**Family Language Policies of Refugees:
Ethiopians and Colombians
in New Zealand**

By

Melanie Sandra Revis

A thesis

submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington

in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Victoria University of Wellington

2015

Abstract

There has been a surprising dearth of research on language maintenance and shift in New Zealand over the last decade. This thesis addresses this gap by examining incipient patterns of language maintenance and shift in families in two refugee communities in Wellington. Earlier research suggests that immigrants may maintain their ethnic languages in spite of societal factors pressuring language shift for up to three generations. By then, however, language shift is often completed, with the third generation using the majority language only (Fishman 1991). In a largely monolingual country such as New Zealand, this shift may be accomplished in only two generations (Holmes et al. 1993).

Understanding the language dynamics at the micro level that eventually lead to language maintenance or shift requires more research into actual language use among family members than traditional methods provide. This investigation therefore uses ethnographic observations, semi-structured interviews and recordings of naturally-occurring interactions between mothers and their children to highlight the challenges involved in transmitting a minority language. Using Spolsky's (2004) tripartite model of language policy, I investigate family language beliefs, practices, and management in the refugee-background Ethiopian and Colombian communities.

The Amharic-speaking Ethiopian community consists mostly of first and second generation members. They first settled in New Zealand in the 1990s and now display awareness of the challenges of maintaining their language. Most Ethiopian parents consider it their responsibility to teach their children Amharic in the home and many have introduced explicit language policies to promote Amharic use. These families exhibit an 'impact belief' (De Houwer 1999) which links their positive beliefs about Amharic with their management of family language practices. Nevertheless, in some cases children subvert and contest explicit language management and become primary agents of language shift. Supporting the parents' efforts, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church provides a social space where Amharic may be used backed by an explicit policy which requires all members to use the language when at church. This policy provides valuable institutional support and cultural capital for Amharic and contributes to the vitality of the language in Wellington.

The Colombian community has had a relatively shorter stay in Wellington, with the first members arriving as recently as 2008. Colombian mothers want to transmit Spanish and

many seem confident that their children will maintain the language. In particular, they consider the Colombian variety of Spanish to be a source of pride and a core value (Smolicz 1992), as many participants closely link this variety to their Colombian identity. They further capitalise on the prestige of Spanish as a world language that motivates them to use it even outside their ethnic community. However, few families have put in place explicit language policies to use Spanish in the home; instead, many regard it as a more urgent concern that their children learn English.

Overall, despite the community members' positive attitudes towards their ethnic languages, their efforts to transmit these languages appear to be constrained by the fact that English is invested with considerable cultural capital (Bourdieu 1977) in New Zealand. English acquisition often takes priority, particularly for many newly arrived Colombian families. The participants' refugee experiences, length of residence in New Zealand and the societal status of their ethnic languages seem influential factors on the degree of control they assume over their children's language practices. Families also dynamically adapt their language policies to the circumstances, for example by introducing an explicit minority language policy after their children have acquired what they consider to be enough English. Despite a strong desire for their children to continue speaking the ethnic language, the parents have many other (non-linguistic) responsibilities and they frequently lack knowledge about "success strategies" for minority language transmission. Moreover, the children often take significant agency by introducing English into the home domain, in some cases even influencing other family members to use it, and thus initiating language shift. The detailed interactional data in this research provides insight into the different ways parents have instantiated their varying language policies and negotiated home language choice with their children.

In sum, this research provides insight into language transmission efforts at the family level, and, using data from observations, interviews and recordings of mother-child interaction, describes in detail the unfolding of language maintenance dynamics. The thesis presents valuable insight into the underlying beliefs about Amharic and Spanish, the role of explicit language management strategies, parental socialisation and discourse styles and children's agency. As the first such research covering two recent refugee communities it will hopefully assist the individual families to socialise their children in a way that enables them to become proficient minority language speakers. This will ensure a linguistically rich future for New Zealand.

Acknowledgements

These three past years have been eventful in many ways and I have received wonderful assistance from many sides. First of all, I would like to thank my primary supervisor Professor Janet Holmes and my secondary supervisor Associate Professor Meredith Marra for their fantastic guidance, encouragement, correction, patience and super-fast correspondence. Your depth and speed of commenting on my writing have surprised me time and again.

I'm also appreciative of the Victoria University of Wellington Doctoral Scholarship and the Faculty Research Grants, which have allowed me to present my research at conferences nationally and overseas and to meet “the people behind the names” as I came into contact with many academics whose frameworks and ideas have inspired my own writing. In this regard, I'd like to thank Bernard Spolsky whose positive feedback after one of my presentations greatly encouraged me, and whose subsequent comments motivated me to explore some further issues in greater depth.

I would like to express my gratitude to staff and students at LALS for being available for chats and for providing me with company as we went on this PhD journey together. In addition, Dr Mary Roberts and Dr Deborah Laurs have frequently commented on my writing and acted as sounding board for my ideas. They have helped me find a greater degree of logical coherence. I have always looked forward to our meetings, thanks so much for listening to me and for your encouraging feedback!

My gratitude also goes to my family, especially to Mama, Oma, Karin and Jürgen, who have supported my academic career so far and surprised me with many care parcels filled with German sweets. Sadly, my dad passed away when I was only few months into my PhD - I miss you and I will always remember our fun times together! I especially thank my husband Mike, who was an amazing “PhD husband”. 😊 I thank you for your patience when I stayed in the office late and read and wrote on holidays, and for your sweet acts of love, like the times that you cooked dinner and showed up to surprise me. We met the day before I started my PhD - where will God take us now that it is finished? I look forward to a life of adventure with you!!

Last but not least, the Ethiopian and Colombian communities in Wellington deserve big thanks – thank you so much for allowing me to get to know you, to draw on your expertise and your own sociolinguistic insights and for being so welcoming. Dear Ethiopian families: You have a beautiful culture and language and your determination to keep them alive in New Zealand is a great inspiration. Dear Colombian families: I have learned a lot from spending so much time with you. You have been a great support and encouragement during the last three years. Muchísimas gracias por las horas que pasamos juntos compartiendo cositas de la vida, y gracias por su ánimo, apoyo y sus oraciones. I really hope this work can benefit your language maintenance efforts and your children will grow up as confident bi- and multilinguals in New Zealand. This PhD is dedicated to all of you who are experiencing the beauties and challenges of raising bilingual children.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research aims	4
1.2	Societal context: Multicultural New Zealand	5
1.2.1	From assimilation to multiculturalism	5
1.2.2	Influences on the health of minority languages	8
1.3	The two communities	13
1.3.1	The Ethiopian community	14
1.3.2	The Colombian community	17
1.3.3	Summary	20
1.4	Thesis overview	20
2	Literature Review.....	23
2.1	Introduction	23
2.2	Family language policy	24
2.2.1	Language beliefs	28
2.2.1.1	Personal experiences, societal ideologies and published research	28
2.2.1.2	Economic influences on language beliefs	29
2.2.1.3	Cultural influences on language beliefs	31
2.2.1.4	Core values and the role of religion	35
2.2.2	Impact belief	37
2.2.3	Language management and practices	40
2.2.3.1	Parental language input	41
2.2.3.2	Activities to foster language development	43
2.2.3.3	Parental responses to their children's use of dispreferred language	48
2.3	Summary	51
2.4	Research questions	53
3	Methodology	55
3.1	Introduction	55
3.2	Ethnographic research design	58
3.2.1	Tenets of ethnography	58
3.2.1	Access to community members	60
3.2.2	Constructing my role as an ethnographer	64
3.2.3	Interviews	66
3.2.3.1	Interviews with mothers	66
3.2.3.2	Interviews with children	72
3.2.4	Recordings of naturally-occurring speech	74
3.2.5	Data analysis	75
3.2.5.1	Model for data analysis	77
3.3	Summary	78

4 Family Language Policy in the Ethiopian Community81

4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Language beliefs	82
4.2.1	Adults' beliefs about cultural identity.....	82
4.2.1.1	Self-positioning	82
4.2.1.2	Cultural acts of identity	86
4.2.1.3	Links between Amharic and Ethiopian identity	87
4.2.2	Children's beliefs about cultural identity.....	90
4.2.1	Influence of religious beliefs on linguistic beliefs	98
4.2.2	Amharic as cultural capital	101
4.2.3	Personal motivations.....	103
4.2.4	Contrasting status of Amharic and English at the societal level.....	104
4.2.5	Summary.....	106
4.3	Language management and practices	106
4.3.1	Socialisation Scenario A	108
4.3.2	Socialisation Scenario B	113
4.3.2.1	Amharic socialisation and language negotiation	113
4.3.2.2	Influence of other family members on FLP.....	115
4.3.2.3	Teaching resources	116
4.3.2.4	The child's perspective.....	117
4.3.3	Socialisation Scenario C	121
4.3.4	Socialisation Scenario D	122
4.3.4.1	Dilingual discourse.....	122
4.3.4.2	English as a medium of communication	124
4.3.4.3	The one person - one language strategy	125
4.3.5	Socialisation Scenario E	128
4.4	Case study: Hiwot	129
4.4.1	Hiwot's cultural identity	130
4.4.2	Hiwot's language management strategies and practices	133
4.5	Summary	135

5 Family Language Policy in the Colombian Community137

5.1	Introduction	137
5.2	Language beliefs	138
5.2.1	Cultural identification	138
5.2.1.1	Links between Spanish and Colombian identity	140
5.2.2	Spanish as cultural capital.....	142
5.2.3	Personal motivations.....	144
5.2.4	Spanish loss	146
5.2.5	English as a world language	147
5.2.6	English as a cause of frustration	150
5.2.7	Summary.....	151
5.3	Language management and practices	152
5.3.1	Socialisation Scenario A: Angélica's Spanish-only management	154

5.3.1.1	Spanish socialisation	155
5.3.1.2	Exposure to English and linguistic insecurity	158
5.3.1.3	Angélica's discourse styles	161
5.3.1.1	Reciprocal exchange of capital.....	164
5.3.2	Socialisation Scenario C: Daniela and Eduardo's 'move-on' style	167
5.3.2.1	Spanish socialisation	167
5.3.2.2	English use in the family	169
5.3.2.3	Parental discourse styles.....	172
5.3.3	Socialisation Scenario D: Laura's failed teaching attempts	176
5.3.3.1	Spanish socialisation	177
5.3.3.2	Language negotiation	179
5.3.4	Socialisation Scenario E: Maritza's English management.....	182
5.4	Summary	186
6	Discussion.....	191
6.1	Research question 1: What language beliefs exist in the ethnic communities and how are these connected to cultural identity claims?.....	192
6.1.1	Bourdieu's view of the relationship between societal markets and immigrant families	192
6.1.1.1	Orthodoxy	193
6.1.1.2	Heterodoxy	194
6.1.1.3	Creation of their own field	194
6.1.2	Relationships between culture and language	195
6.1.3	Summary of response to research question 1	197
6.2	Research question 2: To what extent do parents assume responsibility for their children's language socialisation and what are their management strategies?.....	199
6.2.1	Impact beliefs and the use of explicit management strategies	200
6.2.2	Influences on the development of an impact belief	202
6.2.3	Dynamic nature of language management.....	205
6.2.1	Summary of response to research question 2.....	206
6.3	Research question 3: What key influences affect the co-construction of home language practices by parents and children?	208
6.3.1	Influences on home language practices	208
6.3.2	Children's agency	211
6.3.3	Summary of response to research question 3	213
6.4	Summary	213
7	Conclusion.....	215
7.1	Introduction	215
7.2	Research findings	216
7.3	Methodological implications	218
7.4	Theoretical implications	219
7.5	Practical implications	222
7.6	Suggestions for future research	224

7.7 Closing remarks.....	225
--------------------------	-----

References227

Appendix One: Human Ethics Committee Consent Form.....	250
Appendix Two: Participant Information Sheet	251
Appendix Three A: Interview Schedule with Ethiopian mothers	252
Appendix Three B: Interview Schedule with Colombian mothers	255
Appendix Four: Interview Schedule with Children	258
Appendix Five A: Consent Form (English)	260
Appendix Five B: Consent Form (Spanish)	261
Appendix Six: Transcription conventions.....	262

Table of Figures

Figure 1.1 Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale for immigrant languages in New Zealand (based on Fishman 1991)	9
Figure 2.1 Family Language Policy model (based on Spolsky 2009)	24
Figure 2.2 Parental discourse styles (based on Lanza 2004 and King & Logan-Terry 2008)	48
Figure 3.1 Ethnographic research design	57
Figure 3.2 Gaining access to the communities	59
Figure 3.3 Overview of interviews - mothers	65
Figure 3.4 Overview of interviews - children	70
Figure 3.5 Scenarios A-F, representing combinations of parental language management and child language practices	77
Figure 4.1 Frequency of occurrence of FLP scenarios in Ethiopian families	107
Figure 4.2 Dilingual discourse	123
Figure 4.3 Predominant use of English	124
Figure 4.4 ‘Successful’ OPOL strategy	126
Figure 4.5 ‘Unsuccessful’ OPOL strategy	127
Figure 5.1 Frequency of occurrence of FLP scenarios in Colombian families	152
Figure 5.2 Daniela and Eduardo’s discourse styles (based on Lanza 2004 and King & Logan-Terry 2008)	173
Figure 6.1 Distribution of practice and management scenarios in both communities	197
Figure 6.2 Factors affecting the development of an impact belief	203
Figure 6.3 Typical FLP trajectory	205

Abbreviations

FLP	Family Language Policy
GIDS	Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale
LM	Language Maintenance
LMLS	Language Maintenance and Shift
LS	Language Shift
OPOL	One Person – One Language

“We welcome you, your cultures and your languages.”

Maria Haywards, head of the AUT English teaching programme, in her welcome address to refugees at Mangere Refugee Resettlement Centre, Auckland, June 2012.

“She talked to me in English, but I said no.”

Ethiopian mother in this research about her efforts to use her ethnic language with her daughter, April 2013.

1 Introduction

Immigration is a worldwide phenomenon with the potential to generate rich linguistic diversity. New Zealand continues to welcome a steadily increasing number of immigrants and in the 2013/2014 financial year alone issued over 44,000 residence visas (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment 2014). New immigrants who come from non-English-speaking countries have the choice of maintaining their ethnic languages¹ or shifting to the majority language of the society. Their decision to continue using their ethnic languages and transmitting them to the following generations² is referred to as language maintenance (henceforth: LM). Alternatively, they may cease to use their ethnic languages, meaning that their children may become one of 77.7% of New Zealanders who indicated that they were English monolinguals in the 2013 Census. This indicates language shift (henceforth: LS), that is, a change in language proficiency or use (Jaspaert & Kroon 1993)³. This shift generally occurs in favour of the majority language, with immigrants gaining varying degrees of proficiency in the majority language and losing proficiency in the minority language: the first generation of migrants is typically still proficient in their ethnic language, but the second generation often has predominantly passive knowledge, and the third generation tends to speak the majority language only (Pauwels 2004). As a result, LS may be completed within just three generations (Fishman 1991; Holmes et al. 1993).

Despite this trend, members of migrant communities often believe it is important to maintain their ethnic languages, and some have initiated activities to preserve and develop their ethnic language skills. Within largely monolingual societies, such as the United States, Britain, Australia and New Zealand, these activities provide spaces where the minority language may be used. However, other immigrant community members seem unaware that their ethnic

¹ Alternative terms include ‘heritage language’ (especially in the American and Canadian context) and ‘community language’ (in New Zealand and Australia). I avoid using ‘community language’ because of its similarity to ‘language of the wider community’, which is English in this case. Instead I use either ‘ethnic language’ to signal the close link between language and culture, or ‘minority language’ to stress its status vis-à-vis the majority language (English).

² My definition of ‘generation’ is based on Rumbaut and Ima (1988) and differentiates between first, 1.5 and second generation. All adult migrants are referred to as the first generation, those children who arrived when above the age of 12 belong to the 1.5 generation, and all other children (i.e. under the age of 12 at arrival and those born in New Zealand) are members of the second generation.

³ Clyne points out that this shift may be experienced by “a whole community, a sub-group within it, or an individual” (2003:20).

languages might one day be lost and take proficiency for granted, engaging in only limited steps to ensure the language is maintained (see Taumoeofolau et al. 2002; Pérez Báez 2013). This may suffice for adults who typically continue to speak the minority language in their own ethnic networks. Children, however, whose first language capacities are not as fully developed, are more likely to need active efforts to maintain production skills in the minority language (Quiroz, Snow & Zhao 2010).

The most important domain for such language development is the home, with language transmission from parents to their children being a vital component of sustained language use and proficiency (Fishman 1991). The nature of parents' beliefs about bilingual child-raising and their resultant language practices and management seem to contribute substantially to successful language transmission (Spolsky 2004). In particular the initial period of settlement may be decisive for families with younger children as this is when parental input dominates over outside language influences (Hua & Li 2005:178) and when family language patterns and rules for future use are set (Yates & Terraschke 2013). Children seem to have higher proficiency later on if they are given the opportunity to first acquire a solid grounding in their ethnic language before being exposed to the majority language (Cummins 2000). Building such a foundation seems paramount. A cautionary example is Samoan students in New Zealand who entered English-language primary school with a weak base in their ethnic language and had shifted predominantly to English at the end of their first year (Tagoilelagi-LeotaGlynn et al. 2005). Parents' influence may decrease as the child spends more time outside the home and establishes influential peer groups (Harris 1995). Given research which demonstrates the fast rate of language shift within three generations, it seems that practices for raising bilingual children require explicit attention.

The gap between the desired bilingual outcome and the typical LS patterns led me to investigate the language dynamics at the family level in two refugee communities in New Zealand. My research interest stems from my personal experiences with refugees and their language contact experiences, the identification of gaps in previous research in this area and a perceived need for action in terms of minority language research in New Zealand.

First, my personal interest in language contact and multilingualism peaked through involvement in a large-scale project about contact languages (Michaelis et al. 2013). Capitalising further on experiences gained from my longstanding volunteer work particularly with Ethiopian refugees in Germany and a few months living in Latin America, I aimed to

connect my linguistic expertise with my interest in learning more about the situation of refugees in Wellington. With the backdrop of these interests and past activities, I was able to gain credible access to the two communities which are the focus of this research. My proficiency in Spanish enabled me to become integrated to some extent in the Colombian community. In a similar way, my knowledge of a few Amharic phrases learned during a month-long language stay in Ethiopia helped me to connect with the Ethiopian participants.

Second, refugee-background communities have generally not been the focus of language maintenance and language shift (henceforth: LMLS) studies (but see Sanchez-Castro & Gil's 2008 and Hatoss' 2013 research in Australia). Previous bilingualism studies worldwide have usually dedicated most attention to children's education problems as a result of migration (e.g. Rumbaut & Ima 1988). They have also focused on families of a generally established socio-economic standing wanting their children to be bilingual in their mother tongue and another prestigious language in light of the economic benefits of speaking several languages (e.g. Piller 2001a; King & Fogle 2006). Providing children with a bilingual upbringing is often considered in those families as "good parenting" (King & Fogle 2006). In contrast, LM studies about recent refugees who may be faced with entirely different challenges, begin from a less privileged position, and may not primarily focus on gaining the valuable asset of bilingualism for their children, have been less frequent. Despite New Zealand's intake of an annual refugee quota of 750, there is no comprehensive research to date which focuses on refugees' efforts to maintain their languages.

Third, there is a need for researching the dynamics of language maintenance and shift (henceforth: LMLS) at the present time. Most research about language use in New Zealand migrant communities took place in the 1980s and 1990s, and academic interest seems to have waned in more recent years. Global factors impacting on LM have changed (as argued in more detail by Held et al. 1999), and recent technological developments have enhanced access to different languages resources on the internet. In addition, the reduced cost of international travel has facilitated visits from other family members, who can also be contacted with relative ease thanks to technology. Moreover, New Zealand has become considerably more multicultural with a constant call for sustained immigration to provide an adequate labour force and active local efforts directed to foster the survival of cultures and languages. As a result, younger generations of migrants seem to have more reasons to seek opportunities for using their ethnic languages.

By providing data on the two previously unresearched Ethiopian and Colombian communities, my research responds to Holmes' (1997) call for more information about LM attitudes, proficiency and language use patterns within the different language communities in New Zealand. I complement research in Wellington, which has investigated LMLS in Pacific, Asian and European immigrant groups (Holmes et al. 1993; Shameem 1994), by adding Africa and Latin America as two more recent source regions.

Moreover, I resume the tradition of LMLS research in Wellington by incorporating it into the academic currents 15 years on. While traditional theoretical frameworks for LMLS inform this analysis, the methodology has been chosen to be more ethnographic in nature and involves a more dynamic approach of actual language negotiation in the family. The micro-level has been relatively under-explored, and current trends increasingly highlight the need for analysing home interactions (e.g. Li 2012; see work by Curdt-Christiansen 2013b; Schwartz & Verschik 2013). However, such research is still relatively rare in New Zealand and a knowledge gap exists about the different ways in which immigrant families negotiate their language resources in the home.

1.1 Research aims

The overarching aim of this research is to uncover some of the complexities of implementing a family language policy in the context of recent (forced) migration to a *de facto* monolingual country. I focus on the recent Ethiopian and Colombian refugee communities in Wellington, New Zealand, using the three components of Spolsky's (2004) language policy model as a framework: the families' underlying language beliefs, language practices and management of these practices. Thus, I aim to provide a description of currently used family language policies, a discussion of the ensuing language dynamics and insights into successful minority language acquisition by immigrant children.

I first aim to explore different types of language beliefs present in the communities because these provide a strong foundation for home language practices. On the one hand, positive beliefs about the minority language may translate into maintenance efforts. Researchers have for example suggested that a strong identification with an ethnic community will manifest itself in a commitment to language transmission, especially if the ethnic language is closely linked to their particular cultural identity (Schechter & Bayley 1997; Guardado 2008a). On the other hand, negative or uninformed beliefs are commonly a reason to shift to the majority

language because parents (mistakenly) fear that their children may suffer negative effects through exposure to two languages (see issues discussed in Baetens Beardsmore 2003). These contrasting types of beliefs about language and bilingual development merit attention as they may affect both parents' and children's language practices (Spolsky 2004). To identify the link between the parents' language beliefs and their childrearing practices, I aim to explore the ways in which they feel responsible for their children's minority language acquisition.

My research also aims to identify language practices and management strategies used by families within the two communities to promote their language beliefs. Previous studies have identified that some parents seeking to encourage their children to speak the minority language feel challenged when their children refuse to use it (see Yates & Terraschke 2013). They may lack strategies and resources for providing their children with a solid foundation in their ethnic language while this language is notably absent in wider society. Hence this research aims to investigate the diverse language beliefs, language practices and language management within the two refugee communities in order to contribute to the documentation of effective bilingual socialisation strategies and assist the communities to maintain their languages.

1.2 Societal context: Multicultural New Zealand

1.2.1 From assimilation to multiculturalism

The societal context sets the broad frame for personal LM efforts. Societies may have diverging policies in relation to the contact between different cultures ranging from assimilation policies to multicultural policies embracing diversity. These policies may greatly affect the maintenance of minority languages as they form part of the wider discourse and trickle down to the family domain (Pauwels 2005). The macro-level links to the micro-level as it provides the institutional framework for personal LM efforts. In the following sections I discuss the macro-conditions for language transmission at the societal level in New Zealand by following the historical development from an assimilationist to a multicultural society. I then present responses to societal ideologies at the family level and discuss the *de facto* status of a number of ethnic languages spoken by minority communities in New Zealand.

Over the last forty years New Zealand has by and large transformed from an assimilationist to a multicultural society. During assimilationist times in the 1970s, migrants (as well as the local Māori population) were encouraged to give up their minority languages in order to

become fully integrated into English-speaking society (Benton 2001; Crezee 2012). Initially, therefore, the government preferred to invite Dutch migrants to settle because they had similar racial features to British migrants and tended to assimilate quickly to New Zealand's culture and language (Hulsen 2000:6,7). Migrants other than the Dutch had more difficulties settling in (Roberts 2005). Overall, the goal for New Zealand seemed to be a monocultural society where everyone spoke English only.

Nowadays, the potential value of minority languages for both state and individual migrant (see Cavallaro 2005:200) is more widely recognised. The close relationship between language and cultural identity was highlighted by Romaine (2011:10), who cites the words of Sir James Hēnare during Waitangi Tribunal negotiations, where he claimed *Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori* 'The language is the essence of Māori identity' (Waitangi Tribunal 1989:34; in Romaine 2011:10). New Zealand now espouses a *de facto* multicultural ideology and generally encourages migrants to use their languages (Ward & Liu 2012). Moreover, people are starting to realise that linguistic diversity requires space, that is, domains and social networks where their ethnic languages can be used (Walker 2011a). Former race relations Commissioner Joris de Bres encouraged the public to think more multiculturally. Walker (2011a:149) reports that he opened a national conference for language teachers in 2007 by saying: "New Zealand needs to shake off its monolingual complacency and recognise the value of language diversity for the nation's social, economic and cultural development". His statement indicated that he was asking for an increasingly multilingual ideology for New Zealand.

Similarly, the Department of Labour's Final Settlement Strategy (2007) "Our Future together" gave a general call to New Zealanders to accept and respect new migrant cultures. However, although the strategy highlighted cultural and linguistic diversity, no explicit steps were introduced to ensure that the initial diversity could be maintained over the years. New Zealand's linguistic ecology currently offers few niches for minority languages outside ethnic organisations. Instead, the government's claims that it is essential for migrants to master English in order to participate in the social and economic life of New Zealand (Dept of Labour: New Faces, New Futures 2009) seem to postulate English proficiency as a criterion that decides over 'inclusion' or 'exclusion' in society (Heller 2003; Shohamy 2006). This idea is reinforced by workplace research, which has identified that migrants are usually expected to use English in public domains and to adjust to prevalent language use norms (Holmes, Marra & Vine 2011:158). While these arrangements do not preclude the

maintenance of individual languages, they indicate some pressure to use the language of the majority group.

The need for a language policy for New Zealand has been recognised, but endeavours to create such a document (e.g. Peddie 1991; Waite 1992; Kaplan 1993) have failed to date. Currently, Māori and New Zealand Sign Language are the *de jure* official languages of New Zealand, and English is a *de facto* official language “by virtue of its widespread use” (Te Kete Ipurangi 2007). The respective government departments decide separately whether and how to incorporate other languages into fields such as education and business. However, two recent publications (Harvey 2013; Languages in Aotearoa New Zealand 2013) have again highlighted the current linguistic diversity in New Zealand (RSNZ estimates that more than 160 languages are spoken), and drawn attention to the United Nation’s (1992) resolution that “it is not enough for a language to be tolerated, but that it should be actively provided for and promoted” (Languages in Aotearoa New Zealand 2013:2). These reports emphasise the strategic usefulness of a language policy for the whole nation.

Overall, governmental documents released over the last 20 years seem to reflect the tension between the need for migrants to acquire the majority language to participate in New Zealand’s social and economic life, and for society to provide space where minority languages can be used. A recent release from Internal Affairs suggests that English proficiency relates to economic integration in the labour market and argues that “there is a negative correlation between the conditions that are favourable to English language acquisition and those that promote heritage language maintenance” (2014:1). The report also stresses that, given the lack of institutional support for minority language literacy, migrants are unlikely to attain proficiency in reading, writing and speaking both languages.

Discussions held in mid-2014 between community language organisations and the then Minister of the Strategy and Policy department of the Office of Ethnic Affairs have suggested that the government currently favours English language tutoring over minority language maintenance. However, the report and its underlying tenets have been seriously contested by local sociolinguists (e.g. Smith 2014; Warren, Harvey & Meyerhoff 2014). It is furthermore unclear at this stage how these new ministerial ideologies will influence governmental, societal and the immigrant families’ LM ideologies.

1.2.2 Influences on the health of minority languages

Inevitably, prevailing societal ideologies trickle down to influence family language beliefs (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). Since the family is the child's immediate microcosm that transmits norms and values, the caregivers' understanding of language ideologies plays a key role in child language socialisation. The following two examples from the last ten years suggest that the parents perceived the general climate as unsupportive. For example, De Bres (2004) relates that Dutch families seemed to be aware that they had the opportunity to continue to use Dutch in New Zealand, but they also realised that whether they did so or not did not matter to New Zealanders in general. Similarly, some families in Walker's (2011b) study experienced frustration because of the lack of favourable conditions for language transmission, such as general societal acknowledgement of the worth of languages other than English, the existence of spaces for practising the minority language and provision of formal language classes. These examples suggest that even seemingly multicultural societal ideologies without proper facilitation of minority language use may negatively impact on parents' decisions to transmit their minority language.

The lack of incentive to maintain one's own language is also rendered more concrete by a perceived need within many immigrant families to speak English. For example, Shameem (1994) claims that one reason few Indo-Fijian-speaking children maintain the language in New Zealand is because of a prevailing ideology within the Indo-Fijian community that English will bring them academic and social success. Using this instrumental reason for favouring English, this parental worldview discourages the children from acquiring higher proficiency in Fiji Hindi. Furthermore, other studies revealed a similar trend amongst Italian and Latino migrants. Parents considered that developing a better command of English was more urgent because their children required English for access to social and economic domains in New Zealand (Plimmer 1994; Walker 2011a).

The examples of investigation above are indicative of the strong tradition of research into LMLS in New Zealand. While Fishman's (1972) research posits three to four generations for LS, in New Zealand, a country characterised by sustained immigration, LS may take as little as two generations for some communities (Holmes et al. 1993). Researchers have employed a variety of models to analyse different aspects of the LMLS process and have conducted studies on Afrikaans (Barkhuizen & Knoch 2005; Barkhuizen 2006); Arabic (Al-Sahafi & Barkhuizen 2006); Cantonese (Sun 1999; Cui 2012); Cook Islands Māori (Davis & Starks

2005); Croatian (Stoffel 1981; Stoffel 1996); Dutch (Johri 1998; Roberts 1999; Hulsen 2000; Hulsen, Bot & Weltens 2002; De Bres 2004; Crezee 2008; Crezee 2012); Fiji Hindi (Shameem 1994); Greek (Verivaki 1990); Indonesian (Adlam 1987); Italian (Plimmer 1994; Berardi-Wiltshire 2009); Japanese (Nakanishi 2000); Polish (Surus 1985; Neazor 1991); Samoan (Fairburn-Dunlop 1984; Pilkington 1990; Hoare 1991; Johri 1998; Roberts 1999; McCaffery & Tuafuti 2003); Serbo-Croatian/Dalmatian (Jakich 1987); Spanish (Walker 2011b; Lee 2013); Tongan ('Aipolo & Holmes 1990) and others (see also references in Starks 2005 and list in Lee 2013:22 for further languages). One of the most recent large-scale projects was conducted more than ten years ago. From 2001 to 2003, Auckland University of Technology staff investigated attitudes and the use of four Pasifika languages (Samoan, Tongan, Nuiean and Cook Islands' Māori) in Manukau (Starks et al. 2005). Their analysis of data from surveys and in-depth interviews indicated that minority languages were being maintained but that the younger community members' use of English was likely to signal impending LS.

