

From family language practices to
family language policies:
Children as socializing agents

Mina Kheirkhah



Linköping Studies in Arts and Science No. 676
Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies
Linköping University, Sweden
Linköping 2016

Linköping Studies in Arts and Science ☺ No. 676

At the Faculty of Arts and Science at Linköping University, research and doctoral studies are carried out within broad problem areas. Research is organized in interdisciplinary research environments and doctoral studies mainly in graduate schools. Jointly, they publish the series Linköping Studies in Arts and Science. This thesis comes from the Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies.

Distributed by:

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies

Linköping University

SE-581 83 Linköping

Sweden

Mina Kheirkhah

From family language practices to family language policies:

Children as socializing agents

Edition 1:1

ISBN 978-91-7685-794-6

ISSN 0282-9800

© Mina Kheirkhah, 2016

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies

Cover page photo is taken by Ghazaleh Rajabzadeh

Printed in Sweden by LiU-Tryck, Linköping, Sweden, 2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
The thesis	7
Aims of the study	7
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
Language socialization and family language policy approach.....	9
Research on language policy	10
Practiced language policy in educational settings	11
Studies on family bilingualism and language policy.....	12
Research on language ideologies and parents' language planning	14
Affective and relational factors in family bilingualism.....	15
Monolingual development in bilingual families	16
Research on language practices and parents' strategies in bilingual families	18
Family activities and interactions: Mealtime as a context for the study of family language practices and bilingualism	20
Children's role in shaping family language practices	20
Siblings and family language practices	23
METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	25
Data collection	25
<i>Contact with families</i>	25
<i>Interviews</i>	26
<i>Observations</i>	27
<i>Video recordings</i>	27
Participants	28
<i>Family #1</i>	29
<i>Family #2</i>	29
<i>Family #3</i>	30
<i>Family #4</i>	30
<i>Family #5</i>	31
Data selection and analyses	32

<i>Processing and analyzing the data</i>	32
<i>Translation</i>	33
<i>Transcription key</i>	33
Methodological considerations.....	34
The role of the researcher	35
Ethical considerations.....	37
CONCLUSIONS	38
Findings	38
Implications for future research.....	42
SUMMARIES OF STUDIES.....	44
Study 1: Language maintenance in a multilingual family: Informal heritage language lessons in parent-child interactions	44
Study 2: Language choice negotiations in parent-child interaction: family language policy as a collaborative achievement	46
Study 3: Siblings as language socialization agents in bilingual families.....	48
REFERENCES	50
STUDY I.....	59
STUDY II	89
STUDY III.....	113

Acknowledgements

Four and a half years ago, I started this rewarding, productive, life-changing journey. Many things have happened; many things have changed; many people have come and gone, all of whom have left a souvenir for me on my way. This journey has been filled with moments when I felt lonely and powerless for moving forward. Many people have generously helped me through those moments and shed the light of hope to the darkness I was struggling with.

To begin with, I would like to thank Bengt Sandin, Asta Cekaite, Karin Zetterqvist Nelson for giving me the opportunity of doing a PhD at Child Studies. Special thanks goes to my supervisor, Asta Cekaite who continually assisted me during the whole time. Without her guidance and persistent help, this thesis would have been impossible. I would also like to thank Helena Bani-Shoraka, my co-supervisor for her encouragement and comments on drafts of the thesis. In addition, a thank you to Karin Zetterqvist Nelson, head of the department of Child Studies, who was supportive during my more difficult time and offered her time when I needed to talk.

I am grateful for the PhD group I ended up in, Elin Låby, Mirjam Hagström, Sofia Littmark and Jonathan Josefsson. They were an encouragement for pushing through the courses during the first year as well as during the whole time. All the dinners, coffee breaks and chats gave me energy to continue.

I am wholeheartedly thankful to all the five families who participated in this thesis. They generously opened up their homes to me and made this thesis possible. Their trust and hospitality is really appreciated. I also thank the Iranian union SAM, who welcomed me to their annual meeting and the dinner which provided the opportunity of gaining access to some participants of the study.

I would also like to thank Maziar Yazdan Panah who shared his Kurdish language knowledge with me and helped through the transcription and translation of the Kurdish parts.

I warmly thank all my colleagues at Child Studies who read and commented on my earlier drafts at different seminars. My sincere thanks goes to Nigel Musk who previously introduced me to the field of interactional studies. His comments on my text at my mid seminar and final seminar have been integral to my work. In addition, I appreciate the comments and discussions with Ann-Carita Evaldsson, Francis Hult and Leena Huss at my final seminar.

The cooperation with the project 'Language Policy at Preschools and Families' provided me with valuable insights. Here I should mention Polly Björk Wilén, Sally Boyd, Leena Huss, Ann-Carita Evaldsson, Asta Cekaite, Cajsa Ottesjö, and Tünde Puskas. I would also extend my thanks to all those who commented on my material during SIS (samtals- och interaktionsseminariet) seminars. Thank you Jakob Cromdal, Asta Cekaite, Leelo Keevallik and Matias Broth for organizing them.

Thank you Eva Danielsson, Camilla Junström Hammar, Carin Ennergård, Ian Dickson and Ann-Charlotte Strand for your help in administrative and technical issues.

Thanks to the editors of the edited volume 'Downscaling cultures', Jaspal Singh, Argyro Kantara and Dorottya Cserző for the invitation to write a chapter in their book (Study II) and commenting on the study. Special thanks are addressed to Jaspal for inviting me to the conference in Cardiff, stimulating discussions and helping me through practical issues during the last month.

Thanks to all of those whose presence has supported me in different ways. Thank you Ali Reza Majlesi for the encouragement, Siamak Noroozy for interesting discussions and helping with getting in contact with some of the families, Mehek Muftee, Shayan and all other friends for your support whether it being casual and scientific chats, dinners, coffee breaks, laughs, or technical help. Your support gave me happiness and made the stressful periods bearable. Finally, I extend my love and thanks to my parents for believing in me and with their patience and tolerating the separation made this journey possible.

I dedicate this thesis to all multilingual children and families. I hope this would contribute positively to their everyday lives and language development opportunities.

Stockholm, March 2016

INTRODUCTION

As a result of globalization, for many, intercultural communication, is the norm (Canagarajah, 2013) and multilingual encounters start already in the family (Wei, 2012: 1). However, despite the increased interest in raising children bi/multilingually in immigration contexts (Gafaranga, 2010), even when parents require the child to speak in a specific way/language, children usually become passive bilinguals or dominant in the societal language (Gafaranga, 2010; Luykx, 2005; Tuominen, 1999). Therefore, raising children bi/multilingually and maintaining familial language(s) are parallel concerns of increasing numbers of families. Because access to the heritage language in immigration contexts is usually limited to the immediate family members, family interactions as the child's first and main site for encounters with the heritage language, provide a rich context for the study of language maintenance and shift. Observations of family language practices employing a micro perspective provide a particular analytical focus on the study of family language use and the practices through which/ in which language maintenance and shift are being shaped.

One might consider Sweden to be a monolingual country, however, in practice it is a multilingual country (Boyd, 1985, p. 3; Hult, 2004). The main language is Swedish and there are five official minority languages: Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli, Romani and Sami. There are 150 different languages taught in the Swedish schools during 'home language' classes¹ (Skolverket², academic year 2014/15). Bi/multilingualism is thus a significant characteristic of Swedish society. More than 23% (225,497 people) of school-age children in Sweden have a mother tongue other than Swedish, and many of them start learning Swedish at pre-school (Skolverket, academic year 2014/15).

More than 28% of the current population in Sweden has a foreign background³ or has one foreign-born parent; this amounts to 2,802,519 people (SCB⁴, 2014).

¹ Home language (hemspråk) classes are offered by school to students who have at least one parent who has a native language other than Swedish. Attending these classes is voluntarily.

² The Swedish National Agency for Education

³ People with a foreign background are defined as those who are foreign-born or who were born in Sweden but have two foreign-born parents

(http://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/sv/ssd/START_BE_BE0101_BE0101Q/UtlSvBakgTotNK/table/tableViewLayout1/?rxid=24812345-1e13-426c-89cc-8bee087b5207)

⁴ Statistiska centralbyrån (Statistics Sweden)

There are a considerable number of people with an Iranian background in Sweden⁵: 101194 (SCB, 2014). Persian, the official language of Iran, constitutes the fourth largest minority language taught at ‘home language’ classes in Swedish schools (SCB, 2014). The number of students who have Persian as their heritage language and therefore qualify to attend these classes is 10,849 (SCB, 2014). Studying the language practices of families with Persian as their home language in Sweden can elucidate the processes through which family members practice, maintain, or shift a rather widespread ‘minority’ language.

Iranians are a heterogeneous group with regard to class, ethnicity, and language (Moinian, 2007, p. 120). Different languages are spoken in Iran, including Persian, Gilaki, Azerbaijani, Kurdish, and Balochi. Two political events at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s forced many Iranians to immigrate to Western countries (Namei, 2012, p. 107): the revolution in 1979 and the Iran-Iraq war from 1980 to 1988. After the revolution in 1979, about 2 million Iranians immigrated to other countries (Moianian, 2007, p. 120) including Sweden. The number of Iranians in Sweden increased constantly throughout the 1980s. The largest wave of immigration of Iranians to Sweden was between 1986 and 1990 (Wikström, 2007, p. 80).

During recent years, fewer Iranians have immigrated to Sweden, and the number of Iranian immigrants coming to Sweden annually has decreased to 1,500 individuals (SCB 2010b). Nonetheless, due to the number of children born in Iranian families, the total number of people with an Iranian background has increased (Namei, 2012, p. 109). However, the increased number of people with an Iranian background does not seem to have helped in promoting heritage language maintenance in this group (Namei, 2012, p. 120).

In Sweden, most children attend early educational institutions, and children with parents born outside Sweden come in contact with the societal language at an early age, as they start attending pre-school when they are 2-3 years old. The heritage language(s) is thus primarily used in family interactions, and for the second generation in family contexts – the children – developing bilingualism and maintaining the heritage language is more demanding. However, family interactions, which are the children’s first and main contact with the heritage language(s), have been given little attention in the research.

5

https://www.google.se/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCMQFjAAahUKEwju5K_vmajHAhULGCwKHbjnDpI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scb.se%2FStatistik%2FBE%2FBE0101%2F2014A01J%2FBE0101-Fodelseland-och-ursprungsland.xlsx&ei=Fa3NVa6GGYuwsAG4z7uQCQ&usq=AFQjCNFOSXw62v7RkWNLL3--jFZ7X_oOSA&bvm=bv.99804247.d.bGg

The thesis

The present thesis combines the insights gained from family language policy studies (Fogle, 2013; King et al., 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2012) and language socialization studies (Goodwin, 1996; Ochs, 1996) within the larger field of interactional sociolinguistics. Using detailed analyses of families' spontaneous everyday interactions, it aims to shed light on the role of family language practices in the processes of developing children's bilingualism and heritage language maintenance and shift.

The thesis explores family interactions in Iranian immigrant families in Sweden. The families have Persian, and in one case Kurdish, as their heritage languages. Each of the families has two pre/school-age children who were born in Sweden. In such families, parents have no knowledge of Swedish language upon their arrival to Sweden and they begin learning by attending SFI (Swedish for immigrants) classes afterwards. Children start attending Swedish educational settings from approximately the age of two. The present thesis investigates the language socialization processes and language policies in these families.

Thus far, studies of family language policy, language maintenance and shift have largely focused on societal factors, the school's influence, the language policies of states, parental views and attitudes toward bi/multilingualism and parental strategies for children's language use. Children's language practices and their role as socializing agents in familial interactions and family language policy shaping have received less attention (but see Luykx, 2005; and Paugh, 2005). The present thesis aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of family bilingualism by investigating family language practices, language policies and socialization with a particular focus on children's participation and language choices in family interactions. By analyzing data collected through interviews, observations, and video-recordings of everyday family interactions, the study examines family language practices and policies as they are constituted, negotiated and established in parent-child, and sibling encounters in Iranian families in Sweden.

Aims of the study

The thesis combines insights gained from family language policy studies (Fogle, 2013; King et al, 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2012) and language socialization studies (Ochs, 1996) within the larger field of interactional sociolinguistics. It aims to shed light on the intergenerational context of family bi/multilingualism within the broader processes of heritage language maintenance and shift. Moreover, the thesis furthers the study of families' language practices and children's role in the shaping of family language policy by using detailed analyses of families' recurrent interactions.

Insofar as language use in situ provides an interactional site for language (including heritage language) learning and the development of bilingualism – a detailed analysis of recurrent language practices between family members, including parent-child multiparty and sibling interactions, i.e., everyday language interactions of family members – would seem to be useful in deepening our understanding of the processual aspects of language maintenance or loss. Relatively little work on family bi-/multilingualism and family language policies, however, has examined in detail the interactional practices through which parents' and children's goals and expectations regarding bi-/multilingualism are instantiated as concrete efforts to shape language use and learning outcomes.

Combining approaches to family language policy (King et al, 2008; Spolsky, 2004) with a language socialization approach (Goodwin, 1996; Ochs, 1996), the thesis examines family interactions in five bi/multilingual Iranian families in Sweden. By analyzing families' spontaneous everyday language use, the thesis aims to explore family – parents' and children's – language practices and the ways they contribute to the construction, negotiation and instantiation of family language policies. The role of children's affective stances and that of family members' social relations are taken into account.

