous language is a tool for evaluating and shaping people's culture.

Nothing else other than language itself has such a capability and if it is changed in any way, the very same effect can be observed in culture as well. Indigenous language is directly related to human relations, traditions, customs, and even cuisine itself. Once an indigenous language is forgotten, all these along with history and more will be forgotten with it. In line with this, scholars have explored the role of family language frameworks in preserving indigenous languages such as the Yoruba language.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- 2 To determine the family language framework existing in Ibadan North West Local Government, Oyo State, Nigeria.
- 3 To determine the influence of family language framework on preservation of indigenous language existing in Ibadan North West local government, Oyo state, Ibadan, Nigeria.

### **Research Question**

1. What are the family language framework existing in Ibadan North West Local Government, Oyo State, Nigeria?

### **Research Hypothesis**

**H<sub>0</sub>1.** There will be no significant influence of family language framework (FLF) on preservation of indigenous language in Ibadan North West Local Government Area of Oyo State.

### **Literature Review**

Language is the mind sport and soul of a people (Lo Bianco, 2020). Therefore, every effort must be made to protect, preserve, promote and practice our indigenous languages. Language users must gather unto the circle all the knowledge, wisdom, and energy they possess to ensure their survival. Over the years, various programs, projects, policies and linguists have been initiated and attempted to keep our languages alive. For instance, Igbo's indigenes' writers like Chinua Achebe, Olaudah Equiano, Elechi

Amadi, CyrianEkwensi, Flora Nwankpa, Onuoha Nzekwu, Anezi Okoro, Adiele Afigbo, V.C. Uchendu, Buchi Emecheta and many others have done the nation proud by the quality of their output that have brought awareness of Igbo life and culture to the whole world. We must be grateful and especially recognize and thank these elders and language teachers for their perseverance in efforts to save our languages despite the lack of support given to them.

However, to save what remains of our languages, it is important that we preserve them immediately by recording on audio tape, video tape all our fluent speakers, most of whom are our elders (Ferguson, & Weaselboy, 2020). We must capture the purest oral forms of our language to ensure that they will be available to future generations. According to a scholar, today it may not be important to many of our people to speak their ancestral languages, when the “wake-up” call does come, as I am sure it will, the languages that we “bank” now will make possible a new period of cultural renaissance among our people<sup>2</sup>. However, the very act of recording our languages may produce the spark that inspires the community to begin the process of language revival and maintenance. To save our languages, there is need to ensure that our people know why our languages are nearing extinction and why our languages are so important to our lives and to whom we are.

The family and the community must be responsible for this not only for the school alone if we must achieve this goal. Federal government of Nigeria, through the NPES 1981, 1998, 2004, 2007 and 2013 should after rearrangement of subjects in the curriculum at different levels of primary and secondary education according to the 2013 edition, “accommodate... recent developments in the context of the transformational agenda” of 2012 for the 4-year strategic plan for the development of the education sector 2011-2015. This will go a long way to cushion the problem of curriculum reform and implementation of mother tongue usage in primary and junior secondary schools and encourage National Institute for Nigerians to kick off its mandate of producing language teachers in Nigerian languages. If this is done our languages will be saved. Finally, we must work together as a family, community or on a nation. We must take stock of where we stand in respect to our languages. If we are preaching for languages save, the family, community or the nation must be prepared to do its part very well. We must each help to get the language families together to make long range decisions about our languages. When we get these done, we can then expect a better life for ourselves and for the future generations.

Parents can preserve language by speaking the language proper. A child learns about relationships, manners, self-esteem and royalty by watching and participating in the family. Parents can teach values by sharing family stories, setting boundaries serving others in their own language because the child spends most of his or her time in the home. It can also happen through formal classroom education as well as through informal social networks media and other mediums of culture. Though school counts, but home is more lasting over the years. The family must know the effect of language and so nurture the young generation. Language is the ultimate symbol of belonging. When people lose their

language they are essentially losing their way of life, thought, value, and particular human reality. For instance, when language is taken away from a people's culture, their greetings, curses, praises, laws, literature songs, riddles, proverbs, wisdom, prayers are taken away<sup>1</sup>.

Based on the role of the family in both language acquisition and socialization, micro-level investigations of language practices within the family and around childrearing in general have long been the focus of sociolinguistic enquiry. However it was only relatively recently that researchers turned to the family as a key domain for studies relating to minority language maintenance. Most recently, the exploration of such issues has mostly occurred within a Family Language Policy (FLP) framework, and has given rise to a rapidly developing body of literature that gives consideration to the institutional character of the family as a site of language policy by bringing together two previously distinct areas of enquiry, child language acquisition and language policy distinct areas of enquiry, child language acquisition and language policy (Hollebeke, Struys, & Agirdag, 2020).