In order to show where LM is achieved or shift is impending in the New Zealand context I adopt Fishman's (1991) graded intergenerational disruption scale (GIDS), a model used by a few previous studies (e.g. Roberts 1999). The model portrays a continuum of eight sociolinguistic situations ranging from highly advantageous to disadvantageous in terms of possibilities for LM.

Stage 8	minority language is used by isolated older speakers
Stage 7	minority language is used by socially integrated speakers beyond child-bearing age
Stage 6	Intergenerational language transmission of the minority language assisted by institutional support
Stage 5	minority language literacy efforts in the community
Stage 4	minority language is used in lower education
Stage 3	minority language is used in lower work sphere
Stage 2	minority language is used in lower government services and mass media
Stage 1	minority language is used on higher levels of government and media

Figure 1.1 Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale for immigrant languages in New Zealand (based on Fishman 1991)

Most importantly, the GIDS hypothesises a link between LS and the use of the ethnic language in the home: Fishman (1991) asserts that intergenerational language transmission (Stage six) is crucial for LM. He claims that the family needs to practice and encourage minority language use as a cornerstone for any governmental or educational measures (Stages one to five) in order to achieve LM (see also Pauwels 2005:125; Starks 2005).

Due to increased migration, the demographics of language in New Zealand have changed substantially over the last decade. In 1999, Roberts asserted that most immigrant languages in New Zealand seemed to be located from stage seven to stage five on Fishman's scale, that is, between communal literacy efforts for children who generally learned their ethnic language in the home to the existence of only older ethnic language speakers beyond child-bearing age. Roberts stressed that Serbo-Croatian (Jakich 1987) potentially represented one of the languages least likely to continue to be spoken in the New Zealand context, for reasons outlined below. Other languages were still being transmitted from parents to children (as discussed below), but were not represented in society through any institutional measures. A few migrant languages, such as Samoan and Mandarin, are currently used as media of education at the primary school level (Stage 4); yet, the introduction of such bilingual programmes is scarce and left to the discretion and funding of the school (McCaffery & Tuafuti 2003). Other Pasifika languages have been offered at childcare level. This may have a positive influence on language use by the respective communities and help Pacific Islanders retain their ethnic languages. While Roberts had no data for Stage 3, it is widely reported that several minority languages are currently spoken by immigrants working in low-paid positions such as cleaning or supermarket jobs. Moreover, she claimed that the provision of interpreting services at government agencies for a number of minority languages might mean these are categorised as Stage 2 (but would skip some intermediate stages).

Currently, the most widely used immigrant language in New Zealand (with a population of 4,242,048) is Samoan with 86,403 speakers, followed by Hindi (66,309 speakers) and a language category termed "Northern Chinese" (52,263 speakers), which includes Mandarin (Census 2013 Totals by Topic - Languages). The fact that a number of second generation members of these communities speak their ethnic language suggests that language transmission (Stage 6) is at least partly occurring. In general, minority languages in New Zealand can be categorised at the survival level initially, but their use tends to decrease with each generation.

While New Zealand research on LM within different communities provides diverse results depending on societal attitudes and the specific communities involved, researchers (e.g. Kloss 1966; Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Holmes et al. 1993; Clyne 2003) identified several factors conducive to prolonged LM. For example, Holmes et al. (1993) noted that those communities most successful in maintaining their minority language generally had regular social interactions, used the minority language in the home, exhibited positive attitudes towards their language and linked it strongly to their cultural identity. Moreover, they tended to live closely together, showed resistance to intercultural marriages and regarded their home country positively. Institutional support was often provided through language schools and religious organisations belonging to the community. Higher maintenance was achieved by those communities that fulfilled several of these criteria.

Migrant communities in New Zealand differ in relation to these factors, which I discuss here in terms of intermarriage, the link between culture and language, and institutional support. Low intermarriage rates for Gujarati, Samoan and Cantonese and the fact that both parents spoke the same language seemed to facilitate language transmission (Holmes et al. 1993; Roberts 1999:450). In contrast, extremely high rates for both intermarriage and LS were found for Dutch migrants (Leek 1996; Hulsen 2000:9,162) and Cook Islanders (Davis & Starks 2005). This applied also to the Serbo-Croatian community, with the mostly single men exhibiting a high degree of intermarriage, which contributed to the use of English by the second generation (Stoffel 1981; 1996) (hence Roberts' (1999) assumption that Serbo-Croatian would soon experience a shift). The only hope for maintenance was claimed to be increased migration from (then) Yugoslavia to increase the number of speakers and thus provide more opportunities for language use (Stoffel 1981).

Members of several ethnic communities were shown to closely link their culture with their ethnic language. For example, Lee (2013) reports that the Chilean community in Auckland strongly values the Spanish language as core to their identity and a defining feature of cultural membership. Likewise, Cui (2012) establishes that many of her Chinese participants consider knowledge of Chinese important for maintaining their ethnic identity, and that this contributes to their desire to teach their children. Although a strong link between culture and language does not guarantee LM, it seems to encourage parents to transmit these positive language attitudes to their children.

Members of a small number of ethnic communities, however, explicitly unlinked their language and identity. Dutch communities in New Zealand and Australia valued their cultural identity, but did not perceive language to be an essential identity marker and seemed happy to switch to English even for communication inside the family (Hulsen 2000). Crezee (2008) argues that some individuals ceased to consider Dutch as a core value after a short while of living in New Zealand as a reaction to external pressures of switching to English. Likewise, the Polish in Wellington, contrary to Smolicz's (1992) findings in Australia, considered maintaining Polish traditions and customs more important than their language (Neazor 1991). Alongside other factors, this missing link contributed to faster language attrition and shift.

The New Zealand government provides some institutional support for LM (see Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977), especially for the three Pacific languages Niuean, Cook Island Māori and Tokelauan, given that New Zealand entertains a constitutional relationship with the three Pacific countries where these languages are spoken and many speakers have migrated to New Zealand. With government funding, literacy material for these languages was developed and promoted amidst "a larger programme which [...] seek[s] to preserve the Niue, Tokelau and Cook Island Māori languages among New Zealand communities" (Race Relations 2004:20). These governmental revitalisation efforts yielded positive results, and, undoubtedly supported by the strong traditional role of grandparents in raising children, the languages have since regained speakers: for instance, although two thirds of Tokelauans are New Zealand-born, an increasing number report they can hold an everyday conversation in Tokelauan (Pene, Peita & Howden-Chapman 2009).

Official institutional support for other minority cultures and languages appears to be available to a lesser degree and small ethnic communities usually have the least resources.

Nevertheless, religious institutions such as Samoan churches, Greek Orthodox churches and mosques (Fairburn-Dunlop 1984; Verivaki 1990; Al-Sahafi & Barkhuizen 2006) tend to provide support for ethnic languages (as discussed in Chapter 2). Social clubs and language classes (such as for Gujarati, Italian and Spanish) enable migrants to use their languages to some degree in the host society (Plimmer 1994; Roberts 1999; Berardi-Wiltshire 2009; Lee 2013), thus increasing the vitality of these languages. Overall, factors conducive to LM are present to various degrees in the different migrant communities in New Zealand and may be weighted differently for each community. Conditions for language transmission therefore vary.

Data suggesting that official support is rare and the home domain activities are central for LM might lead us to conclude that research on home language use is essential to understand the dynamics underlying LM. While most researchers so far have based their findings on reported data, it is also recognised that such descriptions cannot adequately capture the real interactions in the family home. The only New Zealand research available to the best of my knowledge using recorded interactions to provide more in-depth descriptions of the language dynamics in immigrant families is Yu's (2005) doctoral research. Yu conducted a longitudinal study using recordings of naturally-occurring interactions in the homes of Chinese skilled migrants and showed that both adults and children were influenced by the majority language, and that children appropriated English to talk to each other sooner than adults. Her study provides a starting point for in-depth investigations of intergenerational language transmission in migrant communities.

In sum, societal openness towards other cultures in New Zealand seems to be coupled with reluctance to provide spaces, encouragement, and institutional support for the preferred language practices of the different minority groups. A variety of factors impact on ethnic communities' LM. Generally those that speak the minority language in the home and have strong community support seem more likely to maintain the minority language. Further analyses of home interactions may therefore shed light on actual LM dynamics.

I now discuss the background of the two ethnic communities for whom I provide such detailed LM descriptions.

1.3 The two communities

My participants are United Nations quota refugees whom the New Zealand government invited to be resettled in New Zealand (see Beaglehole 2013). About 750 refugees come to New Zealand every year from countries as diverse as Afghanistan, Rwanda, Iraq, Zimbabwe, Somalia and Vietnam. Many refugees from Ethiopia were welcomed in the 1990s, but the focus in recent years has been on the Asia-Pacific region comprising countries such as Sri Lanka, Burma and Colombia (Immigration New Zealand 2013). UNHCR-registered refugees are first interviewed by an Immigration New Zealand panel in their country of refuge. They are then brought to New Zealand, where they attend a six-week course at the Mangere Refugee Resettlement Centre to learn English and familiarise themselves with New Zealand culture. Subsequently, they are resettled to various parts of the country, where refugee

agencies attempt to house the different community members close together so they can offer mutual support.

While a detailed study on the resettlement journey has been published for the Bhutanese community (Ferguson 2011) and research has also dealt with the Somali community (e.g. Guerin & Guerin 2007), relatively little is known about the Ethiopian and Colombian communities. The 2013 Census subsumes the diverse ethnic affiliations “Middle Eastern/Latin American/African” under one heading and counts them as 6,567 for the Wellington region. They are considerably outnumbered by other migrant communities such as Asians (47,235) and Pacific Peoples (36,105).

The following descriptions of the Ethiopian and Colombian communities rely on the scarce material available from official sources. I first outline the political and linguistic background of each community and describe findings of relevant LMLS research in other diaspora locations where Ethiopians and Colombians have settled. I then introduce the situation of the two communities in Wellington and situate their languages by presenting perceptions about Amharic and Spanish in New Zealand.

1.3.1 The Ethiopian community

Ethiopia, one of the few countries in Africa never to be colonised, ended its monarchy under Haile Selassie with a coup in 1974. Thereafter, a military Marxist junta under the leadership of Mengistu Haile Mariam assumed rule of the country, brutally murdered many of its opponents and caused others to flee. The junta was overthrown in 1991 and a political multi-party system was established. Although generally described as “stable” (e.g. Green 2011), the country has over the years produced a high number of refugees fleeing from political persecution. Other factors creating refugees were a long-time drought in the country that brought famine, as well as war with Eritrea in the 1990s, resulting in the separation of Eritrea from Ethiopia in 1993. Some Ethiopians who have stayed and remained politically active members of the Opposition parties have been incarcerated and killed (Green 2011).

In Ethiopia, 87 different languages are spoken (Ethnologue Ethiopia 2014), with Oromo, Amharic, Somali and Tigrinya having most speakers. Since 1994, Meles Zenawi and his current successor Hailemariam Desalegn have established Amharic as the official language but essentially promoted ethnic and linguistic diversity. As a result, multilingualism is the norm, and the current government promotes mother-tongue education in addition to Amharic

and, at a later stage, English. Members of the Amhara ethnic group, subject of this investigation, speak the official language of the country and comprise approximately 27% of the population (Central Statistical Agency, Ethiopia, Census 2007).

Teshome (2004) highlights the global scarcity of research about experiences of Ethiopian migrants despite the exodus of Ethiopian refugees. She claims that most resources are historic documents written by white scholars describing the “native people” (2004:4) as they found them in Ethiopia decades ago. Equally, a general gap in research has been noted about the African population in New Zealand, including Ethiopians (but see Meager 2005; Sahele 2005).

The existing research has mostly been produced in the United States, complemented with a few studies from Israel and one from Australia. Although Ethiopians are often considered part of African American communities in the United States, Teshome (2004:45) outlined how a few first-generation Ethiopian migrant women in the United States in her study felt more at ease among the white population than in groups of Black people, where they experienced criticism for not living up to cultural expectations for Blacks. Ethiopians were shown to self-identify mostly as *Habesha*⁴, thus positioning themselves between the predominant White and Black stereotypes (Habecker 2012). Weldeyesus (2009) investigated the language practices of Ethiopian immigrants in Denver and found that the adults continued to use Amharic in their close-knit Ethiopian networks and upheld strong imagined and physical ties with Ethiopia. At the same time, they felt distance from the mainly Ethiopian identity they had had upon arrival and positioned themselves as having a more Americanised Ethiopian identity, though they often still struggled to develop English proficiency. The three Orthodox Churches in Denver played a key role in providing a faith community for adults and teaching children about Ethiopian culture and language. Inculcating in their children a sense of Ethiopian belonging was reportedly very important to the parents, but they generally failed to provide a home environment conducive to this outcome. As a result, the children were typically monolingual in English and adopted a hyphenated identity. This supported Chacko’s (2003) findings that Ethiopian teenagers in Washington of the second generation developed hybrid identities.

⁴ The term *habesha* refers to “a core pan-cultural group of peoples within Greater Ethiopia” (Paul 2000:176), and is often used as an umbrella term to designate Ethiopians and Eritreans (though it is not without problems, see discussion in Smidt 2010).

Other research from Israel (e.g. Stavans, Olshtain & Goldzweig 2009; Tannenbaum 2009), destination of many Ethiopian Jews, shows that these generally proudly maintained Amharic, but also feared losing their language and culture because they recognised that Amharic was not useful in their new environment. Moreover, Ethiopian parents tended to expose their children to patterns of oral literacy in the home before they started school, but usually abandoned their home literacy efforts due to institutional devaluing of their minority culture (Stavans 2012). In Australia, Debela and Milosh's (1993) findings indicated that parents strongly desired for their children to speak Amharic but did not always transform these wishes into actions. Overall, these results suggest that the church has a significant impact on ethnic language socialisation in the Ethiopian communities, but hybrid identity labels and decreasing Amharic knowledge are common for the second generation of Ethiopians in the United States, Israel and Australia.

The New Zealand government sustains only limited political and trade relationships with Ethiopia. However, it has maintained a link with Ethiopia through development collaboration and there is a noteworthy Ethiopian diaspora in New Zealand. The first Ethiopian quota refugees were brought to New Zealand in the year 1993/1994. As at June 2012 (the end of the year 2011/2012), 1173 Ethiopian quota refugees had entered the country. The majority of Ethiopians came under the Refugee Family Reunification Scheme, meaning that they were brought to New Zealand directly from Ethiopia to join family members who were already residents. The majority arrived in the mid- to late 90s (Refugee Quota Arrivals, Immigration NZ) and comprised different ethnicities such as Tigrayans, Oromos and Amharas.

The 2013 Census data unfortunately fails to provide detailed ethnic information as respondents seem to have provided their national identity rather than their ethnic affiliation. While 47.6% of Ethiopians in New Zealand reported speaking Amharic, this may not necessarily signify LS as many of those who do not speak Amharic may belong to another Ethiopian ethnic group. Nevertheless, the Census data also suggests that those born in New Zealand are less likely to speak Amharic than those born overseas. Currently 1245 Ethiopians live in New Zealand. Most of the diaspora has settled in Auckland, with only 19.8% living in Wellington. More than a quarter of these immigrated within the last five years. While the community tends to have overall little public representation in Wellington, they opened a restaurant in 2013. Their strong presence at African and refugee-related events provides an incentive for investigating their cultural and linguistic dynamics.

1.3.2 The Colombian community

Colombia has been involved in a variety of internal conflicts, mostly among armed guerrilla groups (especially the *Ejército de Liberación Nacional* - ELN and the *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia* - FARC), drug cartels and the government. Although the government has claimed to make progress in the fight against drugs and violence and the conflict seems to have died down since 2002, illegal groupings in the country still pose a threat to the population. In addition, the gap between rich and poor is wide: Colombia has produced recent billionaires, but the majority of the population live under the poverty line, making them prone to be recruited as members of illegal groupings (Ribetti 2007). The UNHCR estimates that about 394,007 refugees currently originate from Colombia (UNHCR 2014).

Colombia has a linguistic wealth of 84 languages (Ethnologue Colombia 2014), with Spanish being the official language of the country. Indigenous groups and Creole-speaking populations are disadvantaged, however, because of the overriding power of Spanish in the country. There are movements to promote these minority languages, for example, by including them in the school curriculum or fostering education in the respective language (De Mejía 2006). In contrast, English-Spanish bilingualism, which seems to be considered more prestigious than bilingualism involving indigenous languages, is a plan in action with the recent launch of the strategy “Bogotá Bilingüe”. However, this is viewed critically by supporters of indigenous bilingualism efforts (e.g. De Mejía 2006; Hamel 2008). Despite these strategies and the apparent multilingual nature of Colombian society, Colombia tends to present itself as a monolingual country, with the existing ethnolinguistic groups suppressed in favour of the widespread majority use of Spanish (Ordóñez 2011).

There is a scarcity of research examining Spanish maintenance among immigrant groups in New Zealand and equally limited research on Latin Americans. Apart from studies dealing with general issues of cultural identity and integration of Chilean refugees dating back to the nineties (Barnard 1996; Rivera 1997; Hurtado-Roberts 2002) to the best of my knowledge the only linguistic studies take the form of one journal article (Vaccarino & Walker 2009), one book chapter (Walker 2011b) and one Master’s thesis about LMLS in the Chilean community in Auckland (Lee 2013). In the light of Walker’s (2011b:333,349) call (see also Starks 2005; Lee 2013), there is clearly a need for LMLS research exploring the current status of Spanish among Colombian immigrants.

What these previous studies in New Zealand have shown is that many Spanish-speakers consider their language crucial for their identities and want to transmit it to their children, but are hindered by a lack of societal support. While many families struggle to find space for Spanish in the English-dominant New Zealand context geographically isolated from Latin America (Walker 2011b), a small biliteracy workshop comprising a Chilean family, among others, assisted parents in teaching their children about their ethnic culture and provided a bilingual space (Vaccarino & Walker 2009). Spanish-speaking migrants further benefit from a generally positive view of Hispanic culture. One reason for this, Walker identifies, is the Latin music and dance scene which enhances the language's status. Lee (2013) further argues that the TV show *Dora the Explorer* seems to raise the prestige of Spanish, even for younger children. Both Walker and Lee also stress the role played by the Spanish-speaking community which, though small in number, seems to strengthen the individual efforts of families to transmit Spanish.

One previous finding relevant to LM is that the Colombian variety of Spanish seems to have generally high prestige among Colombians. In Zentella's (2009) study, 56% of Colombians in the United States preferred Colombian Spanish as the variety to be taught in schools because it was the most "correct" Spanish variety in their view. Likewise, Colombians also considered it a compliment to be identified as speaking Colombian Spanish (Zentella 2009). In contrast, a finding that may adversely affect LM dynamics is the widespread disunity which has been reported in research about Colombian migrants in London. "Severe lack of trust and widespread fear" has been highlighted as a result of "a perceived culture of individualism and materialism" and "the Colombian political situation and the misplaced stereotyping of Colombians with drugs" (McIlwaine 2005:5). McIlwaine (2005) reports that the Colombians in her research had no feeling of cohesion with other Colombians in general and therefore forged their identities mostly around family, friends, region and social class. Given the important role of social networks identified by Walker (2011b) and Lee (2013), these dynamics may affect LM as well for the Colombian community in Wellington.

The New Zealand government has invited Colombians into the country under the refugee quota programme since 2008, and the 2013 Census data shows that 654 Colombians currently live in New Zealand. The Census data also shows that there are a total of 26,979 Spanish-

speakers in New Zealand⁵, of whom 4,179 live in the Wellington region. This widespread Spanish knowledge may have facilitated the settlement of the Colombians, as a few Spanish-speakers work in institutions such as schools, banks or other governmental services and provide Colombian refugees the opportunity to occasionally use Spanish at the societal level. There is also a developing Spanish food and music scene in Wellington with restaurants from Mexico gaining ground (Walker 2011b). Spanish is taught in some schools, there are private language schools offering Spanish classes, and students also have the chance to pursue higher education studying Spanish at several universities in the country. Moreover, there are economic incentives to learn Spanish as the Latin America Strategy devised by the New Zealand government stresses the need to use the Spanish language for business opportunities in Latin American countries (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2010). All these factors suggest a growing popularity of Spanish in New Zealand society.

Print information about the Colombian community in Wellington is largely limited to press releases. One local newspaper describes the distressing backgrounds of the new refugee group by reporting that “the majority of the Colombian refugees have been subjected to a fairly high degree of trauma and almost all have lost family members or have been personal victims of severe abuse as a result of confrontations between paramilitary forces in Colombia.” At the same time, the reporter adds that “during interviews with Immigration New Zealand all the Colombian refugees highlighted their dream to go to a safe place, find jobs and educate their children” (Computers in homes Porirua 2010). While newspaper articles naturally need to be read with caution for potential bias, the document provides insight into difficult previous experiences of the Colombian community members. Another striking factor is that a high number of single mothers seems to feature in similar news reports, which potentially reflects the focus of the government of offering refuge to “women at risk” (see De Souza 2012). Overall, this small amount of existing information about the Colombian refugee-background community and their continued immigration motivates my research into their linguistic maintenance.

⁵ This figure includes all census respondents who stated they can hold an everyday conversation in Spanish.

1.3.3 Summary

In summary, both communities have had to flee from longstanding violence in their countries. The Ethiopian community has had more time to become established in New Zealand than the Colombian community. However, neither community has been researched nor become highly visible in Wellington. Spanish and Amharic LM have been researched in some overseas contexts, but research on these two languages in New Zealand is in its infancy. Although members from both communities come from highly linguistically diverse countries, they typically speak the majority language. Hence, they have no experience with being in a minority situation and therefore may not be familiar with maintenance efforts for their own language. The societal profiles of Spanish and Amharic mean that the two languages have different degrees of vitality, with Spanish becoming more popular in New Zealand.

1.4 Thesis overview

Chapter 1 has presented the rationale for my research and served as an entry point to the topic of LMLS and the central influence of home language use. The second part of this chapter has provided an introduction to the research setting and described the background of the two migrant communities.

Chapter 2 provides a literature review of previous research on the factors affecting LMLS including language beliefs, language practices and language management (Spolsky 2004). The review identifies a gap leading to the research questions addressed in this thesis. Chapter 3 locates my research methodology within the field of linguistic ethnography and presents methodological arguments for the research design. It also introduces a model for categorising different family language policy scenarios which will structure the two analyses chapters.

Chapters 4-6 contain analyses of the data. Chapter 4 provides the results of ethnographic observation, recordings and interviews concerning language beliefs, cultural identification and language management and practices in the Ethiopian community. Specific examples from language policies in the families involved in the research illustrate the kinds of issues many families face as they implement explicit management to use Amharic in the home. The chapter concludes with a case study illustrating how language beliefs, cultural identification and membership in the local ethnic community contribute to one mother's efforts to transmit Amharic to her children.

Chapter 5 presents findings from the Colombian community concerning language beliefs, management and practices. The high status of Spanish as an international language with high prestige seems to guide language beliefs and many Colombian parents impart cultural pride to their children; however, I argue that many have only a weak impact belief (De Houwer 1999) or demonstrate a lack of it concerning language transmission. This is evidenced by their rare use of explicit language management strategies and deliberate parental use of both English and Spanish. In-depth case studies of four Colombian families illustrate the diverse ways of handling the tensions generated by language contact in a family situation.

Chapter 6 discusses the issues raised in the analysis chapters and addresses the research questions. Chapter 7 summarises the main findings of the research, outlines possible implications for implementing family language policies and suggests areas for further research.

This chapter has provided an introduction to the topic of LM and described my rationale for conducting this research. The second chapter positions my research within the field of family language policy and provides a survey of literature involving language beliefs, home language practices and language management.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Until recently the topic of language maintenance and language shift (LMLS) has been mainly examined at a macro-level by exploring language use in domains (see Fishman 1965), language vitality (e.g. Giles, Rosenthal & Young 1985), as well as language attitudes and beliefs (e.g. Gibbons & Ramírez 2004a). While these approaches have provided valuable overviews of general language patterns in a community and created tools for predicting LM or LS (e.g. Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Ehala 2011; Karan 2011), they tend to lack further explanations of the dynamics occurring at the micro level where language is used and negotiated. For example, language attitudes may or may not influence actual language practices (Garrett 2010) so that although many parents value their minority language and wish to transmit it to their children, not all take active steps to ensure their children become proficient in the language.

The majority of research based on previous models (such as domain analysis and GIDS) has strongly suggested that the most vital aspect of LM is intergenerational transmission of the minority language in the home domain (Fishman 1965; De Houwer 1999; Spolsky 2012). However, Yu has described “a mythical gap” (2005:34) where the LMLS literature does not explore in detail how bilingual families negotiate language use in the context of minority language maintenance. These interactional studies mostly appear in the field of bilingual language acquisition, but usually without explicit connections to the wider speech community. Connecting the micro- and the macro-level in bilingualism and LMLS research has the potential to offer further benefits (Angermeyer 2010:467). An investigation of language socialisation in the home in particular offers a rich environment for providing more concrete and detailed descriptions of the dynamics underlying LMLS (Holmes 1997).

I take a transdisciplinary⁶ perspective of sociolinguistics, language policy and language socialisation (Bucholtz & Hall 2008; Watson-Gegeo & Bronson 2013) to bridge the micro/macro gap and locate my research within the field of family language policy

⁶ Watson-Gegeo and Bronson (2013:112) argue that *interdisciplinarity* underscores the limits of each discipline and reinforces the boundaries. *Transdisciplinarity*, in contrast, is meant to be a confluence of different disciplines which challenges the traditional boundaries.

(henceforth: FLP) (Spolsky 2012). In this chapter I first offer an overview of topics covered within the recently established FLP paradigm. I then present theories accounting for language beliefs and follow this with a discussion of the role of an impact belief (De Houwer 1999). Finally, I discuss parental socialisation strategies, focusing especially on parental discourse styles as a highly influential factor on children’s minority language acquisition (see De Houwer 1999:77; Lanza 2004; Curdt-Christiansen 2013a). The overview of existing theories and empirical studies leads to the formulation of my research questions at the end of the chapter.

2.2 Family language policy

Studies within the emerging topic of FLP principally discuss “private language planning” (Piller 2001a), which involves language choices and interaction strategies that emerge at the family level (e.g. Shohamy 2006:48), their relationship with societal language ideologies (e.g. Canagarajah 2008) and their influence on family members’ bilingual development (e.g. Schwartz 2008). According to Spolsky’s (2004) influential framework, language policies involve three interrelated factors: first, policies are based on beliefs, which provide a motivating factor for any type of practice. Second, policies are expressed through practices as individuals make linguistic choices. Third, policies sometimes comprise active intervention strategies, so-called language management, in order to change existing language practices. While this model has predominantly been used to describe language policies at the level of the state, it also provides a useful categorisation for policies at institutional (e.g. Kingsley 2010) and family levels (e.g. Moin et al. 2013). The model below visualises the three components of language beliefs, management and practices at the family level.

Figure 2.1 Family Language Policy model (based on Spolsky 2004)

The current interest in language policy at the family level becomes evident when one considers the recent publication of an issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development and Language Policy* with a special focus on FLP as well as a recently edited book (Schwartz & Verschik 2013) dealing specifically with successful FLPs. The complementary foci indicate some common themes of interest, for example ethnographic groundedness as a shared feature of many studies (Curd-Christiansen 2013b). While the home was traditionally considered neutral ground for language input in language acquisition studies, Curdt-Christiansen (2013b:2) rightly points out that FLP approaches (along with several language socialisation studies) investigate the sociocultural influences on FLP (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen 2009). The broad range of topics covered reflects the academic approaches which are integrated in FLP research, such as child language acquisition, language policy, language socialisation and literacy studies (Curd-Christiansen 2013b:2; Fogle & King 2013:1).

The few previous studies of FLP typically focused on so-called 'elective bilingualism' (Piller 2001a) in middle class families that considered bilingualism as an additional asset for their children. The more recent articles (Curd-Christiansen 2013b) focused on non-elite transnational families exhibiting 'natural' (Baetens-Beardsmore 1982) or 'circumstantial bilingualism' (Schechter & Bayley 2002). Still, little research (e.g. Pozo Gutiérrez 2007, Gafaranga 2010 and Hatoss 2013) deals with minority language transmission in refugee families despite the fact that the number of refugees in this world is increasing.

Researchers have not reached a consensus about the effects that refugee status has on people's cultural identification and their wish to transmit their ethnic language to their children. On the one hand, Pozo Gutiérrez (2007) shows that a number of Spanish refugees in England had no immediate prospects of returning to their country and therefore adjusted to English language and culture. Similarly, Gafaranga (2010) reports that a group of Rwandan immigrants to Belgium preferred French and refused to speak Kinyarwanda because they wanted to distance themselves from their dreadful past and were afraid of being identified as Rwandan. Clyne (2003:52) supports this claim with evidence from Latvian, Lithuanian and Croatian refugees in Australia. However, he also argues that refugees may be more likely than migrants to uphold cultural traditions. The reason, he contends, is that they are usually forced to leave their country because of a temporary plight and may well be longing to return once the situation has stabilised. Hence, it is unclear to what extent refugee status impacts on

language beliefs. Positive or negative effects on ethnic language use seem to rather depend on the context and on personal idiosyncrasies.

FLP approaches resemble language socialisation research on minority communities in culturally and linguistically heterogeneous settings (see Kulick 1992; Zentella 1997; Schecter & Bayley 2002; Vasquez et al. 2007; Guardado 2008b; see contributions in Bayley & Schecter 2003; Makihara & Schieffelin 2007). The majority of language socialisation research has notably been conducted in the American context where studies have investigated the influence of cultural identity, language attitudes and ideologies on minority language transmission (e.g. Guardado 2008a:16) and the way people “do bilingualism”⁷ in their everyday lives (e.g. Zentella 1997). A strong focus has been the embeddedness of language skills in the socialising context where language use is deemed necessary on the one hand for socialisation into the culture and simultaneously, on the other hand, to be the product of socialisation efforts (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986).