The foci of the thesis emerge from viewing and analyzing video-recordings of families' everyday interactions, interviews and observations gathered during two phases of fieldwork (encompassing approximately a one-year period). Considering children's active role in family interactions, the three empirical studies aim to explore parents' heritage language maintenance practices and children's responses to these practices. In addition, the studies aim to examine siblings' contribution to familial language practices. The studies direct attention to the way family language policies are negotiated and shaped among family members in everyday interactions. More specifically, the three empirical studies in the thesis explore the following questions:

- How are parental language policies focused on heritage language maintenance negotiated and instantiated in parent-child interactions?
- How does the child's resistant agency contribute to parental language practices and the development of family language policies over time?
- How do siblings' language practices and language choices, in the process of language socialization, contribute to shaping the family language ecology and bi/multilingualism?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter offers a theoretical background to the field of family language policy. By reviewing the previous research and examining related concepts, the chapter situates the study within the field of family language policy and language socialization.

Language socialization and family language policy approach

The thesis combines a language socialization approach (Ochs, 1996) with a theoretical framework that views family language policies as socially constructed, and as including overt and implicit beliefs and norms that are manifested in and that influence mundane language practices (Shohamy, 2006) on the level of family interaction. According to the language socialization paradigm (Duranti, Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012), children, through participation in a broad range of language practices, are socialized into and acquire the social values and expectations associated with different linguistic codes. However, socialization is not a static top-down process of intergenerational transmission of knowledge: rather, as recently emphasized by this research paradigm, it is dynamic and dialectic (Cekaite, 2012; Duranti et al., 2012; Goodwin, 2006). Children themselves are active agents in forming and negotiating the language policy around them, and their willing participation in adult-initiated practices cannot be assumed (Luykx, 2005). Members of the community – multilingual/monolingual speakers and as family members: parents, children, siblings – use shared, linguistic and embodied, resources to index and negotiate dynamic, heterogeneous, linguistic and social identities, as well as social relations (Cekaite, 2012; De Fina, 2012; Ochs, 1996). Language acquisition and social and cultural socialization are interrelated and they begin the moment someone enters a social community (Ochs, 1996, p. 407). This socialization process, together with language acquisition, constitutes language socialization (Ochs, 1996, p. 407). In other words, language socialization is the process through which children and novices are socialized through language to use language appropriately and meaningfully (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Therefore, language socialization as an approach (under the inclusive umbrella of interactional sociolinguistics; see e.g., Bucholtz & Hall, 2008; Lanza, 1997/2004) can provide a fruitful perspective from which to explore how children are immersed and participate in the language ecology of bilingual families in immigration contexts. Using the principle of indexicality, the language socialization approach embraces macro factors (societal structures, ideologies) as well as the micro level of everyday practices and provides a methodological approach – interaction analysis – to analyzing language practices (Ochs, 1996).

Language socialization, or intergenerational language transmission in family settings, is a complex, multi-directional, and nuanced process (Fishman, 1991). In immigration contexts, language maintenance or loss can start in the context of family interactions (Fishman, 1970; Lanza, 1997/2004; Li Wei, 2012, p. 1). With migration to a new country, family members from different generations tend to adopt different attitudes toward languages. Members of immigrant minority families usually have access to different language environments and they have different language experiences from these contexts. For instance, parents usually come to the new country and are exposed to the societal language in their adult years, whereas children have access to the societal language by attending educational settings as early as age of two. Immigrant family members have various experiences of multiple languages, discourses, social domains, and geographical spaces, and bring those together into the everyday life of the family (see Canagarajah, 2008; Pietikainen, 2010, p. 82). The first generation of immigrants tends to maintain their heritage language, while the second generation moves toward a language shift to the language of the society (De Fina, 2012; Fishman, 1970; Straszer, 2011). Families thereby provide a unique intergenerational context for the study of heritage language maintenance or shift (De Fina, 2012; Li Wei, 1994; 2012, p. 1).

In that the field of minority language maintenance and loss regards the family as the driving force in “children’s language socialization within the context of both minority and majority languages” (Schwartz, 2010, p. 173), examination of how families deal with minority-majority languages in their daily life requires paying attention to their everyday language practices. Investigation of family interactions, language choice, language maintenance or shift, which also reflect the impact of social environment in an immigration setting, can provide insights into the language-related aims and goals and the language practices of immigrant families (Spolsky, 2012, p. 6). The present interest in intergenerational communication, and language decisions, behavior and maintenance in immigrant families falls within the scope of research on family language policy (FLP) (Tannenbaum, 2012). Inspired by the general field of language policy research and a range of earlier approaches to children’s bilingualism, the present study identifies and examines multiple factors – language management, ideologies, and practices – that affect families’ development of bi/multilingualism or language shift.

Research on language policy

According to the most recent conceptualization, language policy involves the intersection of multiple layers, such as language ideologies, management and practices (Shohamy, 2006). The use of a certain language (or forms or varieties of languages) in a certain context can be regimented and controlled by language policies. On a macro level, language policy involves “a political decision and a deliberate attempt to change/influence/affect the various aspects of language practices and the status of one or more languages in a given society” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009, p. 352) and it can be articulated, for instance, in official state documents, that establish a country’s official language (Spolsky, 2004, p. 11). Language ideologies are conceptualized as “the values and statuses” assigned to particular languages or

language varieties; for instance, a high value may be assigned to the national, regional, or heritage language (Spolsky, 2008, p. 4). Language ideologies are usually considered to be the underlying forces in language management and practices (King, 2000, p. 169; King et al., 2008). There is usually more than one ideology in a community (Spolsky, 2004), and the conflicts between ideologies are therefore the focus of language policy studies (King et al., 2008, p. 911). Various ideologies, such as linguistic purity or foreignness, can be exploited and invoked in overt and covert ways in an effort to influence language management and practices. Language management is viewed as the explicit effort to modify and manipulate others' language practices and beliefs (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Spolsky, 2008, p. 4). In a state context, language management involves the act of assigning a national language or a language of education (Spolsky, 2004, p. 8). The 'top-down', overt formulations and implementation of macro-level (state or educational) language policies have been in focus in much of the language policy research and studies of the language policies of state or institutional – educational and workplace – settings (King et al., 2008; Spolsky, 2012).

Language practices, i.e., observable language behaviors and language choices occurring in, for instance, social interaction, provide a context for language use and language learning (Spolsky, 2008) and are influenced by a group's or an individual's (language) ideologies (Shohamy, 2006, p. xv). They can be managed and controlled implicitly and explicitly through a range of actions. In that, language management efforts (at least to some extent) are articulated and instantiated through language practices, and provide certain language input or strategies (Ren & Hu, 2013), language practices can be viewed as partially overlapping with language management efforts (e.g., language choice, corrections) (King et al., 2008, p. 911). Spolsky (2007, p. 4) suggests that speakers infer implicit rules regarding the appropriate language use in a certain context, and it is in this way particular language practices can influence speakers' further language use. A better understanding of how language policy works can therefore be achieved by investigating what varieties and patterns of language use are established in the context of particular language ideologies and management efforts (Bonacina, 2010; 2012; Shohamy, 2006, p. xv;). In order to understand the interaction between micro and macro social domains and the way they influence each other, 'bottom-up' forces need to be studied to the same extent as 'top-down' forces (Spolsky, 2012, p. 3).

Practiced language policy in educational settings

In recent years, language policy researchers have directed their attention to the 'bottom-up' forces (e.g., Bonacina, 2010; Papageorgiou, 2009), arguing and demonstrating that language policies are practiced and negotiated in interactions in all social domains, even when there is no explicit law requiring such policies (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; King et al., 2008; Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2012). Bonacina (2012, p. 216) foregrounds a "practiced language policy" approach that emphasizes actual language practices. She defines practiced language policy as

“implicit and deducible rules of language choice from which speakers draw upon in an interaction” (Bonacina, 2012, p. 218), suggesting that “language policy can be interactionally constructed in practice” (Bonacina, 2012, p. 217). In order to investigate the implicit rules manifested in language use, detailed and systematic analysis of social interaction (e.g., the Conversation Analytical approach) can be used.

Such an interactional approach is adopted in Bonacina’s (2010; 2012) studies of language introduction classrooms for newly-arrived immigrant children in France. She shows that, rather than complying with the explicit (what Bonacina calls, ‘declared’) French monolingual language policy, the students also used other (their heritage) languages, thus creating and orienting to a different practiced language policy in their language use in the classroom (Bonacina, 2012, p. 221). Similarly, Amir and Musk (2013; 2014) have examined micro-level language policy-in-process or language policing, that is, “the normative, situated enforcement of a target-language-only policy” in an English as a foreign language classroom in Sweden (Amir & Musk, 2013, p. 1). Their research shows that language policing involved an explicit enactment of English as the only appropriate language for classroom use. When Swedish was used, some students or the teacher switched to English, thus (re)establishing the normatively prescribed language policy. Language policing in interaction included reminders, warnings, and sanctions. Students initiated language policing when other students or the teacher were not following the English-only rule of the classroom. The students initiated corrective acts (e.g., requesting that they ‘speak English’ or explicitly commented ‘you said a Swedish word’).

Studies on family bilingualism and language policy

As an emerging research field, studies on family language policy (FLP) are interdisciplinary and firmly grounded in prior research on family bilingualism. They combine insights from research using sociolinguistic, anthropological, and language socialization approaches, which study child language acquisition, early second language learning and socialization, as well as children’s bilingualism (Boyd, 1985; Caldas, 2006; Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; De Houwer, 2009; Döpke, 1992; Gafaranga, 2010; Huss, 1991; King & Fogle, 2006; 2013; Lanza, 1997/2004; Straszer, 2011). Research on family bilingualism has largely focused on the roles of parental discourse strategies, input and linguistic environment in developing balanced bilingualism in Western middle-class families. Current approaches to FLP are interested in understanding how and why families maintain and develop various languages, primarily paying attention to heritage and generally, minority, language maintenance (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). They have broadened the perspective by including various types of families from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, e.g., non-middle class (Hill & Hill, 1986), binational families (Ogierman, 2013), families with adopted children (Fogle, 2012), and families with an endangered language background (Patrick et al., 2013).

In general, FLP research seeks to understand why some children grow up to be bilinguals and some monolinguals, and how this is related to the ways in which parents promote or discourage children's use of a particular (usually heritage) language (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Thereby, FLP research focuses on parents' efforts to "preserve heritage language by modifying their children's language development" (Spolsky, 2012, p. 7). Similar to the general field of language policy research, the FLP approach embraces multiple factors – language management, ideologies and practices – and conceptualizes family as a micro social institution that is in interaction with the macro society and other societal institutions (Canagarajah, 2008, p. 170; Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). The sociolinguistic ecology within and outside the family as well as parents' beliefs regarding language strategies influence language management efforts and the home language choice (Spolsky, 2009, p. 18).

A significant focus of the FLP studies is family language ideologies, i.e. beliefs about language and language use. Language ideologies can foreground the importance of maintaining the heritage language(s), and emphasize the need to control and even forbid the use of the societal language at home or, on the contrary, allow bilingual practices (e.g., the use of societal and heritage languages). Language ideologies are conceptualized as the driving force in family language management (practical efforts to modify language use) (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; 2013; King et al., 2008). Language management is defined as parental/caregivers' attempts to provide children with linguistic resources in order to enhance their language learning. Such attempts may involve travels to the country of origin, enrolling children in home language classes, visiting heritage language speakers (e.g., relatives) and, importantly, using the target language in interactions with children (Spolsky, 2004, p. 8).

Spolsky (2009, p. 24) suggests that controlling the home language environment, selecting children's peers, allowing or forbidding TV and computers are examples of explicit language management strategies. Such decisive control of the language environment is argued to be effective in children's language socialization in that it aims to determine the language(s) the child should use in the family (Spolsky, 2009, p. 17). In situations where a family member dislikes the language use of another member, s/he might initiate organized language management by, for instance, consciously discouraging specific language use patterns or by giving explicit instructions (Spolsky, 2009, p. 16). Such conceptualizations of language management strongly foreground parents' authority and control by planning and actively shaping children's activities and language use, and are less focused on children's own perspectives and actions.

Language practice in families involves the varieties and patterns of language use that are established in the context of particular language ideologies. A more detailed description of language practices is presented in the section 'Research on language practices and parents' language strategies in bilingual families'.

Research on language ideologies and parents' language planning

A significant part of the research on family language policies has argued for and highlighted the importance of language ideologies and their impact on parental language planning/language management efforts. Parental consistency in following through with language policy, it is argued, builds the ground for promoting children's bilingual development and lack of attention to language planning can lead to language shift (Spolsky, 2009). This motivates researchers in the FLP field to focus on families', and primarily parents', language ideologies and to study the relationship between ideologies and family language policies, including the ways in which language ideologies affect families' language management. Interviews or questionnaires are usually used to gain insights into parental perspectives.

Parents' experiences of migration and language learning, societal and educational ideologies have been shown to have a significant impact on their decisions and the shaping of their attempts to promote children's bilingualism (Caldas, 2012; Curdt-Christiansen, 2013; King & Fogle, 2006; Piller, 2001). The effect of public discourses about the benefits and drawbacks of bilingualism on parents' decisions and language planning has, for instance, been examined in a study of English-speaking mothers living in Germany (Piller, 2001). The mothers' self-reports and interviews showed that parents who planned to raise their children bilingually (preserving the heritage language) were familiar with the popularized research on bilingualism. They were also informed by media depictions of the positive and 'normal' aspects of being bilingual (in contrast to the previously negative view of bilingualism).