Family language policy is defined as “a deliberate attempt at practicing a particular language use pattern and particular literacy practices within home domains and among family members”. This involves explorations of the home domain through an analysis of language beliefs or ideologies, language practices and language management (Smith-Christmas, & Smith-Christmas, 2016). This is one of the three core components of original language policy model. As part of that framework, the author defined the language practices of a speech community as “the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire”, its language beliefs or ideology as “the beliefs about language and language use”, and language management as any specific effort to modify or influence practices “by any kind of language intervention, planning or management”. These three components are strongly interrelated in that language practices are influenced by ideologies and sometimes they lead to language management.

## **Methodology**

The survey research design will be used in this study. The sample size for this study is one hundred and fifty parents (150) of pupils from the three selected private primary schools. Total enumeration was used. A structured questionnaire adapted from various studies is used as the main instrument for data collection. Data was analyzed descriptively using tables and simple percentages. The null hypothesis was tested at 0.05 significant level using regression analysis.

## **Analysis and Discussion of Findings**

The questionnaire return rate was 128 of 150 making 85.3%.

From the demographic analysis, it was shown that 41 respondents (representing 32% of the total respondents) were male while 87 were female (indicating 68% of the total respondents). This is an indication that mothers are more engaged in pupils' school affairs than fathers which implies that they

are more frequent at their children's school activities compare to the fathers. It was also revealed that that the respondents who were Yorubas were 106 (representing 82.8% of the total respondents), Igbo tribe were 20 (representing 15.6% of the total respondents) and Hausa tribe were 2 (representing 1.6% of the total respondents). This might be due to the fact that the study area is largely populated by Yoruba tribes.

**Table 1.1. Analysis of Respondents on Language Preservation and Family Settings**

SN	Language Preservations	SA	A	D	SD
Panel A	<b>Imitation (LPI)</b>				
LPI1	My child has learnt to speak indigenous language by listening to his/her Siblings	43 (33.6%)	57 (44.5%)	18 (14.1%)	10 (7.8%)
LPI2	My child has learnt to speak indigenous language by listening to his /her parents	74 (57.8%)	51 (39.8)	3 (2.3%)	-
LPI3	My child has learnt to speak indigenous language by interacting with neighbours and relatives	27 (21.1%)	51 (39.8%)	37 (28.9%)	13 (10.2%)
LPI4	My child has learnt to speak indigenous language by watching indigenous language movies	20 (15.6%)	45 (35.2%)	43 (33.6%)	20 (15.6%)
LPI5	My child has learnt to speak indigenous language by listening to indigenous language music	27 (21.1%)	51 (39.8%)	33 (25.8%)	17 (13.3%)
	<b>Reinforcement (LPR)</b>				
LPR1	My child is always praised when he/she speaks indigenous language correctly	58 (45.3%)	59 (46.1%)	10 (7.8%)	1 (0.8%)
LPR2	My child is encouraged to speak indigenous language at home	68 (53.1%)	48 (37.5%)	10 (7.8%)	2 (1.6%)
LPR3	My child has learnt to encourage others to speak indigenous language	19 (14.8%)	50 (39.1%)	50 (39.1%)	9 (7.0%)

LPR4	My child is not ashamed of speaking indigenous language to strangers or visitors in our home	51 (39.8%)	55 (43.0%)	18 (14.1%)	4 (3.1%)
	<b>Family Language Policy Belief (FLPB)</b>				
FLPB1	Multilingual children do better at school than monolingual children	40 (31.2%)	37 (28.9%)	33 (25.8%)	18 (14.1%)
FLPB2	Multilingual children make friends more easily than monolingual children	34 (26.6%)	58 (45.3%)	29 (22.7%)	7 (6.5%)
FLPB3	Multilingual children have a stronger bond with their family more than monolingual children	28 (21.9%)	38 (29.7%)	46 (35.9%)	16 (12.5%)
FLPB4	Multilingual children are more confident than monolingual children	28 (21.9%)	44 (34.4%)	41 (32.0%)	15 (11.7%)
	<b>Family Language Policy Practice (FLPP)</b>				
FLPP1	My child(ren) are exposed to indigenous language at home	66 (51.6%)	50 (39.1)	10 (7.8%)	2 (01.6%)
FLPP2	I speak indigenous language with my children at home	54 (42.2%)	60 (46.9%)	11 (8.6%)	3 (2.3%)
FLPP3	Grandparents on both sides speak indigenous language with my children	65 (50.8%)	55 (43.0%)	6 (4.7%)	2 (1.6%)
FLPP4	Indigenous language is spoken by my child and his/her siblings	39 (30.5%)	62 (48.4%)	26 (20.3%)	1 (0.8%)
FLPP5	Me and my partner speak indigenous language among ourselves	75 (58.6%)	45 (35.2%)	8 (6.2%)	-
	<b>Family Language Policy Management (FLPM)</b>				