Curdt-Christiansen (2013b) argues that one of the recent developments is the focus on the negotiation and co-construction of language policies among family members (Luykx 2005). This opposes previous widespread understandings of children as passive recipients, as for example expressed by Phinney, Romero and associates who argue that “it seems improbable that parental cultural maintenance [...] would be influenced by the adolescents’ ethnic identity” (2001:150, 151) and clarify that parents can exert significant influence on their children’s cultural identity by using the ethnic language. This clearly differs from parental conceptions of language management in Navajo communities where Spolsky (2002) found that parents refrained from imposing any authority and let the children decide which language they wanted to use. Luykx’ (2005) investigation of Aymara parents, members of a minority group in Bolivian society, suggested that the children significantly shaped the families’ language practices as parents promoted the majority language Spanish because of their linguistic objectives for their children. Furthermore, she found that parents learned Spanish from their children as these used the language at home. Likewise, other researchers have highlighted children’s agency (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986; Tuominen 1999; Fogle & King

⁷ What exactly is meant by bilingualism differs across studies. De Houwer (1999:77) refers to children as active bilinguals if they frequently initiate conversations in both languages. She describes them as passive bilinguals if they produce utterances in only one of the languages but have receptive knowledge of both. Li (2000) provides a more comprehensive list of types of bilinguals in which he takes into account factors such as age of acquisition and domains of language use.

2013) and suggested that children may use metalinguistic comments and conscious and subconscious resistance strategies to alter home language use and undermine existing FLPs (Fogle & King 2013). Parents' language management may therefore be contingent on their children's cooperation.

Children's changing linguistic competences may also cause their parents to change their interaction strategies over time (Okita 2002:Chapter 6; Schechter & Bayley 2002; Fogle & King 2013). For example, Caldas reports that he and his wife initially used the one person-one language (OPOL) strategy (see below), but soon realised that this provided their child with too little exposure to the ethnic language. As a result, they changed to speaking only the ethnic language in the home (2012:355).

These findings suggest that individual family members' beliefs and practices may influence FLP dynamics (Spolsky 2012). While the scarce research on fathers' roles has noted their influential role on children's minority language acquisition for the Korean community in New Zealand (see Kim & Starks 2009), studies in various ethnic communities have highlighted the mother's influence (Fishman 1991; Dabène & Moore 1995; Extra & Verhoeven 1999:20; Winter & Pauwels 2000:512; Tannenbaum 2003; Mills 2005; Walker 2011b). She has been referred to as the "gatekeeper of language maintenance" (Extra & Verhoeven 1999:20) and as a "repositor[y] of culture [...] responsible for the maintenance of tradition and language" (Kuncha & Bathula 2004:3). It has been argued that her role in passing on traditional values and protecting the ethnic language seems to confine her to socialisation inside the ethnic community and shelter her from the influence of the host language (e.g. Joudi Kadri 2009:95).

Applying Spolsky's model of language policy to research investigating minority language transmission calls for an investigation of language beliefs, practices and management in the family. The following section investigates sources of language beliefs.

2.2.1 Language beliefs⁸

Language beliefs and practices are constantly shaped as individuals are embedded in an ecological system and interact with their social and linguistic environment (Mühlhäusler 2002; Spolsky 2004:7200). While language beliefs are likely to be influenced by people's personal experiences with language, they may also be affected by published research, societal ideologies and economic considerations (e.g. Bourdieu 1990; Guardado 2008a; Mirvahedi 2014). Widespread ideologies may trickle down to the family domain and affect parents' and children's language choices. In addition, migrants' perceived relationship between a particular language and their cultural or religious identity may account for particular language beliefs (see Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985; Guardado 2008b; García 2012). These language beliefs motivate language practices and therefore significantly influence LM (De Houwer 1999; Gibbons & Ramírez 2004b). In the following sections I present theories that account for the formation of language beliefs particularly in the context of minority language transmission.

2.2.1.1 Personal experiences, societal ideologies and published research

Piller (2001a) found that parents' personal experiences with language, official discourses and published research played a role in their decisions to raise their children bilingual. Parents in her study were shown to rely most strongly on their own experiences, whereas they accepted or rejected other information depending on whether it agreed with or contradicted these experiences.

Societal ideologies were another source of language beliefs and often promoted very critical ideas about bilingualism (as discussed in Chapter 1). European nation states founded on the principle of "one nation-one language" have historically established monolingualism as the norm to unify the nations. The recent English-Only movement in the United States has received widespread societal attention, but is reflective of historical processes in a number of other countries (such as Australia and New Zealand) that have tried to linguistically

⁸ The terms *attitude*, *belief* and *ideology* tend to refer to similar phenomena. *Attitudes* generally have a cognitive (beliefs), an affective (feelings) and a conative (behavioural) component (Baker 1992:13ff; Garrett 2010). However, past research has used the term *belief* to refer to both conative and affective components in a manner equivalent to *attitude* (see Gibbons & Ramírez 2004a; Yu 2010; see also discussion in Sallabank 2010:60–63). The term *ideology*, in contrast, tends to refer to beliefs which are shared by a group of people (see Van Dijk 2011). With the motivation to stay faithful to Spolsky's (2004:5) terminology, I use the term *belief* to refer to a combination of these different aspects.

assimilate migrants because they perceived multilingualism as a threat (see Djité 2011; Ward & Liu 2012).

Early linguistic publication titles such as *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (Fishman, Ferguson & Gupta 1968) and a recent publication with the challenging title of *The Bilingualism Controversy* (Gogolin 2009) have (in the latter case deliberately) emphasised the view of bilingualism as a problem or anomaly. They highlight that monolingualism is frequently considered the norm with fears that multilingual children may lack proper knowledge of any language (see Canagarajah 2008). It is only in the case of more prestigious languages such as English, French and Mandarin that so-called elective bilingualism is often desired (Piller 2001a). This suggests that inhibitions towards bilingualism may correlate with other social and economic factors of the respective languages and of the individuals wanting bilingualism (Cummins 2000:239; King & Logan-Terry 2008:5).

Few sociolinguists hold such negative attitudes towards multilingualism and researchers have provided copious evidence that the acquisition of two languages does not pose any significant threat to the speed of language development (e.g. Cummins 1979; Hoff et al. 2012). They also indicate that children can cope well with exposure to multiple languages, and that vocabulary knowledge of bilinguals is typically similar to that of monolinguals if the words of both languages are counted (Hoff et al. 2012). Moreover, they highlight cognitive and social benefits of bilingualism, such as greater executive control, greater tolerance of ambiguity, less danger of dementia in old age, easier acquisition of further languages, greater feelings of belonging to and understanding of another cultural group, greater empathy, and, very relevant to this study, a greater sense of well-being for those who speak their ethnic languages (e.g. Swain & Cummins 1979; Cho 2000; Bialystok 2001; Phinney, Horenczyk, et al. 2001; Bialystok & Feng 2009; Barac & Bialystok 2012; Bialystok, Craik & Luk 2012; Dewaele & Li 2013). These positive aspects of bilingualism are currently promoted in many countries to counter the stereotype of damaging bilingualism.

2.2.1.2 Economic influences on language beliefs

Bourdieu (1977b) uses more economic terminology to argue that languages operate in a market where their value is derived in opposition to other languages. His theory focuses on beliefs about the economic and instrumental values of different languages, which function as

an incentive or disincentive to use them. Three of his so-called “thinking tools” are capital, field and habitus.

Language is considered to be *cultural (linguistic) capital* which rises in value with its economic growth in the societal linguistic marketplace and at the same time with the value of its speakers (Bourdieu 1977b:652). The theory presupposes that individuals are aware of the economic value of the respective languages and tend to learn and use those languages with the highest values (Edwards 1985). Bourdieu posits that there may be several *fields* (or *markets*), where the respective languages have diverging values. These fields may be composed of the whole society or represent smaller segments such as day care institutions, the school and the home.

Bourdieu stresses that the symbolic power relations among speakers and listeners influence the legitimacy of the respective language used. These power relations in turn depend on the size of the speakers’ respective symbolic capital. This process of internalising prevalent market structures and acting based on their evaluation creates “durable dispositions” (*habitus*), which cause individuals to perceive and use language in a certain way and perpetuate the dominant market structure (Bourdieu 1977b). Thus, language choice is generally stable in linguistic markets as people’s habitus dictates the repeated use of the language with the highest value. However, due to a change of field, such as immigration, the structures in the surrounding marketplace may change and individuals’ habitus may be transformed (see Jo 2013).

Bourdieu further offers the term *doxa* to refer to “that which is beyond question and which each agent tacitly accords by the mere fact of acting in accord with social convention” (1977a:169). Doxa refers to the “fundamental presuppositions of the field” (Bourdieu 1990:68) and can be responded to in two ways – by using orthodoxy or heterodoxy. While orthodoxy re-establishes the doxa, heterodoxy contests doxic structures. Bourdieu claims that the doxa generally remains unnoticed until heterodox actions violate the norms and draw attention to its basic presuppositions. I discuss these different responses to the sociolinguistic norms of New Zealand in the context of migration in Chapter 6.

Bourdieu’s viewpoint of LM puts the value of the language in relation to the surrounding field: “those who seek to defend a threatened capital [...] are forced to conduct a total struggle [...], because they cannot save the competence without saving the market, [...]” (1977b:651). In other words, he posits that a language will rarely be maintained as an abstract system and

speakers need to find (or create) a market where the language is valued and legitimate. This suggests that minority languages are more likely to be maintained if they have a high socio-economic status and can lead to education or employment opportunities.

The linguistic market model has both benefits and drawbacks. On the one hand, a model stressing competing social values is suitable for analysing conflicting language situations because economic and social incentives seem to affect language learning attitudes (see Curdt-Christiansen 2009a; Jones Diaz 2011; Walker 2011a). This is reflected in many students' high investment worldwide in learning economically useful languages such as English, Spanish and, more recently, Chinese. The marketplace value theory may thus provide an explanation for the potential maintenance of prestigious and useful languages (see Clyne & Kipp 1999 for an account of this in Australia).

On the other hand, the theory of the linguistic marketplace seems to posit that economic value is generally desirable. Although it takes into account the social and cultural values a language may possess, it posits that these are indirectly converted into economic capital (Bourdieu 1986). Some languages exhibit much lower economic value and may therefore experience a faster rate of shift in an immigrant context according to this theory. Nevertheless, previous census-based analyses in Australia have shown that even languages with low economic value (such as Eritrean languages, Somali and Vietnamese) fared somewhat better than other languages and were used for communication in the home (Kipp & Clyne 2003:3). These findings cannot be accounted for only by economic factors.

2.2.1.3 Cultural influences on language beliefs

Cultural identification may be another influential factor in the formation of language beliefs. Such identifications may be perceived as an internal state or as a performance, where cultural belonging is expressed through an individual's behaviour (as discussed below). Recent postmodernist approaches have highlighted the fluidity of identity by stressing that it is situated, dynamic and multifaceted (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004; Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Fought 2006; Cabo & Rothman 2012).

An early proposition for such a performative conceptualisation of identity was given by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) who suggested that cultural identity may be performed through *acts of identity*, that is, speakers' expressions of social and ethnic solidarity through the symbolic dimension of language use. Gibbons and Ramirez suggest, for example, that

Hispanic teenagers in Australia tend to “demonstrate a full command of English-speaking Australian cultural practices in English-speaking contexts, and to ‘present’ as Latino in Latino cultural contexts” (2004:197-198). Such shifts between cultural practices (which represent acts of identity) underscore the situatedness of cultural identity. Shohamy points out that performances of culture are not only language-related, but that such “linguaging” (2006:14) encompasses people’s ways of dressing, eating and behaving.

The notion of identity as ever fluid and dynamic has been contested by some researchers (Meyerhoff & Niedzielski 1994; Bell 2001; 2014). Bell (2001, 2014) attempts to reconcile this social-constructionist approach with more traditional and stable conceptualisations of identity. While he acknowledges that people foreground and background different aspects of their identity depending on the context, he suggests the existence of a stable core arguing that “we do not recreate ourselves moment by moment out of nothing”, but that “to the present we bring the shapings of our past, of our relationships, of our environment” (2014:328).

A way of describing cultural identification from a sociocultural perspective involves the notion of an *imagined community* (Wenger 1998; Anderson 2006), that is, a “group of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of the imagination” (Kanno & Norton 2003:241). Individuals’ feeling of imagined belonging may be due to their sharing the same cultural identity; in Stuart’s words: “the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as ‘one people’, with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history” (1990:223) which “impos[e] an imaginary coherence” (1990:224). Arguably, the diverse experiences of the community members are held together by this common underlying core of shared history and codes of behaviour, which so frequently appear in individuals’ accounts of their cultural attachment.

Migrants’ identifications, however, often do not draw on monocultural ideologies. Instead, ‘global villages’ (McLuhan 1962) that have emerged through people’s exposure to different cultures in their surroundings and on the internet impact on their lived identity constructions. Originally formed in the context of post-colonial studies where cultural confrontation was a key issue, the notion of ‘hybridity’ (Bhabha 2012) challenges the separation between stereotypical cultures. Bhabha proposes many migrants are situated in what he terms a ‘third space’, that is, an in-between space that bridges two or more widely recognised cultural centres. Migrants and their children are often shown to occupy such third spaces as they

negotiate the different linguistic and cultural resources at their disposal. In fact, Guardado found that Hispanic parents in Canada “notwithstanding their goals for language and cultural maintenance [...] also strived to socialize their children into hybridized identities that particularly embraced broad worldviews” (2008a:216). This suggests that such hybridisation may be regarded as a positive enrichment.

Some research indicates that immigrants’ awareness of their own cultural identity seems to be a prerequisite for transmitting their language and culture to their children (Johri 1998; Guardado 2002; 2006; 2008b:172). Parents who value their cultural heritage seem more likely to actively engage in transmission efforts of the ethnic language (see Prevoo et al. 2011). Prevoo and associates found that the strength of ethnic identification of Turkish mothers in the Netherlands correlated with their use of Turkish with their children. The more Turkish they reported to feel, the more Turkish they used with their children before these started attending day care. Positive parental attitudes towards their cultural community may thus exert a strong influence on children’s language attitudes, proficiency and identity formation.

Likewise, children who strongly identify with their ethnic culture are more likely to use their ethnic language (e.g. Rampton 1995; Blum-Kulka 1997; Guardado 2002; Gibbons & Ramírez 2004b). Norton (2013) claims that learners’ investment in language learning is closely related to their identity claims. For example, Kanno (2000) tells of an Australian-born Japanese man, who identified strongly as Japanese although he lacked experiential knowledge of living in Japan. His strong identification with the Japanese culture positively affected his high commitment to studying Japanese. Likewise, a sample of Hispanic teenagers in Sydney were shown to resist linguistic and cultural assimilation because they were proud of their own ethnic and linguistic background (Gibbons & Ramírez 2004b). A strong correlation between their cultural identity and use of the ethnic language was also observed for Turkish teenagers in the Netherlands (Extra & Yağmur 2010). These findings underscore the dynamic relationship between cultural identity and the maintenance of the ethnic language: if individuals identify with their own ethnic community, they are likely to work towards strengthening and stabilising it, and to use the ethnic language as an identity marker (Fishman 1989:217; Guardado 2008a). Thus, children’s investment in minority language use is likely to increase if they envision their own identity as successful minority language-speakers and aim to work towards that goal. Conversely, a lack of positive attitudes to and identification with

their own language and culture, as Gafaranga (2010) describes for Rwandans in Belgium, may lead to quick erosion of the language.

Some researchers maintain that language acts as the main symbol of a particular culture and is therefore strongly intertwined with identity (e.g. Fishman 1991). As such, it offers members of a culture a tool to claim group membership and the opportunity to use the language as a central element of their cultural identity (Giles & Johnson 1981; Gudykunst & Schmidt 1987). Language use, Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:326) argue, is a stronger symbol of identification for group members than shared cultural background. In fact, Bucholtz reasons that “the ideological link between language and ethnicity is so potent that the use of linguistic practices associated with a given ethnic group may be sufficient for an individual to pass as a group member” (1995:355). If one follows these primordialist claims (that the words in a language are representative of the particular culture), then language loss may lead to a change in identity. This attitude was found in Schecter & Bayley’s (1997) study for several Hispanic parents in the United States who considered Spanish part of their cultural identity and therefore contended that their children’s cultural identity was endangered if they lost command of Spanish. Likewise, the Chinese parents in Yu’s New Zealand study identified language abilities as one of the requirements for claiming cultural membership (2005:200). The strong relationship suggested between language and culture has therefore become a convincing argument for some communities in favour of maintaining their language.

However, opposing voices to this claim state that cultural identity can continue to exist even in cases of LS. May (2011) claims that cultural identity is first of all disturbed by the loss of the language, but that this is a natural event because culture changes anyway. For instance, Canagarajah’s (2008) research on Tamils in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom shows that they felt their culture and ethnicity could be maintained in spite of LS. A similar situation is found in Australia, where a sample of Salvadoreans was shown to value the Spanish language without considering it a necessary prerequisite for preserving their identity (Sanchez-Castro & Gil 2008). Likewise, Johri (1998) found that Samoans in New Zealand were readily accepted as members of the ethnic community even if they did not

speak Samoan⁹. Nevertheless, these findings seem to vary depending on the ethnic group and their specific migratory situation.

2.2.1.4 Core values and the role of religion

Smolicz' (1992) theory of core values makes an important contribution to the discussion about the relationship between language and ethnicity by linking the existence/lack of certain core values to LM. Smolicz postulates that every ethnic community has particular values that members of the community must adhere to in order to be included in the group. For example, religion and clan served as core values for the Somali community in Australia, and language and (Orthodox) religion were core values for Macedonians (Clyne & Kipp 2006). Smolicz argues that if a language is a core value of a community, it is more likely to be maintained in an immigrant context. One reason for this, he maintains, is that the community will take more precautions against losing the language if they perceive the language to be linked to their ethnicity. On the basis of research with several ethnic groups in Australia (Smolicz 1992; 2001), he identified language as a core value for the Poles, Greeks and Chinese and assumed that these groups would show more investment in maintaining their languages.

Other communities had core values that did not involve language, but still contributed to LM. For example, a group of Latino immigrants to Canada was shown to have *familism* as their core value (Guardado 2011). *Familism* refers to Latinos' emphasis on physical and emotional closeness to other family members (Sabogal et al. 1987; Guardado 2008b) with consequent obligations to support them. The lack of proximity in the migrant situation where families are torn apart creates an empty space (Guardado 2011:178). Guardado argues that one main reason for maintaining Spanish for Latino families in his study was the need for communication with the extended family created by the core value of familism (2008b:178). This suggests that the family structure and languages spoken within the family seem to have a great influence on the LMLS processes in Latino migrant communities. Likewise, Ethiopian immigrants to Israel generally considered their language, Amharic, to be an important means of communication to uphold cultural values, such as familism and respect. Their preferred use of Amharic for the transmission of these values positively affected LM (Tannenbaum 2009:977).

⁹ However, Bell and Gibson (2008) noted an alternative way of indexing belonging to the wider Pasifika community by using an emerging ethnolect.

Also, religion has been identified as a core value for some communities. This may facilitate LM when these religions are inherently linked to particular languages (Fishman 1991; Paulston & Watt 2012). Fishman mentions languages such as Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, Sanskrit and Ge'ez, which have all been “holy vessels” (Fishman 2002:17) as they have transported written and oral religious traditions. Such an ideological function as a ‘sacred language’ (Karan 2011) even allowed Hebrew to undergo a revitalising process from being a dead language to being actively adopted as the official language of the State of Israel (Spolsky & Cooper 1991). Given that religion permeates the whole life style for some communities (see Ward 2013), reserving the right for one language to be used for religious purposes greatly enhances its status and frequency of use. LM in Arabic-speaking communities, for example, is facilitated by the use of Arabic for practicing Islam (see Kipp & Clyne 2003:38; Al-Sahafi & Barkhuizen 2006; Gogonas 2012). These links between certain religions and languages provide a background to Fishman et al.’s (1985:268) claims that the religious domain usually shows least shift to the majority language.

Community identified religious organisations often contribute to LM because they provide a space for minority language use (see also Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Woods 2004). For example, Orthodox Churches tend to be particular to one ethnic group (such as the Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox and Ethiopian Orthodox denominations) and thus incorporate ethnic traditions, values and languages. Verivaki (1990) showed that the Greek Orthodox Church in Wellington contributed to prolonged Greek maintenance within the community. It served as an important meeting point for community members and the church service was held in Greek. Even though younger people preferred using English in other domains and decreasing Greek proficiency was noted especially for the second and third generations (Holmes et al. 1993), they were shown to use Greek at church to older people (Verivaki 1990; Holmes et al. 1993). Similar patterns of prolonged Greek maintenance have been attested in other societal contexts for Greek communities, with the Orthodox church being a driving factor for LM (e.g. McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas 2001; Komondouros & McEntee-Atalianis 2007). While copious research exists about the role of the Greek Orthodox Church and some about the Macedonian Orthodox Church (see Clyne & Kipp 2006), there has been scarce documentation about the influence on LM of the Ethiopian Tewahedo Orthodox Church, which is the focus of this investigation. Given that religion is a core value for many

Ethiopians and the church services are generally held in Amharic¹⁰, similar results may be expected. In Chapter 4, I discuss the efforts of the Ethiopian community in Wellington to define the Orthodox Church as an Amharic-only space.

Protestant Churches seem to affect LM positively mostly because of the space they create for community members to use their ethnic languages. Many well-established church communities for different Pacific Islander communities function as meeting places (Holmes et al. 1993; Fairburn-Dunlop 1984). A similar role, though at a smaller scale, is fulfilled by several Protestant churches particular to one ethnic group, for example Indonesian, Mandarin, Spanish and Amharic-language churches in Wellington. While these churches generally do not attach ideological value to ethnic language use and regard it instead as a “matter of convenience” (Holmes et al. 1993:19), they nevertheless conduct the church service in the ethnic language. Protestant churches may thus also facilitate LM because they tend to offer an ethnic space to socialise in the ethnic language and expose children to secondary socialisation in the community language. However, taking account of all these findings, the nature of the exact driving factors for LM is still unclear – whether it is the close link between religion and language, the institutional support provided by the religious organisations, or a general derivation of identity claims resulting from the adherence to a particular religious grouping.

Overall, while personal and economic considerations seem to be crucial, as noted in the previous section, the research in this section seems to suggest that identity constructions linked to cultural core values and religious affiliation are important factors in the formation of language beliefs.

2.2.2 Impact belief

Given that language beliefs may often be positive in minority language speaking families, it seems surprising that in some cases language transmission is not or only partly successful. One reason to account for this is that there tends to be a gap between the parents’ stated goal and their actual practices (e.g. Yu 2010). Although many parents want their children to speak the ethnic language, they signal acceptance when their children use the majority language and sometimes do so themselves (as discussed in Sections 2.2.3.1 and 2.2.3.3).

¹⁰ The original language of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church is Ge’ez. However, Amharic has come to be used in church services, and Ge’ez is often used for only some parts of the liturgy (Weldeyesus 2009).

An important linking concept to account for this gap between beliefs and practices was introduced by De Houwer (1999) who utilised the notion of “impact belief” as a crucial intervening factor for whether parents socialised their children into using the minority language. ‘Impact belief’ refers to the parents’ conviction of being able to “exercise some sort of control over their children’s linguistic functioning” (1999:83). There is no doubt that parents may positively affect children’s language development without any deliberate intent, as discussed below. Nevertheless, parents who deliberately plan their interaction strategies may be more successful in contributing to their children’s acquisition of the ethnic language, particularly in minority language context where the ethnic language typically receives less support (Grosjean 1982; De Houwer 1999; Ghimenton 2013; Pérez Báez 2013). De Houwer differentiates between a strong impact belief, where the parents consider their language input to have direct consequences on their children’s language, and a weak impact belief. The latter presupposes that children’s linguistic environment is to some degree influential, but that there may be no direct modelling effects (1999:83, 84).

Parents with a strong impact belief tend to be attentive to their language use and even use metalinguistic means to convince children to speak the desired language. Chumak-Horbatsch argues that a parental impact belief “is accompanied by strategies such as home language rules and praising/punishing children’s language behaviour” (2008:5). It is reported that one mother threatened to withhold food from her son if he did not speak the language she wanted (Fredman 1995 in De Houwer 1999:89). However, usually the means parents employ are less drastic and may range from consciously modelling the preferred language to explicitly telling children to speak a certain language. For instance, Walker (2011b) describes the case of a Peruvian mother married to a monolingual English-speaker who raised her son with a strong impact belief, which meant that she only spoke to him in Spanish and expected him to reply in Spanish. This extended even to situations where other monolingual English-speakers were present and where she reportedly continued to address him in Spanish and afterwards repeated her statement in English for overhearers (Bell 2001). Altogether, her language practices instantiated her conviction that her son should learn Spanish (see also Saunders 1988).

In contrast, if immigrant parents do not have an impact belief, they might let the child use either the majority or minority language (Lanza 2007:52). De Houwer (1999) claims that majority language use in the home is due to either an underlying negative attitude towards the minority language or the lack of an impact belief. For example, it appeared that a group of

Zapotec immigrant parents to Los Angeles did not have an impact belief as they did not believe that they could influence their children's language behaviour (Pérez Báez 2013). They stopped using Zapotec with their children and LS occurred within only few years. This pattern was also found in an early language socialisation study. Kulick's (1992) research investigated the decline of a local language Taiap in a village in Papua New Guinea to the benefit of the Creole language Tok Pisin, which served as a national lingua franca. Parents lamented the fact that their children had only receptive proficiency in Taiap and never spoke it in the village. However, upon ethnographic investigation Kulick found that the parents used the local language only for baby talk and reserved Tok Pisin for more substantial interactions with their children. The children's lack of Taiap proficiency was essentially due to a lack of parental input.

This research suggests that an impact belief seems to be the intervening variable between positive minority language attitudes and home language management and practices which are conducive to bilingual development. Parents who consider it their responsibility to influence their children's language use appear more likely to use management and practices that encourage their children to use the minority language. In relationship with other factors, such as the families' sociolinguistic ecology and the quantity and quality of their language input (as discussed below), an impact belief seems to be a necessary component for intergenerational minority language transmission.

While the notion of impact belief has typically been used in reference to minority language maintenance, it may also account for immigrant parents' concern for their children to acquire the majority language. In this case, an impact belief may mean that parents make increased efforts to provide a home environment in which their children can practice the majority language. As yet there are no investigations into the influence of an impact belief on the promotion of the majority language though they may be very relevant for understanding management and practice dynamics underlying rapid minority language shift.

In this section I have presented key theories identifying influences on languages beliefs such as personal experiences, published research, societal and economic ideologies, and cultural and religious motivations. These beliefs affect the decisions of migrant parents concerning the transmission of their ethnic languages to their children as well as the children's wishes to use their ethnic language. I have also provided a framework for linking these beliefs to practices using De Houwer's concept of an impact belief. In the next section I discuss how

migrant families may instantiate language management and practices and impact on their children's acquisition of the ethnic language.

2.2.3 Language management and practices

The previous section has indicated that parents with an impact belief are likely to introduce explicit language management. This is another one of the three areas of language policy concerning "the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs" (Spolsky 2009:4). It is evidenced by an "explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document" (Spolsky 2004:11). Similar to Spolsky's focus on the explicitness of management, King, Fogle and Logan-Terry (2008:907) also place the focus of FLP studies on "explicit (Shohamy 2006) and overt (Schiffman 1996) planning in relation to language use within the home among family members". This indicates that family members have engaged in metalinguistic reflexivity: they have discussed their practices, developed strategies to modify them and articulated rules.

Parental management may occur with or without the support of appropriate actions. For example, some parents may impose top-down explicit language management just by articulating to their children that they want them to speak the minority language. Spolsky asserts that parents may appeal to their authority ("Your father wants you to speak Yiddish") (2009:25). Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons they may not back up their articulated management with appropriate practices or their children may fail to follow their rules. Other parents may accompany their instructions with use of the minority language for entertainment and other play, such as cultural music, dance and poetry.

King and associates, who are among the most prolific writers around the topics of FLP, admit that implicit negotiations contribute to the formation of the FLP in the background (Fogle & King 2013). Families may overtly state a policy, but this explicit policy may be changed or undermined through the practices of individual actors (Hornberger & Johnson 2007). These practices then furnish so-called "implicit" or "covert" language management" (Schiffman 1996; Shohamy 2006). As prominent examples from the classroom show, students may obey monolingual classroom ideologies in official contexts, but may subvert them with covert practices by speaking non-legitimised languages in other contexts (see contributions in Heller & Martin-Jones 2001). Thus, even in cases where there is explicit language management,

Spolsky claims that “[...] the real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices than in the management” (2004:222). Likewise, Shohamy advises consideration of the “covert and implicit ways” (2006:46) with which language policy is carried out, and which might deviate from the stated policy (Schiffman 1996).

Spolsky also suggests that not all practices are shaped by such explicit rules and may instead arise out of an “unmanaged” situation (2004:8). Families who have never reflected on their language behaviour in the home have a “no-policy policy” (Fishman 1989), that is, although an explicit FLP has not been discussed in those cases, a policy is nevertheless implemented through *de facto* practices (Shohamy 2006:50). Some parents may prefer such a *laissez-faire* policy (Curdts-Christiansen 2013a) where they socialise their children without paying much interest to language choice. A few of those parents may even engage in playful and significant activities with their children in the minority language. This was the case for the family father in Kopeliovich’s (2009) study of her own family bringing up their children in Russian in Israel. He preferred to spark the children’s enthusiasm for the culture with planned literacy activities, which he conducted individually with each child, reading poems and books in both Hebrew and Russian and using both languages equally for vivid discussions of these works. Although he explained that he was not interested in putting effort into transmitting Russian to his children, his various activities with his children ultimately contributed to their increased Russian competence. Language transmission in these cases seems to be a by-product of some other superordinate goal.

While this section has focused on different types of language management I now discuss the practices with which parents socialise their children into minority language use.

2.2.3.1 Parental language input

Parental language practices furnish the input which contributes to the children’s language development (Hua & Li 2005). While the exact influence of parental language choices is still unclear, researchers generally agree that they set a model for the child to imitate. Studies concerning the relation between language input and language development date back at least 100 years: Ronjat furnished one of the first studies about bilingual development by giving a detailed account of his own son’s language behaviour growing up with German and French (1913). He set a precedent for descriptions of his one parent – one language (OPOL) approach, where each parent consistently speaks a single language. His study was closely

followed by Leopold's (1939) lengthy description of his daughter growing up in Germany and the United States with shifting language preferences and strengths between German and English, largely depending on her length of stay in each country. Many of these studies have been conducted by linguist-parents who have documented their bilingual children's speech development, often using the OPOL strategy (e.g. Fantini 1985; Saunders 1988; Hoffmann 1985; Caldas 2006).