Parents' own – multilingual – language experiences have been shown to have an impact on families' language approach and management. As demonstrated by Kirsch (2012) in an interview-based study of Luxembourgish mothers in the US (examining parents' language beliefs, expectations regarding children's language skills, personal experiences of language use, and transmission strategies), mothers had positive attitudes toward bilingualism because of their own multilingual experiences and competencies, formed by the language environment of Luxembourg. They wished for their children to acquire similar multilingual skills (Kirsch, 2012, p. 108). Their planning of language management involved strategies for using Luxembourgish and dealing with children's language mixing (use of two languages in the same interactional context).

Parental language ideologies are also influenced by professional advice (suggesting, e.g., the use of target language books and training) and advice from family members (King et. al., 2008, p. 913). Parents' beliefs and decisions are also affected by public discourses that stretch beyond language ideologies and deal with the positive or negative effects of bi-/multilingualism. For instance, King and Fogle (2006), in their study of family bilingualism, show that cultural notions concerning what is regarded as a 'good' or 'bad' parent affected parents' views and plans for children's (linguistic) upbringing. Some communities may consider raising children bilingually to be bad parenting and others may consider it good parenting (King & Fogle, 2006, p. 697). Parents in the study considered bilingualism

as an advantage and also a benefit for maintaining the cultural background and promoting economic opportunities (King & Fogle, 2006, p. 700). They viewed themselves as good parents who offered their children the ‘gift’ of bilingual opportunities.

Language management in families is also motivated by parents’ expectations about their children’s language and literacy development (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). As a language management resource, parents can enroll children in educational institutions that promote certain languages, provided such institutions are available where they live. Such decisions can be made on the basis of the parents’ assessments of their children’s language development (directing their choices of monolingual vs. bilingual preschool education) and their notions of what constitutes good conditions for children’s language acquisition (e.g., learning the societal language in immigration contexts, Schwartz & Moin, 2012).

Thus, as the FLP approach argues, language ideologies play a significant role in language policy and language acquisition. However, heritage language development is not an easy process, although minority-language parents may be willing to maintain their heritage language in the family (King & Fogle, 2006, p. 696). Thus, as demonstrated by several studies, it is highly probable that children will become dominant in the societal language (King & Fogle, 2006; Tuominen, 1999), and even in OPOL (one-parent, one-language) families where each parent uses his or her language with the child (Döpke, 1992), children most often become passive bilinguals (Döpke, 1992; Yamamoto, 2001). Parental language decisions alone are not sufficient to achieve the development of children’s bilingualism (Kirsch, 2012). Other significant factors involve parental consistency in implementing particular policies, children’s age, and support from the societal and educational context (Döpke, 1998; Lanza, 1997/2004). For instance, as demonstrated by Piller (2006) in her study of bilingual English-German couples, interviews with mothers and data from discussions of online forums regarding bilingual upbringing of their children, all parents planned to raise their children bilingually. However, these goals were not achieved in each case and some children became dominant in the societal language despite parents’ explicit planning. Therefore, how various components – ideologies, management and practices – interact with each other (King et al., 2008; Schwartz, 2010, p. 186) and how the interactional locus of language learning – language practices – is shaped and organized require more empirical attention (King et al., 2008, p. 917; Ren & Hu, 2013).

Affective and relational factors in family bilingualism

Whereas a considerable number of studies have been devoted to and have outlined and foregrounded language ideologies as important factors affecting parents’ decisions, few studies thus far have considered the emotional and relational factors informing FLP decisions (but see Pavlenko, 2004; Smolicz, 1992; Tannenbaum, 2012). These studies have directed attention to the sociocultural and emotional perspectives informing and articulated in parental views about bilingualism and

the values parents ascribe to different languages (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; 2013; King et al., 2008). Tannenbaum (2012) reviews studies on FLP and argues that the findings indicate that choices about family languages may be emotionally motivated. Parents may choose to maintain heritage language and aim to achieve children's bilingualism in order to create strong family ties and contribute to the emotionally positive social relations between different generations of family members. Such a view aligns with Pavlenko's (2004) conceptualization that heritage language/first language has particularly important emotional values for its speakers and that it serves as an appropriate medium for conveying intimate emotions and rich affective repertoires. Heritage language maintenance is therefore suggested to be significant for promoting family ties and close parent-child relations (Tannenbaum, 2012). Familial language tends to be viewed as a close medium for representing one's cultural identity: it is associated with positive emotions, stories, laughter and intimacy in social life (Guardado, 2008).

The importance of positive emotions in families can influence family practices and language choices in various ways. In order to show their positive affective alignment with parents, children may adapt to parents' language requirements. They may also move toward the societal language. Especially older children, who experience peer influence in, for instance, majority language educational settings, may be motivated to use and feel more closely related to the societal language (Caldas, 2006). Moreover, parental ideologies to raise their children bilingually, while at the same time bonding with them emotionally and accommodating their language choice, may cause tensions in families (Fogle, 2012). If children show resistance to the heritage language, the adults may accommodate to these choices by using the societal language or parallel discourse (i.e., when children use the societal language and parents use their heritage language, Gafaranga, 2010). As demonstrated by Fogle (2012), in an interview study with English-speaking parents, adults accommodated to adoptive Russian-speaking children's choices, refraining from attempts to enforce children's use of the parental language and, by doing this, they acted against their own language ideologies (Fogle, 2012, p. 169). Language maintenance in immigrant/bi-/multilingual families is thus a complex and emotionally charged matter.

Monolingual development in bilingual families

Maintaining heritage language(s) may be one of the multiple language issues families deal with. The language ideologies in play may involve the dominant monolingual organization of society that requires, which family members (children) learn and use the official language in, for instance, educational institutions. Families need to interact with the society in the societal language for career and school opportunities (Tuominen, 1999, p. 60). Factors that contribute to children's monolingual development, have been shown to be dependent on the dominant status of societal languages in various societal arenas. The use of an official language is usually privileged by the national constitution and national policies are rarely (fully) supportive of minority languages (Spolsky, 2004, p. 12). As a result of the

socioeconomic factors (such as career and educational aspirations) and the monolingual norm dominating many societies, immigrant/minority families may aim to promote the development and use of the societal language and provide children with access to the majority language social media and peers, as well as allow use of the societal language in sibling and/or parent-child interactions.

As demonstrated in a sociolinguistic interview study of language maintenance and shift in Iranian families (first and second generation immigrants, 88 Iranian adults and 100 children) in Sweden (Namei, 2012), children were being socialized to use Swedish in the society (at school and with peers) and even at home, mostly via the media and also through interactions with their mothers, who used more Swedish with their children than the fathers did. Namei suggests that sociopsychological reasons, i.e. individual motivations for specific language behavior (e.g. being more involved in children's schooling), were more influential than psychological reasons (e.g., positive feelings about the home country and heritage language) in the process of language shift in families (Namei, 2012, p. 213) and that they contributed to children's use and preference for Swedish.

Moreover, the shape of language management efforts is multifaceted and multidirectional, rather than a straightforward intergenerational transmission of knowledge. As demonstrated by Tuominen (1999) in an interview study with 25 multilingual parents in the US, parents' positive attitudes toward their children's multilingualism did not always lead to successful language transmission: most parents reported that they used the majority language, English, or a mix of their home language and English in interactions with their children. Children challenged parents' rule to use the heritage language by using English in the home, and by protesting enrollment in home-language schools. "Children usually decided the home language in the families" although parents had indicated language rules according to which the children were to use the heritage language (Tuominen, 1999, p. 68). However, in a few families where the language rules were quite strict, the children did develop bilingual skills.

Children's and young people's transition to the societal language (language of the educational settings and the peer group) is also demonstrated in Boyd's (1985) large-scale sociolinguistic study on the language use patterns of young people (14 to 16 year-olds) in immigrant families from different backgrounds in Sweden. Swedish was children's dominant language, used in interaction with peers and siblings, whereas the minority language was used with parents and adults. The study has also identified different levels of children's bilingual skills, documenting that children with parents from the same minority language background, who usually lived in areas with many minority language speakers and/or planned to return to their country of origin, were more active bilinguals (Boyd, 1985: 150).

Yet another aspect of the multifaceted features of language management is highlighted by Kopeliovich (2010) in a study of a Russian family with 8 children (1.5 - 21 years) in Israel. The study shows that whereas the parents' language management was oriented toward the maintenance of Russian in family interactions, the parents' (mothers') explicit and straightforward language maintenance efforts were resisted and ignored by children and that language maintenance efforts were entangled in open negotiations in interaction with children. The contrast between

the parents' language ideologies and the actual language practices is highlighted, suggesting that language practice is not a direct result of language management and that language maintenance is not the product of language ideologies, but rather that it is a process that is realized on the level of practice.

Research on language practices and parents' strategies in bilingual families

Thus far, few empirical studies taking an FLP approach have investigated family language practices in detail (Ren & Hu, 2013). Attention to interactions at the language practice level characterizes studies informed by a language socialization approach (e.g., Fogle, 2012; Luykx, 2005). Ethnographic observations of family interactions may, it is argued, illuminate both explicit and implicit language policies and practices (Schwartz, 2010, p. 187) and may, together with interview data and the analysis of wider societal ideologies and structures, provide opportunities to investigate the interaction between the multiple layers affecting family bilingualism. While family language policy may initially be explicit and have a particular shape and goals, it is also subject to negotiations and change (Fogle & King, 2013; Kopeliovitch, 2010).

Practice-level studies (from early on) have been interested in exploring how children develop bilingual skills by participating in parent-child interactions (Döpke, 1992; Huss, 1991; Lanza, 1997/2004) and what interactional strategies parents use with young children to enhance bilingual development. For instance, Döpke's (1992) interactional study of language the use of OPOL English-German families in Australia investigated the features that were different in the interactional environment of the children who gained an active command of German and those who only passively understood it. Factors that contributed to the development of bilingualism included the character of parental language input, parents' consistency and insistence on children's use of the appropriate language and the teaching of formal aspects of the languages. Overall, the study shows that English, the societal language, was the dominant language for all children. Children's use of English in interactions with their German-speaking parent was not strictly criticized and children's degree of bilingualism and parental child centeredness (when parents focused on meaning making with the child rather than on controlling the child's language choice) were related (Döpke, 1992, p. 177). It has been shown that children who were met with strategies of insistence, such as requests for translation, acquired active command of the minority language, in this case German (Döpke, 1992, p. 191).

Similarly, Lanza (1997/2004) examined English-Norwegian families' language practices and young (2-year-old) children's development of bilingualism by analyzing parents' language strategies regarding children's language mixing. The analysis of mother-child interactions describes various types of interactional strategies and their impact on children's language choice: for instance, mothers tried to construct an 'English-only' mode of interaction and establish a monolingual language context by replying to children's Norwegian utterances in English. They

also used explicit practices to correct the child's language choice. It is through such explicit practices that they succeeded in enforcing the child's responses in English: The more the minority parent proposes a monolingual context, the more likely it is that the language will be maintained.

In a recent study of how parents' language strategies impact on (2- to 3- year-old) children's bilingualism, Mishina-Mori (2011) examined the impact of parental language input on children's language choice and parental discourse strategies for children's language mixing. The study shows that parental language choice patterns alone did not result into the child's use of the parental language. Parents' language use together with discourse strategies for children's mixing affected children's language choices (Mishina-Mori, 2011, p. 3131). A longitudinal analysis of parent-child language negotiation strategies showed that children were socialized using different interaction patterns and that children whose inappropriate language choice was explicitly corrected tended to use the minority language more actively.

Studies of the OPOL language strategies in Swedish-Finish families with young children in Sweden (Huss, 1991) and in Finland (Palviainen & Boyd, 2013) have pointed out various aspects of how these strategies are implemented in different participant constellations and contexts. Huss (1991) studied the development of children's bilingualism in Swedish-Finnish families in Sweden. The study explored young (2- to 4-year-old) children's language choice in interaction with each parent, and examined the relation between children's home language environment (Swedish or Finish) and their language choice and language mixing. The study shows that parents' strategies involved: pretending non-understanding and/or asking for translation, parental translation, and no reaction or code-switching to child's language choice (Huss, 1991, pp. 120-122, see Döpke, 1988 and Lanza, 1997/ 2004). Children were engaged in more language mixing in interactions with their Finnish parent, and Finnish parents showed more permissive reactions to language mixing than Swedish parents did. Parents' permissive responses motivated the child to participate in the interaction and did not generate negative feelings toward the minority language, which was usually the child's weaker language.

In a study of multilingual (Finish-Swedish) families in Finland, Palviainen and Boyd (2013) examined the OPOL language policy, demonstrating that it was an outcome of explicit and overt language planning as well as less overt decisions and unplanned practices. Whereas parents reported that they had explicitly decided on a Swedish daycare for children, the adoption of OPOL had occurred and developed naturally and unconsciously. The flexibility of family language policies is also indicated by parental reports indicating that their language use and strategies had changed over time depending on where they lived, the language proficiency of family members and the language environment at work.

In all, studies focusing on how bi-/multilingual families' language strategies shape young (approximately 1- to 4-year-old) children's bilingual development have shown that the quantity and quality of exposure to the heritage language, i.e., the character of social interactional practices in adult-child interactions, is crucial for children's language development. Simultaneously, they point to some interactionally emerging dilemmas that are related to parental aims to promote children's

bilingualism (e.g., Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997/2004; Venables et al., 2014). Parents' attempts to promote their language in everyday family interactions by using lexical modeling, requests for translation (Döpke, 1992), or in other ways directing and constraining children's language choice may hinder the conversational flow and interrupt the interaction, thereby affecting the social ambience of the family encounter.