FLPM1	My partner and I discussed the language or languages in which we want to raise our children	37 (28.9%)	56 (43.8%)	26 (20.3%)	9 (7.0%)
FLPM2	Our family has clear agreement on the language we use	34 (26.6%)	53 (41.4%)	34 (26.6%)	7 (5.5%)
FLPM3	I am conscious of the language or languages I use at home	43 (33.6%)	57 (44.5%)	22 (17.2%)	6 (4.7%)

Source: Field Survey, 2023

### Imitation as a means of Language Preservation

Table 1.1 presents the findings regarding language preservation and its connection to family dynamics. It is evident that children often acquire their indigenous language through exposure to their siblings, with 57 respondents (44.5%) agreeing and 43 respondents (33.6%) strongly agreeing that children learn their indigenous language (IL) by listening to their siblings. This consensus is supported by a total of 100 respondents, while a minority of 28 respondents (18, 14.1%) disagreed and 10 respondents (7.8%) strongly disagreed. Notably, a significant number of participants emphasized that children primarily learn their indigenous language from their parents. A substantial majority of 74 respondents (57.8%) strongly agreed, and 51 respondents (39.8%) agreed that children acquire IL by listening to their parents communicate in the language. In contrast, a minimal 3 respondents (2.3%) disagreed, and none expressed strong disagreement. Regarding the influence of neighbors and relatives, 27 respondents (21.1%) strongly agreed, 51 respondents (39.8%) agreed, 37 respondents (28.9%) disagreed, and 13 respondents (10.2%) strongly disagreed that children learn IL by interacting with those around them. This implies that children also gather their linguistic skills by engaging in conversations with neighbors and relatives. The results further demonstrate that children learn their indigenous language through exposure to media, such as movies and music. For instance, 20 respondents (15.6%) strongly agreed, 45 respondents (35.2%) agreed, 43 respondents (33.6%) disagreed, and 20 respondents (15.6%) strongly disagreed about children acquiring IL from watching indigenous language movies. Similarly, 27 respondents (21.1%) strongly agreed, 51 respondents (39.8%) agreed, 33 respondents (25.8%) disagreed, and 17 respondents (13.3%) strongly disagreed that children learn their indigenous language by listening to indigenous language music. In summary, the data highlights that children predominantly learn their indigenous language through their family interactions, specifically from their siblings and parents. Moreover, exposure to neighbors, relatives, movies, and music also contributes to children's acquisition of their indigenous language.

### **Reinforcement means of Language Preservation**

The respondents who always praise their children when IL is spoken correctly are 58 (45.3%) strongly agreed, 59(46.1%) agreed, 10 (7.8%) disagreed and 1 (0.8%) strongly disagreed. This indicates that IL can be preserved by motivating children when they speak their IL appropriately since the percentage of the respondents who favourably answer the question that is [58 (45.3%) strongly agreed and 59(46.1%) agreed] is greater than that of the respondents who oppose the motive. Those whose children are encouraged to speak IL at home are: 68 (53.1%) strongly agreed, 48 (37.5%) agreed, 10 (7.8%) disagreed and 2 (1.6%) strongly disagreed. This implies that larger percentage (53.1% plus 37.5 % =90.6%) of the respondents speak IL more often at home than the percentage of those who disagreed and strongly disagreed (7.8% plus 1.6% = 9.4%). The respondents whose children have learnt to encourage others to speak IL are 19 (14.8%) strongly agreed, 50 (39.1%) agreed, 50 (39.1%) disagreed and 9 (7.0%) strongly disagreed.

Those whose children are not ashamed to speak IL to strangers or visitors at home are 51 (39.8%) strongly agreed, 55 (43.0%) agreed, 18 (14.1%) disagreed and 4 (3.1%) strongly disagreed. This means the children of the majority of the respondents are confident to speak IL to faces they are not familiar with than the children of the minority respondents.