Romaine (1995:183–205) provides a much-cited overview of different input patterns. The most relevant pattern for immigrant families is her Type 3 where both parents are speakers of the same minority language which they use with their children. De Houwer (2007) identifies this language use pattern as most successful for a bilingual outcome, but assumes that a pattern of both parents speaking both the majority and the minority language may be more common (De Houwer 2009:111).

Despite the great number of studies, no conclusive research has yet clarified the relationship between parental language input and children's language choices. The diverging results appear to be due to some researchers taking a quantitative focus whereas other emphasise the interactional aspect of parent-child interactions (Lanza 2007). While sufficient exposure to each language is necessary for a balanced bilingual outcome, research has also shown that children may lose proficiency even in families where both parents speak the ethnic language and children receive substantial exposure (Oller et al. 2011). Thus, the successes of minority language transmission appear to depend on much more than just the quantity of parental input. For example, De Houwer's (2007) study suggests that the quantity of input in the minority language was influential on children's minority language use, but she also acknowledged that this link was not straightforward. She suggested discourse strategies (Lanza 2004) and greater expected 'engagement' with the minority language (Yamamoto 2001) as further factors affecting the children's language choice. Evidence for this is provided by other more qualitatively-oriented studies (e.g. Goodz 1989; Döpke 1992; Kasuya 1998; Lanza 2004) which suggest a close relationship between parents' and children's language choices, but also stress the importance that their interactions be of 'high quality', as discussed below.

What has been shown is that if parents consistently use one language, children may become accustomed to this and begin to differentiate between interlocutors as they learn the pragmatics of choosing the appropriate language for specific contexts (Genesee, Nicoladis &

Paradis 1995). For example, De Houwer (2009:140) reports that she always spoke to her daughter in Dutch using the OPOL principle and that her daughter had a strong adverse reaction when she used English with her when she was three and a half, demanding vehemently that her mother speak Dutch. The idea that children associate a particular language with a person was also supported in Yu's (2005:79, 80) data. She suggests that one of her seven-year-old child participants may have refrained from using English in one of the recordings because only the mother, who generally had very low English proficiency and only sparsely used English, was present. In turn, when the father, who occasionally used English, joined them, the child switched to English more often.

Switching to the language or speech style of one's interlocutor is a principle which has frequently been noted and which has been summarised in accommodation theory (Giles & Smith 1979). The theory maintains that individuals tend to tailor their speech specifically for their interlocutors so that these often have the strongest influence on language choice. In particular, they tend to converge with interlocutors whose favour they want to win, whereas they diverge from people whose views they do not share. Slightly more comprehensive in its goals, Bell's (2001) audience design approach further posits that it is not only interlocutors who may affect language use, but also overhearers and eavesdroppers who happen to witness an interaction. Bell claims that speakers may converge with their interlocutors to win their approval, and may direct various stylistic and language switches towards the changing audience. For example, in Yu's (2005) data above, the child's language use was affected by the presence of the parents, both as interlocutors and overhearers. Hence, parents who established a communicative context with their children that suited their language preferences were likely to be more successful in providing practice for their child in the language they desired.

2.2.3.2 Activities to foster language development

Although a certain quantity of language input is necessary for language development, a number of studies suggest that the quality of the input may be a more important influence on the child's language acquisition (Döpke 1992; Takeuchi 2006). This section identifies strategies and activities that have been found useful for language development, such as explicit teaching, child-centred activities, and appropriate discourse strategies. The account highlights Okita's (2002) so-called "Invisible Work", with which she implies that a lot of the labour of childrearing involving emotional and language-related work is often not recognized.

More appropriately, Schwartz and Verschik (2013) have renamed this as “Visible Work” because of the deliberate efforts involved in minority language transmission.

Specific parental discourse strategies and teaching techniques have been found to make a difference to a child’s linguistic output (see Döpke 1992; Tamis-LeMonda, Bornstein & Baumwell 2001; Tamis-LeMonda & Rodriguez 2008). At the most basic level, teaching takes place through modelling as the child imitates the parents’ language use and learns about turn-taking in conversation and pragmatic rules to language use (Clark 2003:47–49). In addition, parents may employ explicit teaching strategies such as “present[ing] the child with verbal models, rehears[ing] language information [...], [making] pattern structures transparent, or elicit[ing] verbalisations from the child] (Döpke 1992:146,147). Kopeliovich provides a list of activities which she used with her four children in her so-called “Happylingual” approach, including the translation of literary texts from one language to the other and grammar exercises to stimulate the children’s metalinguistic knowledge (2013). Engaging in these exercises was no doubt facilitated by both her and her husband’s high degree of education and linguistic expertise.

Despite the effectiveness of such strategies, Clark rightly points out that “adults don’t talk to young children to teach them language. [...] They set out to make themselves understood [...]” (2003:45). Alternatively, child-centred interactions constitute an approach involving less direct teaching and have been found to be conducive to healthy language development (Döpke 1992; Tamis-LeMonda, Bornstein & Baumwell 2001). Activities that have been found to encourage a good environment for language learning comprise shared learning activities such as book reading or storytelling, quality interactions and the provision of learning material for the child (Tamis-LeMonda & Rodriguez 2008). Children in Hispanic families in Canada tended to use the ethnic language more if the language and culture of the immigrants’ country were present in the home of the family through books, songs and other enjoyable ways of exposing the child to the language (Guardado 2002). In particular, parents’ use of authentic and testing questions, for example while reading, was shown to increase the child’s minority language skills (Döpke 1992; Quiroz, Snow & Zhao 2010). Chevalier (2012) describes how a child’s lively and talkative aunt contributed fundamentally to her niece’s fast development in the language she used with her.

Kopeliovich (2013) introduced the minority language Russian into her children’s Hebrew role plays by pretending she was an old monolingual Russian immigrant who wanted to be

treated at a hospital where her children were doctors. This created a need for her children to use their Russian skills and she reports that they continued playing for another hour in Russian after she withdrew from the role play. In a less deliberate but nevertheless highly effective manner, her husband engaged them in word plays using both Hebrew and Russian and actively tried to understand their use of Hebrew terms (Kopeliovich 2009). These activities contributed to the development of close relationships (Schwartz & Verschik 2013:6) and provided an environment which invited the child to linguistically (and emotionally) engage with the parents (Caldas 2012:359).

Cultural influences further impact on parenting styles and parental expectations of their children's minority language acquisition (Guardado 2002; Curdt-Christiansen 2009). A cultural value that strongly affected parenting styles in a number of cultures was 'respect'. Curdt-Christiansen (2009) describes the strong influence of Confucianism on Chinese parents' childrearing styles that rendered "learning [...] a way to gain social status and a way to contribute to society" (2009:369) and therefore motivated teaching of the minority language in the home. Studies investigating cultural parenting styles (see Gebrekidan 2012; Varela et al. 2013) also describe the varying degrees of control parents assume over their children's upbringing¹¹. These studies suggest for example that Latino and Ethiopian parents tend to use authoritative parenting styles that exert control over their children's behaviour (e.g. language use) while they also provide them with the opportunity to become engaged in decision-making (e.g. about FLP). These findings indicate the impact cultural conceptualisations of the child-rearing process may have on language transmission.

Focus on the child's locus of attention and responsiveness to the child's initiations were also shown to facilitate earlier achievement of language developmental milestones (Tamis-LeMonda, Bornstein & Baumwell 2001). Blum-Kulka (1997) investigated 34 families during their discussions at dinner time and found common socialisation patterns: parents exposed their children to adult topics, directly encouraged children to talk and take up conversations that were already underway and accepted their opinions as equal in the course of the conversation. These invitations for the child to actively participate in adult discourse were found by Döpke (1992) to be very efficient in strengthening minority language skills.

¹¹ These studies also indicate that while broad generalisations of the impact of culture on parenting styles are untenable, there seem to be cultural patterns of the ways parents conceptualise and carry out childrearing.

In order to enable such engaged interactions, Li (1993) suggests, perhaps counter-intuitively, that the parents' proficiency in the majority language may impact on the child's bilingual development. For example, in order for child-centred discourse to take place, it is necessary for parents and children to have what has been called mutual "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al. 1992). Li proposes that parents often obtain these mutual funds because they have the linguistic means to engage with their children's social worlds outside the home. When parents and children incorporate these into their discussions in the ethnic language their interactions may become more relevant and their children may be encouraged to maintain proficiency in their parents' language. Supporting this argument, his research demonstrated that Chinese immigrant parents to Britain who had high English proficiency were more likely to have children with higher proficiency in Chinese than those who had low English proficiency.

A study conducted in the United States further showed that "[i]n many homes where children lead the way in changing family language patterns, parents can barely speak English" (Wong Fillmore 1991:338). Likewise, Yates and Terraschke (2013) assert that a mother's inability to speak the majority language did not automatically mean that she was successful in persuading her children to use the minority language. In contrast, parents' majority language abilities and 'savviness' of local culture seemed to contribute to parents' success in establishing home language patterns, as Tuominen suggests in her study of home language use in Seattle: "multilingual parents who have true language choices because they speak both their own language and English fluently and who understand American culture are able to set rules about home language use and enforce them with their children more easily than less-educated and less-well-off parents" (1999:73; see also Guardado 2008a:262). Low majority language proficiency may thus be a factor which inhibits the mother's success in establishing home language management.

Nevertheless, parents' low proficiency in the majority language also seems to have positive effects because their lack of fluency creates a need to use the ethnic language if communication is to be successful. This feeling of need and the resulting usefulness are perceived by some as two of the most essential factors for maintaining a minority language (Grosjean 1982:175; Fishman 2001). For example, Barkhuizen (2006) recounts a story which features a South African mother in New Zealand whose son experienced Afrikaans language loss. Her son had a Taiwanese classmate who still spoke fluent Chinese with his parents. Although at first ignorant as to why this was the case, the South African mother later realised

that, while she could easily switch to English to speak with her son, the Taiwanese parents' English was 'pathetic' (2006:69) which necessitated the son using Chinese. Thus, a mother's lack of proficiency in the majority language may also encourage her children's minority language use.

Connecting these two perspectives, Kasuya (2002:297) argues that the mothers' proficiency in the majority language seems largely irrelevant in the early years before the children are exposed to social worlds outside the home domain. However, once school and peer groups begin to exert influence on the child's language choice, parents' high proficiency in the majority language appears to be conducive to LM. Conversely, as the discussion has highlighted, mothers' low majority language proficiency may have varying effects, either creating a need for the child to use the ethnic language, or facilitating shift due to limited mutual funds of knowledge.

A further factor influencing the degree of involvement with the child is family composition. While most LMLS studies seem to focus on two-parent families, the challenges of single parenting have been highlighted in a few case studies. Hatoss notes the restraints one single Sudanese mother in her Australian study experienced in spending time with her children because of her work commitments (2013:184). Hatoss claims that language maintenance is rendered difficult because "the limited time spent together as a family does not allow sufficient engagement with the language at home" (2013:184). Schechter and Bayley provide similar reasons for failed LM attempts arguing that single mothers "were no longer available to assume full-time care-giving roles" (2004:18). In a large-scale study conducted with immigrant families in Belgium, De Houwer (2007:420) reports that children of single parents who only spoke the ethnic language at home were less likely to speak the ethnic language than in two-parent families. However, she found that both single parents and two-parent families who used both their ethnic and the majority language had similar (decreased) chances of raising children proficient in the ethnic language. What can be gathered from this is that particularly in a situation of single parenthood, a firm commitment to speaking the ethnic language is necessary for successful language transmission.

In these sections I have shown that both the quantity and quality of interactions with children greatly contribute to their level of ethnic language proficiency. The parents' proficiency in both the minority and majority language and family structure have been shown to impact

these socialisation styles. In the next section I present parental responses to children's use of what they consider the inappropriate language.

2.2.3.3 Parental responses to their children's use of dispreferred language

The discussion so far has focused on general input patterns and styles. In this section, I discuss the immediate evolving and dynamic context as parents and children negotiate language choice (Lanza 2004:253ff). 'Parental discourse strategies' (Lanza 2004; see also Döpke 1992:63–70), that is, parental responses to children's use of what they consider the inappropriate language, have been found to affect children's language choices (see Kasuya 1998; Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal 2001; King & Logan-Terry 2008; De Houwer 2009:138; Chevalier 2013).

As a means of categorising parents' responses after children's use of the undesired language, several researchers have attempted to arrange parental reactions on a continuum (e.g. Döpke 1992:67; Lanza 2004; King & Logan-Terry 2008), ranging from strategies which open up a monolingual (high constraint on the interaction) to a bilingual (low constraint) context. Conventionalised use of certain styles socialises the child into a monolingual or bilingual context (Lanza 2004:269). A bilingual style provides the child with the opportunity to choose between either of the languages. In a monolingual interaction style, children understand that only one language is appropriate in a specific discourse situation and are required to talk to their parents in the language that these chose for the interaction. However, Lanza (2004) suggested that the context is not automatically monolingual just because a parent may be using only one language. Rather, she claims that a bilingual situation is present even when the parent signals understanding of a word used in the 'inappropriate' language (2007:58). The following figure positions parental reactions on such a continuum.

monolingual discourse style ¹²			bilingual discourse style		
minimal grasp	expressed guess	adult repetition	move on response	expansion/ incorporation	language-switching
1	2	3	4	5	6

Figure 2.2 Parental discourse styles (based on Lanza 2004 and King & Logan-Terry 2008)

¹² While Lanza (2004) uses the term *strategy*, I prefer the term *style* (see Quay (2001:181). The term *strategy* suggests that actions underlie a conscious decision, which, as Lanza (2007) herself stresses, may not always be the case.

In the ‘minimal grasp’ style, the parent actively opposes the child’s language choice by asking for clarification (see Ochs 1988). If a bilingual immigrant child, for example, produces an utterance in the majority language, but the parent wants him or her to speak the ethnic language, the parent would ask for clarification in the ethnic language, either directly, such as “Speak x”, or indirectly by saying “I don’t understand”. It is suggested that this response may be effective particularly when children are young, because they learn that they have to use a certain language to reach their goal (Kasuya 2002). In general, parents’ insistence on clarifying meaning and obtaining translation in these bilingual contexts had a very positive impact on their child’s minority language development (see Döpke 1992). However, Yu’s (2005) research in New Zealand showed that the minimal grasp response was rarely used in a sample of Chinese migrant families. Only one parent directly requested the child to use Chinese, and these requests were unsuccessful. The parents most often used Chinese in response to their children’s use of English, but more than a third of the time they also mixed or used English. The effect of these responses on the child’s language use in the following turn was significant: depending on which language the parent responded in, the children tended to follow suit.

In the ‘expressed guess’ style, the parent repeats the child’s utterance in the ethnic language and expects confirmation from the child. The ‘repetition’ style involves the parent repeating the same utterance in the ethnic language for which the child used the majority language. However, the child is not expected to respond. In the ‘move on’ style, the conversation continues, but the parent continues to use the ethnic language even after utterances by the child in the majority language. It has been argued that the move-on style is “less effective” in promoting bilingualism because it essentially ignores the language issue (King & Logan-Terry 2008:11). King and Logan-Terry (2008) supply the additional category of ‘expansion/incorporation’. In this case, the parents provide an expansion of the child’s code-switch by repeating the word in the majority language, but embedding it into an utterance in the ethnic language. The most monolingual style is the ‘language switch’ (De Houwer 2009:135, or code-switch according to Lanza 2004). In this response, the child’s use of the majority language triggers the parent to also use the majority language to continue the interaction.

These conversational moves may actually represent an active interplay of language negotiation. One important occurrence for example as the parent continually uses a “move on” response is the development of “dilingual discourse” (Saville-Troike 1987), where one

individual uses language A while the other individual uses language B. This communication mode tends to be frequent in homes without an overt language strategy where there has been little reflection on bilingual practices (De Houwer 2009).

At least two more terms have been used to describe this phenomenon, both of which stress the negotiation aspect. First, Auer (1984:20) uses the (more neutral) term “language negotiation sequence” for situations in which the individuals in a conversation consistently use divergent languages, indicating that some form of language contestation occurs, and that the sequence ends once one of the participants agrees to use the respective other language. Second, Gafaranga (2010) uses the term “medium request” to highlight the active role bilingual Rwandan children older than five and young adults in Belgium assume in the process of language negotiation. They typically do not ask for a language switch directly, but rather use French consistently regardless of their interlocutors’ language choices. Gafaranga thus describes how they “talk language shift into being” by insisting on their use of French until the parents give in and switch to French themselves. Nevertheless, children may not deliberately request a language change every time they use the majority language. Instead, they may have a “competence-related preference” (Torras & Gafaranga 2002) to use the majority language because they have developed greater ease, comfort and convenience in it. I will therefore adopt the more neutral term “dilingual conversation” (Saville-Troike 1987).

The tension parents feel between providing explicit corrective feedback and encouraging the child to speak has become evident in studies contrasting parents’ responses with those of nannies and other relatives (e.g. King & Logan-Terry 2008; Chevalier 2013). Parents often adopted different responses than other caregivers because they wanted to simply engage with the child versus teaching the child the language. In a description of one trilingual girl’s father’s and aunt’s conversational styles and responses to the girl’s use of what they considered the inappropriate language, Chevalier (2013) notes that the aunt often repeated the word or phrase in the appropriate language and thus provided the girl with vocabulary to build her language skills. In contrast, the father generally moved on in his desired language, thus ratifying his daughter’s language choice and opening up a bilingual space. As a result, bilingual conversations between him and his daughter were common. Likewise, in King & Logan-Terry’s (2008) study, mothers used more incorporation/expansion responses than nannies. The authors analyse this as a reflection of the mothers’ desire to encourage the child to speak. This seemed to have priority for them over having their children use the target language. Thus, parents are likely to refrain from providing negative feedback after their

children's attempts to communicate because they want to foster an environment that would encourage their children's general language development (Goodz 1994).

While claims about the influence of parental discourse styles have been challenged (notably by Nicoladis & Genesee 1998), it is generally agreed that the different long term effects of these responses on language proficiency are that a monolingual context requires immigrant children to have active command of the ethnic language. Conversely, a bilingual context provides the opportunity for children to use the majority language in the home and does not require them to have active command of the ethnic language (De Houwer 1999:80). The theories and findings discussed in this section make it clear that the dynamic interactional context and active language management is crucial for effecting successful minority language transmission.

2.3 Summary

Considering research from the areas of sociolinguistics, language policy and language socialisation, this literature review has provided insight into previous FLP research and provided a background against which my research questions for the current thesis can be formulated. The first section delineated the research field as FLP, composed of beliefs, management and practices (Spolsky 2004). This three-fold division also provided a structure for the review. The second section focused on linguistic, cultural and religious beliefs and considered the arguably close link between cultural identification and linguistic choices (Norton 2013). This link is especially exemplified in Smolizec's (1981) core value theory. A view of language as linguistic capital was derived from Bourdieu's (1977b) understanding of society as a linguistic marketplace.

De Houwer (1999) suggests that an impact belief is an important mediating link between general language beliefs and home language management and practices. The small amount of literature about the nature of an "impact belief" seems to reinforce that a strong impact belief typically contributes to parental practices that encourage the use of the minority language, while the lack of an impact belief may be expressed by non-use of the minority language. Less research has focused on the role of an impact belief for promoting fast acquisition of the majority language in an immigrant situation.

The third section discussed language management and practices. Management strategies range from explicit requests to use the language to "laissez-faire policies" (Curd-

Christiansen 2013a) of families who had not reflected on their language practices. I further identified a number of parental language socialisation activities and discourse styles that may foster a home environment conducive to LM. These include explicit teaching strategies (Döpke 1992), child responsiveness (Tamis-LeMonda, Bornstein & Baumwell 2001) and monolingual parental discourse styles (Lanza 2004). The research reviewed suggests that families' language beliefs, practices and management together significantly affect their success in passing on their ethnic languages.

2.4 Research questions

My overarching research question explores the type of FLP that Ethiopian and Colombian families pursue to maintain their ethnic language in New Zealand. Based on Spolsky's tripartite language policy model I seek to answer the following questions:

How do Ethiopian and Colombian refugee parents and children in New Zealand form, articulate and instantiate their family language policy?

This research question can be subdivided into three subquestions:

- 1) What language beliefs exist in the ethnic communities and how are these connected to cultural identity claims?

The first question addresses beliefs which underlie language practices and management decisions. These are beliefs about the ethnic language, English as the societal language in New Zealand, and child bilingualism. Taking into account the impact that cultural identity claims may have on language (as discussed before), I investigate to what degree my participants' language beliefs are shaped by their cultural identification.

- 2) To what extent do parents assume responsibility for their children's language socialisation and what are their management strategies?

The second question explores whether the parents have an impact belief in their wish to transmit their ethnic language to their children and relates this to the type of language management used by the families. I explore whether parents show awareness of their responsibilities to model language use to their children and identify the factors that influence this.

- 3) What key influences affect the co-construction of home language practices by parents and children?

The third question explores factors that impact on parents' and children's language practices. I particularly explore the children's involvement in negotiating the FLP process.

The next chapter describes the methodology used to address these research questions.

3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

It may be evident from the introduction of the two communities in Chapter 1 that refugees are typically in a vulnerable position not only due to the process of resettlement in a new country but also because of the trauma they may have experienced in their home countries. My methodological approach therefore had to allow for special caution when gaining access to the participants. An ethnographic approach seemed most suitable as it would allow my participants to get to know me in more depth and hopefully establish a trusting relationship.

This decision fits into the methodological shift that research into language maintenance and language shift (LMLS) has experienced (as mentioned in Chapter 1). Previously, researchers tended to use postal questionnaires (Roberts 1999), sociolinguistic questionnaires and interviews, all of which collected data on reported language use, language attitudes and social networks (Gal 1979; ‘Aipolo & Holmes 1990; Verivaki 1990; Li 1994; Walker 1995; Stoessel 2002; Nakanishi 2000; Mills 2001; Fernandez & Clyne 2007; Park & Sarkar 2007; Curdt-Christiansen 2009; Fogle 2013). Others elicited narratives about participants’ experiences with LM (Barkhuizen & Knoch 2005; Barkhuizen 2006). Some researchers additionally assessed their participants’ language proficiency (‘Aipolo & Holmes 1990; Verivaki 1990; Shameem 1995; Hulsén 2000). A shift in the last decade or so has meant that ethnographic approaches investigating actual language behaviour have become more popular (see Hatoss 2013; see also contributions in Gardner & Martin-Jones 2012; McCarty 2014). Both the changing research paradigm towards ethnographic practices and the suitability of these for research with refugee communities motivated my methodological decisions. I used observations, recordings of naturally-occurring family interactions and interviews with mothers and children to explore minority language transmission within the family.

The structure of this chapter is as follows: after outlining ethical arguments guiding my choice of data collection methodology with refugees, I introduce the overall research design and describe the nature of my ethnographic approach. I outline steps that I took for gaining access to my participants and present my role within the communities. I further discuss my collection of qualitative interviews and recordings of naturally-occurring interactions in the family domain. I finally present the procedures used during data analysis and introduce an

FLP model that I developed based on the literature review and that provides a means of classification for Chapters 4-6.

Taking account of the potential previous hardships and current distresses of my participants (mentioned above), I consulted the guidelines for refugee research published by the local organisation *ChangeMakers Refugee Forum* with the desire to ensure that my research was ethically responsible (see Jacobsen & Landau 2003; Lawrence 2007; Joudi Kadri 2009). I benefitted from their expertise gained from assisting refugees through workshops and local research. Their guidelines caution that trust may be more difficult to establish because of refugees' potentially negative experiences with authorities which may have caused suspicion and hesitancy, if not unwillingness, to answer questions truthfully (Changemakers Refugee Forum 2008:3). These issues resulting from experiences of persecution and murder in their home country seemed to be a sensitive issue particularly for Colombian participants, as McIlwaine (2005) attests for the Colombian refugee community in Britain. The guidelines further note the vulnerability particularly of female refugees. Goodkind and Deacon (2004:723) describe additional problems female refugees may face, such as "limited transferable occupational skills, multiple and conflicting roles, the double burden of work inside and outside of the home, shifting gender and power dynamics, and sexism both within their communities and [the] larger society". Ethical approval for the research was obtained from the Human Ethics Committee of Victoria University of Wellington (see Appendix One). Below I explain my attempts to research in a way that would benefit and not harm participants.

The ethnographic approach I have adopted in response to these challenges has served as the overarching method of data collection allowing me to gain understanding of the structure and dynamics of the two research communities. I first outline the overall methodological design of my research (as illustrated in the graphic below) and then discuss the theoretical foundations and methodological procedures in more detail in the following sections.

Figure 3.1 Ethnographic research design

Participant observations represented the first and broadest phase (in terms of the number of participants) and provided insight into the dynamics of the communities. They were an ongoing process during the interview and recording phases and enabled me to devise these in a participant-oriented way. Field notes were either written down after the meeting in a journal or in a Word document or spoken on a recorder and subsequently transcribed.

The second phase of the research process consisted of interviews, which narrowed the focus of the investigation. These were conducted with 15 mothers and nine of their children from the Colombian community and 13 mothers and eight of their children from the Ethiopian community. After interviewing the Colombian participants for three months, I proceeded to the fieldwork in the Ethiopian community (but maintained some of the relationships formed in the Colombian community and continued to attend community events).

As an additional enhancement to allow for richer interpretation of the data I included recordings of family interactions in three Colombian families to gain understanding of how language use is negotiated between children and adults. To avoid influencing data collection through my presence, I gave three mothers a recorder and asked them to turn it on whenever their children were talkative.

These different research phases are described in more detail in the following sections. First, I introduce the field of “linguistic ethnography” (Rampton 2007), with which I associate my approach, and I elaborate on the decisions made in my role as an ethnographer. The second section describes the interviews, and the third section discusses the recordings.

3.2 Ethnographic research design

3.2.1 Tenets of ethnography

While general ethnographic approaches, originating in the field of cultural anthropology, have been used in linguistics in the past (e.g. Hymes 1962), the field of linguistic ethnography (Rampton et al. 2004) provides a relatively new qualitative research methodology and perspective (Blommaert & Jie 2010:5). Linguistic ethnography brings together different research disciplines (such as interactional sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, new literacy studies) in “Late Modernity” (Rampton 2006), that is, in current times where globalisation has led to a more “fluid, heterogeneous and underpatterned” (Bauman 1992:65) understanding of reality than had previously been assumed. Rather than aiming to provide comprehensive ethnographies of whole cultures, linguistic ethnography is topic-oriented (Rampton 2007:592). Moreover, while traditional ethnographers typically immersed themselves in foreign ethnic communities (Rampton et al. 2004:2; O’Leary 2010:115), researchers in linguistic ethnography often focus on close-by communities and therefore need to adopt strategies which enable them to gain analytic distance (Rampton 2007:590, 591). My focus on language transmission within local refugee families benefitted from such an approach, and also linked methodologically to other studies (e.g. Rampton et al. 2004; Mirvahedi 2014).

Every methodology entails certain assumptions and procedures which may affect participants and the research, and Garner, Raschka and Sercombe therefore argue that “methodological choice is in principle ethical” (2006:62). The method of linguistic ethnography promotes research *with* rather than *on* the participants. The inclusion of participants in the research is a principle of action research, where the researcher acts responsibly concerning “ethics, power, control and access to information” (Sercombe, Garner & Raschka 2006:1). I wanted to raise the participants’ awareness of potential language loss in their children and use my findings to provide them with advice on parenting strategies to enhance LM. At the same time, I wanted to respond to my societal responsibilities as a researcher (see Jacobsen & Landau 2003) by describing the communities’ language dynamics. This would allow future steps towards improved support to be implemented.

The main method used within the ethnographic research paradigm, conducive to such involvement, is participant observation. Dell Hymes, who introduced ethnographic approaches into linguistics with his Ethnography of Communication framework, critically

remarked: “Some social research seems incredibly to assume that what there is to find out can be found out by asking” (Hymes 1981:84). He criticised survey researchers for seeming to assume that people could report and provide a rationale for most of their actions.

Ascertaining concrete language behaviour is difficult in an interview setting (Piller 2001a) and researchers have commonly encountered contradictions between reported behaviour and actual practices (e.g. Goodz 1994; Schwartz 2008). Parents may claim that they use only their ethnic language to speak to their children, but observations and recordings may reveal that they often experience ‘slippages’ (King & Logan-Terry 2008:9) into the majority language (see Döpke 1992; Goodz 1994; Pan 1995; Lanza 2004; Yu 2005; Chevalier 2012). Famously, in Gumperz’ (1972) study of code-switching in Norway, some of his participants claimed to use the village dialect when speaking with each other in casual conversations, and were surprised to learn from recordings of their speech that they had also used standard Norwegian.

My interviews often provided opportunities for observations of naturally-occurring language use, for example when the phone would ring or other community members would spontaneously visit. While I interviewed one Ethiopian mother, her son asked her for bike keys in Amharic, thereby showing his language knowledge for such functions. Moreover, when I asked one Ethiopian mother and her talkative six-year-old son a question, the mother replied in English. Her son then contradicted her in Amharic and explained his answer to her in Amharic, orienting to her language preferences. Subsequently, the mother elaborated the point to me in English. Situations like this allowed me to watch mother-child interactions and view language transmission unfold before me.

Sarangi (2005) suggests “thick participation”, that is, continuous participation in the community and observance of the mutual obligations that are attached to the relationships developed within the research setting. Insights obtained through this prolonged engagement enable the researcher to understand underlying, covert processes and insider concepts necessary to furnish an emic perspective, that is, the “tacit and articulated understandings of the participants” (Rampton et al. 2004:2; see also O’Leary 2010). I experienced cycles of increased understanding in my interactions with both communities. In the Colombian community in particular, where I had the chance to be involved to a greater degree due to my knowledge of Spanish, I occasionally thought I had understood core motivations and dynamics, just to have this understanding refined at later stages (see Guerin & Guerin 2007).

Since I was myself a new migrant in New Zealand, and unfamiliar with either of the communities initially, an exploratory phase of ethnographic observation in the research communities was a valuable process during which I could obtain more information about the structure, languages and dynamics of the two communities and the ways in which they came into contact with societal ideologies. For example, exploring the linguistic backgrounds of the multilingual Ethiopian community members in the initial fieldwork period yielded information suggesting the approximate number of families speaking Amharic at home. This collaboration with the community countered a potential researcher bias, which refers to the influence researchers have on the data as they select the topic, choose questions, relate to the participants and interpret the data (Talmy 2011:7).