Family activities and interactions: Mealtime as a context for the study of family language practices and bilingualism

As demonstrated above, recurrent interactional practices are a crucial locus for shaping family bilingualism. One of the intergenerational and multiparty spaces for families' use of, for instance, heritage language is joint mealtimes and dinner talk. For most middle-class families, gathering around the dinner table is a daily routine and a moment when all members of the family sit together and share their experiences of the day, emotions, family norms and values. Hence, family mealtimes are multiparty intergenerational interactional sites that play an important role in language socialization (Blum-Kulka, 2002, p. 85; see also Fasulo, Liberati, & Pontecorvo, 2002) and language maintenance (Blum-Kulka, 1997, Pitton, 2013, p. 510). Parents socialize children into social and "local cultural practices regulating conversation, such as the choice of topics, rules of turn taking, modes of storytelling, rules of politeness, and choice of language" (Blum-Kulka, 2002, p. 86). Dinner conversations are therefore rich contexts for the study of bilingual interaction, and in these conversations, children listen to and interact with their parents and sibling(s) who, in bilingual families, may have different language use patterns and make different language choices (Fogle, 2012).

In addition to family dinner talk, children's interactions with siblings and peers (e.g., play, home-work and others) constitute recurrent and extensive communicative sites where family language practices and language policy and goals are implemented and negotiated and, at times, resisted.

Children's role in shaping family language practices

In the current social and anthropological perspectives, children are viewed as active members of communities (Corsaro, 2005; Goodwin, 1990). Whereas children have been considered the objects of socialization into the languages and cultures of older members of the community (Luykx, 2005, p. 1407), language socialization studies consider children to be agents who act in the processes of their own socialization and who themselves socialize parents and other members into particular language practices (Duranti, Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Fogle & King, 2013; Gafaranga, 2010; Kyratzis, 2004; Luykx, 2005). The language socialization perspective that focuses on peer interaction argues that children, in their peer cultures, create

and recreate their own “socially organized world of meaning” (Goodwin, 1990, p. 13). However, in much of the research on FLP and family bi-/multilingualism, “the incorporation of the children’s perspectives in the parental data” (Schwartz; 2010, p. 186) is rather scarce and until now relatively few studies have collected data from both parents and children.

Children’s peer groups, especially in educational settings, provide a site for negotiations and exploitations of multiple languages, and children in peer groups articulate various orientations toward different language varieties, (societal) monolingualism, and the bilingualism of families (Blum-Kulka & Snow, 2004; Kyratzis, 2004). Children, as demonstrated by Kyratzis (2010), can use bilingual practices (e.g. code-switching between the heritage language, Spanish, and English, the language of school) in organizing their local peer group’s social order and challenge the hierarchical positioning of Spanish and English. In bilingual Swedish-English children’s play, multiple languages can be used to negotiate access to play activities (Cromdal, 2001; 2004). Evaldsson and Cekaite (2010) examined peer interactions in monolingual Swedish educational settings and showed how minority language children engaged in corrective practices that targeted others’ faulty Swedish, thereby co-constructing the prevalent societal monolingual ideology (see also Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2013). Moreover, Evaldsson (2005) shows that children oriented to the hierarchical value of majority language by resisting others’ criticism of their Swedish language skills and the categorization as not fully competent in Swedish.

According to a dynamic view on children’s agency, there is no given causal relation between parental language ideologies and planning and actual language practices. Although parents may encourage and demand the use of a certain language(s), families’ language use patterns may not be what parents’ explicit policies aim for. Children can reject parents’ efforts and the family can become a site for conflictual understandings of what constitutes family members’ appropriate language choices (Spolsky, 2008, p. 18). As demonstrated by several ethnographic language socialization studies, children’s peer talk and peer culture can constitute a major factor in family language maintenance or shift (Gafaranga, 2010; Kulick, 1997). In a study of children’s language practices in Dominica, Paugh (2005) shows that, despite parents’ demands that children use English (the language of school), the increased time for out-of school peer play created possibilities for children to use Patwa (heritage language) for entertaining play purposes. The study suggests that children’s peer play can contribute to at least partial maintenance of Patwa.

Yet another factor that concerns children’s role in the shaping of family language practices and family language socialization is the way the official language of the school gains importance in children’s interactions (e.g., Canagarajah, 2008; Fogle & King, 2013; Luykx, 2003). In immigration contexts, children usually have extensive access to the societal language by spending a great deal of time in educational institutions and with their peers, and in this way they can inadvertently pressure parents to learn and use the majority language as well (Luykx, 2005). Children can redefine the usual age-based parent-child asymmetrical positions of power and status that characterize traditional language socialization processes and

the socialization of younger, usually less experienced and skilled members into the cultures and languages of the older ones (Luykx, 2005, p. 1408). As demonstrated in a study on language socialization among family members in a bilingual (Aymara-Spanish) town in Bolivia (Luykx, 2003), the official language of the school, Spanish, also had an impact on children's language choice, and although adults were bilinguals of Spanish and Aymara, the children were adopting Spanish monolingualism. Children's language socialization was thus not a one-way process. Rather, children were as much agents as they were objects of socialization processes: parents used Aymara with elements from Spanish and, in their play, children, by imitating adult roles and adult speech style, i.e., mixing and switching, also appropriated the communicative mode of language mixing and switching.

Children's peer group influences are also demonstrated in Yamamoto's (2001) study of English-Japanese families living in Japan. Children were influenced by the language of the society and moved toward "passive bilingualism if not total monolingualism" (Yamamoto, 2001, p. 127). Although they knew and used both Japanese and English, they showed negative reactions when parents spoke to them in English in the presence of their Japanese friends although they used large number of mixed utterances (Yamamoto, 2001, p. 74).

Fogle (2012) broadened the perspective of the study of family bilingualism by directing attention to transnational adoptive families (US American parents with children from Russia), parental language planning and practices emerging in multiparty family interactions. Children influenced family language practices by initiating metalinguistic questions about the target language, negotiating and resisting language choice by, for instance, showing reluctance to use English in multiparty parent-child conversations, thereby achieving parents' accommodation to these strategies. As argued by Fogle, such acts were multilayered: they constituted part of children's construction of language identities as well as their social identities as members of transnational families.

By resisting the use of parents' languages, (e.g., by using the majority language and/or refusing and criticizing heritage/minority (or parental) language use), children can implicitly or explicitly negotiate and reshape family members' language choices (Fogle & King, 2013, p. 2). Child-initiated interactional practices that demonstrate their lack of competence in the heritage language (e.g., 'medium requests') can influence language choices in families' everyday interactions (Gafaranga, 2010). Gafaranga (2010), in his study of Rwandan (Kinyarwanda-speaking) community in Belgium, shows that children used "medium requests", in their preferred language (French) asking for translations of Kinyarwanda-speaking adults' talk. Adults not only translated particular items to French, but also shifted to French as the medium for the rest of the interaction (Gafaranga, 2010, p. 264). Gafaranga highlights the importance of children's agency, arguing that through such interactional practices, family members "talked language shift into being" (Gafaranga, 2010, p. 266) in that families adopted French as the main medium of family interactions.

Thus, as demonstrated by studies that attend to the practice level, there may be a considerable "gap between the parents' role as language teachers who are expected to insist on minority language use ... and the reality within authentic

families” (Schwartz, 2010, p. 185). Children’s language practices therefore constitute a crucial area for examining how parental language policies are implemented or transformed in social interaction (Fogle & King, 2013, p. 2).

Siblings and family language practices

Family language socialization processes involve more than parents: siblings and extended family members (grandparents) participate in various kinds of social interactions. However, what characterizes sibling talk, how family language policies are implemented in sibling interaction, and subsequently how sibling talk influences family language practices are questions that have been rather under-researched (Baker, 1995, p. 63). Thus far, detailed studies investigating the actual language use between siblings at home are limited in number, and there are few “clear indications regarding actual language interactions between siblings at home” (Schwartz, 2010, p. 174).

The importance of sibling interactions has been revealed by a growing, but still small, number of studies representing various approaches. For instance, siblings can have constraining effects on minority language learning and as a result contribute to language shift. Rindstedt and Aronsson’s (2002) language socialization study of intergenerational language practices in a Quichua-Spanish community showed that sibling play is a significant site for home language transmission. Siblings’ language choices during caretaking and play, and in adult-child interactions (children’s interactions with grandparents and parents) revealed the process of language shift underway. Because the older siblings spoke predominantly Spanish to the younger ones (with some Quichua insertions), the considerable amount of time siblings spent together contributed to the shift of their language from the minority language to Spanish. This development contradicted parents’ goals and expectations concerning their children’s bilingualism.

Siblings can also facilitate each other’s minority and societal language learning and thereby influence families’ language environment. Barron-Hauwaert (2011) reports her findings from an online survey about siblings’ influence on family language policies and practices. The responses of parents from 105 families with two or more children showed that parental language strategies were flexible in that parents modified their strategies according to children’s preferences. Over time, they adapted to children’s language choice by stopping or starting to use specific languages, or mixing various languages. Moreover, sibling interactions were beneficial for minority and societal language learning: older siblings who had a broader vocabulary in both languages could teach and act as language models for younger siblings. Parents also reported that older siblings, who used the minority language, shared various interests with younger siblings and spent time together, contributed to the maintenance of the minority language.

Yet another area where siblings can benefit from each other’s language skills is that of majority and minority language literacy. As demonstrated in Obied’s (2009) study of Portuguese-English siblings in Portugal, siblings influenced the family language environment especially when they reached adolescence and parental influence decreased. Siblings played a positive role in the development of

bilingualism: the older sibling could act as a mediator of English and Portuguese and support the younger sibling's biliteracy by helping with reading and writing in both languages. On the whole, siblings' language preferences influenced the family language balance and siblings' bilingualism. Age was also a significant factor in that language shift to the majority language could occur as children grew older.

Several studies have similarly pointed out the importance of children's age and that siblings exert a crucial influence on each other's language use and on family language practices, particularly when they reach adolescence. Some studies have indicated that not only the age, but also the number of siblings may affect family language policies and practices. Whereas parents may have control over the language use of a first-born child, family language dynamics can change with the arrival of a sibling. For instance, Caldas (2006) documented his three children's bilingual and biliterate upbringing in English-speaking Louisiana and French-speaking Québec. The parents changed their OPOL policy (initially used with the first-born child) and used only French because of the increasing majority language (English) impact on the child. They also strengthened the enforcement of this strategy upon the arrival of younger siblings (who all adopted the majority language in their interactions) by, among other means, not allowing the children to watch English language TV at home. In all, the study highlights the influence of society, peers, and siblings, and shows that the parents lost their power to control their children's language use when the children had more contact with the societal language and when they reached adolescence.

Although several studies have pointed to the importance of children's age for their language use, there has been little discussion of how children's age figures in as a feature that can impact on children's and families' language practices. Owing to their participation in various social and linguistic domains, children's age, related social and language experiences, social relations, identity work and changing aspirations over time (from early childhood to adolescents) constitute some of the factors affecting the social worlds and linguistic ecologies of bi-/multilingual families. Whereas younger children can more easily adhere to and comply with parents' requests to use a particular language, older children may exhibit more powerful resistance. Parental strategies and ideologies as well as children's language practices and preferences may change over time (Barron-Hauwaert, 2011; see also Huss, 1991). Thus, how family language policies, management and practices are dealt with when children resist and refuse parental goals constitutes a relevant issue for further exploration.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This study draws on video recordings of everyday family interactions, ethnographic observations, and semi-structured interviews in five families with an Iranian background in Sweden. In this chapter, I present the data collection procedures, participants and methods of analysis.

Data collection

The data for this study consist of video recordings of everyday family interactions (family mealtimes and sibling talk), observations, and interviews with the parents and the children. Five bi/multilingual Iranian families, each of which had two school-age children who were born in Sweden, participated in the study. The study adopted a longitudinal perspective. The data for each family were collected during two data collection phases separated by approximately a one-year interval. On average, two hours of video-recordings were made at the home of each family during each phase (except for one family that withdrew their participation after the first phase). In total, 20 hours of video recordings (family mealtimes and siblings' activities) were made for all families.

Contact with families

The study design was planned to include five Iranian families living in Sweden. In order to gain access to families who met the criteria of the research project, I tested many approaches. I contacted several teachers of Persian language at 'home language classes' and asked them if they had students with siblings who were in the age range of relevance for the study. Some parents informed the teacher about their willingness to participate in the study if the data collection was conducted at school. I also informed my acquaintances about the project and asked them to introduce me to families who met the criteria for the study. Additionally, I posted an announcement on a Facebook page for Iranians living in Sweden. There, I explained the purpose of the project. The announcement resulted in a discussion, comments and messages among users of the page. Many of the comments were not related to the project and I decided to remove the announcement. I also contacted an association for Iranians living in Sweden and presented the project at one of their annual meetings. The director of a Persian radio channel broadcasted in Sweden, who was present at the meeting, suggested that I broadcast an interview and introduce the project on this radio channel. I also provided my contact information for potential participants among the audience.

In total, approximately 20 families, residing in different cities in Sweden, expressed their willingness to participate and I contacted them via email or telephone.

I introduced the research project, explained the ethical considerations and answered their questions about the study and about me as the researcher. Gaining access to people's private lives was extremely demanding and took about one year. I introduced myself and assured them that I would treat their personal information and video-recordings in accordance with the relevant ethical guidelines (see Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 65). I experienced that my gender was significant in gaining access to the families, because mothers were mainly responsible for decision-making in the households. Often families refrained from participating when they found out that the study included video recordings. They said, for instance, that for political reasons they did not want to be filmed, or the family did not eat dinner together, or they were very busy, or simply they did not like video recording, or that they would call me back later (though they did not contact me again).

Approximately 10 families, however, agreed to participate and accepted the video recordings. We arranged a time when I would visit them at their homes. Some of the visits, however, were cancelled at the last minute for unexpected reasons, such as children being sick, travelling, and disagreement among family members regarding their participation. In the end, five families agreed to take part in the study.