### **For Language Policy Belief:**

The respondents who strongly agreed that multilingual children do better at school than monolingual children are 40 (31.2%) strongly agreed, 37 (28.9%) agreed, 33 (25.8%) disagreed and 18 (14.1%) strongly disagreed. This means most of the respondents support the notion that children who speak and understand more than one language perform better in their academics than those who understand and speak one language. Respondents who believe that multilingual children make friends more easily than monolingual children are 34 (26.6%) strongly agreed, 58 (45.3%) agreed, 29 (22.7%) disagreed and 7 (6.5%) strongly disagreed. The indication of this is that children who speak and understand more than one language relates with their peers well than those who speak and understand only one language. Those who believe that multilingual children have a stronger bond with their family more than monolingual children are 28 (21.9%) strongly agreed, 38 (29.7%) agreed, 46 (35.9%) disagreed and 16 (12.5%) strongly disagreed which means being very close to the family members has nothing to do with the number of language children speak. Respondents who believe that multilingual children are more confident than monolingual children are 28 (21.9%) strongly agreed, 44 (34.4%) agreed, 41 (32.0%) disagreed and 15 (11.7%) strongly disagreed. This suggests that speaking and understanding more than one language makes children bold and believe in themselves compared to children who speak only one language.

**For Family Language Policy Practice:**

Respondents whose children are exposed to IL at home are 66 (51.6%) strongly agreed, 50 (39.1%) agreed, 10 (7.8%) disagreed and 2 (1.6%) strongly disagreed which is an indication that majority of the children live in an environment where IL is spoken often. Those who speak IL with their children at home are 54 (42.2%) strongly agreed, 60 (46.9%) agreed, 11 (8.6%) disagreed and 3 (2.3%) strongly disagreed which is an indication that majority of the children often speak IL at home. Respondents whose grandparents from both sides speak IL with their children are 65 (50.8%) strongly agreed, 55 (43.0%) agreed, 6 (4.7%) disagreed and 2 (1.6%) strongly disagreed. This indicates that the grandparents of majority of the children of the respondents valued their IL and would not trade it with foreign language or probably most of them are not educated to have fully embraced foreign language. Those whose children speak IL with their siblings are 39 (30.5%) strongly agreed, 62 (48.4%) agreed, 26 (20.3%) disagreed and 1(0.8%) strongly disagreed. So to say, the result of this question shows that majority of the children of the respondents learn IL greatly by interacting with their siblings. Respondents who speak IL with their partners are 75 (58.6%) strongly agreed, 45 (35.2%) agreed, 8 (6.2%) disagreed and none strongly disagreed which indicate that speaking IL among couples help the children of the respondents to learn and understand it better.

**Family Language Policy Management:**

Respondents who discussed with their partners, the language or languages in which they want to raise their children are 37 (28.9%) strongly agreed, 56 (43.8%) agreed, 26 (20.3%) disagreed and 9 (7.0%) strongly disagreed. This shows that couples who agree on the language to interact with at home help the children a great deal in learning and understanding the picked language than the children of the couple who didn't discussed the clear language to be used. Those whose families have clear agreement on the language they speak are 34 (26.6%) strongly agreed, 53 (41.4%) agreed, 34 (26.6%) disagreed and 7 (5.5%) strongly disagreed. This is an indication that families who have a clear agreement on the language they use to raise their children greatly help their children to learn IL. Respondents who are conscious of the language they use at home are 43 (33.6%) strongly agreed, 57 (44.5%) agreed, 22 (17.2%) disagreed and 6 (4.7%) strongly disagreed which is an indication that being conscious in speaking IL at home with the children of the respondents has really helped their children to improve their learning of IL.

**Testing of Hypothesis**

**Family Language Setting will not have significant influence on Language preservation**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.470 <sup>a</sup>	.221	.215	.40858

a. Predictors: (Constant), FAMILYSETTING

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.974	1	5.974	35.789	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	21.034	126	.167		
	Total	27.008	127			

a. Predictors: (Constant), FAMILYSETTING

b. Dependent Variable: LANGPRESERVATION

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.039	.163		6.383	.000
FAMILYSETTING	.487	.081	.470	5.982	.000

a. Dependent Variable: LANGPRESERVATION

The model above explains around 22.1% of the variance in the dependent variable (language preservation). Adjusted R-squared is approximately 0.215, considering the complexity of the model. The standard error of estimate is about 0.409, indicating the accuracy of predictions.

ANOVA: The regression model is significant ( $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ), indicating it explains variance beyond chance. The sum of squared differences is partitioned into "Regression" (5.974) and "Residual" (21.034). The F-statistic is 35.789, suggesting the model is statistically significant.