Although ethnographic observations offer such detailed insights, both triangulation of the data and an emphasis on the co-constructed nature of research have been suggested in order to increase its “internal validity” (Duff 2006; see also Zentella 1997:12; Blommaert & Jie 2010:17). Investigator and methodological triangulation (Guion, Diehl & McDonald 2011) helped me to obtain more comprehensive and reliable situational accounts. One way to achieve investigator triangulation is to have another observer present. Orienting to this requirement, I occasionally took along my husband when I went to observe families and this usually rendered the social context more relaxed. Since my husband tended to be less directly involved in the interactions but more of an observer, he perceived code-switching in a few instances where I had not noticed a change in language and he also provided other valuable comments. I also used “member-checking” as I shared some results with a few participants to receive feedback on my understanding of the situation (see Duff 2006). In terms of methodological triangulation, I discuss further below how I supplemented participant observation with other qualitative methods, namely informal interviews, recordings of naturally-occurring interactions and field notes.

3.2.1 Access to community members

Initially, I was faced with the challenge of becoming familiar with two communities that were yet unknown to me and had not been investigated by others. Given my participants’ past experiences, I feared I would be identified as a potential threat to their safety. Experience showed that this caution was appropriate because an Ethiopian couple whom I contacted by email before coming to New Zealand confessed later that they had considered I was a spy because they had previously been contacted by Ethiopian spies. I explain in the following

sections how I used theoretical concepts described in the literature for gaining access to the two communities. The following table provides an overview.

	Colombian community	Ethiopian community
Gatekeepers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refugee Services ▪ Mangere Refugee Reception Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refugee Changemakers ▪ Ethiopian Community Association
Friend-of-a-friend approach		
Community events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome dinners ▪ Visits to different churches and long-term involvement in one church ▪ Membership in football team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protestant Church ▪ Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church ▪ New Year celebrations

Figure 3.2 Gaining access to the communities

Gaining access to a research community is facilitated if the researcher is already part of the community or has an institutional role within it, for example as a teacher or youth worker (see Rampton 1995: Appendix II). However, accessing a community that one is not already a member of is most easily facilitated with a contact person (Zentella 1997; Roberts 1999). First of all, I found it essential to identify the ‘gatekeepers’ for the community, that is, the people who are able to grant a researcher official or unofficial access to the field. Generally, these are local officials, leaders or agencies that work with the respective community. Since both of my communities were refugee groups, the agency responsible for their well-being in New Zealand was Refugee Services, whom I contacted for two reasons: first of all, it was important to me to inform them of my research project because they were in charge of resettling the refugees and assisting them with the first steps in their life in New Zealand. They were clearly the gatekeepers who were able to grant permission for me to carry out the research. Second, I hoped they would provide contact with some future participants. While they encouraged me to go ahead with my research, as Joudi Kadri (2009:88) already experienced, confidentiality reasons prevented them from helping me to meet potential participants.

Furthermore, I planned to meet *Colombian* refugees by visiting an English class. The Colombian family whom I met at the English class introduced me to their community lawyer who assists refugees in resettling their families in New Zealand. As a result of that meeting, I was asked to become a volunteer interpreter for the Colombian community. On the one hand, this work helped me gain credibility and a positive reputation among the community and provided me with insight into some community dynamics. On the other hand, I was put in a position of authority from which I could not ask people to join my research fearing they might feel obliged to do so. I tried to find further access through community events such as birthday parties and welcome dinners, which were held for newly arrived refugees from various countries every three months. These offered me yet another opportunity to meet more community members.

After a patient search for access, the breakthrough seemed to come in the form of a three-day stay at the Mangere Refugee Reception Centre in Auckland, where Maria Haywards from AUT had graciously arranged for me to attend several English classes to gain an understanding of how refugees were welcomed once they arrived in New Zealand. During my time there I often acted as unofficial interpreter for the Colombian newcomers and showed them around the neighbourhood in their free time. Out of that time grew a friendship with one family, who was later resettled to the Wellington area and introduced me to a few future participants. This family represented members of the community who vouched for me (see Zentella 1997), and was also one of the two families with whom I conducted a pilot interview.

Once these closer connections were established, I also used the friend of a friend method (Milroy 1987; see also Hulsen, Bot & Weltens 2002; Guardado 2008a) to contact more participants. Generally, as Pilkington (1990:29) had experienced when contacting the Samoan community, the participants were more open and enthusiastic if they had already heard the researcher's name from a friend. I found that uncertainties about my research could be cleared if another member of the community vouched for me, such as one woman referring me by phone to another woman and assuaging her doubts about the interview by declaring that my research was 'cool'. One person apparently promoted my work to such a degree that I was greeted upon arrival by a very enthusiastic participant who declared that she felt very privileged to participate in this type of research for the university.

Access to the *Ethiopian community* was facilitated by my previous contact with one Ethiopian family whom I had contacted before leaving Germany where I had extensively worked with Ethiopian asylum seekers. I had had the desire to stay in touch with Ethiopians and improve my Amharic. This type of access through personal connections has frequently been used by other researchers (e.g. Kopeliovich 2010; Wilson 2011). I used the friend of a friend approach as well as an offer from Changemakers Refugee Forum to send an information letter to the Ethiopian community advertising my research. The latter yielded no results, possibly reflecting a preference for oral communication in the community. It may have also been considered too official and easy to ignore due to its formality. Still, the friend-of-a-friend approach provided me with valuable contacts, so that I had the chance to be referred from one family to the next.

After eight interviews, there seemed to be obstacles to contacting more participants. Some had just travelled to Ethiopia, and others were busy entertaining visitors from Ethiopia, providing evidence of the existing transnational ties (see Vertovec 2009). I was then referred to the Ethiopian community association. This organisation had surprisingly not previously been mentioned in the interviews, possibly due to its recent origins. With the generous help of the then vice-president I followed the friend-of-a-friend approach as he called participants for me, explained my research to them, and then gave me their numbers if they agreed to participate. This procedure offered me the chance to be more selective about my choice of participants. For example, I could now select parents with children of different age ranges. Further, to encompass as many different religious groups as possible apart from the Orthodox and Protestant Christians I had interviewed so far, I asked for participants with Atheist and Muslim beliefs. However, no community member of either of the groups was identified. Since many Ethiopians lived closely together and interacted with each other, I was additionally interested in community members who lived further away and who had less contact with other community members. Shortly after, another influential community member offered to contact further women for me using the same procedure. These two contacts helped me to contact five additional participants who fitted my criteria.

Overall, contacting the two communities through a combination of approaches such as gatekeepers, community events and the friend-of-a-friend approach proved useful for being connected with a wide range of participants.

3.2.2 Constructing my role as an ethnographer

Both the participants and I co-constructed the research (Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Blommaert & Jie 2010:12), which means that providing an account of my own characteristics is important as these shaped the data collection processes and rendered me part of the research product (see Hammersley & Atkinson 2007; Davies 2012). In principle, I was an outsider to both communities. I was one of the White people frequently ‘Othered’ in the accounts of Ethiopian participants. For example, one participant remarked *I’m just proud of my country, my everything. But you know it’s just hard [...] for white peoples like you, they might not understand you*. I was also positioned as a fluent English speaker, of a higher socioeconomic status than most members of the two communities, a “Westerner”, and, particularly for one woman who had spent time in Switzerland, a German, which was apparent as she inserted German words into our conversation. The free choice and economic means I had to embark on various journeys and the fact that I entered New Zealand as a voluntary migrant differentiated me from the two refugee communities.

My overall position as an outsider even offered a few advantages. First, people willingly explained details because they did not assume I was familiar with their culture (Rubin & Rubin 2012). Second, given accounts of mistrust in small minority communities (e.g. McIlwaine 2005), I had the impression that participants seemed more eager to talk to me as a community outsider. Third, I believe that my participants happily shared their experiences with me due to the fact that I was also a foreigner in New Zealand, could relate to some of their cultural perceptions and was also a second language speaker of English (see Johri 1998). My experiences of living in a variety of different countries have hopefully made me more understanding of different world views and enabled me to empathise with my participants.

I invested time and energy in establishing trusting relationships with the community (Eckert 2000:79; Rubin & Rubin 2012), for instance by attending community and refugee events, and maintaining contact through visits, phone calls and social media (notably *Facebook*).

Examples of other researchers show that, although they never acquired insider status in their respective research communities, their continuous presence still made the members feel more at ease around them (see Blom & Gumperz 1972; Gal 1979). Likewise, my regular participation and constant interaction with some community members seemed to establish trust and gave me the standing of a “friendly outsider” (Greenwood & Levin 2006:124; see also Wilson 2011; Smith-Christmas 2014). In order to construct my research identity further

as an insider, I joined typical activities, such as Salsa and Merengue dancing in the Colombian community, and heard several approving comments of this at later stages of the research from people who were enthusiastic that I also like to dance “like them” (that is, “their” style). Wilson (2011:48) considers this double position of being both an outsider and an insider ideal for ethnographic research.

The insider/outsider continuum seemed dynamic and sometimes changed even within the course of one meeting as different identity aspects were foregrounded. Garner et al. (2006:68) argue that people “seek commonality and mutuality through their interaction”, and I was frequently positioned as an insider, for example when my participants focused on my status as a fellow migrant and as someone sharing similar value systems. The fact that I had married soon after I met my husband seemed to create epistemic and interactional alignment (Stivers 2008) during the interview with one participant, as she stressed that marriage is considered important in Ethiopian culture. She contrasted this with other “Westerners”, who tend to live together unmarried, thus creating a common outgroup.

This interactional alignment was often also achieved through Christian beliefs that I shared with a number of my participants. My regular involvement in a Colombian church established friendships of mutual respect and a broader level of trust (see also Joudi Kadri 2009; Peuronen 2013). The congregation welcomed me very warmly into the group, and offered me the chance to actively participate in the life of the church.

I also accessed other opportunities for social, religious and athletic engagement with the communities. During the last year of my research I was invited to join a Colombian women’s football team. I continued to attend Ethiopian community events such as a wedding and a joint football game. I also attended both the Protestant and the Orthodox Churches several times for special Church festivals and regular church services. Individual follow-up visits with a few participants helped corroborate the findings and observe further language socialisation processes.

This discussion has illustrated how the insider-outsider dichotomy may be helpful in characterising a researcher’s general position. It has also suggested that the relationship is always more complex depending on the researchers’ and researched positioning. Garner et al. have argued that “the social relationship between researcher and researched is not fixed, but is in one way or another being negotiated as the work progresses” (2006:70). Overall, the participants positioned me in different ways and foregrounded different aspects throughout

our interactions. In general, I developed “friendly relationships” with a few participants in both the Ethiopian and Colombian community similar to those which Mark Garner had with his Russian participants in Australia, as he explains that “he was invited into their homes, occasionally to meals, and found them willing to respond to his questions at great length [...]” (Garner, Raschka & Sercombe 2006:71). These contacts enabled me to develop positive relationships and obtain information while I maintained the distance necessary for analysis (see Rampton 2007).

3.2.3 Interviews

To corroborate the data gained from observations, I used qualitative semi- to unstructured in-depth interviews. These have been a central method in the study of LMLS to elicit attitudes and reports about language use (see Chapter 2 for examples). Participants who exhibit low literacy and are used to interpersonal relationships are less likely to respond to surveys and questionnaires, which are “impersonal and silencing” (Joudi Kadri 2009:82). For these participants, active listening and story-telling were more conducive to successful research (Goodkind & Deacon 2004). Instead of fully-formulated questions, I “delineat[ed] the topic and draft[ed] the questions”. The interviews resembled a conversation and helped me obtain nuanced “in-depth” data as I encouraged the interviewees to discuss their subjective views and experiences. They also provided an opportunity to gain systematic answers to questions I had prepared based on previous research and results of preliminary ethnographic observations. Overall, I conducted 28 interviews with mothers¹³ and 17 with children. The following sections discuss the details of the interviews with these two groups.

3.2.3.1 Interviews with mothers

I interviewed mothers because they are the traditional child carers in the Ethiopian and Colombian communities and their language use is the most likely influence on their children’s language choices (as discussed in Chapter 2). In three instances, the ‘mother role’ was fulfilled by a grandmother, a single father and an uncle, who volunteered to participate. The table below provides details about the interviews.

¹³ Other researchers based their studies on a similar number of interviews (e.g. Johri 1998; Okita 2002; Guardado 2008a). The last few interviews seemed to indicate that saturation was reached because no new topics of relevance to the research question were introduced (Dörnyei 2007:244).

Participants	# of interviewees	Age	Length of interview
Colombian mothers	15	17 - ~50	0:32-2:23h; total 19h
Ethiopian mothers	13	26 - 50	0:21-1:24, total 13:10h ¹⁴

Figure 3.3 Overview of interviews - mothers

My participant selection was based on the idea of representing a diverse range of the population who held different opinions and had different social, economic, political and religious backgrounds (Rubin & Rubin 2012). I included mothers who were known within the community to be worried about their children losing minority language proficiency in addition to mothers who claimed that their children remained competent speakers. Different lifestyles were included – stay-at-home mothers who attended English classes as well as those that were employed or had opened their own business. A few women had partners and others were single mothers. Their length of residence in New Zealand ranged from five months to 14 years. Based on my estimates and those of community leaders, the number of participants from each community comprised about half of the research population of Ethiopian and Colombian refugee mothers with children under 12 in Wellington at the time of the interviews in autumn 2012.

I ensured that all adult participants had grown up in either Colombia or Ethiopia, with subsequent migration. One participant originally came from Eritrea, but had been separated from her family and spent her childhood in Ethiopia. By counting her as Ethiopian, I ascribed cultural identity to her based on subjective and objective criteria, as she self-identified as Ethiopian and had received all of her primary socialisation in Ethiopia using Amharic.

My research specifically dealt with those Ethiopians who speak Amharic as their main language of communication. While I did not intend to convey any linguistic pre-eminence of Amharic over other languages, referring to this subgroup as ‘Ethiopians’ seems to be in agreement with local self-labelling. For example, anecdotal evidence suggests that the official Ethiopian community included mostly Amharic-speakers while Oromos, another substantial group, generally preferred to call themselves Oromo and had an Oromo organisation.

¹⁴ Children were present for some of these interviews and also responded to questions (whether or not they were asked directly).

The interviews were pilot-tested with two families, which resulted in a change to a question about education. Since it was pointed out that low education levels were potentially embarrassing to admit for some participants, I decided to ask about education in a less direct way. Another important aspect which I decided to stress more after the pilot interviews was confidentiality. Whilst the research was conducted with the approval of the university Human Ethics Committee and I had educated myself about additional ethical measures for research with refugees, I still noticed the formality introduced by the recorder in one of the pilot tests and shyness to discuss certain issues. I explained to participants before each interview that participation was voluntary, that their names would remain confidential and that only transcripts would be published, which meant that I was the only person who would listen to our conversations. Usually I obtained verbal consent before the interviews, and asked participants to sign the written consent form afterwards (see Appendices Five A and B). For two illiterate mothers in my research I recorded oral consent.

Apart from the question about education and the continuous need to build rapport and ensure an understanding of confidentiality, my interview schedule and set-up seemed to work well. The first interviews in both communities were conducted with mothers with whom I had previously become friends, so that there was a sociable and open atmosphere which enabled me to ask about potential improvements for further interviews.

The questions were inspired by previously used schedules by other researchers investigating LMLS (Hulsen 2000; Pease-Alvarez 2002; Stoessel 2002; Guardado 2008a; György-Ullholm 2010). I divided them into six sections asking about the demographic background, social networks, language proficiency, cultural identity, language use and attitudes of the mother, and language use and attitudes of the children (see Appendices Three A and B). The individual sections had a funnel style which dealt with broader issues before asking more detailed questions (Wilson & Powell 2001:45). The emerging data was so rich that the results often resembled those of a life history interview (see Okita 2002; Taumoevalau et al. 2002).

All participants had received an information sheet with more detailed information (see Appendix Two) and I usually began the interviews by explaining that I was interested in topics of language use within the Ethiopian and Colombian communities. I enquired first about the demographic background to relax the interviewees because these were questions

that they could generally easily answer (Holmes & Bell 1988; but see Plimmer 1994)¹⁵. These initial questions also frequently served as a springboard into other questions about language use and attitudes. The second section dealt with social networks: I asked with whom the participants usually related in their daily lives for different activities and needs. This section was based on selected items from Stoessel's (2002) influential social networks study (based on Cochran et al. 1993). I also enquired about the participants' satisfaction with the social networks and their comparison to those in the home country. The third section asked participants to rate their language skills in English and in their ethnic language on a scale from 1 to 10. My observations and recordings allowed me to check such reported proficiency. The fourth section concerned their cultural identity, and was adapted from Guardado's (2008) questionnaire. The last two sections dealt with the mothers' language use and their attitudes toward these languages and toward bilingualism. I also enquired about their children's language use and beliefs.

While both individual and group (e.g. Clyne & Kipp 2006) interviews have been used in qualitative sociolinguistic research, I decided to conduct interviews individually for two main reasons: first, given the small-group dynamics of the two groups, "pre-existing power relations" (Goss & Leinbach 1996:115) between the participants in a group setting could have discouraged some participants from voicing their opinions (see Kuncha & Bathula 2004:4). Second, it was generally easier for mothers from both communities, occupied with their children, to continue their daily chores if I went to their individual homes (see Mills 2001:385). In light of Yu's (2005) findings that fathers may answer for their wives I generally found it preferable to speak to the mothers in the absence of the fathers. Interestingly, the husband in one Ethiopian family continued to interfere in our conversation to explain my questions to his wife in more detail until she sent him out of the room.

His attempts to mediate were most likely due to his perceptions that his wife lacked English proficiency. This highlights the challenges of multilingual research that have attracted academic attention (see e.g. publications in Andrews, Holmes & Fay 2013) with researchers responding differently to such "language asymmetries" (Ganassin & Holmes 2013). Some researchers engaged interpreters, such as Lawrence (2007) for her work with the New Zealand Somali refugee community. Other researchers recruited research assistants from the

¹⁵ Plimmer's rationale for leaving the background questions to the end was that they "might seem intrusive" and that asking questions about language at the beginning might provide more validity to the interview (1994:90).

community to carry out the fieldwork for and with them (e.g. Roberts 1999). For my research with the Colombians, it proved useful that I spoke Spanish and could communicate with the participants in their mother tongue. This step might have even mitigated the hierarchical distance between us because I as a researcher was now in the position of a second-language learner (see Phipps 2013).

Within the Ethiopian community, tailoring my language use to my participants' overall ability to communicate in English was vital to avoid intimidation and to ensure that they were able to understand the questions and articulate the answers (Miller 2011:2). It was beneficial that I knew simple words and phrases in Amharic and my previous visit to Ethiopia enabled me to talk about different places, customs and food (see Lawrence 2007). This also seemingly established more informal relationships as I witnessed that several participants became more talkative after they learned about my visit to their country. Moreover, my willingness to have the Ethiopian participants teach me bits of their language and to potentially embarrass myself by trying to speak it may have "acted as a leveller" (Phipps 2013:334), and helped many participants to feel noticeably more at ease about speaking English. Overall, my use of Spanish with the Colombian community was instrumental, whereas my use of Amharic had the symbolic effect of establishing more comfortable connections in the Ethiopian community.

Apart from ensuring successful communication, establishing rapport with the participants and earning their trust was another important phase (O'Leary 2010:118; Blommaert & Jie 2010:44). Sometimes we chatted informally upon my arrival at their house while the women prepared coffee. The fact that two Colombian families had attended my wedding in the same year in which I conducted my fieldwork facilitated rapport as some mentioned that they had seen my wedding photos on *Facebook*. On several occasions I was offered marital advice, which I interpreted as a sign of growing confidence and the participants positioning themselves in a more experienced way than me in this field. Sometimes, the participants also started voicing their opinions on LM issues during the introductory phase, and I had to ask them to pause briefly to turn on the recorder (see also Wilson 2011:68). In other situations, the "social talk" (Danby, Ewing & Thorpe 2011:76) normally expected to create a relaxed atmosphere only took a few minutes because the participants were visibly ready to proceed to the more formal "conversation". One participant, once I had turned on the recorder, provided an official opening to our conversation by enquiring very directly *So what do you want to hear about?*.

I endeavoured to “create a conversational space in which the interviewees felt at ease” (Ghimenton 2013:9) to help them feel comfortable, respected and protected (Blommaert & Jie 2010:44). The general success of this was suggested by their general willingness to talk, their invitations for me to stay for lunch, return another day or have a coffee together at a later stage. It was also evidenced by pauses within the interview, followed by comments such as “we had nice summer this year, eh?”, suggesting that the participant was not overly constrained by the conversational format as she furnished a number of small talk topics. Moreover, the interview roles turned around occasionally when the participants started to show interest in my life. This had the effect of mitigating the formality and the power relationship because I was making myself vulnerable by revealing personal information (see Blommaert & Jie 2010:45).

I avoided research terminology and encouraged the participants to tell stories about their experiences with language in New Zealand (see Barkhuizen 2006). Leaving the format of the answers up to the participants usually gave the interview a less formal character. The participants’ stories sometimes revealed more information about their attitudes and identity than they could put in direct statements (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004:3; Rubin & Rubin 2012). In one instance, my thanks for the interview and the hospitality was responded to with *¿Para qué? Hicimos nada más que conversar* ‘For what? We only had a chat’. In spite of the Colombian woman’s downplaying of the formality of the interview, she had vividly engaged in the conversation and we had covered many important topics.

Earlier research identified respondents’ “tendency to agree with survey items regardless of their ‘true’ preference or the question’s content” (Baron-Epel et al. 2010:543). To reduce this so-called ‘acquiescence bias’, I tried to avoid questions that could be answered with simple affirmation. Instead, I preferred to ask open, non-guiding questions requiring an elaboration. I also stressed to the participants that I was interested in their genuine opinion and did not expect any specific answers (see also Johri 1998:92). This hopefully served to counter a potential “social desirability bias”, which may influence the interviewees to answer in socially appropriate ways, that is, to reveal attitudes they think they ought to have as members of society (Garrett 2010:44). Frequently this is connected with the wish to be cooperative or to convey a positive impression to the researcher (Garrett 2010:45). The fact that I interviewed each participant separately may have reduced this bias because they were under less pressure to hold opinions that were endorsed within their ethnic community.

Moreover, my observations helped clarify whether some statements could be corroborated through their actions.

Overall, the interviews with the mothers furnished detailed information and enabled me to identify their language beliefs and language choices with their children. They also provided supplementary information to which I sometimes made reference when I interviewed the children. I explain the structure of these interviews with children in the next section.

3.2.3.2 Interviews with children

Many studies dealing with intergenerational language transmission focus on adults' perceptions of LMLS, and rely on parents' reports about their children's attitudes and behaviour. Few researchers have conducted surveys or interviews with children, who are the actual bearers of maintenance or shift (but see Van Der Avoird, Broeder & Extra 2001; Okita 2002; György-Ullholm 2010). The table below shows the details of the interviews conducted with children.

Participants	Number of children interviewed	Age range	Length of interviews
Colombian children	9	7 - 11	0:20-1:15h; total 5h
Ethiopian children	8	6 - 17 ¹⁶	usually integrated into interviews with mothers, otherwise 5-29 minutes

Figure 3.4 Overview of interviews - children

The age restriction for the children ensured that they had experienced English socialisation at school, but were still young enough to learn English effortlessly (see discussion in Montrul 2008:Chapter 2). In the Ethiopian community, five children were present when I interviewed their mothers and since they seemed to feel comfortable together, I also entered into fruitful discussion with the children about the different topics from the interview schedule. I also interviewed three children separately. All interviews were conducted in English. In the Colombian community, I conducted interviews separately with mothers and children. I asked each child at the beginning of the interview which language they preferred. Seven children

¹⁶ While I focused on children under 12, their older siblings sometimes joined the conversation and furnished interesting viewpoints that I decided to include in my results.

preferred Spanish, whereas I conducted two more interviews in English. An outline of the interview questions is found in Appendix Four.

Interviewing children allowed me to gain insight into their perspectives on LM (see Kortessluoma, Hentinen & Nikkonen 2003:435). György-Ullholm (2010:114) found few discrepancies between the parents' and the children's accounts, but found that the children expounded on the stories from their own viewpoint. I took care to conduct the interviews in a child-centred way, taking into account a few ethical, methodological and developmental differences.

From an ethical point of view, the parents' role as legal caregivers meant that I interviewed each mother first and once the mother was familiar with the research goals, I asked her for permission to interview her children (see Zentella 1997). In addition, I obtained consent from the children (Danby, Ewing & Thorpe 2011) and informed them that there were no right or wrong answers and that they had the right to say "I don't know" (see Wilson & Powell 2001:61; György-Ullholm 2010). Previous acquaintance with the child based on my ethnographic observations was a supportive influence for establishing trust and mitigating subjective power imbalances. Likewise, the presence of siblings or friends proved beneficial in two cases (Holmes & Bell 1988:22).

Further, I adapted my methodology to the children's level of cognitive and linguistic development. Since children are likely to have a shorter attention span than adults (Punch 2002:324), I tailored the interview length accordingly to about 30 minutes (Wilson & Powell 2001:64). During the initial process, I usually enquired about their toys and friends (Kortessluoma, Hentinen & Nikkonen 2003:438; Danby, Ewing & Thorpe 2011:76) and explained that I was going to ask questions about the two languages (Wilson & Powell 2001:44). I created context for my questions by putting abstract concepts into a language and concrete situations ('here and now') (Wilson & Powell 2001:19), for example 'which language did you use with your mum when you came home from school today' over 'which language do you generally use with your parents'. Moreover, I tried to use linguistic items and questions according to the developmental (linguistic and cognitive) stage of the child (Faux, Walsh, & Deatrick 1988). Overall the interviews with the children yielded complementary accounts to those of the parents and provided further insight into their language beliefs and use.

3.2.4 Recordings of naturally-occurring speech

While the information gained from interviews paints an initial picture, recordings of naturally-occurring speech between the child and the mother open the backstage where language choice is actually negotiated in family interactions (Genesee, Nicoladis & Paradis 1995; Lanza 2004; Guardado 2008a). Recordings have the advantage over observations that they mitigate the ‘observer’s paradox’ (Labov 1972) as the researcher is usually absent (cf. Kasuya 2002).

My proficiency in Spanish allowed me to enrich the analysis for the Colombian community with this additional data set. I sampled three families with a maximum of three children according to the enthusiasm and interest they had shown during the interview. The maximum number of children ensured that I could distinguish their voices and that the mothers were more likely to find time for the recordings. I also sat in for observations in one larger family. While two mothers happily recorded a number of interactions with their children and their spouse, the third mother apologised after a few weeks for failing to record because the child spoke so much English in the home. I therefore emphasised again that my interest was in general language use with no preference towards a certain language, and she felt more comfortable to record her son’s language.

It appeared that the recorders were generally not intrusive for the family and that the individual members became used to the recorder quite quickly (Holmes, Marra & Vine 2011). When I played back the recordings to one family in which all members were aware of the presence of the recorder, the father and mother were both surprised about recordings on some occasions where they had not been aware that their spouse had turned on the recorder. I subsequently confirmed that both parents were comfortable with me using these recordings.

Recordings were conducted in the children’s regular home environment. The first family (Daniela and Eduardo, see Socialisation Scenario C in Chapter 5) provided one hour of extensive conversations assembled in 17 recordings that were collected over the course of three months in late 2012. Contexts ranged from breakfast, lunch and dinner conversations, playtime with the father to baking with both parents. Eight of the recordings were dyadic, which means that the interaction took place solely either between father and son or mother and son. Seven recordings contained multi-party interactions between father, mother and son. The other two families provided 30 minutes of recordings each, typically comprising home interactions between mother and child with no other people present (Laura, see Socialisation

Scenario D) or in the presence of a young sibling (Angélica and Andrés, see Socialisation Scenario A).

Although other studies show that meal times provide an excellent family socialisation context (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1997; Pan 1995; Caldas & Caron-Caldas 2002; Lanza 2004), I found that recordings of those events in the two families with younger children mostly included transactional talk, i.e. “talk primarily focused on the transference of information” (Blum-Kulka 2002:91), where the parents persuaded their children to eat. Hence, the dinner table did not seem to be the main place for sociability (Blum-Kulka 1997:34–38). At other times, such as during playtime and a family baking event, the children were more strongly involved as they initiated topics and asked questions.

3.2.5 Data analysis

Data analysis begins with data collection which I have discussed in the previous sections. This section provides information on the transcription of interviews and family recordings and outlines my methods for data analysis. I further present a model which I developed based on the literature review to assist my analysis and structure my findings.

Both the interview data and the recordings of naturally-occurring conversation were recorded with an Olympus digital recorder and transcribed in the qualitative data software NVivo 10. The transcription conventions were adapted from guidelines set forth by Vine et al. (2002) and MacWhinney (2014) and can be found in Appendix Five. For the interviews, I used detailed descriptions instead of verbatim transcriptions. I refrained from transcribing pauses and hesitations unless these clearly expressed the view point of the participants (see György-Ullholm 2010:109, 110). Passages that are reproduced in the thesis were double-checked, fully transcribed and, where necessary, translated into English (Mann 2011:15; see Guardado 2008a; Weldeyesus 2009). I provide the original version on the left (see Rubin & Rubin 2012).

The transcriptions of home interactions in the Colombian families were fully transcribed in all instances where the participants used both English and Spanish. I documented longer stretches in Spanish using detailed descriptions. Two of the case study families listened to their recordings with me and I verified and adjusted the transcriptions according to their feedback, where appropriate. The pseudonyms used in the present thesis are based on common Colombian and Ethiopian first names, and were chosen after consulting websites

that listed typical Colombian and Ethiopian names. Pseudonyms were also chosen to reflect religious membership where the actual names did so.

I undertook a thematic analysis of the interviews (Braun & Clarke 2006). As I transcribed the data and read through it several times, I noted down topics that emerged from each interview. To avoid “perceptions that certain groups appear simplistic and static, rather than dynamic and multilayered” (Garner, Raschka & Sercombe 2006:64), I also identified acts and statements which did not fit the general pattern.

Discourse analysis and language socialisation as my guiding methodologies and theories presuppose that language is not only a tool with which we communicate, but it is also performative because discursive practices create meaning in the interaction (Austin 1962; Butler 1990; Bucholtz & Hall 2005). On the one hand, my interview schedule clearly addressed some of my research questions, and I focused on the content conveyed explicitly in the interviews. On the other hand, I also undertook a latent analysis (Braun & Clarke 2006:84) by exploring the ideas and assumptions that underlay the interview data. For example, I focused on pronoun use and stance taking to analyse meaning-making at more implicit levels (De Fina 2003).