Interviews

As mentioned above, the study adopted a longitudinal perspective. The data for each family were collected during two data collection phases separated by approximately a one-year interval. During the first visit with each family at each data collection period, I conducted a semi-structured interview with the parents and with older children. The interviews generated insights into matters concerning the family's ethnic background, family members' ages, jobs, leisure activities, children's schooling, language attitudes, family language policies, children's level of proficiency in different languages, and family's contact with relatives and Swedish society.

I conducted the interviews in Persian, as it was the language shared by the families and me. Some children, however, occasionally replied in Swedish. The welcoming attitude of the families contributed to the informal atmosphere of the interviews. The questions posed were open-ended and the participants explained and shared their experiences regarding a certain matter to the degree they wished to do. The parents were eager to tell me their stories and at times asked for confirmation or suggestions regarding language policies.

Depending on the situation, I took notes on a laptop computer, notepad, or mobile phone. I experienced that using smaller objects such as a notepad or a mobile phone for note taking helped to preserve the informal atmosphere of the family much better than a computer did. The computer created a barrier between the participants and me, as it decreased eye contact and created an official setting. Therefore, during most of the interviews, I used a notepad and a note-taking application on my mobile phone.

In the process of analyzing the interview data as well as video-recordings, when I needed more elaboration, I contacted the families on the phone. I combined the purpose of calling with an occasional greeting and/or special occasions such as birthdays, New Year, Easter and similar occasions.

Observations

Observations were carried out mainly during two visits to the families during each data collection phase. The first visit took place when I conducted a semi-structured interview and left the camera with the families. The second visit was when the families had completed the video recording and I picked up the camera.

Usually the first visit with each family took about 2-3 hours. After I conducted the interview and video recorded the family dinner (in most families), a friendly chat continued over a cup of tea. By that time, the families were more acquainted with me and engaged in their routine activities ranging from watching TV, helping children with their homework, playing games, to brushing teeth and preparing children for bed. Meanwhile, I observed and at times took notes about their activities and their language choice along with any interesting language-related phenomena.

The second observation took place when I visited the families to collect the camera. This was from one week to several months after the first visit. The families welcomed me into their homes and offered dinner or tea depending on the time of the day. I spent several hours with them and they talked about their experiences of video recording, the children's cooperation, while observing the family routines and the children's interactions. The same procedures were followed during the second phase of data collection.

After I became acquainted with the families during the first visit, a friendly relationship was built, especially with Family 1 and 2. I was invited to several of their family events such as birthday parties, dinners, and a New Year's celebration. They provided additional occasions for observations of the families' everyday interactional patterns.

Video recordings

The choice of documenting and analyzing family mealtimes as the main familial activity in focus draws on the understanding of family dinners as a multiparty interactional context that provides an opportunity for parents and children to come together and engage in joint activity during a temporal, spatial and social moment (Ochs et al., 1989, p. 238). In the present thesis, family mealtimes are considered to be shared speech events and pragmatic contexts for children's socialization and social relations (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 12; Quay, 2008, pp. 8-9).

The study also considers sibling talk to be a language socialization site in multilingual families. Siblings change the dynamics of the family language (Baker, 1995; Caldas, 2012) in multiple ways: they promote exposure to different languages, and their language may be different from the language used in parent-child

interactions (Barron-Hauwaert, 2011; Yamamoto, 2001). The recordings for the thesis include siblings' activities, such as when they are engaged in play situations, cleaning their rooms, painting, baking, eating, studying, planning holidays, and watching cartoons.

The recordings were made with one digital camera that captured high quality images (with a wide angle) and sound. During the first visit with each family, I instructed the parents and in some cases children about how to use the camera. After my presentation of my research project and the particular focus of interest (that included documentation of mealtime activities), most of the families invited me to join their dinner and were willing to start the first mealtime video recording right away. Therefore, the first video recording at four families was made when I was present.

Afterwards, I installed the camera on a tripod facing the dinner table and left it there to be controlled by the parents. This gave the parents a certain degree of autonomy as to which mealtimes they wanted to record and when to start and stop the recording (see Fasulo, Liberati, & Pontecorvo, 2002, p. 210; Heath, Hindmarsh & Luff, 2010, p. 44). The families had as much time as they needed to record approximately 5 mealtimes and 2 sibling play activities. In order to record sibling play, the camera was set up on a tripod facing the children by either the parents or in some cases by the children (on one occasion by me). The siblings were engaged in uninstructed play and other activities ranging from painting, doing puzzles, baking, cleaning their rooms, etc.

Participants

As mentioned above, five families consisting of Iranian parents and two Sweden-born children participated in the project. The parents in these families had moved to Sweden as adults and had lived in Sweden for 10-20 years. After their arrival to Sweden, they attended *SFI (Swedish for immigrants)* classes and learned to read and write in Swedish. They have studied at university or taken part in courses and educational programs preparing them for various occupations suitable for the Swedish labor market. In their daily work, they used Swedish as a medium of interaction. All children were enrolled in Swedish educational settings (pre-school and school). Most of them started Swedish preschool at around two years of age. According to the parents, preschool was the first time the children spent considerable time in a Swedish language context.

In families with younger children (Family 1 & 5), in stressful situations, the parents usually switched from Persian, their main language of interaction with their children, to Swedish. Parents reported that because the children were in more intensive contact with Swedish because they attended regular Swedish preschools on daily basis, they had better command of the majority language and more quickly understood the parent's directives in Swedish.

In the following, I will shortly describe the families. The information about each family is compiled by using interview material, observations and video-recordings. All names of participants in the study are pseudonyms.

Family #1

First family consisted of a mother in her late 30-ies⁶, a father in his late 30-ies, a 6-year-old son Pouyan and a 3-year-old daughter Kiana. The parents were recently divorced and the children were mostly staying with their mother. The data collection was conducted when the children were staying with their mother. The son has been taking part in ‘home language’⁷ classes since he was three years old and the daughter has attended the classes since she was four.

According to the mothers’ accounts in interactions with children, she spoke Persian at home and Swedish outside the family, i.e., at preschool, the playground, supermarket, etc. In stressful situations and when stricter disciplining was needed, such as when the family was getting ready for preschool in the morning, brushing teeth and getting ready for bed, she switched to Swedish. The mother explained that in situations when quick directives and explanations were needed, using Swedish was easier. She thought that Swedish was the children’s first language and the children used and heard it during a larger part of the day at preschool, and with their friends who came over to their home. Regardless of the context, at home or in the community, the children used Swedish with the mother and with each other. The mother did not use strict strategies to make the children speak Persian.

The father’s sister and some Persian-speaking friends lived close to the family. The children spoke Swedish with them. The family traveled to Iran regularly. According to the mother, the children spoke Swedish during the first few days but after a while they used Persian while in Iran. Even after coming back to Sweden, they spoke Persian at home, preschool and school for a few days until they shifted back to their usual language pattern of using Swedish most of the time.

Family #2

This family consisted of a mother, father, two daughters, and a dog. The mother was in her early 40-ies and a native Persian speaker from Iran with (passive) comprehension skill of Kurdish. Father was in his early 50-ies and bilingual in Kurdish and Persian. He was from the bilingual Persian-/Kurdish-speaking part of Iran, where the language of school is Persian and families speak Kurdish at home. The older daughter, Sara, was 12 years old and the younger daughter, Mona, was 7 years old. The children never attended the ‘home language’ classes offered by the school. They decided not to attend these classes and the parents did not resist. The

⁶ The ages at the time when the data collection began.

⁷ *hemspråk*: language classes offered by the school for students who have a language other than Swedish at home.

children thought that they already knew Persian and Kurdish and they did not need to attend language classes.

The parents spoke Persian with each other and they adopted the OPOL policy: the father spoke Kurdish to the children and the mother Persian. During the first data collection period, the children replied and addressed each parent in their respective language. During the second data collection, this pattern changed and Mona used mostly Swedish at home. The sibling language was Swedish. The parents said that Swedish was the children's language and they built a closer relation to each other in Swedish. According to the mother, the parents used some language strategies to resist children's use of Swedish in parent-child conversations. However, they sometimes gave the children opportunities to speak in the way they wanted, and during the second data collection period, the parents allowed Mona's use of Swedish.

The family was in contact with a large community of Kurdish speakers. In addition, the father's brother and sister lived in Sweden and they got together regularly. Sara and Mona spoke Swedish to the children and Kurdish to the adults. For political reasons, the children had never traveled to Iran.

Family #3

This family included a father in his late 40-ies and a mother in her late 30-ies who had Persian as their main language. They had two daughters, Elena 12 and Meneli 8. The children have been attending 'home language' classes since first grade at primary school. The parents used both Persian and Swedish in their daily communication with children. The children used Swedish with each other and with their parents. According to the interviews, the parents thought that their children heard and used Swedish most of the day and that they were more comfortable using Swedish, therefore, they did not coerce the children into speaking Persian. According to the interviews and observations, the children considered Persian to be the language of adults and laughed when they were asked to speak Persian. However, the children did speak Persian to those who did not speak/understand Swedish.

The family had Persian-speaking relatives and friends living in Sweden, some in the same city. The children spoke Swedish to adults and children in these other families. The family traveled to Iran almost every other year and stayed for several weeks. During their stay, the children used Persian with their relatives and occasionally used Swedish with the parents and in sibling interactions.

Family #4

The father in this family was in his late 40-ies and the mother was in her early 40-ies. They had a 17-year-old son Maz, and an 8-year-old daughter Pegah. The children have attended 'home language' classes once a week since they were in the first grade of primary school but they both thought that the lessons were boring,

difficult and unnecessary. The parents spoke Persian to each other and to the children, but they sometimes also used Swedish words in their talk. The sibling language was Swedish, though in multiparty family interactions, the children used both Swedish and Persian. The mother thought that the children used Swedish most of the day at school, and they therefore were more comfortable using Swedish. For this reason, she did not force them to speak Persian. As the children said in the interviews, they considered Persian to be the language of adults and thought that using Persian in conversations with adults was a way to be respectful to them.

The family had relatives in other cities in Sweden and Persian-speaking friends and neighbors with whom the family had close relationship. The children used Persian with adults in those families and Swedish with their children. The family traveled to Iran every couple of years. During these visits, the children spoke Persian to everybody. The mother thought that traveling to Iran gave the children good opportunities to practice Persian.

Family #5

The father in this family was in his 40-ies and mother was in her 30-ies. They had a 4-year-old daughter Katrin and a 3-year-old son David. The children attended the same Swedish daycare. They had not started attending 'home language' classes yet, but the parents provided them with Persian books and cartoons.

The parents spoke Persian among themselves and used both Persian and Swedish with the children. However, according to the mother and examples from video-recordings, in serious and stressful situations where the children were involved, such as rushing to the car to go to pre-school, or reminding the children that they had to hurry up, they switched to Swedish. Children mostly used Swedish in interaction with their parents and in sibling talk, though they occasionally used Persian.

Some of the family's relatives had moved to Sweden at the time of the second data collection period. According to the interviews, after some weeks, the children started using Persian with them and sometimes used Persian in conversations with their parents and in sibling talk. The family traveled to Iran almost once a year. The parents reported that, during the first days of their stay in Iran with their relatives, the children spoke Swedish but after some days they used Persian. By the end of their visit, the children usually became more acquainted with the language environment. Even after returning to Sweden, they spoke Persian with parents, sibling and peers. After a few days, they returned to their usual language pattern and predominantly used Swedish.

Data selection and analyses

Processing and analyzing the data

I transferred my interview and observation notes to my computer where I sorted data from each family into a separate file. I began the description of each data set with information regarding the setting, the participants, and the data format (e.g., interview or observation) (see the procedures for attribute coding, Saldaña, 2009, p. 55). I then read the notes and highlighted the parts related to language choice, language attitudes and language practices for future reference. The data generated at this stage provided background information about the families. During the interviews, the family members usually told about their language expectations and preferences, as well as their language strategies. I noted these as language preferences, dislikes, language strategies and as I delved into the previous research, I categorized them under the headings 'language ideologies' and 'language management strategies' and used them as supporting arguments for further analyses (see Saldaña, 2009, p. 41).

The video recording files were transformed to formats compatible with different video player programs. Repeated viewings of video recordings allowed me to prepare a catalog containing notes about the participants, their activities, language choices, and other language-related phenomena (e.g., language repair and instruction). The catalog notes also included the time at which the phenomena occurred on the video recording file.

Further viewings of the logged activities and phenomena on the video recording files allowed me to make more detailed notes about the ongoing interaction (Saldaña, 2009, p. 44 cf. Walsh et al., 2007). A general language use pattern was observed in the families: the parents used mainly the heritage languages and the children used predominantly Swedish. I became interested in episodes where this pattern was not followed, i.e. when the children used the heritage languages or when the parents used Swedish. The language use pattern and the language environment in Family #2 was different from other families in that the family was trilingual and the children predominantly used the heritage languages – Persian and Kurdish – in interactions with parents. Therefore, a considerable part of this thesis is concentrated on studying the language practices of this family.

I transcribed the episodes where the children used Persian in interactions with parents and their siblings, or when language choice and family language policies were discussed among family members, including their beginning and some minutes after, in the original language(s) (Persian, Swedish, and Kurdish). I added more specific details (e.g. pauses, gestures, overlaps) and modified the transcripts as my focus on the phenomena developed. Alongside this, I studied previous research in the area of the categorized episodes. I noticed a gap in the previous research, namely, the scarcity of studies on parent interactions with older children with a focus on language policies and the participants' language choice patterns. Therefore, I transcribed in detail the episodes that included parent-child interaction

focusing in particular on the children's language choices and parental responses, as well as the children's use of Persian and Kurdish.