### **The constant term contributes 1.039 to the dependent variable.**

The family setting predictor has a coefficient of 0.487, indicating a significant influence.

Both coefficients have low  $p$ -values ( $p < 0.001$ ), showing their statistical significance. In summary, the regression model, particularly the predictor family setting, significantly affects the dependent variable language preservation. The model as a whole is statistically significant and explains a notable portion of the variance in language preservation. Therefore, the null hypothesis that family language framework will not have significant influence of language policy is hereby rejected.

### **Summary of findings**

The study established that family language policy and family language practice had significant positive correlation with language preservation, while family language management had insignificant positive correlation with language preservation. Overall, the study confirmed that family settings had significant positive correlation with language preservation.

The study showed that family language practice had a positive and significant effect on language preservation at 1% significant level. This implies that a 1% increase in family language practice increases language preservation by about 0.52%, while family language policy and family language management had negligible impact on language preservation. Generally, the study confirmed that family settings had a positive and significant effect on language preservation at 1% significant level, implying that a 1% rise in family setting enhances language preservation.

### **Conclusion**

The preservation of indigenous language is a critical issue that needs to be critically considered and studied. The study adopted primary data which are collected via questionnaires. Adopting correlation and regression analysis method, the study confirmed that family settings promote language preservation in Nigeria. The outcomes signifies that family settings are key in ensuring that indigenous language in Nigeria are adequately preserved

### **Recommendations**

Family members should ensure that all their children are brought up in their local language. Parents

should ensure that they always communicate with their children particularly those between the ages of 1 to 7 years.

## References

- Ajepe, I. & Ademowo, A.J. *English Language Dominance and the Fate of Indigenous Languages in Nigeria. International Journal of History and Cultural Studies (IJHCS) Volume 2, Issue 4, 2016, PP10-17*
- Babinski, S., Jewell, J., Haakman, K., Kim, J., Lake, A., Yi, I. & Bowern, C., *How usable are digital collections for endangered languages? A review. Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America, 7(1), 2022. p.5219.*
- Ferguson, J. & Weaselboy, M., *Indigenous Sustainable Relations: Considering Land In Language And Language In Land. Current Opinion In Environmental Sustainability, 43, 2020. Pp.1-7.*
- Fitzgerald, C.M., *A framework for Language Revitalization and Documentation. Language, 97(1), 2021. pp.e1-e11.*
- Hollebeke, I., Struys, E. & Agirdag, O., *Can Family Language Policy Predict Linguistic, Socio-Emotional And Cognitive Child And Family Outcomes? A Systematic Review. Journal Of Multilingual And Multicultural Development, 2020. Pp.1-32.*
- Iwuala, Z.C., *Interlingual Borrowing Of Words: A Viable Option For The Emergency Of An Acceptable Lingua-Franca In Nigeria. Journal of Advances in Social Science and Humanities, 7(4), 2021. pp.1724-1728.*
- Lo Bianco, J., *A Meeting Of Concepts And Praxis: Multilingualism, Language Policy And The Dominant Language Constellation. Dominant Language Constellations: A New Perspective On Multilingualism, 2020. Pp.35-56.*
- Obukadeta, F.M. *Language Policy and Planning in the Broadcast Media of a Multilingual Context: A Case Study of Kogi State, Nigeria.* Thesis Dissertation submitted to School of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Sheffield. 2019
- Olajoke, A.S. & Oluwapelumi, A.M., *A Study on the Extinction of Indigenous Languages in Nigeria: Causes and Possible Solutions. Annals of Language and Literature, 2(1), 2018. pp.22-26.*
- Radcliffe, C. & Parissi, C., *Understanding and preserving Indigenous agricultural knowledge: a suggested way forward for future research. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication, (ahead-of-print). 2022.*
- Robert, H.R. & Crystal, D., *Pidgins and Creoles. Language. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 2020.. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/language> accessed 22nd April.*
- Smith-Christmas, C. & Smith-Christmas, C., *What Is Family Language Policy?* Palgrave Macmillan UK. 2016. Pp. 1-19
- Ugwu, E. O., & Ogunremi, P. O. *Nigeria and the Sustainable Development Goals: Why the indigenous*

*languages count. European Scientific Journal*, 15(5), 2019, 52-68.

Uwen, G.S.O., Bassey, V.O. & Nta, E.G., *Emerging Sociolinguistic Teaching Trends of English as a First Language in Nigeria. International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3), 2020. pp.398-407.