Data analysis was a flexible process and my engagement with the community facilitated my understanding of the data. My reports of the findings therefore model “thick descriptions” (Geertz 1973; Dörnyei 2007:130), that is, rich, detailed descriptions of the context of the observed. By providing enough background information for readers to understand the circumstances that were involved in producing the relevant situation (Blommaert & Jie 2010:6), I aimed to enhance transparency and convey understanding of the participants’ behaviour in a “situated” way (Lave & Wenger 1991).

I conceptualised my participants’ practices using a Bourdieusian ontology which considers both the structuring effects of an individual’s social context, and the individual’s agency to reproduce or contest those structures. The actual structural constraints on interaction may be societal, institutional, occur at the level of the community and even at the level of personal interaction (see Holmes, Marra & Vine 2011). As an example of how this ontological approach may be translated into practice, Norton (2013) identifies powerful societal structures in her research about immigrant women in Canada. She claims that these structures do not grant the women access to the majority culture where they can practice their language skills. At the same time, however, the women demonstrate their own agency as they find

ways of navigating their lives in English. My participants were also involved in actively reproducing or contesting the existing power structures with their decisions about transmitting Amharic and Spanish to their children (as I discuss in Chapter 6).

3.2.5.1 Model for data analysis

Since my research discusses different ways of “doing FLP”, I found it useful to have a means of categorisation which would provide an overview of different FLP scenarios. Based on Spolsky’s (2004) differentiation between language management and practices, I developed such a model categorising possible combinations of these two components. More specifically, I related parental management practices to their children’s language choices. The three options for parents range on a continuum from management to use the ethnic language via ‘no management’ to management to use the majority language (English). The two options for language practices are ‘Child typically uses ethnic language’ and ‘Child typically uses English’.

Figure 3.5 Scenarios A-F, representing combinations of parental language management and child language practices

I have labelled each option as a “scenario”. In Scenarios A and B, the parents use explicit management and strive to set an example for their children through their language behaviour. The children observe the explicit management in Scenario A, but not in Scenario B, where they typically use the majority language (English). Scenarios C and D describe the lack of any overt management, with the children using the ethnic language in Scenario C, and English in Scenario D. Scenarios E and F refer to parental use of explicit management toward the majority language (English) with similarly contrasting outcomes. The model provides a

clear overview of different management and practice combinations. It visualises that practices do not always agree with the expressed management and provides a useful tool for descriptions of FLP.

Defining management in a family context is challenging and, as far as I have identified, the FLP literature has not yet produced an exact definition of language management at the family level. Typically, management is understood to be explicit (as discussed in Chapter 2) because authorities communicate the rules, for example in the form of written language policies, and typically expect the recipients to have the mental abilities to understand the rules. The difference with language management at the family level is that children initially may not understand such explicitly articulated metalinguistic rules, such as “Speak x”. Although it may be obvious for a ten-year-old, for example, that their parents have introduced rules concerning language use, a one-and-a-half-year-old child may live under such management without the parents having said so explicitly to the child¹⁷. For these reasons, I suggest that explicit management refers to parents’ deliberate introduction of rules for language use, regardless of whether they have explicitly articulated these to their children.

3.3 Summary

This chapter has located my methodological approach within the field of linguistic ethnography and presented the three main methods I have used for collecting data, namely participant observation, qualitative interviews and recordings of naturally-occurring conversations. I have discussed my steps of gaining access to the participants as well as details of the interviews with both mothers and children, and argued that interviewing both groups provides a more comprehensive picture of attitudes and dynamics underlying language transmission. The second half of the chapter has focused on the details of obtaining the recordings of family interaction and on data analysis procedures. Ethical and relational issues have been a main concern throughout the chapter to ensure that the methodology is not only well-suited to answer the research questions, but is also ethically responsible to and beneficial for the participants. I have also developed a model that comprises different combinations of management and practices. This model will be used in the following chapters to structure the analysis of the participating families’ FLPs.

¹⁷ Even two-year-olds have been shown to be context sensitive in their language choice (see Lanza 2004; Quay 2008), but their awareness hinged on factors other than articulated metalinguistic rules (such as parental language proficiency and language modelling).

This third chapter concludes the preparatory part of the thesis and leads into the analysis. The fourth chapter discusses FLP within the Ethiopian community and the fifth chapter deals with FLP in the Colombian community. The two chapters are structured partly parallel following Spolsky's (2004) language policy framework with the three components of language beliefs, practices and management. Given the nature of the data I obtained, the chapter about the Ethiopian community includes more data on identity issues and the religious domain because these were discussed at length and appeared influential on language beliefs and use. The scenarios representing different management-practices combinations are illustrated with data from several families each in the form of mini case studies. These provide an overview of significant issues arising within the respective scenario in several families. In turn, I provide four larger case studies for the Colombian community as a result of the detailed interactional data I obtained from the recordings of naturally-occurring home interactions. The sixth chapter then provides a discussion and comparison of the two communities.

4 Family Language Policy in the Ethiopian Community

4.1 Introduction

The Ethiopian refugee-background community began settling in Wellington in the early 1990s. While the initial influx mostly comprised quota refugees, many of the later migrants arrived through family reunification programs, under which residents with a refugee background have the opportunity to bring their immediate family members to New Zealand. The most recent data shows that 1245 people identify as Ethiopians, and 237 of these live in Wellington (Statistics NZ, 2013 Census ethnic group profile Ethiopians). Ethiopian diversity is certainly reflected in the community, which consists of several ethnic groups, notably the Oromo, the Tigrayans and the Amhara. All ethnic groups unite for national celebrations such as the New Year in September. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the Amhara, one of the more powerful ethnic groups in Ethiopia and the focus of this thesis, generally use the label ‘Ethiopian community’. Estimates from community leaders put the number of Amhara in Wellington at 100 (Samson Sahele, personal communication).

The community members tend to live close together, with many settling in two adjacent suburbs in Wellington. Many social and religious events are organised by and for community members, and this offers them the chance to find a social network whose members uphold Ethiopian traditions and use Amharic with each other. As I discuss in Section 4.2.1.2, many participants strongly engage in this cultural network and use Amharic for most interactions. They want their children to learn Amharic, and report that they know of their parental responsibility to teach them the language.

This chapter investigates the language beliefs, practices and management of these Ethiopian families in Wellington (see Spolsky 2004). I first focus on beliefs about cultural identity among first-generation Ethiopian adults in New Zealand by exploring their self-positioning, their integration into the local Ethiopian community and their performance of this cultural identity through ‘acts of identity’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). I further investigate cultural identification and language use among the children in four short mini case studies and highlight further beliefs community members hold about Amharic and English. Since management and practices are often intricately linked (as discussed in Chapter 2), I discuss

both together in the second section. I conclude the chapter with a case study linking the notions of language beliefs, practices and management.

4.2 Language beliefs

The beliefs people hold about a language significantly influence to what extent and where they use the language (Curd-Christiansen 2009; Spolsky 2009:4). They may therefore affect LM (Tannenbaum 2003:374). Spolsky (2004:14) explains that beliefs concern the minority language as well as the majority language and other potential languages involved. The following sections are based on data from my ethnographic fieldwork and provide an overview of the varying beliefs Ethiopian community members hold about their cultural identifications, Amharic and English.

4.2.1 Adults' beliefs about cultural identity

4.2.1.1 Self-positioning

Although community members were interviewed on the basis of their “objectively” belonging to the community based on their ethnicity and current location (Ethiopian in Wellington), this essentialist categorisation was only a starting point because of the necessity of exploring how these categories were performed and became important for the participants themselves. I asked the participants a question about which cultural label they would use to index themselves (Bucholtz & Hall 2005), that is, whether they felt more Ethiopian, more ‘Kiwi’¹⁸, or somewhere “in between”¹⁹. The answers are thus a result of direct questioning and divided into three categories. The first category ‘Only Ethiopian’ comprises six answers, which were accompanied by an explanation for why the participants labelled themselves Ethiopian. The second category includes answers indicating that they felt ‘Ethiopian, but..’, and were followed by some sort of modifying statement, or that they felt ‘50/50, because...’, providing more information as to why they did not feel fully Ethiopian. The third category, only described by one participant, implied awareness that a new identity was being created. Though not often mentioned, this category is clearly a relevant and important one because it underscores the emergence of hybrid identities and third spaces (Bhabha 2012).

¹⁸ ‘Kiwi’ is a term New Zealanders commonly use for labelling themselves.

¹⁹ This phrasing seemed to generate sufficient context and facilitated better understanding than the question that I had originally planned to ask (“Which cultural group do you feel you belong to”).

The first category of answers comprises only those that indicated absolute identification with Ethiopia.

1) Only Ethiopian, because

- *I feel Ethiopian*
- *most of the time I use my own language*
- *I grew up in Ethiopia*
- *my family is in Ethiopia*

I was amazed at the epistemic stance of certainty with which most participants positioned themselves as Ethiopian: they answered the question in many cases without hesitation and with much vigour, sometimes even with knowing laughter, presumably to express the absurdity of considering themselves anything but Ethiopian. The reasons provided by participants who identified as only Ethiopian point to affective motives (*feel* Ethiopian) and patterns of language use, emphasising the strong felt link between language and ethnic belonging (see Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Pease-Alvarez 2002) which has frequently been expressed in research that has identified language as a core value (Smolicz 1992; Clyne & Kipp 2006). Other reasons were stages of primary socialisation spent in Ethiopia and the location of the family.

Answers within the second category have Ethiopian labels, but are followed by restrictions as New Zealand criteria are indexed. This category also includes statements indicating a shared 50/50 identification followed by a justification as to why the participants also felt part of New Zealand culture. The justifications were always presented in this manner; that is, explanations were given to show why they also felt partly Kiwi, but never why they still felt Ethiopian. Answers in this second category indicated a certain (limited) awareness of hybridity (Hall 1992:310).

2) Only Ethiopian, but ... / 50/50 because

- *my home is here, I live here*
- *I like New Zealand*
- *New Zealand government is better*
- *I eat some food from New Zealand*
- *I have to speak English sometimes*

Reasons for feeling in some way connected to both cultures concern the participants' current residence and positive feelings about the country and the government, which may be especially relevant considering at least one participant's status as a political refugee.

Although the above points express a connection to New Zealand, they also illustrate how strongly Ethiopian traditions continue to be lived by these participants. Participants stated eating some food from New Zealand and having to speak English sometimes. Both the use of *some* and *sometimes* in these comments implies that Ethiopian food and language practices are upheld as well. Moreover, the use of the modal verb *have to* suggests that the participant would potentially prefer to speak Amharic all the time, but feels forced through the *de facto* monolingual environment to use English for certain activities. This establishes a difference from other migrant groups in New Zealand, such as the Dutch and the Serbo-Croatians (Stoffel 1981; Roberts 1999; Crezee 2012) who were shown to assimilate more easily to dominant culinary and linguistic practices (as noted in Chapter 1).

Overall, almost all answers could be allocated to one of the previous two identity categories (only Ethiopian / 50/50), reflecting strong imagined identification with the Ethiopian community for the first generation. These results resemble those by Debela (1995:184) for the Ethiopian community in Southern Australia, whose members also strongly identified with their home country.

My only Protestant (rather than Orthodox) participant, Sara, also initially stated that she was 'in the middle' between Ethiopian and New Zealander identity, but her subsequent comments alluded to the development of a new identity:

3) New identity

- *I think that sometimes scares me. I'm in the middle, even sometimes you don't know when it's celebration day. Even last year we didn't have our Christmas, we used to celebrate our Easter, we used to cook our food. For me it doesn't make sense anymore. Last year I forgot about [Ethiopian] Christmas, and my husband was like "oh my God".*

As corroborated by further interview data, Sara was the only participant who talked about the development of a new identity. She recounted that she used to celebrate Ethiopian festivals in the past, but did not see the value of clinging to old traditions after spending twelve years in New Zealand. Illustrating the diverging values and traditions, she mentioned that the previous year she even forgot to prepare food for the Ethiopian Christmas celebration, which is held on the 7th of January. She alluded to a feeling of fear that overcame her as she realised that she

was positioned in a limbo situation in between two polarised cultural extremes (Kiwi vs. Ethiopian) (see Gao 2012; Norton 2013).

Her feelings can be related to the Durkheimian (1897) concept of anomie (see Lambert et al. 1963). Lambert and associates have used it to refer to the feeling of regret and anticipation in language learning and migration as the individual adapts more to the host culture while feeling homeless at the same time because the ties to the home culture are loosening (e.g. Lambert et al. 1963; Gardner & Lambert 1972). In Lambert's studies of language acquisition, anomie frequently occurs when there is a stage of mastery of the majority language, as in Sara's case here. Moreover, Sara partly described the birth of two of her children in New Zealand as an alienating factor from her home culture:

After having these kids, after going back home and coming back, when I go back home I feel the same thing, I feel like I don't belong there.

Pozo Gutiérrez explains the impact on cultural identity of having children as following: "The birth and upbringing of children in the host country implied in most cases a certain degree of permanence [...] that often resulted in an acceleration of social integration and linguistic and cultural assimilation" (2007:212).

Furthermore, Sara did not seem to identify an existing hybrid community that connects Ethiopian and New Zealand identity categories and merges them in a type of 'third space' (as described in Chapter 2). This suggests that she indirectly positioned the other Ethiopians in Wellington as a diaspora (Cohen 2008) which closely upholds Ethiopian traditions in a new local context. This idea seemed reinforced through common public discourse, which referred to them as Ethiopians or Africans more generally. Although the label 'Ethiopian American' is common in the United States and reflects the development of a new hybrid identity (Chacko 2003), I encountered no such hyphenated categories in my research. This may be linked to the relatively short length of stay and small size of the Ethiopian community in Wellington which may have prevented the emergence of such a unified category.

Overall, the majority of participants strongly identified as Ethiopians. This was evidenced in their accounts that continually refer back to *our country*, a feature of a diasporic community which feels closely aligned with a wider imagined community in the home country (Anderson 2006; Cohen 2008).

4.2.1.2 Cultural acts of identity

Identification with a community impacts on people's lived identity constructions (see Kanno & Norton 2003; Gao 2012). The participants actively used 'acts of identity'²⁰ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) to index membership in the Ethiopian community through their cultural and religious practices. I discuss these below and also highlight instances of hybridity (Coupland 2010; Bhabha 2012) emerging from their migration to New Zealand. In the subsequent section I expound on the strong perceived relationship between their linguistic practices and cultural identity.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the Ethiopian community was supportive and strong. Similar to dynamics in Samoan, Tongan and Greek communities in New Zealand (Holmes et al. 1993; Johri 1998), numerous church activities, children's birthdays and weddings provided occasions which "enable[d] engagement" (Wenger 1998:74) and contributed to "community maintenance" (Wenger 1998:74). To facilitate this engagement and maintenance in a more official capacity, the Ethiopian community *reified* (Wenger 1998) its existence in 2013 by creating an official incorporated society both for the community and their football team 'Ethiolions'. These provided further venues for social engagement and community-run institutional support (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977). Events such as Easter and Christmas celebrations were especially prominent in the Orthodox and the Protestant Churches. For example, the Orthodox Churches held a vigil at Easter: community members celebrated a church service with chants, readings and prayers on the Saturday evening before Easter until the early morning hours of Easter Sunday, followed by fellowship and a meal of *injera* (a type of sourdough typically eaten with stew). Similarly, the Protestant Church offered camp activities over Easter and Christmas enabling engagement with Protestant Ethiopians living in other parts of New Zealand. These diverse events provided an opportunity for Ethiopians to gather together in an Amharic-language environment. The wide array of events seemed to strengthen community cohesion and assisted members in developing close-knit networks.

As a result of the close organisational ties of the community, some participants had little contact with English-speaking New Zealanders. One 26-year-old participant explained that

²⁰ While Le Page & Tabouret-Keller (1985) exclusively refer to linguistic practices as 'acts of identity', I use the term here to refer to various practices through which "people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social roles" (1985:14). This is similar to Shohamy's (2006) use of the term "linguaging".

she used to have school friends outside the Ethiopian community, but now her social network comprised only Ethiopians. She reported that the organised events and visiting obligations within the Ethiopian community strengthened community ties. I saw these reports confirmed during my fieldwork when families visited each other to welcome visitors or to support others in times of need and grief.

Furthermore, culinary choices such as the choice of *injera* as a staple dish for many families strongly indexed Ethiopian identity. Another common practice among Orthodox Christians was fasting (see Poluha 2004:163). Many participants reported abstaining from animal products during the 55-day Lent Period before Easter (see Blackwell 2009:46), incidentally the period during which I carried out most of my research. Community members who regularly attended church services as well as those that did so infrequently reported obeying those fasts. One participant explained:

Yea, I do it sometimes. I mean not sometimes, now I do it continuously. It's not sometimes. If you do it, you have to do it, every day. That's how we keep the culture and our religion in here.

Her slip of the tongue reinforces that fasting for Lent requires deliberate and continuous observance in order to maintain Ethiopian culture and religion in New Zealand.

While these 'acts of identity' clearly indexed Ethiopian culture, identity constructions were also somewhat juxtaposed to New Zealand influences and most participants' home interiors showed instances of transnationalism (see Vertovec 2009). For example, they featured diverse Ethiopian wall decorations, such as pictures portraying religious objects or Ethiopian landscapes, but items reflecting New Zealand culture also appeared. The duality became particularly visible in the house of one participant who showed me her *jebena*, the traditional Ethiopian jar for brewing coffee, located next to a *McDonald's* bag (an entity foreign to Ethiopia) that her family had brought home for lunch. Thus, while Ethiopian culture was reproduced in the New Zealand context, the influence of the societal culture also created instantiations of hybridity.

4.2.1.3 Links between Amharic and Ethiopian identity

The first generation generally considered Amharic their 'we-code' (see Gumperz 1982; but see discussion in Gardner-Chloros 2009:56–58) and used the language for habitual in-group

communication. Hiwot, whose strong feelings about ethnic identification are discussed in a case study in Section 4.4, noted that Amharic use with other Ethiopians created positive feelings:

*When you speak your own language with your people you feel good.
You're not gonna meet a habesha person and speak in English,
that's not what our language is,
'cause we have our own language and we have our own culture.*

Hiwot explained that Ethiopians in New Zealand generally spoke Amharic with other Ethiopians because it reflected their identity. This corresponds to reports about members of the Tongan community who would also readily use Tongan to address fellow community members (Holmes et al. 1993). Its function as a language of unity and prestige within the confines of the community was further suggested in Sara's (the mother in Socialisation Scenario B) report that Amharic keeps them together and is used when they are *together in the church or in the community*. These comments suggest that some community members considered a shared repertoire important for establishing and expressing solidarity.

The Amharic language thus functioned as an integrative marker of identity for a number of participants. Similar to Curdth-Christiansen's (2009:365) findings that the Chinese language was central to identity claims for Chinese migrants in Canada, Amharic was considered reflective of the parents' identity and therefore had to be transmitted to the children as a heritage. Hiwot asserted:

That's where they are from, they have to learn, they have to speak, they have to know their language, their culture, their religion especially.

Using the third person plural possessive to index language, culture and religion, she suggested that the children, though born in New Zealand, also had an inherent affiliation with the language.

The fact that Amharic was referred to as *our language*, using the 1PL pronoun, seemed to index familiarity and ownership of the language (see De Fina 2003). Other immigrants' accounts frequently also index linguistic belonging by connecting the first person possessive pronoun with *language* (e.g. Shameem 1995; Mills 2005; Hatoss & Sheely 2009; De Souza 2012). Interestingly, one participant, who expressed a rather liberal stance concerning

Amharic maintenance (she stressed that English was more important for them than Amharic), did not use constructions such as *my/our language*. Instead, she used *Ethiopian language* and *Amharic language*, contrary to the apparent norm within my participants' discourse to voice feelings of attachment and possession when they referred to their language.

Only a few other community members diminished the link between Amharic and Ethiopian identity. Salome reported a lack of special feelings towards Amharic as opposed to other languages, claiming that *all languages is the same for me, language is just for understanding*. Her claim indicates that she did not consider the Amharic language to be essential for maintaining culture. This is contrary to Debela and Milosh's (1995:60) findings for Ethiopians in Australia who confirmed that Amharic was closely related to expressions of their identity. Similar to the contradiction expressed in Sanchez-Castro and Gil (2008), however, this mother also, despite the fact that she rejected links between her language and her cultural identity, showed active efforts to use the language with her son, suggesting that it had symbolic value for her (Bourdieu 1991).

Judgments about the strong links between Amharic and the participants' cultural identity diverged when these commented on a personal level. All agreed that their children could still call themselves Ethiopian as long as they identified with Ethiopia, even if they lacked Amharic knowledge. This resembles dynamics in the Samoan community in New Zealand, where, as Johri (1998:254, 255) argues, the subjective identity category for being Samoan was expanded (as mentioned in Chapter 2) after parents realised that their children no longer had mastery over the language. My participants' claim may have further been influenced by the fact that Ethiopians from other ethnic groups were expected to transmit their own minority languages (such as Tigrinya and Oromo) rather than Amharic. This meant that many children learned another minority language but could still claim Ethiopian belonging. It is therefore possible that a lack of proficiency may have been easier to justify for Amharas since a category of non-Amharic speaking Ethiopians already existed.

On the one hand, Amharic was highly valued for its integrative functions to signal belonging to the Ethiopian community. On the other hand, it was not considered essential for claiming ethnic belonging and thus resembled findings about the Samoan language in New Zealand (see also Fairburn-Dunlop 1984; Johri 1998; Taumoevalau et al. 2002). Such an unlinking of language and culture may affect LM negatively.

4.2.2 Children's beliefs about cultural identity

Children's imagined cultural identities were affected by their integration into New Zealand society. I suspected that they would find themselves in a "third space" (Bhabha 2012), because they grew up in New Zealand but were also influenced by the potential ethnic socialising attempts of their caregivers (see Garrett & Baquedano-López 2002). A number of the children whom I interviewed were too young to verbalise an opinion about their cultural identity, but others articulated clear thoughts and shared experiences. The following discussion is based on answers provided by the eight children interviewed, aged between six and 14. It also includes additional data from two older siblings aged 16 and 17. The two oldest children belonged to the 1.5 generation, whereas all other children were members of the second generation (as defined in Chapter 1).

Surprisingly, I found that the considerable time two children had spent in Sudan had no immediate effects on LM or cultural identification. Even those children who had never been to Ethiopia still identified with the wider Ethiopian community and made efforts to speak Amharic, contrary to the children in Debela and Milosh's (1995:60) study in Australia. It is thus possible that their mother's LM strategies benefitted from the previous experience of living in a situation where the family spoke a minority language. Such a "premigration language maintenance experience" has been shown to facilitate language maintenance for a few ethnic communities in Australia (see Clyne 2003:49).

The children's story shows, however, that not all had the opportunity to personally experience tangible membership in the Ethiopian community (Anderson 2006). For example, six-year-old New Zealand-born Ermias expressed pride in Ethiopia by speaking Amharic and wearing Ethiopian clothing. Asserting *I love Africa*, he widened his imagined community to Africans in general but then affirmed that he did not like Ethiopia because *they haven't got showers*. He must have won this impression when his family took him to Ethiopia at the age of four. His statement suggested that, although he felt connected to an imagined community of Africans, seeing the reality in Ethiopia might have changed his understanding (see Kanno 2000).

Four children from the second generation, born in either New Zealand, Sudan or Ethiopia, claimed that they felt in between the two cultures but did not provide any further comments. The remaining seven children commented explicitly on their imagined cultural identity. Two of these, who belonged to the 1.5 generation and had arrived in New Zealand within the last

two years, asserted that they identified strongly as Ethiopians and considered Amharic use important. The following mini case study describes their conviction that constant practice is crucial for maintaining Amharic proficiency:

Mini case study 1: Frustration over other children's failure to use Amharic

Name: Kidist	Age: 14	Age upon arrival in New Zealand: 12
Name: Helena	Age: 17	Age upon arrival in New Zealand: 15

Although both sisters admitted feeling tempted to use English in the home for gaining speaking practice, their ideological views persuaded them to use Amharic. Helena explained:

Sometimes when you speak English, you wanna know more English, so you speak with your sisters. But when you speak English you are forgetting your language. So we are not speaking English at home, we speak only Amharic.

Her sister Kidist voiced strong criticism against other Ethiopian children who refused to speak Amharic:

Sometimes, like, I'm not trying to be racist, but black people they try to forget their own culture, their own everything, and when I speak to them, they try to forget it, [...] when you even talk to them in their own language, they wouldn't respond to you in their own language.

By using a popular disclaimer preceding racial judgments ('I'm not trying to be racist', see Augoustinos & Every 2007:125ff), Kidist may have reflected the wider socio-political climate in New Zealand where references to ethnic 'others' are preferably avoided and commonalities stressed instead (see Wetherell & Potter 1992). She thus tailored her discourse to the anticipated objections or evaluations of the listener by using "internally polemical discourse" (Bakhtin 1984:108), that is, she positioned herself as knowledgeable of what is readily acceptable in New Zealand discourse before introducing a statement that potentially offered room for misinterpretation. However, her criticism was ironically directed against 'black people', whom she positioned as trying to forget their own culture. Being *habesha* herself, she could have subsumed herself within that group, but judging from her evaluation of their behaviour, she exempted herself without overtly mentioning it.

In particular, she adopted a stance of moral superiority (Jaffe 2012) by confidently expressing her normative views on their behaviour and holding black people who did not speak Amharic to account. She also used exaggeration as a device to make her argument convincing and urgent. First, the category of black people comprises more than just Amharic-speaking Ethiopians. Second, ethnographic observations at the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and other public get-togethers (such as an African fashion show and a refugee book launch) showed that even other Ethiopians around her used Amharic for their interactions and that she also communicated in Amharic with them. Her exaggeration possibly expressed the severity of her judgment of the ‘black people’s’ behaviour.

Her sister Helena furthermore expressed feelings of sadness when other children avoided speaking Amharic:

You know, some black people they feel embarrassed because of their language. Or if they know English they think, oh, they’re famous or something. But, you know, it doesn’t feel right.

But if you know your language, it means a lot for you and for your family. You could speak with anybody in here. But the thing is if you know English and you talk to them in our language, they will respond to you in English, not in Amharic. And you’re like “I’m talking to you in Amharic, don’t respond me in English. I know what you’re talking about, it just doesn’t feel right.” [Mel: *Is it because they can’t speak Amharic?*]

They can speak, but they just don’t want to speak Amharic. They feel it is a shame, they are embarrassed, it’s like oh my gosh, they just don’t like it.

Two important points emerged from Helena’s categorisations. First, she outlined how Others (‘black people’) perceived Amharic and English: she positioned them as experiencing a sense of shame and embarrassment when they hear their languages whereas they reportedly considered English as a source of fame (similar to reports by Samoan respondents in Johri 1998). This is probably related to the position of the languages in the linguistic marketplace, where English is a prestigious language associated with social and economic progress and representing higher linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1977b). They reinforced the status of the “legitimate language” (English) by adjusting to the outside ‘normal’ culture and language and thus subordinating to the power relations in the societal linguistic market (Bourdieu 1977b:656). Second, Helena positioned ‘others’ in opposition to herself in terms of

interactional norms about language choice. She explained that she occasionally found her preference to speak Amharic contested when other Ethiopians chose to use English, providing that their interlocutor was proficient in English. Overall, both sisters strongly linked the language with their cultural identity (see also Holmes et al. 1993) and portrayed speaking it as an obligation to index their “Ethiopian identity”.

While these claims echo adults’ assertions within the community, younger children identified more strongly with New Zealand culture and did not voice expectations for others to speak Amharic. About half of the children maintained that they belonged to both cultures. They agreed that they felt well-aculturated and considered themselves full members of New Zealand society. At the same time, they maintained a feeling of belonging to their ethnic community. Rather than expressing a feeling of in-betweenness, these children stressed their full belonging to both cultures. This is discussed in Ward (2013) as alternating identities with the relevant cultural identity being situated depending on the context. The following two mini case studies discuss relevant factors for this feeling of biculturalism:

Mini Case Study 2: Social network and language choice

Name: Mimi Age: 9 Age upon arrival in New Zealand: 2

Mimi’s case confirms findings in Phinney, Romero and associates (2001) stating that language, parents and peers are highly influential on immigrant children’s cultural identity. Mimi reported that her family and peer group, who used Amharic and English respectively, influenced her feeling of belonging to two different cultures. She felt well acculturated and alternated her Ethiopian and New Zealand identities depending on the context. By claiming that she felt *fifty fifty, because I can speak English and Ethiopia is my country*, she highlighted her proficiency in English (which supposedly aligned her with New Zealanders) and the fact that *Ethiopia is my country*, with the personal pronoun construction implying identification with the country. Moreover, she continued to report that she felt Kiwi when she talked to her friends, but Ethiopian when she was with her parents because they always spoke to her in Amharic. The emphasis on the people in her immediate surroundings suggest that the language choices of her social contacts exerted great influence on her subjective feeling of belonging (see Zentella 1997).

Mini Case Study 3: Private vs. public domains

Name: Yonas

Age: 14

Age upon arrival in New Zealand: 9

Rather than social networks alone, Yonas identified the dichotomy of the private (inside the home) and public domain as a factor for cultural identification. He was the only member of the second generation in my data who identified (at least initially) solely as Ethiopian. The location of the interview inside his home may have influenced his response. He rendered his relationship to Ethiopia explicit by saying that he felt *Ethiopian, 'cause I was born there*. However, he softened his claim, suggesting an underlying ideology that being mainstream New Zealander may be the 'normal state' (see Makihara & Schieffelin 2007) by asserting that he was also a full member of New Zealand society:

When I'm at school I just feel normal, and then when I'm here, our culture and stuff.

This dichotomy may have been passed down by his aunt, who was responsible for his upbringing and used the same comparison when stating that her home felt entirely Ethiopian, but *whenever I go outside I don't feel anything, I just live normal life*. Like Mimi in the previous mini case study, Yonas comments above suggest an alternating of identities (Ward 2013) depending on whether he was in the private or public domain. Thus, the children constructed situated identities with one identification (and language) dominating in relation to immediate context (see Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004; Bucholtz & Hall 2005).