The video-recorded data enabled multimodal analyses of the interactions, especially because I, the researcher was absent during most of the video-recording sessions. Multimodal utterances consist of linguistic structures, talk, prosody, gestures, posture and the structure of the environment (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004, p. 227; Goodwin, 2006). The video captured information on talk as well as the setting of the activity, the comings and goings of the participants, their affective stances, displayed by nonverbal components, for example, gaze, body gestures, and posture. In the study, for instance, affective stances were displayed through talk and body gestures. Expressing negative emotions, the child turned her back to the parents, looked down at the table, and rolled her eyes. Without access to video-recordings, these gestures would have been transcribed as the child's 'pause'.

Readings of the transcripts from the families' interactions showed that the children's use of Swedish in Family #2, in contrast to interactions in other families (Family 1, 3, 4, 5), was a matter for parental language instructions and negotiations. These instructional sequences are analyzed in Study I.

Video recordings from the second phase of data collection in this family were transcribed and compared with transcripts from the first phase of the study. The longitudinal data collection allowed further analyses of the video recordings (made by this family) for possible changes in language patterns and language policies. The results of the analysis of the family members' language negotiations are described in Study II.

Repeated viewings of the video recordings from all of the families showed a common language pattern in sibling talk: the sibling language was primarily in Swedish. The episodes in which siblings were engaged in dyadic interaction were transcribed and analyzed in Study III.

Translation

The original transcripts from Persian and Kurdish were translated to English by the author. The translation of the Kurdish transcripts was done with the help of a native Kurdish speaker. In order to make the data more comprehensible for non-speakers of the above-mentioned languages, a separate line of word-by-word translation was prepared when more elaboration was needed.

Transcription key

- (.5) pauses in tenths of a second
- (.) micropause, i.e., shorter than (.2)
- = latching between utterances
- [overlapping talk
- denotes cut-off

:	prolonged syllable
.	denotes falling terminal intonation
?	denotes rising terminal intonation
,	denotes continuing intonation
>what<	quicker than surrounding talk
<what>	slower than surrounding talk
°what°	quieter than surrounding talk
WHAT	relatively high amplitude
what	denotes emphatic stress
(())	further comments of the transcriber
vet inte	talk in Swedish
<i>afærin</i>	talk in Persian
lowbia	talk in Kurdish
<i>hi</i>	talk in English (Study III)
okay beans	translation to English from Swedish, Persian or Kurdish

Methodological considerations

The present thesis combines a family language policy approach (King et al., 2008; Spolsky, 2004) and language socialization (Goodwin, 1996; Ochs, 1996), as part of an interactional sociolinguistics approach to human interaction and sense-making (Schiffrin, 1994). FLP research combines the study of child language acquisition, early second language learning and bilingualism with the study of language policy (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; King & Fogle, 2006). Interactional sociolinguistics views language and culture as mutually constitutive, i.e. language, culture and society are in a “reflexive relationship with the self, the other, and the self-other relationship” (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 134). Interactional sociolinguistics has its roots in anthropology, sociology, and linguistics (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 97). In the present thesis, it contributes analytically to the study of situated meaning. Utterances are viewed as indexical of activities, roles and identities that are performed and negotiated by the participants and “interactively and socially embedded” in the context (Schiffrin, 1994, pp. 131-134; Ochs, 1996).

Language socialization is defined as the processes through which children and novices become socialized through language to use language as meaningful social actions (Ochs 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Study of language socialization is the study of the relationships between language, culture and learning (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Watson-Gegeo & Bronson, 2013, p. 112). It focuses on the “socially and culturally organized interactions” involving novices and more experienced members of the community (Ochs, 2000, p. 230).

The present thesis combines multiple methodologies and interdisciplinary approaches to address complex research questions that would have been difficult to

study using a single approach (see Klein, 1996). In the thesis, the FLP approach enables the study of intergenerational communication, language decisions and maintenance in immigrant families (Tannenbaum, 2012). However, because the focus of this approach is mainly parental language ideologies and strategies to promote children's heritage language use (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013), it was important to include other approaches when studying families' language practices. Therefore, analytical methods from interactional sociolinguistics were employed to examine family interactions on a turn-by-turn basis (including verbal and nonverbal actions). The procedure used to capture the interactional data was video recordings of spontaneous family interactions.

The present study is informed by the ways in which the language socialization approach focuses on an activity-based locus of socialization, i.e. on recurrent activities such as storytelling, eating, playing, routinely undertaken in, e.g., families and other social institutions (Ochs, 1988, p. 226; Ochs, 2000, p. 230). Drawing from this understanding, the present thesis examines family mealtimes because they are such routinized activities, bounded in time and space, and repeated with specific participants on a daily basis (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 8).

Transcription conventions are informed by detailed interaction analysis (conversation analysis), the aim being to study the details of family interactions along with nonverbal behavior. Observations of the families and video-recordings enabled insights into some of the families' mundane interactional practices and language use (Patton, 2002).

The role of the researcher

Studying humans and human interaction, using any social methodology (e.g. the presence of the researcher, the researcher's notebook, tape recorder, questionnaire), affects the situation (Duranti, 1997, p. 117). However, it is not only through research that we affect others: being and acting as a member of a society entails the ability to affect it. It is not possible to avoid our effect on the context we observe, however, we should be aware that there are different forms and degrees of influence (Duranti, 1997, p. 118). One can consider how the context changes when, for example, a camera is brought in. In the data for the present thesis, the participants were engaged in their everyday life while in the presence of the camera. They, for instance, discussed their activities of the day, argued with each other, and showed their emotions. The camera could have influenced the context and the setting. For instance, the participants might have avoided saying or doing particular things in front of the camera.

During data collection, I aimed to take a more passive role (Duranti, 1997) and tried to be less intrusive on the ongoing interaction. I explained to the families that I was not there to evaluate their proficiency in Swedish, Persian or any other languages. Even though I participated in some family dinners and activities at the time of data collection, I tried to avoid making judgements or giving feedback on family members' language use and behavior. I followed their lead in the activities and did not criticize or praise their level of language proficiency. However, they

might have regarded me as an expert or a critic of their actions (see Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 64). My language background as a Persian speaker could have influenced the language dynamics while I was present during the data collection. I used Persian with the parents and children. On some occasions, I experienced that, using Swedish, I could better include the children in the conversation during the interviews. Therefore, I used some Swedish with them. At times, I observed that the parents would ask their children to speak Persian to me, although the children mostly spoke Swedish at home. They may have thought their children's mastery of Persian was a significant part of their being good parents. There are several such examples in the video-recordings as well, and I did not use those episodes for analytical purposes. I have observed that the overall language use is different from these few occasions. In addition, after these explicit requests, the children usually did not immediately produce extended utterances in Persian, but said a few words after a while, and some children ignored the request and used Swedish. Besides, my language and cultural background knowledge helped me through the transcription and translation processes.

The influence I may have had on the family interactions may have lessened when I left the field and left the camera for the families to control (see Heath, Hindmarsh & Luff, 2010, p. 44). Having installed the camera on a tripod made the presence of the camera less visible after some days (as reported by the families). The families kept the cameras from one week to several months. The families themselves decided when to start a recording, how much to record and when to stop the recording. The parents would stop the video recording when, for instance, children started crying, a guest came over, or children were touching the camera and would not listen to the parents' directives to come back to the table. In a few cases, the children were engaged in obvious camera-related behaviors (Duranti, 1997, p. 118), such as waving to the camera and looking through the lens. I experienced that when I explained to the families that they could control the video camera themselves, they became more eager to participate as it gave them the autonomy to choose which occasions to record and they had the benefit of stopping the recording whenever they wished to. I also explained to them that they could access the video recording files and delete parts or the whole session, if they wanted to.

The fact that the families were in charge of making the recordings made the data collection process longer. I gave them as much time as they needed and waited for them to get back to me. My absence during the video recordings did not allow me to get more information about the surroundings, the off-camera setting, and the activities leading to the video-recorded part. However, because the main focus was on family mealtimes and because the families usually recorded the whole mealtime session, from setting the table to leaving the table, this might not have affected the data negatively. The siblings' activities, however, were recorded less carefully.

Ethical considerations

The present study follows the Swedish Research Council's ethical guidelines for data collection and processing (www.codex.vr.se). I contacted the parents and introduced the department where the research was conducted and the research project itself. I presented myself as a PhD student at the department of Child Studies, Linköping University. I explained my research interest as being in the area of language socialization in bilingual families.

The parents received consent letters in Swedish (they also received an oral explanation in Persian) and were given time to read and discuss this information with me. I also asked the children whether they agreed to participate in the video recordings. The consent letter contained information concerning the study, the family members' participation and the purpose of data collection. The letter clarified the ethical considerations, such as: the participants have the right to stop their participation any time during the study; the participants' identity (names and addresses) will be anonymized; the collected material (videos, pictures and info) will be used for research purposes only and will not be made available over the Internet and to anyone outside the research project. During the second data collection period, I presented the same information to the parents and children and the parents received consent letters containing same information as the letters from the first data collection, in Swedish.

CONCLUSIONS

The current thesis has explored the language socialization and language practices of bi/multilingual families in recurrent activities, i.e. family mealtimes and sibling interactions. The study has examined family members' contribution to the shaping of family language practices and policies in their everyday interactions. In the following, the key findings and the limitations of the study as well as possible considerations for future research are discussed.

Findings

The thesis was informed by family language policy and language socialization approaches, which were combined to investigate how families' daily language practices were organized and shaped. It examined language socialization patterns in five bi/multilingual Iranian families. The data consisted of video-recordings of family interaction, interviews and observations. The families represented a range of views on children's bilingualism and maintenance of the heritage language, and the language practices of the families demonstrated similarities and differences. All parents actively used their heritage language(s), Persian and Kurdish in family interactions. However, most of the parents also mixed Swedish in interactions with children (except Family 2). The children, too, showed different language use patterns in these families. Longitudinal examination of some of the data has revealed certain differences in family language practices over time (e.g., Study II).

As demonstrated in the thesis, family language practices provided a continuous locus for the enactment and negotiation of family language policies. Study I illustrates the dynamic character of parents' efforts to enhance heritage language maintenance through family interactions. The OPOL strategies were used in parent-child interactions. In addition, the parents, by demanding the children's use of the heritage languages (Persian and Kurdish) in adult-child interactions, aimed to create a rich environment for the children's multilingualism. A recurrent practice dealing with the focus child's language mixing (the use of Swedish, the societal language in a heritage language interactional context) involved parents' requests for translation into the heritage language (e.g., *what is x called?*) and their displays of non-understanding (**I didn't understand what you said.**). Through these sequences, the parents constrained the focus child's language choice, requesting her to use the heritage language and enforced a monolingual interactional context. In addition, parental requests for translation worked as informal language lessons, through which the child's gaps in lexical knowledge of the heritage language were attended to. However, as demonstrated, such heritage language maintenance efforts affected the ongoing interaction and influenced the social ambience: parents

interrupted the child's conversational contributions and diverted the focus of interaction. They centered on the child's 'faulty' language use and threatened the social ambience of the interaction. The child interpreted these sequences as initiations of language instruction and recurrently resisted and refused to participate, stating, for instance, that she did not know the heritage language(s). She also showed negative embodied affective stances (for instance, used angry, irritated tone or turned her back to the parents). The child's negative displays of affect influenced the parents' language practices and management efforts in that the parents usually terminated their language instructions (Study I).

As demonstrated, these parental strategies were multidirectional in terms of how heritage language policy was instantiated and re-negotiated in parent-child interactions. At times, parents succeeded in constraining the child's language choice and enforcing the 'only heritage language' policy. These findings corroborate the results of sociolinguistic studies that examined young children's bilingual development (Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997/2004), and that demonstrated the relevance and efficiency of parents' strategies deployed to constrain the child's language choice. The present study highlights the social valence of such informal heritage language lessons, namely the notion that these sequences were potentially threatening to the social ambience of the family interactions. Parents positioned themselves as experts who had the authority to examine the child's language; simultaneously, they positioned the child as less competent in those languages.

The thesis also shows that family language practices and the ways in which family language policy is instantiated through various language management attempts are amenable to change over time. Parents may need to modify and change their heritage language maintenance attempts owing to the child's resistant agency in relation to family language policy (Study II). As demonstrated in Study II (based on data collected a year later, during the second phase of the study), the focus child resisted the parents' expectations that the children use the heritage languages with them. As time went by, the child predominantly used Swedish in her interaction with parents. This resistance contributed to modifications in other family members' – parents' and the sibling's – language practices. They explicitly requested that the child use the heritage language(s) and reminded the child of the social advantages of developing competences in those languages. However, such sequences recurrently resulted in the child's resistance and refusals, and the parents (like in Study I) terminated these practices. In response to the child's refusals, the parents redefined their language requirements and demands and prioritized the social ambience and positive parent-child relations (thus conforming to the societal cultural child-centeredness of adult-child relations). They reconfigured the family language practices by using a so-called parallel discourse with the child.

Parallel discourse (which characterized the other families participating in the studies) provided the child with heritage language input, contributing to heritage language maintenance in family interactions. The character of the child's resistance is of interest here: although she refused to adhere to parental language choices, she did not insist on generating a monolingual Swedish interactional context and participated in the interactional parallel discourse. Thus, as demonstrated

by the case study of the multilingual family and its language management and language practices over time, parents, in response to a child's resistant agency, may need to tone down and modify their language practices as the child grows older. Over time, the child's ability to assert resistant agency may increase, and in a mutual relational process, parents may ratify the child's increasing resistance.

The thesis has also examined families that have adopted different ways of implementing their aspirations to develop and achieve children's bi-/multilingualism (Study III, Families 1; 3-5). These families used a parallel mode of interaction, with parents predominantly using the heritage language and the children using Swedish. The parents did not employ constraining language strategies in order to enforce a monolingual heritage language context with the children. As articulated in the interviews (Study III), the parents modified their language practices and choices in relation to the children's language competences and preferences by switching to Swedish in stressful situations (e.g., when getting ready for school). They explained that using Swedish makes their conversation flow more smoothly and quickly.

Yet another significant factor related to children's agency examined in the thesis concerns the role of siblings. Study III explored siblings' interactions and their contribution to shaping each other's language practices and the families' language policies. Swedish was the language of all siblings in all of the families. Parents' child-orientedness was significant in taking into account and accepting the siblings' orientations to Swedish as their shared language (e.g., Family 2). Interestingly, in family multiparty interactions with parents present (i.e., parallel mode of interaction), siblings were engaged in some heritage language use (e.g., in cases when a heritage language problem occurred). Older siblings in particular targeted different aspects of the other's language use by correcting the younger sibling's language use and choices, requesting and providing language instructions, and commenting on and reminding about the family language policies. Through these language practices, the siblings influenced each other's language practices.

Sibling discourse and their attention to various – heritage, Swedish, and English – languages in the so-called language-related episodes reveal an interesting and significant feature of the goals of immigrant family language policy, i.e., its multiple goals, one of which is heritage language maintenance. All families showed their orientations toward supporting the children's development of the societal, school language. As demonstrated in siblings' language-focused episodes, the siblings engaged in instructional sequences, and the older siblings adopted and were positioned in the role of language experts in different languages, the heritage language(s), the societal language and English. For instance, the older siblings asked younger siblings to demonstrate their knowledge in different languages and corrected or modeled their incorrect language use (Study III).

Such instructional sequences can be seen to support the younger siblings in developing their skills in both the societal language and the heritage languages, at the same time providing the older siblings with opportunities to rehearse and practice their already known knowledge. Therefore, these sequences can be viewed as 'double-opportunity spaces' for both siblings (Blum-Kulka & Snow, 2004). As

demonstrated in Study III, siblings in immigrant families can act as language socialization agents in various ways: through instructional sequences regarding the heritage language(s), siblings can contribute to language maintenance. On the other hand, as demonstrated in all of the families, the siblings primarily use the societal language, Swedish, together, thereby potentially contributing to the shift away from the family's heritage language. In other words, in families, siblings play a significant role in shaping the family language practices because their interactions usually increase the amount of exposure to the societal language (Barron-Hauwaert, 2011; King & Fogle, 2006; Yamamoto, 2001).

By closely examining immigrant families' language practices, the present thesis has aimed to generate knowledge about the under-researched area of FLP and heritage language maintenance. The thesis broadens the view of FLP research that focuses on parental language ideologies as the driving force behind parental language management and decisions regarding their own and their children's language practices (King & Fogle, 2006; King et al., 2008; Piller, 2001); it also considers other factors involved, such as children's and siblings' role in shaping family language practices. By widening the scope of investigation to include analyses of family language practices as concrete implementations and management of overtly articulated FLP goals, the thesis contributes to approaches to family bilingualism (see Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; 2013; King et al., 2008; Spolsky, 2004). Whereas parental perspectives are considered to be influential in shaping children's heritage language development, the present thesis shows some of the difficulties that parents might face in the mundane situations of family life. As demonstrated, most children predominantly used Swedish in family interactions, although the parents used the heritage language(s) with them and also employed explicit language management efforts (providing children with books and TV programs, traveling to the country of origin, having relatives staying with them for an extended period of time, and having the children attend home language classes). The children's predominant orientation to and use of the societal language, Swedish, is in line with research findings reporting that children often become dominant in the societal language, despite parents' plans to raise them bilingually (e.g., Piller, 2001).

The present thesis has documented some of the parental strategies used to implement a heritage language policy by enforcing and constraining the children's heritage language use (Study I-II). As demonstrated, such strategies at times resulted in the child's uptake of and alignment with parental language choice and language policy. However, they also led to explicit and implicit language negotiations, and the children's growing resistance contributed to changes in parents' language practices.

In conversations, the parents used a 'move on' strategy: instead of interrupting the interaction, they opted for not criticizing the child's language choice. These findings are in line with results from few studies on family bilingualism (Gafaranga, 2010; Kopeliovich, 2010), showing how changes in children's language practices contribute to parents' modifications of their language policies (Caldas, 2006; Kopeliovich, 2010). Analysis of family language practices can thus provide

knowledge about why explicit language maintenance efforts do not necessarily result in children's use of the heritage language.

As demonstrated, parents' language ideologies and language strategies are only some of the influential factors in children's language development and shaping of family language policies. The present study reveals some features characterizing the processes through which children participate in shaping family language practices, where they act not only as recipients of socialization but also as socializing agents.

As discussed above, FLP studies have primarily focused on the role of parental language ideologies and policies and the factors that influence them. Such studies have mainly considered parents' explicit, covert, "declared language strategies" (Bonacina, 2010, what parents said their policies were), experiences and expectations by predominantly using questionnaires and interviews with parents (e.g., Kirsch, 2012; Tuominen, 1999; Yamamoto, 2011). The present thesis explored not only the parents' language ideologies and expectations, but by examining everyday family interactions, it has emphasized families' and children's language practices. It is shown that parents were also engaged in implicit negotiations when they, for instance, used the heritage language in response to their children's use of the societal language. Therefore, explicit parental policies constituted only one of the factors influencing family language practices. The study suggests that a broad range of factors and practices – including so-called explicit (overt) and implicit (covert) methods of enhancing the children's heritage language use – deserve analytical attention.

Implications for future research

The studies were conducted in a particular context and the results may not be generalizable to other settings. Sweden provides children and immigrant families with circumstances that are supportive of their multilingual development. Such circumstances include: the accessibility of 'home language' classes for children with language backgrounds other than Swedish, children starting early childhood education in the majority language at an early age, recurrent contact with English through formal school education and public media, and, for adults, the opportunity to attend Swedish language classes for immigrants (SFI). This means that immigrant families are in active contact with different languages soon after their arrival to Sweden. Thus, one might not be able to generalize the results of this study to more monolingual contexts.

One can also consider the characteristics and possible limitations of the data collection and the study design. The limited number of families participating in the study does not allow direct application of the results to other families from, for instance, different socioeconomic backgrounds. The families, including both parents in this study, were well-educated and had access to all of the welfare facilities, including work-places in Swedish-speaking environments, that other middle-class families in Sweden had. However, the limited number of families facilitated conducting an extensive, in-depth analysis of their language practices. As Agar notes,

“better to understand their relationship in a few cases than to misunderstand three of them in a population of five hundred” (Agar, 1980, p. 123).

The sensitivity of the specific group (Iranians) who had immigrated to Sweden, mostly for political reasons, resulted in difficulties in finding families that were willing to participate in the study. The criteria for choosing specific families were therefore primarily limited to the number and age of the children (families with two school-aged children, which covers a broad age range in Sweden: 2-18 years). Other factors, including parents’ ages and education level, were not decisive in the selection of families. The broad age range of the children could have provided an opportunity for examining the ways in which children’s age might influence family language ecology. Although the implications of children’s age were not the main research question, the study suggests that older children are more prone to using the majority language. This observation is in line with the findings of previous studies showing the importance of children’s age for family language practices, especially as the children get older (e.g., Caldas, 2006; Obied, 2009). Parents may insist that (especially young) children comply with parental enforcement of preferred language policies (Kopeliovitch, 2010; Schwartz, 2010, p. 183). Children may refuse to comply with or negotiate parents’ language choices (Barron-Hauwaert, 2004; Fogle & King, 2013, p. 2; Shohamy, 2006). As discussed earlier, due to children’s resistance, parental control actions intended to enforce particular language choice in the home environment can be exhausting and challenge parental plans and aspirations (Study II).

The thesis used video-recordings of family interactions, and ethnographic observational data were more limited in scope. Richer ethnographic data and longer observation periods could have provided more detailed knowledge regarding, for instance, the external factors in family members’ preferred language(s) and their contacts with speakers of different languages. In addition, an extended longitudinal study could have provided knowledge about the development of family language practices over time. Such limitations regarding the design of the study can be considered in preparing further studies of family bilingualism. In conclusion, the present study shows the relevance of combining multiple methodological perspectives and approaches in the study of heritage language maintenance or shift in family contexts.

SUMMARIES OF STUDIES

Study 1: Language maintenance in a multilingual family: Informal heritage language lessons in parent-child interactions

Mina Kheirkhah & Asta Cekaite. 2015. *Multilingua* 34(3), 319–346

Maintenance of the heritage language is a constant concern for families raising children bi-/multilingually in communities where their language is a minority language. Sociolinguistic research has highlighted the strong tendencies toward language shift in the second generation of immigrants (Li Wei 1994; Luykx 2005, p. 1408; Touminen 1999). The family, like many domains of social life, constitutes a complex, intergenerational context for negotiating language policies and expectations regarding language use (Li Wei 1994; 2012). Understanding the processes of language maintenance/shift can be enriched by an examination of face-to-face social life and family interactions in their own right (Fishman 1991, p. 4).

The present study combines the language socialization approach (Ochs, 1996) with the theoretical framework that views family language policies as socially constructed. Here, socialization is conceptualized not as a static top-down process of intergenerational transmission of knowledge, but rather as dynamic and dialectic (Cekaite 2012; Duranti et al. 2012). Accordingly, children themselves contribute to the process of forming the language policy around them, and their willing participation in adult-initiated practices cannot be assumed (Paugh 2005; Rindstedt and Aronsson 2002).

Study I explores the language practices of a Persian-Kurdish family in Sweden – practices through which heritage language maintenance and a OPOL policy are realized. Parents' request for translation in response to the focus child's language mixing (primarily, use of Swedish lexical items), as well as the child's uptake, language choice, compliant and noncompliant responses are examined.

The parents used routinized questions (“*What is x called?*”) and announcements that articulated their alleged incomprehension of the lexical trouble source (“**I didn't understand what you said**”). Their utterances were interpreted by the child as requests for translation: What is x called in the language (Persian or Kurdish) we're speaking now?

The study demonstrates that through such practices, the parents invoked and negotiated a monolingual, heritage language context (Lanza, 1997/2004) and displayed their identities as competent speakers of the heritage language. The child

was simultaneously positioned as insufficiently competent in either Kurdish or Persian. The child recurrently produced the translation; however, rather frequently, she did not immediately engage in the requested action. The non-forthcoming responses entailed the child's accounts that topicalized her lack of heritage language knowledge. The child displayed negative affective stances, demonstrating her resistance and unwillingness to contribute to the requests for translation.

Parental requests for translation were instrumental in their efforts to continuously expand the child's communicative repertoires in heritage languages and, in this way, contribute to the child's heritage language development. Simultaneously, the analyses show that these interactional practices suspended the ongoing conversational activity and shifted the focus from interactional concerns and meaning-making to language choice and language form.

Study 2: Language choice negotiations in parent-child interaction: family language policy as a collaborative achievement

Mina Kheirkhah (in press) In J.N. Singh, A. Kantara, & D. Cserző (Eds.), *Downscaling Culture: Revisiting Intercultural Communication*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Family language practices operate at a local, micro scale in interaction with societal policies at a global, macro scale. In other words, family language policies are influenced by wider social, political, and cultural contexts (Caldas, 2012; Curdt-Christiansen, 2013; Palviainen & Boyd, 2013). Parental language policies are not static or unidirectional (Caldas, 2012), and they may be subject to negotiations among family members (Barron-Hauwaert, 2004; Fogle & King, 2013; Shohamy 2006).

By adopting a dynamic perspective on family language policy and language practices, this case study examines the development of language practices and policies in a trilingual family over the course of one year. Particular focus was put on parental language maintenance practices that targeted the focus child's resistance to parental policy, according to which the children should use heritage languages in the family on an OPOL basis. The study also explored the target child's responses to these practices.

The study shows that the focus child, who predominantly used heritage languages with the parents a year before (during the first data collection of the present study), resisted the use of heritage languages with the parents later on. The parents employed implicit language negotiations such as a *move-on* practice (Lanza, 1997/2004), where they used their heritage languages while allowing the child to use Swedish. The parents and the older sister also engaged in explicit language maintenance practices in relation to the child's resistant behavior. One of the explicit practices was the family's metalinguistic talk regarding their language ideologies. Such talk topicalized the family's language expectations and the advantages of trilingualism and targeted the child's resistant behavior in relation to the family language policies.

The explicit practices focused on the language form rather than the content matter, thus interrupting the flow of the interaction. These practices required the child to switch to the heritage language, and highlighted the social and relational advantages of developing competences in heritage languages, thus evoking a higher scale of normativity. Such interactional upscaling, however, was only rarely successful, recurrently resulting in the child's resistance and refusals to use the heritage languages. In response, the parents terminated the language constraining strategies.

These parental discourse strategies can have an impact on the child's comprehension of a specific language by providing more input in the heritage languages, thus serving as a resource for language maintenance, yet they do not guarantee that the child will use the heritage language.

In all, the study shows that children's resistant language behavior can occasion implicit or explicit negotiations over the language choice of the family members (see also Fogle & King, 2013, p. 2). The study thus supports the view that family language policy is a collaborative, 'polycentric' (Blommaert, 2010) achievement made by family members.