Nevertheless, a crossover of domains in these situations may lead to language conflict. For example, the (Amharic) church and the (English) school domain overlapped for Yonas when his teacher asked him to pray for a shared lunch in Amharic. He reported refusing to do so a few times before he finally gave in to the pleas of his friends to *just do it*. It is possible that his restriction of Amharic to the private and ethnic domain may have influenced him to feel embarrassed about using it in more public domains. This reflected his awareness of English as the "legitimate language" (Bourdieu 1991) of the school. Although the teacher endorsed his short-term use of Amharic for the prayer, Yonas' initial adverse reaction suggested that such domain crossovers occurred rarely. As such, his *habitus* had "objectively adjusted to a [low] level of acceptability" (Bourdieu 1977b:655) of Amharic in the school context, and he therefore needed encouragement from other agents (fellow students) in the 'market' to render his use of Amharic more acceptable. This converges with Bourdieu's (1977b:655–656)

proposition that acceptability of a language depends not only on the situation (here: being asked to pray in Amharic), but rather on the relationship between the situation and habitus (here: being asked to pray but having internalised that Amharic should be used only in private domains).

Concerning non-linguistic ‘acts of identity’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985), Yonas reported that he had developed different greeting habits: he high fived his friends at school, used the traditional Ethiopian hand shake at church (with one hand supporting the other arm and a bow as a sign of respect) and on special occasions at school shook the principal’s hand without the supporting arm. He thus adjusted to the situation depending on its formality and its ethnic association and drew on his cultural non-linguistic and linguistic repertoires accordingly (see Giles & Smith 1979).

These two mini case studies highlight the influence of social networks, domains and societal power relations on Mimi’s and Yonas’ feelings of cultural belonging and language choices. I observed these two children use Amharic with apparent agility, demonstrating the proficiency they had maintained and further developed after arriving in New Zealand. Nevertheless, due to the limited number of domains in which the children were exposed to Amharic, their language proficiency developed differently in New Zealand from how it would have done in Ethiopia. Yonas’ statement *I know the words I need to know* suggests that he may have lacked the linguistic and pragmatic resources to use Amharic in all domains but recognised that his level of Amharic was sufficient for use in the relevant domains in New Zealand.

Language choice among the children suggested the emergence of a multicultural habitus (Vertovec 2009:76): while they were often encouraged/expected to speak Amharic in the home, they typically used English with each other as observed at community events and reported by other community members. As such, English represented the ‘we-code’, i.e. the language habitually used within the younger generation (see Gumperz 1982; Gardner-Chloros 2009). The children also described code-switching where, for example, those proficient in Amharic used a mixture of Amharic and English with children who spoke only little Amharic *to make it easier for them*. This is an example of audience design (Bell 2001) illustrating Woolard’s claim that “overt acts [...] can index addressee-focused attributions rather than speaker-focused claims” (2007:192).

Although code-switching in the migrant context tends to be considered a sign of incipient LS as the more powerful language intrudes into the private domains of the minority language,

my study shows one instance where this occurrence was reversed. Mimi reported that, while she mixed English words into her Amharic in the home, the opposite happened at school: on occasions, she code-switched to Amharic unintentionally, for example saying *beqe* instead of *wait*. This suggests that also her ‘matrix language’ (Myers-Scotton 1997) English was affected by her use of Amharic in the home domain.

One nine-year-old girl also took Amharic into the public domain because the language inherently seemed to provide “warmth, emotional shelter and soothing support” (Guardado 2008a:217). She reported that, despite her low Amharic proficiency, she used the language for affective purposes such as comforting her Ethiopian friend at school. She possibly considered Amharic linked to the more intimate family domain, so that the need for a reassuring response contributed to her use of Amharic over English, even at school and among children where English was the habitual language. This type of code-switching to the ethnic language for expressing emotions, though it has received little academic attention for children in particular, seems common (see Pavlenko 2006). As such, Amharic was used even intra-generationally for particular purposes.

Although Amharic proficiency was useful for accessing the first generation Ethiopian community, it was not critical for perceived inclusion in the group. This reflects what has been reported about Hopi speakers and their children in the United States who are experiencing fast LS: whereas older Hopi speakers link language and identity, younger Hopi “express cultural identity inherent in a process associated with ‘practicing’ culture” (Nicholas 2011:53). Similarly, the Ethiopian children linked their professed Ethiopian identity not exclusively to the language but to constructions of cultural identity through practices such as eating Ethiopian food and wearing Ethiopian clothes on particular occasions.

Although a few children knew very little Amharic, this did not necessarily correlate with a lack of Ethiopian belonging. The following mini case study suggests a shift to viewing Ethiopian identity as unrelated to Amharic proficiency.

Mini Case Study 4: Belonging despite lack of Amharic proficiency

Name: Naomi

Age: 11, born in New Zealand

Similar to the children in the previous mini case studies, eleven-year-old Naomi made her cultural belonging dependent on her current location and on the surrounding social network:

It's kind of when I'm here [in New Zealand] I feel mostly Kiwi, but when I'm in Ethiopia I feel more Ethiopian. And sometimes when I see Ethiopian people here I just feel in between.

She expressed a positive sense of belonging and adjustment to both cultures depending on her location. In addition, she declared feeling *in between* when the two cultures co-occurred.

Interestingly, my (outsider) presence in her home when I interviewed her mother seemed to provide an Ethiopian context because, when she was asked to greet me, she shook my hand shyly without looking me in the eye, exemplary of a well-mannered Ethiopian girl who “lower[s her] eyes when speaking to [adults]” (Roer-Strier & Strier 2006:110; see also Tannenbaum 2009) and different from more confident behaviour typical of New Zealand children. Despite this appearance resonant of Ethiopian manners, her mother reported that the majority of her daughter’s encounters were with other New Zealanders and that her daughter did not possess the linguistic capital to access monolingual Ethiopian networks.

Given this limited contact with Ethiopians and her inability to speak Amharic, it is not clear whether Naomi was simply describing an imagined identity which did not align with her habits and abilities. Conversely, her alignment with these imagined communities may have been a first example of considering Ethiopian identity independent of Amharic proficiency. This would be similar to the descriptions of Hopi culture mentioned above (Nicholas 2011) and to the Samoan understanding in New Zealand, where *fa’asamoa*, the Samoan “way of life”, provided the frame for claims to cultural membership even in cases where the individuals did not speak the language (Johri 1998; Anae 2012). Similarly, the Ethiopian lifestyle with its values of respect and religion – representing common discourses within the community – may have defined membership sufficiently. The contrast of Ethiopian to New Zealand culture was significant and this potentially meant that Amharic use was no longer necessary to warrant a separate identity label (see also Johri 1998; Roberts 1999). However, this contradicts assumptions by Clyne (2003) claiming that immigrants who have a culture

that is very different to the culture of the host society are more likely to maintain their languages.

In summary, only three out of the seven children who commented on their cultural identity claimed that they felt only Ethiopian, and one also acknowledged that he felt ‘normal’ among New Zealanders. Contrary to my expectations of encountering a third space (Bhabha 2012) and an emerging hybrid identity, the other three children stressed that they felt connected to both communities. While there is need for further research, the results suggest that, at least at this point, the second generation had developed a broad range of linguistic and social capital because many children were bilingual and exercised belonging to both the Ethiopian and New Zealand communities (Bourdieu 1977b). Nevertheless, the last mini case study suggests that, although Amharic knowledge facilitated access to the community, it may increasingly not be considered an essential criterion for claiming Ethiopian membership.

In the next section I consider the impact of religion on language choice.

4.2.1 Influence of religious beliefs on linguistic beliefs

Previous literature indicates cultural identity and religion are closely connected (Extra & Yağmur 2010; Ward 2013), particularly in Ethiopia (Poluha 2004:171) and Ethiopian diasporic communities (Weldeyesus 2009). Ethiopians often proudly report that their country embraced Christianity long before many European nations became Christian. Orthodox Christianity is recognised by many as the true Ethiopian religion (see Aalen 2011:31), which means a close link between Ethiopian identity and Orthodox Church affiliation in public discourse. Religion took a central role in my participants’ stories, illustrating it as a core value in the community. The stories revealed the prominent role of religion in everyday life in general and the elevated role of the Orthodox Church in Ethiopian society. Religion influenced everyday life and beliefs, for example the decision of many Ethiopian participants to send their children to Catholic schools where Christian values were transmitted. As discussed in Chapter 2, religion as a core value was also highlighted in other migrant communities, for example the link between Islam and Arabs or Macedonians and the Orthodox Church (see Clyne & Kipp 2006; Extra & Yağmur 2010; Gogonas 2012).

Spolsky and many other scholars argue that “religious observances help maintain languages after immigration” (2004:49). They may slow down a potential shift towards the majority language, especially when both language and religion are core values (Gogonas 2012:115).

First, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church functions as a ‘market’ in the Bourdieusian sense where Amharic is the legitimate language (Bourdieu 1977b). It contributes to LM by imposing an explicit language policy where children (and adults) are only allowed to speak Amharic. The adults customarily used Amharic with each other in any case, but the rule acted as a restraining force on the children’s use of English. One girl reported:

We’re not even allowed to speak English at church ‘cause they’re like “Stop speaking English there”, you know when they’re joking, “you’re insulting me when you are speaking English, I want you to speak only Amharic”. They just make fun when we speak English.

She described receiving the instant corrections after using English in the church. Her claims were corroborated by other accounts from both children and adults, who considered it their duty to ensure that the children used Amharic. The children willingly accepted the language policy and recognised the legitimacy of Amharic for the church domain (Bourdieu 1977b). Reports from other diasporic Ethiopian Orthodox Churches, however, suggest that it might be crucial for the church to offer English-speaking services in the future in order to stay interesting for the youth, many of whom no longer understand Amharic (Mawji 2013). No such practices were yet planned within the Ethiopian Orthodox Church in Wellington.

Active members of the Orthodox Church, which comprised the majority of my participants, adopted a more traditional attitude towards maintaining Ethiopian values and norms. This was possibly connected to the socio-history of language use in the church where Amharic assumes an important role and frequently replaces Ge’ez, the original language used for liturgy and devotions (Wagaw 1999:76). Most practices in the church such as praying and singing are tied to Amharic, reinforcing its legitimacy even for church members who belong to a different Ethiopian ethnic group. Certainly, the majority of participants appeared to strongly associate Amharic with the church as evidenced by religious posters in their homes with Amharic writing and their use of Amharic in the Church. Moreover, one participant explicitly commented that Amharic brought her closer to God on a personal level. Thus, Amharic may be classified for some as a “sacred language” (Karan 2011), a fact which may encourage more Ethiopians to use it.

In contrast, based on my observations, the Ethiopian Protestant Church did not seem to elevate Amharic to sacred status. As suggested by the fact that interpretation was willingly offered to English-speaking visitors, church members appeared to consider the content of the service more important than the language used. My one participant from the Protestant

Church read the Bible to her daughter in English and this presented a clearly different linguistic choice from those parents attending the Orthodox Church, who read their Bibles in Amharic. Although the adults in the church exclusively used Amharic, they had no explicit language policy which prevented the children from using English. Moreover, a number of church members belonged to another Ethiopian ethnic group or were Eritrean. While the parents had command of their own ethnic language and Amharic, their children were partly bilingual in their ethnic language and English, but not necessarily in Amharic. In their case, moving to New Zealand meant that they assigned lower priority to Amharic, which, although previously the legitimate official language, had decreased to a lower level of importance than their own ethnic language. Due to this intra-ethnic composition of the Protestant Church and the less central role of Amharic to the religion, the church was a domain where the children were exposed to Amharic but not required to use the language. This corresponds to findings about the only pragmatic link between other ethnic Protestant Churches and their language practices (see Holmes et al. 1993 for a description of the use of Tongan in New Zealand churches; or Park & Sarkar 2007 for the use of Korean in Canadian churches).

Since community members adhered to different religions, some had asked for an organisation to provide Amharic teaching which was not combined with religious instruction. This would mean that all children from Orthodox, Muslim and Protestant families had the chance to receive minority language education. One participant from the Protestant Church reported that she did not intend to send her daughter to the Orthodox Church for Amharic class because she was certain that church doctrine would be mixed into the classes held at the church. Conversely, when asked about including other religious groups in their Amharic classes at the Orthodox Church, one mother reasoned:

They've got their own church or mesquit [mosque], so they can do [it] there. If they ever wanna teach their kids, it is better to teach where they belong, you know, doesn't have to be my church. So if they really want to do [it] they can do it that way. That's what I believe.

This comment, though only voiced this strongly by one participant, suggests that religion seemingly outranked in importance communal efforts to maintain Amharic and may have posed a barrier to any potential united LM endeavours.

In sum, the religious beliefs within the community identified in this section indicate that the church had considerable influence, with the Orthodox Church's strict language policies being extremely effective in promoting the use of Amharic among the parish for both adults and

children. By contrast, while Amharic was spoken in the Protestant Church, the lack of any ideological link between their religious beliefs and Amharic meant that church members refrained from establishing a strict language policy.

4.2.2 Amharic as cultural capital

Another factor that contributed to Amharic use was the recognition that Amharic symbolised cultural capital for Ethiopia (Bourdieu 1991). Although Ethiopia has over 80 languages, Amharic is the official language and enjoys high ethnolinguistic vitality, even to the point of replacing other Ethiopian languages (Mous 2003). The possibility of returning to Ethiopia in the future, if only for a visit, rendered this a relevant motivator for maintaining the language. Corresponding to Weldeyesus' (2009) findings, many families wanted to maintain the link to Ethiopia and possibly even return for retirement. One mother stressed that she wanted to provide her daughter with the linguistic capital for visits to Ethiopia and enable her to live without a need for interpreters. She emphasized therefore that her daughter's effort in learning Amharic was for her own benefit.

The theme of visiting grandparents and the extended family in Ethiopia emerged in most interviews as an essential motivation for maintaining Amharic. Many participants highlighted that their extended families were not proficient in English. These integrative motivations (see Gardner & Lambert 1972) for LM are commonly reported in migrant communities (see Debela & Milosh 1995; Worthy & Rodriguez-Galindo 2006; Guardado 2008a; Shenk 2008:243; Jones Díaz 2011). Many mothers declared that their children's potential future inability to speak Amharic would produce "sadness" and one mother explained:

[...] when he goes home, that's how he communicates with his, you know, cousins, aunts, and uncles, and, you know, grandparents. Otherwise you go there, you know, you don't communicate. If you don't communicate your family how would you feel? [...] So, you know, I try to teach him so that thing won't happen.

This mother enumerated family connections and posed a rhetorical question (*If you don't communicate your family, how would you feel?*) to highlight the impact of affective separation.

The importance of Amharic proficiency for speaking with other family members was generally expressed to the children as the key motivation for learning Amharic. One mother

recounts the difficulties her 11-year-old daughter had trying to communicate with the family when they visited Ethiopia (see also Caldas & Caron-Caldas 2002). New Zealand-born Naomi (see mini case study 4) spoke little Amharic when she visited Ethiopia with her mother for the first time at the age of ten. Her mother reported that she spent most of the time with her one cousin who spoke English. However, she also reported that *she felt really left out* and faced difficulty communicating with her grandmother. When I asked Naomi whether she could speak with her relatives, she recounted:

They knew a little bit of English, and I kind of understand what they say. I just don't know what to answer them. But I just answer them sometimes in English and if I know how to answer back [in Amharic], I just use what I know. They understand a little when I speak in English.

This rather sad comment illustrated how communication with the monolingual older generations in her family was limited for Naomi. The lack of language transmission in Naomi's family hindered her from communicating with her grandmother. This provides support for Kopeliovich's (2009:245) claim that minority language proficiency is "crucial for maintaining adequate and warm communication between the [...] generations of a family" (see also Schwartz 2010:175). Despite bonds created by inherent belonging to the family, Naomi was unable to relate with her grandmother verbally due to their incongruent language skills.

Amharic was also considered useful for communication in other diasporic communities. For example, while Sara affirmed that Amharic was not useful for New Zealand because there were no Ethiopian-owned restaurants or other institutions²¹, she also claimed that it would be a useful language in Australia where the Ethiopian population was quite large and owned barber shops, restaurants and beauty shops. She assumed that Ethiopian migrants in other countries also maintained their language instead of adopting the majority language exclusively. This is different, however, from Weldeyesus' (2009) findings that highlight processes of language shift for a group of Ethiopians in the United States. Overall, the high prestige and usefulness of Amharic in Ethiopia, among the extended family and in other diaspora communities seemed to be an influential incentive for language transmission.

²¹ Since the time of the interview an Ethiopian restaurant has opened in Wellington.

4.2.3 Personal motivations

Positive affect, pride linked to Amharic (see Baker 2006:120) as well as a general sense of being able to express their emotions created further incentives for language use. Most participants declared that they liked their language and one participant expressed that hearing Amharic spoken produced extreme pride in her country. It has been documented for other Ethiopian diaspora communities that families and ethnic institutions promoted this feeling of pride in the national culture (Chacko 2003:499, 500). Another participant reported that she preferred singing in Amharic because *you feel something when you sing it*, feelings she did not experience when she sang in English. This reflects Pavlenko's (2006) claim that the ethnic language may provide emotional content not readily available in a second language (see also Dewaele & Nakano 2013). Surprisingly, another participant who had spent half of her life in New Zealand asserted that she enjoyed speaking Amharic a lot and that the language seemed to connect to emotions on a deeper level than English, despite her lack of proficiency in the language, because *when I speak to someone in Amharic it's like I can explain myself very well, I don't know, that's what I feel inside*. Even though she could express her emotions more eloquently in English, the participant explained that she preferred using Amharic. While this can also be linked back to Dewaele and Nakano's (2013) conclusions that multilinguals tend to feel more emotional in the languages they acquired early in life, her claim also supports findings that highlight the importance of language attitudes for Maori use in New Zealand. These suggested that whether Maori was used depended mostly on the speakers' attitudes towards the language, rather than proficiency (Te Puni Kokiri 2006). Hence, it is especially for these personal functions such as thinking or singing to oneself that the ethnic language is expected to be maintained longest (Fishman 1965:427).

Having greater proficiency in Amharic was another motivation for using the language. One participant reported that Amharic was *nice* because it was her mother tongue and she could understand it and express herself in it. In contrast, she claimed that her limited knowledge of English hindered her from communicating clearly with others. A number of participants also reported that alongside ideological reasons for using the language they spoke only Amharic with their friends because of their low English proficiency:

Because I can't, she not, I can't. Not too much + she not can't English word, just my country word.

Overall, the positive feelings which Amharic evoked, its expressive strength and the high proficiency of many participants were conducive to its frequent use in the community.

4.2.4 Contrasting status of Amharic and English at the societal level

The previous section has highlighted the generally strong desire to maintain Amharic across families. However, despite these positive beliefs about Amharic, the language had virtually no societal prestige in New Zealand. Amharic was considered a rather powerless minority language within the New Zealand marketplace where English was the dominant language (see Starks, Harlow & Bell 2005:18). This illustrates how languages may take on the status of a hegemonic language (here: Amharic in Ethiopia) as well as that of a (weaker) minority language (here: Amharic in New Zealand). One participant, representative of many others, stated that Amharic was not useful for living in New Zealand, and thus echoed claims of other minority language speakers in New Zealand about their languages (Holmes et al. 1993; Benton 2001; Kuncha & Bathula 2004; Caldas 2012). Her response pointed effectively to a low demographic profile and a lack of institutional support for Amharic in Wellington (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977). Sallabank (2012:111) reports similar findings for minority languages all over the world, and laments that it is the lack of expediency in speakers' eyes which causes them to prefer other more 'useful' languages.

A main factor for the limited usefulness of Amharic in Wellington was reportedly the small size of the Ethiopian population, especially as compared to other Ethiopian communities abroad. Switzerland, Germany and Australia were among the places mentioned where the large size of the Ethiopian diaspora increased both their visible presence and the ethnolinguistic vitality of Amharic (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977). Moreover, the Ethiopian community was constructed as small and powerless through 'distinction' (Bucholtz & Hall 2005), as participants contrasted it with other minority groups in Wellington, such as the Chinese and Samoans. Overall, all participants agreed that only a few instrumental motivations (Gardner & Lambert 1972) existed for teaching Amharic to their children, and the perceived lack of interest from other New Zealanders in learning Amharic did not warrant launching government-run Amharic classes for such a small community. The same arguments about the small size of the community and the lack of interest shown by New Zealanders were found in Johri's (1998) study investigating Korean LM in Dunedin, New Zealand. This differed strongly for other more powerful minority groups such as Samoans who expressed

keen interest in establishing Samoan classes (Johri 1998). A group's size and prestige thus appear to be important indicators of its vitality.

One participant expressed the "continuous battle between ideologies" (Shohamy 2006:450) in the following way:

English is the most important language, it's international language, so we can go anywhere, [...] but Amharic we only use in our country.

Her comment suggested that more societal incentives existed for the families to speak English. First of all, English was an international language, spoken in many countries in the world and used as a lingua franca among many others. Moreover, English was considered cultural capital (Bourdieu 1977b) for New Zealand, a *de facto* monolingual English-speaking country. All participants considered English proficiency essential, and one woman expressed sympathy for elderly immigrants who spoke little English. Arguments provided for English proficiency were its strong presence in society and opportunities it presented for employment.

The fact that English is valued so highly at a societal level offers a strong challenge to the mostly in-group prestige of Amharic and the lack of social and economic progress attached to it. Therefore, the community's language ideology ("what people think should be done", Spolsky 2004:14) seemed to consist of a desire for bilingualism, with English having a more immediately important status than Amharic. For example, one participant stressed that she would only be happy about bilingualism if her children learned English first, followed by Amharic. Equally, another participant responded to the question whether she wanted her son to grow up speaking Amharic:

Yea, both, I'd love to. English must be, 'cause they are born here, they grow up here, they have to, but as well I'd love them to speak Amharic.

From the way she ranked the languages in her statement and from the emphasis placed on each, it can be inferred that English also took priority for her over Amharic. Similarly, Abeba (whose FLP I describe in Scenario D) suggested that bilingualism and biculturalism might be more important for her daughter than Amharic proficiency alone: when asked about her opinion about an Amharic class, she states that it would be good for her daughter because it would enable her to compare the two cultures *side by side*. All of this suggests that the parents did not only focus on the value of Amharic in their language maintenance attempts but clearly took into account the value of other languages, notably English.

4.2.5 Summary

This section has discussed the range of beliefs which the participants in this study expressed about Amharic and English. Their language beliefs were strongly influenced by their cultural and religious identifications. While the first generation identified predominantly as Ethiopian and used Amharic, the second generation showed a greater sense of biculturalism and used both English and Amharic with varying degrees of proficiency. Beliefs towards Amharic were generally positive because of the linguistic capital which Amharic represented in Ethiopia, in other diasporic communities and within the religious and family domain. Moreover, personal affective motives and the wish to connect with the extended family were reasons for undertaking LM efforts. Despite these positive beliefs, the low societal prestige of Amharic was in stark contrast to the high linguistic capital of the English language in New Zealand and in the world. Many participants wanted their children to be bilingual, but emphasised that they especially needed to know English well to cope in New Zealand.

4.3 Language management and practices

These underlying language beliefs gave rise to various language practices and management, which are the focus of this section. First, I provide a general overview of advantages and challenges of minority language socialisation and of the family language policies (FLP) in the Ethiopian community. I then use the model (outlined in Chapter 3) which I developed building on the concepts in the existing literature to categorise different language management scenarios based on observed and reported data from the families.

The following quote exemplifies how one Ethiopian participant had positive perceptions of the outcome of her family language policy. She expressed a sense of comfort, security and familiar territory as she related how she felt whenever she was at home:

To me, whenever I'm in this house, I don't know where I am. It's my family, it's my language, the culture, the food, everything it's like Ethiopia. So I don't have any [New Zealand] culture in this house.

The participant suggested that when inside the home she forgot that she was in New Zealand (*I don't know where I am*) because the culture was only Ethiopian. Against this backdrop of seemingly successful Amharic language implementation, desired by many other participants, I will elaborate on the practices of other families. In part, these echoed similarly positive

results in providing spaces for Amharic maintenance. However, traces of LS were also visible as children frequently introduced the majority language into the home domain.

In most families, the parents used Amharic with each other, but these practices were usually not based on an explicit rule. Instead, they reflected the pragmatic reason of understanding each other better (*it is the easiest way to communicate for us*). This mirrors Li's (1994) argument that bilinguals will use the language in which they have higher proficiency for any particular task. It is also influenced by the "inertia principle" posited by Spolsky and Cooper (1991) who claim that people will usually continue to use the language that they first used with a particular person. Often no overt management is therefore needed to regulate home language use between parents.

Such planning in migrant families generally becomes more necessary, however, when the first child is born and parents make language decisions beyond their own individual practices. Five different language policy scenarios occurred within the families I interviewed. Typically, families used Amharic for intra-family communication based on explicit management. Nevertheless, other families used English along with Amharic for a variety of reasons. The following figure shows how frequently the different scenarios occurred across Ethiopian families. The more saturated the colour, the more families fit the respective scenario.

Figure 4.1 Frequency of occurrence of FLP scenarios in Ethiopian families

Most parents used Amharic-only management, which the children followed most of the time (Scenario A). One family had an explicit rule to speak only Amharic which the children hardly ever followed, but instead spoke English most of the time (Scenario B). Some parents used no management, and their children used Amharic (Scenario C). Some parents used no management and their children typically used English (Scenario D). Some families used English-only management but were not successful with it (Scenario E). No family was successful in trying to make English the language of communication (Scenario F). I use this model to structure the following discussion of language practices and management.

4.3.1 Socialisation Scenario A

Management	Practices
Amharic-only management	Amharic is typically used

Families who used Amharic as a home language based on explicit management recognised that they needed to do so to resist losing their language. The following section provides examples of the most important issues emerging from three of the families' choices to speak only Amharic.

Family 1:

Members: Abaynesh (aunt), Yeshi (grandmother),
Iyasu (nephew, age 12), Yonas (nephew, age 14)
Length of stay: ~10 years (aunt), 5 years (nephews)

Abaynesh, who was in her late twenties had already spent over ten years in New Zealand before bringing her two nephews from Ethiopia to live with her and her mother. She constructed her beliefs about Amharic maintenance in New Zealand by stressing the value of gaining a language “for free” (Cunningham 2011:68) if they continued to speak their ethnic language:

I don't want them to forget [Amharic]. 'Cause English they will learn it anytime, but once they forget the culture and the language it's gonna be very hard for us to teach them again. I don't want them to forget.

Her statement highlighted the dominance of and easy access to English (*they will learn it anytime*), and also her belief that the boys had sufficient exposure to English outside the

home. Abaynesh emphasized, however, the need to preserve the boys' knowledge of Amharic and Ethiopian culture, because they would have no opportunity to learn it in Wellington. Given these underlying beliefs, she immediately enforced a strict Amharic only rule in the home (see also Worthy & Rodriguez-Galindo 2006):

Whenever they're here, we don't use English, we use Amharic, and we eat our traditional food.

Her management seemed to be effective because one of the boys stressed various times that the home domain was strictly Amharic for him. For example, when I asked him whether he preferred to speak English or Amharic to express his feelings when he was happy, he immediately asked whether I meant *at home or outside*. His aunt assumed an authoritative stance by repeating her previous statement about language management:

Whenever they are around family or any Ethiopian people, it's Amharic. Otherwise it's always English.

She made it very clear that their family could not neglect using Amharic because this was in her opinion (justifiably) the only way of preserving the language.

Family 2:

Members:	Marta (mother), Tessema (father), Noel (son, age 2)
Length of stay:	13 years (mother), 5 years (father)

Marta and her husband discussed language choice when they had their first child and decided to speak only Amharic. When I enquired whether they sometimes switched to English, she firmly rejected this idea. The previously described positive beliefs about Amharic were clearly present in this family and the parents showed a strong impact belief (De Houwer 1999) as they implemented management supportive of Amharic transmission.

This course of action entailed further decisions, such as the choice to avoid sending their son to day care. Although Marta's son was only two years old, she considered that attending an English-language institution might have a future impact on him. The example of other children in the Ethiopian community who had lost most Amharic proficiency after attending day care (see Prevoo et al. 2011) acted as a warning sign for her:

Some people push me to put him in school, like day care, but I don't want to. Because I stay home, I can look after him. But if he goes to day care, he just loses everything + Amharic language. So I don't want to take him there.

Although Marta faced external pressures from other community members, she argued that since she stayed home, she could take care of her son and help him maintain the Amharic skills that he had acquired in his first three years spent with the family. She further indicated that day care attendance from an early age inhibited children from gaining further Amharic skills. Her comment revealed a lack of institutional support for smaller children, who had no opportunity to attend childcare in Amharic. This situation of exclusive exposure to the majority language in secondary socialisation environments, Marta recognised, may be detrimental to LM. She decided to shield her son from English influences as much as possible by keeping him in the Amharic-speaking home environment. His only English influences were reportedly the children he met at the playground and occasional English TV programs watched in the home. Marta's decision to keep her son at home corresponds to the opinions of LM scholars who recommend exposing children to the majority language only after they have developed a good command of their ethnic language (e.g. Wong Fillmore 1991:345; Cummins 2000).

Amharic use and management strategies in the home appeared to be only loosely related to English proficiency and were instead a result of cultural "acts of identity" (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) and strong convictions about teaching Amharic. For Marta's family, the strong ideology of Amharic-only management and practices aligning with these beliefs was a wider pattern regardless of the individual family member's proficiency. She asserted that although her younger brother even *sounds like a Kiwi* when he spoke English, her whole family spoke only Amharic in the home. As such, language choice was not necessarily based on proficiency. Instead, Marta's claim that *he has to know about his parents' language* provided some evidence for her decision being based on the ideology that her son needed Amharic to connect with his family's roots.

Family 3:

Members: Selam (mother), Joas (father), Mimi (daughter, age 9)
Length of stay: ~ 7 years

Although the use of explicit language management was generally backed by strong ideological feelings, some families only implemented such management as circumstances changed. For instance, the enactment of explicit management in Selam's family was dynamic and reactive in response to her daughter's changing language proficiency and choice (King & Fogle 2013). While Selam saw no need for explicit management initially, she reported that the linguistic choices of her daughter Mimi actively influenced their trajectory of language management over time and contributed to the current FLP. When she arrived in New Zealand with a two-and-a-half-year-old both were monolingual in Amharic. Mimi therefore struggled when she started kindergarten at the age of three, because everyone spoke English and she still had to learn the language. However, after a while she spoke enough English to communicate with the other children. In addition, she started to transfer the English language of the kindergarten to the home domain. The home language was negotiated for a while (Gafaranga 2010), as Selam spoke to Mimi in Amharic and Mimi replied in English. This is bilingual discourse (Saville-Troike 1987) as described in Chapter 2. In terms of parental discourse strategy, Selam used a "move on strategy" (Lanza 2004) as she allowed Mimi to use English while she continued to speak in Amharic.