Study 3: Siblings as language socialization agents in bilingual families

Mina Kheirkhah & Asta Cekaite (submitted to the *International Multilingual Research Journal*)

In immigration contexts, heritage language maintenance efforts are primarily located in, and sometimes limited to interactions between family members (Fishman, 1991, p. 4; Gafaranga, 2011). Sociolinguistic and anthropological studies show that children's peer groups constitute a major influence in shaping children's language use (Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2011; Paugh, 2005). However, relatively few studies have considered siblings' influence on the language practices of immigrant families (Baker, 2007, p. 55; Barron-Hauwaert, 2011, p. 2). The few studies on siblings in contexts of bilingualism suggest that siblings may experience different language environments: the first-born child has more opportunity to use the heritage language in one-to-one interactions with parents (Barron-Hauwaert, 2011; King & Mackay, 2007). In this sense, it is suggested by previous research that the second child comes into a family with an established language policy, and the child's active role in shaping family language policies cannot be neglected.

The present study examines siblings' contributions to the language practices and language environment of Iranian immigrant families residing in Sweden. In line with the families' complex language socialization goals, comprising the children's development of heritage and societal languages, the study examines language practices in which siblings participate. More specifically, the study examines children's language use, their orientations to various language choices in family interactions and their orientations to language knowledge.

The siblings, as demonstrated in the study, participated in a range of language-related episodes targeting various aspects of the other sibling's language use (heritage languages, societal language and English). Interactions involving siblings were characterized by the give-and-take of everyday life, i.e., social alignments (criticism and support), and handling knowledge asymmetries (including informal teaching and learning).

Siblings requested each other's help, translated or corrected each other's language use and choices. In many language-related situations, the older sibling took on and was ascribed the role of the language expert in relation to a variety of languages: Swedish, Persian, and English. The older siblings questioned the younger siblings' knowledge, asked them to demonstrate their language skills, corrected or modeled their incorrect language use. Siblings engaged in discussions about language competences, 'proper' language knowledge and bi-/multilingualism. Interactions about language-related matters provided support for the, usually younger, siblings practicing and developing their skills/competencies (in the school/societal language and, at times, in the heritage language). A common feature was that the younger siblings largely accepted and acknowledged the older siblings' language expertise and did not question the older siblings' self-ascribed right to evaluate their language skills. The older siblings readily took on the role of the expert and the more knowledgeable one.

Siblings used Swedish with each other and even when they focused on a specific aspect of the heritage language, these sequences were embedded in and produced in Swedish. Such teaching episodes can be seen as ‘double-opportunity spaces’ for both siblings (Blum-Kulka et al., 2004). The study shows that the siblings’ language choices affected family interactions, and the siblings’ interactions in Swedish could be seen as contributing to a generational language shift.

REFERENCES

- Agar, M. H. (1980) *The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography*. New York: Academic Press.
- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013) Language policing: micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151-167.
- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2014) "Pupils' doing language policy: Micro-interactional insights from the English as a foreign language classroom." *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 8, 93-113.
- Baker, C. (1995) *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2007) *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2004) *Language strategies for bilingual families: the one-parent-one-language approach*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2011) *Bilingual siblings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997) *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (2002) "Do you believe Lot's wife is blocking the way to Jericho?" Co-constructing theories about the world with adults. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 85-117). Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Snow, C. E. (2004). Introduction: The potential of peer talk. *Discourse Studies*, 6, 291-306.
- Bonacina, F. (2010) *A conversational analytic approach to practiced language policies: The example of an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh.
- Bonacina, F. (2012) Researching 'practiced language policies': insights from conversation analysis. *Language Policy*, 11(3), 213-234.

- Boyd, S. (1985) *Language survival: A study of language contact, language shift and language choice in Sweden*. (Doctoral dissertation, 6). Department of Linguistics. University of Gothenburg.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2008) Finding identity: Theory and data. *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Communication*, 27(1-2), 151-163.
- Caldas, S. J. (2006) *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in monolingual cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Caldas, S. J. (2012) Language policy in the family. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 351-373). Cambridge/UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2008) Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(2), 143- 176.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013) *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Cekaite, A. (2012) Affective stances in teacher-novice student interactions: Language, embodiment, and willingness to learn in a Swedish primary classroom. *Language in Society*, 41(5), 641–670.
- Cekaite, A., & Björk-Willén, P. (2013) Peer group interactions in multilingual educational settings: Co-constructing social order and norms for language use. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2), 174-188.
- Corsaro, W. A. (2005) *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Cromdal, J. (2001) Can I be with?: Negotiating play entry in a bilingual school. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(4), 515- 543.
- Cromdal, J. (2004) Building bilingual oppositions: Code-switching in children's disputes. *Language in Society*, 33(1). 33–58.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009) Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8(4), 351-357.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2013) Caregiver responses to the language mixing of a young trilingual. *Multilingua- Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 32(1), 1-32.

- De Fina A. (2012) Family interaction and engagement with the heritage language: A case study. *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 31(4), 349–379.
- De Houwer, A. (2009) *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duranti, A. (1997) *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.) (2012) *Handbook of language socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Döpke, S. (1988) The role of parental teaching techniques in bilingual German-English families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 72, 101-112.
- Döpke, S. (1992) *One parent – one language: An interactional approach*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Döpke, S. (1998) Competing language structures: the acquisition of verb placement by bilingual German-English children. *Journal of Child Language*, 25(3), 555-584.
- Evaldsson, A. C. (2005) Staging insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group. *Discourse & Society*, 16(6), 763- 786.
- Evaldsson, A. C., & Cekaite, A. (2010) ‘Schwedis’ he can’t even say Swedish’ - subverting and reproducing institutionalized norms for language use in multilingual peer groups. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 587- 605.
- Fasulo, A., Liberati, V., & Pontecorvo, C. (2002) Language games in the strict sense of the term: Children’s poetics and conversation. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*. (pp. 209- 237). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Fishman, J. (1991) *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. (1970) *Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fogle, L. W. (2012) *Second language socialization and learner agency: Adoptive family talk*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L. W. (2013) Parental ethnotheories and family language policy in transnational adoptive families. *Language Policy* 12(1), 83–102.

- Fogle, L. W., & King, K. A. (2013) Child agency and language policy in transnational families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19(0), 1-25.
- Gafaranga, J. (2010) Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society*, 32(2), 241-270.
- Gafaranga, J. (2011) Transition space medium repair: Language shift talked into being. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 118–135.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990) *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1996) Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 370-404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006) Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk*, 26(4/5), 515- 543.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (2004) Participation. In A. Duranti (Ed.) *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 222-244). Oxford. Blackwell.
- Guardado, M. (2008) *Language socialization in Canadian Hispanic communities: Ideologies and practice* (Doctoral Dissertation). The University of British Columbia.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed). London & New York: Routledge.
- Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P (2010) *Video in qualitative research: Analyzing social interaction in everyday life*. Chennai: India.
- Hill, J., & Hill, K. (1986) *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic language in central Mexico*. Tucson: University Arizona Press.
- Hult, F. (2004) Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden. *Language Policy*, 3(2), 181-201.
- Huss, L. (1991) *Simultan tvåspråkighet i svensk-finsk kontext [Simultaneous bilingualism in a Swedish-Finnish context]* (Doctoral Dissertation, 21). University of Uppsala.
- King, K. A., & De Fina, A. (2010) Language policy and Latin immigrants: An analysis of personal experience and identity in interview talk. *Applied linguistics*, 31(5), 651- 670.

- King, K. A. (2000) Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(3), 167–184.
- King, K. A., & Fogle, L. W. (2006) Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L. W. (2013). Family language policy and bilingual parenting. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 172-194.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L. W., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008) Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907–922.
- Kirsch, C. (2012) Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 95- 112.
- Klein, J.T. (1996) *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarity, and interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville, VA.: University Press of Virginia.
- Kopeliovich, S. (2010) Family language policy: A case study of a Russian-Hebrew bilingual family: Toward a theoretical framework. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 4(3), 162–178.
- Kulick, D. (1997) *Language shift and cultural reproduction, Socialization, self, and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kyratzis, A. (2004). Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33(1), 625–649.
- Kyratzis, A. (2010) Latina girls' peer play interactions in a bilingual Spanish-English US preschool: heteroglossia, frame-shifting, and language ideology. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 557- 586.
- Lanza, E. (1997/2004) *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Li Wei (2012) Language policy and practice in multilingual, transnational families and beyond. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 1–2.
- Luykx, A. (2003) Weaving language together: Family language policy and gender socialization in bilingual Aymara households. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 25-43). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Luykx, A. (2005) Children as socializing agents: Family language policy in situations of language shift. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism (ISB)*, 1407- 1414.
- Mishima-Mori, S. (2011) A longitudinal analysis of language choice in bilingual children: The role of parental input and interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(13), 3122-3138.
- Moinian, F. (2007) *Negotiating identities: Exploring children's perspectives on themselves and their lives*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Namei, S. (2012) *Iranians in Sweden: A study of language maintenance and shift*. Skrifter utgivna av institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet [Institution of Nordic languages. University of Uppsala].
- Obied, V. M. (2009) How do siblings shape the language environment in bilingual families? *International Journal of Bilingual education and Bilingualism*, 12(6), 705-720.
- Ochs, E. (1988) *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1996) Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relatively* (pp. 407–437). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (2000) Socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1-2), 230-233.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008) Language socialization: An historical overview. In P.A. Duff & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language Education*, (2nd ed), Vol 8, Language Socialization, (pp. 3-15). New York: Springer.
- Ochs, E., Smith, R., & Taylor, C. (1989) Dinner narratives as detective stories. *Cultural Dynamics*, 2(2), 238-257.
- Ogierman, E. (2013) On the inclusive and exclusive functions of the 'other' language in family talk. *Multilingua- Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 32(4), 463–484.
- Palviainen, Å., & Boyd, S. (2013) Unity in discourse, diversity in practice: The one person one language policy in bilingual families. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful family language policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 223-248). Multilingual Education 7. Netherlands: Springer.

- Papageorgiou, I. (2009) Towards an alternative framework for the investigation of 'prac-ticed' policies in bilingual classrooms. Conference paper presented at the linguistics and English language postgraduate conference. The University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh, Scotland, 20- 23.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paugh, A. L. (2005) Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role-play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society*, 34(1), 63-86.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004) 'Stop doing that, Ia Komu Skazala!': Language choice and emotions in parent-child communication. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2-3), 179-203.
- Pietikainen, S. (2010) Sámi language mobility: scales and discourses of multilingualism in a polycentric environment. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 202, 79- 101.
- Piller, I. (2001) Private language planning: The best of both worlds. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 2(1), 61–80.
- Piller, I. (2006) Living with multiple languages: Multilingualism, identity, and belonging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(5), 689-692.
- Pitton, L. M. (2013) From language maintenance to bilingual parenting: Negotiating behavior and language choice at the dinner table in binational-bilingual families. *Multilingua- Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 32(4), 507–526.
- Quay, S. (2008) Dinner conversations with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language*, 28(1), 5–33.
- Rindstedt, C., & Aronsson, K. (2002) Growing up monolingual in a bilingual community: The Quichua revitalization paradox. *Language in Society*, 31(5), 721- 742.
- Ren, L., & Hu, G. (2013). Prolepsis, syncretism, and synergy in early language and literacy practices: a case study of family language policy in Singapore. *Language Policy*, 12(1), 63-82.
- Saldaña, J. (2009) *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a) Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15(1), 163-191.

- Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Schwartz, M. (2010) Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1, 171-92.
- Schwartz, M., & Moin, V. (2012) Parents' assessments of their preschool children's bilingual development in the context of family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 35-55.
- Shohamy, E. (2006) *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1992) Minority languages as core values of ethnic cultures: A study of maintenance and erosion of Polish, Welsh, and Chinese languages in Australia. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert & S. Kroon (Eds.), *Maintenance and loss of minority languages* (pp. 277-306). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2007) Towards a theory of language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22(1), 1-14.
- Spolsky, B. (2008) Introduction: What is educational linguistics? In B. Spolsky & F. Hult (Eds.), *The Handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 1-9). Blackwell Publishing.
- Spolsky, B. (2009) *Language management*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2012) *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Straszer, B. (2011) "Ungerska för rötternas skull": språkval och identitet bland andra-generationens ungrare i Sverige och Finland [Hungarian for the sake of my roots. *Language choice and identity among second-generation Hungarians in Sweden and Finland*] (Doctoral Dissertation, 38). Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Tannenbaum, M. (2012) Family language policy as a form of coping or defense mechanism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 57-66.
- Tuominen, A. (1999) Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 140(1), 59-76.

- Venables, E., Eisenclas, S. A., & Schalley, A. C. (2014) One-parent- one-language (OPOL) families: Is the majority language-speaking parent instrumental in the minority language development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(4), 429-448.
- Walsh, D.J., Bakin, N., Lee, T. B., Chung, Y., Chung, K., & colleagues (2007) Using digital video in field-based research with children: A primer. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Early childhood qualitative research* (pp. 43-62). New York: Routledge.
- Watson-Gegeo, K., & Bronson, M. C. (2013) The intersection of language socialization and sociolinguistics. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron, & C. Lucas (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 111-131). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wikström, H. (2007) *(O)möjliga positioner: familjer från Iran & postkoloniala reflektioner [(im)possible positions. Families from Iran & postcolonial reflections]* (Doctoral Dissertation, 2). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet, University of Gothenburg.
- Yamamoto, M. (2001) *Language use in interlingual families: A Japanese-English socio-linguistic study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Papers

The articles associated with this thesis have been removed for copyright reasons. For more details about these see:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-126178>