Bilingual discourse was brought to an end when Selam explicitly told Mimi to only speak to her in Amharic. Although she recognised her own need to learn English, she understood that it was for Mimi's own benefit to speak Amharic:

She talk[ed] to me in English, but I said no. I need English, but I need her not to forget [Amharic] because it's good for her.

Both Selam and Mimi reported that they only used Amharic in the home after the introduction of such explicitly verbalised management. Mimi claimed that she only spoke English when Selam asked her to do so, for example as a language broker *when she doesn't know how to explain things, so she asks me and I tell her how* (Valdés, Chavez & Angelelli 2003). Moreover, Mimi occasionally mixed languages subconsciously, as evident from our interview where she showed great linguistic awareness. After I asked her whether she ever mixed languages, she replied the following:

(to me) *yea, I do do that.*
 (to Selam) *andande gize **mix** alesh?*²²
 *sometimes **mix** you.do?*
 (to me) *see, I just said it right now!*

Mimi demonstrated her ability to distinguish the two languages because she realised her switch to English (ironically choosing the word *mix*) when she finished interpreting for her mother. Despite the family's successful Amharic-only management, Mimi's word choice suggested that some English words may still intrude into the home domain, particularly in the shape of borrowings. Given the emergence of "hybrid communicative practices" (Romaine 2011:21) in other contexts, such as Tex-Mex or Spanglish in the United States (Schecter & Bayley 2002; see also Walker 2011b for an account of the use of Spanglish in one Latino family in New Zealand), the incorporation of English words into Amharic and pragmatic changes (see Ramirez 2007) may not be unusual as the family negotiate their language and identity in the New Zealand context.

Although Selam had socialised Mimi into speaking Amharic and was very happy with the result, she nevertheless voiced discontent about Mimi's changed understanding of the socialisation process. In particular, she highlighted how the concept of 'respect', a highly valued characteristic in Ethiopian culture (see Roer-Strier & Strier 2006) evidenced by its frequent mention during the interviews, was becoming less important for Ethiopian children as they grew up in New Zealand. This shift in values has also been documented for other immigrant groups (e.g. Hua 2008). Selam explained that Mimi sometimes interfered into her parents' conversations with visitors, conversed during dinner, sometimes talked back to her parents and generally lacked the respect which Ethiopian children are expected to have, especially towards elders (see Tannenbaum 2009). The active role which children assumed in shaping the language socialisation process thus worked against an Ethiopian understanding of childrearing and reflected the children's upbringing in the New Zealand context.

Overall, Scenario A (explicit Amharic management, Amharic spoken) might be termed a 'successful' LM situation, as the rules seem to oblige all family members to actively use Amharic in the home. I highlighted several common themes for families choosing this scenario, such as Abaynesh's persuasion that minority language transmission had to occur in the home domain and her strict separation of the private and public domains for language use.

²² I here use Latin script to transcribe the Amharic phrase.

Marta's example showed that some children were kept at home for fear they might forget Amharic when attending day care. Furthermore, even family members who spoke English fluently used Amharic for ideological reasons. The example of Selam's family illustrated that language management has a dynamic character and responds to other linguistic and non-linguistic circumstances. The next scenario exposes a family situation where explicit language management does not yield the intended results.

4.3.2 Socialisation Scenario B

Management	Practices
Amharic-only management	English is typically used
Family members:	Sara (mother), Essayas (father), Lydia (daughter, age 6), Hosanna (daughter, age 2), Konjit (daughter, 2 months)
Length of stay:	12 years (mother), 9 years (father), children born in New Zealand

In Scenario B, which characterised one family, management was explicit but practices diverged from the stated rules. Sara explained that her family initially tried to speak Amharic only, but then failed because of their daughter's strong insistence on using English in the home after she started attending day care. The influence of Lydia's language choice reached beyond her own interactions with family members as she even affected parental language use with each other. The child's agency thus affected the instantiation of the family's beliefs and management attempts (see Gibbons & Ramírez 2004a).

4.3.2.1 Amharic socialisation and language negotiation

The family initially established Amharic as the language for home communication. This continued Sara and Essayas' *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977b) of using Amharic with each other before having children. They spoke Amharic with their first daughter, Lydia, for the first three years of her life and provided her with a solid foundation in the language. However, they explained that gradual LS resulted from the majority language leaking into the home domain after Lydia started attending day care (see also Wong Fillmore 1991:333). Sara reported how Lydia's increased exposure to English and decreasing Amharic skills led to the current situation:

Before I had my first daughter, we usually, almost always, 99.9%, we spoke in Amharic, me and my husband. But after I had my first child, when she was two-and-a-half, I sent her to day care, so there the first language that she was speaking was English. So I found it really hard to communicate with her in the house. She can listen to me, but she can't respond very well in Amharic, so I end up speaking in English. So nowadays, almost 89 %, we speak English in the house.

As Sara and Lydia spent time together and discussed the day's events, Lydia would often switch to English to better recount everything that happened at day care. This eventually influenced Sara's language choice too. A proficient English speaker herself, Sara accommodated to her daughter. She reported that it took Lydia six months after starting day care to negotiate their predominantly English language choice (Gafaranga 2010). This time was marked by Sara *trying very hard almost for the first year [Lydia] was in preschool* to establish Amharic as a home language. It was followed by a period where she admitted that she *got tired*, resulting in a switch to respond to her daughter in English. Through the use of vocabulary from the area of effort (*try very hard, get tired*), Sara illustrated the draining struggle with language choice in the home in her efforts of transmitting Amharic. This may present an emotional burden for mothers who generally juggle a variety of other responsibilities (Okita 2002). Pauwels argues that "even enthusiastic and committed families make comments that LM requires a significant amount of effort" (2005:127).

Sara also brought her English language choice into interactions with Essayas, who usually returned home in the afternoons after driving a taxi and having used both English and Amharic. While my observations showed that the parents used Amharic with each other, Sara's comment below suggests that they also used English. As such, language mixing was a cyclical process, beginning with one family member (Lydia) and reaching out to the whole family (both Sara and Essayas, and her younger sister as described below). Ideological Amharic use was thus gradually abandoned in this family in favour of a mixture of codes.

Although initial home language decisions are generally attributed to parents, this scenario illustrates that children may strongly influence the implementation and negotiation of language policy. Explicit language management only comes into effect if children collaborate. However, parents may experience difficulty in establishing a home language as their children "resist from bottom-up the policy that is imposed from top-down" (Shohamy 2006:51). Whether deliberately or not, children may contest their parents' wishes and even

become the main actors in the implementation of the language policy (Tuominen 1999; Luykx 2005; Canagarajah 2008:164; Gafaranga 2010). This seemed to be occurring in Sara's family, where six-year-old Lydia was an influential agent who shifted home language use.

4.3.2.2 Influence of other family members on FLP

Other family members were also involved in this language shift. Lydia's grandmother, who frequently visited her grandchildren, experienced occasional communication breakdowns (Wong Fillmore 1991) due to her low English proficiency. Sara explained that, in principle, Lydia had very good Amharic listening skills and could also speak Amharic. However, she hinted that Lydia sometimes seemed to feign a lack of understanding to avoid following orders.

Sometimes she will just shut down, especially with [her grandmother], and she will find it really hard to understand what [Lydia is] saying. [...] And if she doesn't want to follow her order, she usually says something like (high, agitated voice) "I don't know what she's talking, I don't know what you're talking".

Generally, the influence of grandparents on LM is considered vital because many remain virtually monolingual in the minority language and provide children with an incentive to use it (see Ruby 2012; Kopeliovich 2013). However, in this instance, Lydia strategically turned her grandmother's lack of English proficiency into an opportunity to avoid obedience.

Siblings and fathers are typically further influential agents affecting home language choice. (Roer-Strier & Strier 2006; Kim & Starks 2009; Barron-Hauwaert 2010). Sara reported that her youngest daughter who had not yet started attending childcare preferred to use Amharic with Lydia and sometimes did so even when her older sister replied in English. As a result, she explained they used both languages together. The fathers in the Ethiopian community were frequently portrayed as the ideological backbone of explicit Amharic policies. At the same time, they were the breadwinners of the family and therefore only marginally involved in childrearing. For instance, Sara's husband was reportedly a stronger advocate for Ethiopian culture and language and had strong opinions about Amharic use in the home. Sara maintained that their different occupations and social networks during the day reinforced their respective stances about language transmission:

I'm spending more time with the kids. I'm more exposed to the way they are living. But for him, he always goes to work, so he doesn't see that pressure that I'm having with Lydia. You know, the pressure to speak with her in English. And taking them to the playground, and she chats with other kids and other mums, you know. So for him, he just goes to work and he will see all his colleagues and mostly the taxi drivers are Ethiopian [...] so he will end up talking a lot in Amharic.

Nevertheless, Lydia's strong language negotiation skills, Sara reported, usually broke his will once he spent enough time with her:

I can see him, when he, if he, spends one day with them, he usually ends up even talking with them in English. And I end up saying to him "Please can you talk to them in Amharic"
[laughs].

Sara took on a stance of irony and victory as she reported telling her husband to speak Amharic. She portrayed him as an advocate of Amharic use, but noted that he faced the same linguistic resistance if he spent time with his daughters. It seems therefore that particularly children's language practices are an important influence on their families' language use and that children may "talk language shift into being" (Gafaranga 2010).

4.3.2.3 Teaching resources

Another theme for this family, representative of many others, was the teaching of minority language literacy. Potentially due to the range of responsibilities as parents Sara and her husband, as well as most other participants, found oral proficiency for their children more crucial and feasible than literacy (see Vaccarino & Walker 2009:90). Parents were typically afraid that children would become confused if they were asked to acquire English and Amharic literacy simultaneously. They also saw that their children were tired when they returned from school, which meant that further efforts to teach the ethnic language were not realistic. Moreover, many adults explained that they lacked time for teaching literacy. Sara expressed disappointment when she explained:

My husband promised me he would teach her how to read by this age, but he didn't get the time to.

In addition to occasional Amharic and cultural classes at the Orthodox Church, many participants had put up posters in their houses showing the Amharic alphabet, which they

sometimes taught their children to recite. Since this characterized the traditional way of learning, little interest was generally shown in the alphabet books that I had brought from Ethiopia (due to my personal interest in learning Amharic) which contained playful illustrations and writing exercises. Overall, due to pragmatic reasons, the parents seemed to mainly aim for their children to acquire oral proficiency²³.

Resulting from a focus on oral fluency, DVDs in the minority language were popular. Lydia's family, along with many others, preferred using religious media. The choice of songs, for instance, was affected by religious affiliation: a number of Orthodox families only listened to Orthodox hymns and the Protestant family equally restricted their music choice to Protestant Christian music. Although Lydia was fond of an Amharic Christian music DVD for children, she found it boring to view it repeatedly. Hence, the family turned to English resources, which most likely contributed to increasing language shift.

4.3.2.4 The child's perspective

Data from an interview with Lydia illustrated her view of the FLP. In the course of our conversation, Lydia's attitude towards Amharic changed from an apparent wish to hide her Amharic abilities to overt display of her liking the language. The extract below is situated towards the beginning of our interview. I had previously interviewed her mother and Lydia had seen us talk while she was playing with her father and sister. Lydia was a very open-minded and talkative child, but I had not been planning to interview her because she was only six, and I wanted to interview children older than eight, who would have greater ability to critically reflect on their sociolinguistic situation. However, Lydia seemed to marvel at how I used the recorder and, having in mind the fact that she liked to talk, I asked whether I could also interview her. Both she and the mother agreed and, visibly proud, Lydia led me into her room.

When I had first entered the house, Lydia discovered that I was trying to learn Amharic, and she and I exchanged two sentences together in Amharic, much to her delight because she spoke it slowly, but I spoke less. I referred to this situation at the beginning of this extract.

²³ The topic of literacy can only be addressed briefly in this thesis and warrants further investigation.

Mel: *So you were speaking with me in Amharic, right?*

[Lydia starts to whisper. From her words and motions I deduce that she tells me not to mention Amharic because she does not want it to be on the recorder.]

Mel: *So you don't speak Amharic?*

Lydia: *Sometimes I do, but sometimes not. I speak Amharic but more when people come. Like we have to speak Amharic every end of the year, because this guy, he's called Yafet, he keeps on telling me to speak Amharic.*

Mel: *Oh really?*

Lydia: *And like he'll put my dad into trouble.*

Mel: *Sorry?*

Lydia: *He'll put my dad into trouble.*

Mel: [laughs] *If you don't speak it?*

Lydia: *Yea.*

Mel: *Oh [laughs].*

Lydia: *So every end of the year I have to talk in Amharic.*

At first, Lydia was proud and confident about being asked questions. However, once I referred to our exchange of Amharic phrases, her stance briefly changed as she communicated quietly and visibly embarrassed about mentioning Amharic on the recorder. Her reaction appeared closely related to the power dynamics within the different linguistic marketplaces to which she belonged. Society and the school domain were linguistic marketplaces in which the languages assumed a reverse hierarchy from that in the home domain (see Bourdieu 1977b). English is the legitimate language (Bourdieu 1991) in New Zealand at a societal level where it is commonly used (Holmes, Marra & Vine 2011) and signals in-group membership and cultural belonging. These societal attitudes have been found to exert great influence on the practices found in the home (see Canagarajah 2008:170). For example, since peers exert great influence on the children during their school years, it has been suggested that children will not speak their ethnic language if their peers do not speak it (Caldas 2012:356). These factors could possibly influence Lydia's behaviour in relation to my question about her Amharic use. She might think it better in this (presumably) significant interview situation to deny her language skills to appear like "mainstream" children as she sees them in the school – white and predominantly English monolingual children. Lydia's

apparent denying of any Amharic knowledge is nevertheless an extreme response from a six-year-old, which, if it reflects her linguistic surroundings, provides a rather worrying impression of her perceived link between language and identity.

The following extract from the interview with Lydia's mother points to a few underlying motivations for Lydia's reticent use of Amharic. Potentially at the root of the situation was that Lydia was my only participant who attended a predominantly 'white' school. She was bullied because of her phenotype²⁴, and seemed to link this to her language choice. Her mother Sara reported that Lydia often reacted to the racial discrimination she experienced by reversing the charges against her mother upon her return from school:

She usually says I am born here, I'm a Kiwi, uh, I'm not an African, and she will keep on saying I know this and you don't know this because I'm born here, and I'm a New Zealander. [...] she usually says those things when she had a really bad day at school. Especially about her colour. They do pick on her, yea, they do. So because she hasn't got anyone to identify with, she just wants to be like Kiwi and she just complains, like I'm a Kiwi, I know this and you don't know that. [...] So that's how she responds. Sometimes she really needs someone from Africa to identify with and she keeps on saying to me "Mum, can I go to xxx" you know, she'll go [play with] someone from Nigeria, and she love it being African. Another day she will come home and say "Mum, I'm a Kiwi, I'm not an African" and she will keep on saying I know this better than you because I'm born here. Even sometimes she will say like you know "Why do I need to speak in Amharic, I'm not gonna use it, I'm a Kiwi".

Sara's account highlights Lydia's need to identify with a group, as postulated by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner 1979). On the one hand, she desired to be accepted by her friends at school and to 'fit in'. As a result, she deflected the 'othering' strategies (see Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Coupland 2010), which she perceived at least one child in her school using against her, targeting her mother. Lydia positioned Sara as a foreigner, an 'African' unfamiliar with life in New Zealand, while she positioned herself as more knowledgeable of New Zealand culture and possessing higher cultural capital (Bourdieu 1977b). Her cultural positioning as a Kiwi also impacted on her linguistic preferences as she argued that she had no need for using Amharic. On the other hand, when spending time with her African friend, Lydia was reportedly successful at finding company which reinforced her African identity,

²⁴ Sara noted that one particular South African girl had voiced her dislike of Lydia by repeatedly saying to her "Blacks are dumb".

and this produced a feeling of satisfaction in her. This account indicates that Lydia seemed to negotiate her identity as she entered different linguistic marketplaces and was surrounded by different social networks to which she sought to belong (see Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004). At times, she appeared successfully integrated into these networks, but at other times, she lacked access or was rejected (see Norton 2013). Importantly, this also affected her attitudes towards Amharic.

Lydia's story about Yafet above further suggests that she did not recognise the family's explicit Amharic management as such, since she only casually stated *sometimes I do, sometimes I don't*. On occasions, Sara and Essayas encouraged Lydia to use Amharic in my presence. While she partly refused to do, her shy smile when she did so at other times showed that she was visibly aware of the performance aspect of the situation. This supports Fogle's (2013:183) claim that children are often unaware of language management around them. Another explanation is that Lydia might think that "speaking Amharic" referred to a ritualistic performance, whereas casually speaking the language in the home did not fit into the category. This view of behaviour as a performance can be traced back to Goffman's (1959) work (see also Austin 1962; Butler 1990). Lydia admitted that she was rather worried during these performances because of the negative consequences for her father if she failed to perform sufficiently well, namely her understanding that *[Yafet] will put [her] dad into trouble*²⁵. The seriousness of this threat was reinforced by its recurrent existence (*every end of the year*). The situation seems like a climax to the year where she has to show off her ability to perform as an Amharic speaker to protect her father's face.

Lydia had recently recognised the value of Amharic as a language of exclusion and secrecy. The fact that language choice was tailored for overhearers (Bell 2001) proved beneficial for LM in rather unexpected ways. While the unmarked language choice for a conversation between Lydia and her mother was generally English, the presence of an overhearer occasionally changed their language choice to Amharic, because, as Lydia phrased it, *I can talk stuff secretly if I don't want others to hear*. Sara commented that Lydia had only recently recognised the value of speaking another language. For example, she explained that in the presence of her friend from Eritrea, Lydia actively requested a language switch from her mother with a metalinguistic comment (Fogle & King 2013): *please speak in Amharic to me*.

²⁵ Sara explained to me that their friend Yafet was a strong advocate of the Amharic language and had raised his children in New Zealand to be fluent bilinguals. He reportedly criticised Sara's house because it resembled "typical New Zealand houses", whereas his house exhibited plentiful Ethiopian decoration.

Although using Amharic as a secret language did not mean that Lydia wanted to use the language in all other interactions, it did represent one incentive for her to use it.

Overall, this family provided evidence of serious attempts to implement language management conducive to Amharic, but these efforts ultimately failed because of strong resistance from their daughter. While the grandmother's presence may have brought more Amharic influence into the home, Lydia also strategically used her lack of English proficiency to avoid following orders as she pretended not to understand Amharic. On the other hand, the presence of her sister who has not yet been strongly influenced by the majority language seemed to encourage Lydia to use more Amharic, as reported by her mother. Finally, visits from community members on the one hand and bullying at school on the other hand were factors for and against Lydia's use of the ethnic language. The example of this family thus highlights children's agency in the FLP process (see Luykx 2005) and provides insight into societal ideologies that affected the daughter's willingness to use Amharic.

4.3.3 Socialisation Scenario C

Management	Practices
No language management	Amharic is typically used

In Scenario C, family members speak Amharic with each other in the absence of explicit language management. In these situations the mother's inability to converse in English generally creates a need for the child to use Amharic.

A few of the largely Amharic-monolingual mothers were successful in socialising their children entirely in Amharic. For instance, Yohana who had arrived in New Zealand only two years before being interviewed almost exclusively spent time speaking Amharic with other Ethiopians outside the home. Similarly, conversations inside her home also took place only in Amharic with both her husband and her two-year-old son. Her son did not seem to understand me when I spoke English during my visit, but he engaged in interaction when I spoke Amharic. Overall, Yohana successfully reproduced Ethiopian culture in her home by cooking Ethiopian food, playing Ethiopian music and speaking Amharic. One apparent impact on her son's Amharic knowledge was the fact that Yohana often used Amharic-language DVDs featuring music and dance. Her son demonstrated his familiarity with these during my visit when he inserted the DVD and spontaneously started dancing along. Overall, the family

sheltered their child from societal influences of English and created a veritable island of Amharic language use in their home.

Yohana's example demonstrates the positive effects of a mother's inability to use the majority language (as discussed in Chapter 2). In fact, Scenario C characterises a number of mothers in my sample who are able to manage their lives almost entirely in Amharic (Worthy 2006). Their confinement to the ethnic domain is partly wanted, but also partly due to existing power structures as they reportedly do not find sufficient entry to English-speaking networks (see Norton 2013). As a result of their stay within the community and their limited English skills, their children have to use Amharic if they want to successfully converse with their mother.

Thus, the situation may be fortuitously beneficial for LM in the short term, but it remains to be seen whether the children continue to use Amharic even after prolonged exposure to English. As discussed in later sections, this may depend on many other individual and input-related factors.

4.3.4 Socialisation Scenario D

Management	Practices
No language management	English is typically used

Families covered by Scenario D did not have explicit management and their children typically used English. This scenario took quite different forms, three of which are described here. They differ in terms of the quantity of English used and on parental language use patterns (see Romaine 1995).

4.3.4.1 Dilingual discourse

Family 1:

Members: Nigist (mother), Zelalem (father)
Nebiat (son, age 2), Yonatan (son, age 6)
Length of stay: 8 years, children born in New Zealand

The first family frequently engaged in dilingual discourse (Saville-Troike 1987), where the language choice was stable for each participant but both interlocutors used different languages (as explained in Chapter 2). Nigist's reported language choice with Yonatan was

Amharic, but he replied in English. Their interactions were mostly ‘successful’ because of Nigist’s high English proficiency.

Figure 4.2 Dilingual discourse

Yonatan’s general language development was reportedly delayed. Nigist claimed that he only started speaking when he went to school and that the few words he currently used were in English. Nigist may have had a different understanding of what ‘speaking’ meant and may have referred to the production of longer utterances as it is highly unlikely that Yonatan did not say anything at all. However, in my visits to the family I observed indeed that Yonatan never said anything while I was there, and Nigist usually dismissed my enquiries stating that he did not speak. The only time he answered my questions and I heard him speak (in English) was about half a year after he had started attending school. My observations then also showed that Nigist addressed Yonatan occasionally in English as a result of his English use with her.

Yonatan clearly preferred speaking English and he articulated this at times. For example, the mother reported that when an Amharic film was put on, Yonatan often claimed “This is a film for Nebiat” (his younger brother who enjoyed speaking Amharic). Nevertheless, during one of my later visits to the family’s home Yonatan also switched to Amharic briefly, thus demonstrating his ability to understand and speak: when he explained the picture that he had painted of me, he mentioned all different body parts and clothes in English (*nose, eye, mouth, ears, hands, pants*, etc.), but then referred to *suri* ‘pants’ in Amharic. A possible explanation for this switch to Amharic was that he wanted to show off because I had previously endorsed Ethiopian culture by dancing along to cultural music with the younger brother and trying to use Amharic with him. This illustrates how the status and prestige of a language may rise even sporadically if it is endorsed from the outside. However, when I left the house and

Nigist, Nebiat and I said *dehna deri* ‘goodbye’ in Amharic²⁶, Yonatan refused to switch language and insisted on using English to say *bye bye, see you later*.

4.3.4.2 English as a medium of communication

Family 2:

Members: Abeba (mother), Naomi (daughter, age 11)
Length of stay: ~ 12 years (Abeba), Naomi born in New Zealand

A version of Scenario D which included more use of the majority language characterised a second family. Abeba claimed that she initially tried to use Amharic with her 11-year-old daughter Naomi (see mini case study 4), but that Naomi no longer understood her at times and asked her to explain in English. As a result, she generally abandoned attempts to speak Amharic and interacted with Naomi almost exclusively in English.

Figure 4.3 Predominant use of English

This inability for mother and daughter to communicate in the minority language had the effect that “important cognitive scaffolding [was] dismantled” (Baker 2006:128) as Abeba could no longer offer instruction in Amharic to Naomi. As a result, the Amharic language no longer represented a mutual code for intergenerational communication and thus lost its function of socialising Naomi (Garrett & Baquedano-López 2002). Despite Abeba’s claim that she could best express her emotions in Amharic (Section 4.2.4 described her claim that songs had more expressive strength in Amharic, for instance), she had to sustain emotional bonds with her daughter in her second language, which Pavlenko notes some of her respondents in a survey about emotions and language choice in parenting found “fake” and “unnatural” (2004:190). While Schwartz and Verschik note that LM “can serve as a powerful

²⁶ Nigist told me at the beginning of my research that Nebiat replied to her in English, but his behaviour seemingly changed over the course of my fieldwork. Despite his brother continuing to speak to him in English, he had developed increasing Amharic proficiency while at home with his mother.

tool for cohesion between generations of immigrants” (2013:6), they caution that LS can have “a negative effect on family relations if adults and children speak different languages” (2013:6).

The interview data and observations of this family suggest that the mother had a relatively weak impact belief. While she wanted her daughter to speak Amharic (*Yea, I push her, that’s her language*), she noticed that her expectations exceeded Naomi’s Amharic skills. Naomi was born in New Zealand and started attending day care when she was only six months old because Abeba was the sole caretaker and was taking a full-time English course at the time. As discussed previously, it can be detrimental to bilingualism if children are exposed to the majority language before they have developed a stable knowledge of their ethnic language (Wong Fillmore 1991:345; Cummins 2000; Montrul 2008). However, especially in immigrant families consisting of a sole carer, this occurs frequently because (generally) the mother needs to provide for the family and raise her children simultaneously.

Abeba commented on Naomi’s Amharic proficiency: *she is not really great because she is by her own here. But I’m trying to do, but all the time she just goes to her English things*. Similar to parents in Kulick’s (1992) study, Abeba passed the responsibility on to Naomi by claiming that *she just goes to her English things*, but did not seem to make active efforts to immerse her into environments where Amharic was spoken (such as the church or other communal events). Instead, she occasionally asked her friend from New Zealand to take care of her daughter, an influence which almost certainly further socialised Naomi into the majority culture.

4.3.4.3 The one person - one language strategy

A third family used the OPOL strategy (Grammont 1902; Ronjat 1913; Goodz 1989; Döpke 1992), where both parents use a different language with their children. This strategy is frequently recommended for raising bilingual children in interlingual marriages in a monolingual environment (Caldas 2012:355). It tends to be used less frequently in immigrant families who share the same ethnic language.

Family 3:

Members: Mekdes (mother), Kifle (father),
Ermias (son, age 6), Muna (daughter, age 4)
Length of stay: ~7 years (mother), 10 years (father)

Essentially Mekdes' language choice with Ermias could be classified as Amharic-only without any explicit management. However, I decided to present their family language scenario under Scenario D because English was present in the home due to the fact that Kifle and Mekdes took clearly different paths for communicating with their children. No generic home language pattern existed – instead, each parent had their own language preferences and the children responded differently to their parents' language choices.

The parents had different language preferences: Mekdes spoke Amharic with her children, while Kifle spoke English. Unfortunately no data was available from him directly to account for his language choice, but it may have been partly influenced by the longer amount of time he had spent in New Zealand. Six-year-old Ermias reportedly generally reciprocated his parents' language choice, and my observation corroborated that he spoke mainly Amharic with his mother. A visit to Ethiopia when he was four helped him develop his Amharic proficiency.

Figure 4.4 'Successful' OPOL strategy

In contrast, three-and-a-half-year-old Muna used English with Mekdes despite Mekdes' use of Amharic. English was thus the language she used with both parents. Mekdes reported that Muna understood Amharic, but that she could not speak the language. This is surprising because one would think that Mekdes furnished the majority of language input at Muna's age. However, Muna's attendance of day care from the age of two, which limited her minority language input, most likely contributed to her preference for English (see Wong Fillmore 1991; Prevoo et al. 2011).

Figure 4.5 ‘Unsuccessful’ OPOL strategy

As discussed for Scenario C, this family’s example suggest that it may be beneficial in the short term if the mother does not know the majority language because it creates a need for her children to use the language. This applied to Ermias, who, despite attending English-medium school, had initially acquired a substantial amount of Amharic from his mother and also from others during his visit to Ethiopia. This enabled him to speak to Mekdes in a language she understood and rendered the parents’ OPOL strategy successful for him.

Nevertheless, despite OPOL’s reported success with their son and in many other contexts (e.g. Ronjat 1913; Saunders 1988; De Houwer 1990; Döpke 1992), the approach seemed less effective for their daughter. I did not observe the family long enough to make definite statements, but the outcome might be related to a potential lack of mutual funds of knowledge (Moll et al. 1992) as I discussed in Chapter 2. While Muna spent only her first two years in Mekdes’ care, she was later exposed to English in a number of places: at day care and in the home through her father and brother. Mekdes, however, possibly did not understand all concepts discussed in English around her and may therefore have acquired only some of the funds of knowledge that her daughter brought home. Moreover, Mekdes generally used a “move-on style” (Lanza 2004) after Muna used English and did not insist that her daughter use Amharic. This most likely contributed to Muna developing a habitus (Bourdieu 1991) of using English which sometimes reportedly led to communication breakdowns with her mother (see Wong Fillmore 1991). Alternatively, the siblings’ differing degrees of language accommodation (Giles & Smith 1979) might also reflect individual differences between the two related to agency and to desires to conform to their mother’s language choice. While more ethnographic observations are needed to understand the rationale for the family’s current language use, the suggested reasons (the mother’s low English proficiency, limited mutual funds of knowledge, use of a move-on style (Lanza 2004) and different degrees of

children's agency) may have influenced the outcome of using the OPOL strategy with their children.

Scenario E and F represent attempts to modify the children's language practices to English. This tends to be a course of action particularly popular with new migrants who feel the need to learn the majority language as soon as possible (Pauwels 2005:128). In my sample, only one family reported opting for such management, and it turned out to be unsuccessful (Scenario E).

4.3.5 Socialisation Scenario E

Management	Practices
English-only management	Amharic is typically used

Family members: Dina (mother), Anwar (father), four sons
 Length of stay: ~7 years (mother), 10 years (father)

Dina, who had spent five years in New Zealand at the time of the interview, reported that she had tried to implement explicit English-language management. The reason was that she was not accepted into employment due to her low proficiency and considered her four sons as a source of English. Dina recounted in detail her lack of access to English-speakers in society (see Norton 2013) and her attempt to modify their home language practices to provide her with opportunities to speak English. However, she related that her children refused to use English with her because they apparently considered their mother to be a monolingual Amharic speaker (this was in fact a stereotype circulating in the community about several women). Due to their mother's limited English skills, conversation with her would have been very slow and taken the form of a teacher-student relationship, which her children may have been hesitant to enter. Ironically, Dina reported that her children sometimes incidentally used English with her but that she usually did not understand them and used a "minimal grasp strategy" (Lanza 2004) by responding *hmm* [falling intonation], after which they switched to Amharic. Their general rejection of her management attempts was actually conducive to LM because it set apart their home domain for use of the ethnic language.

The continued use of the ethnic language in the home has been a theme throughout the different case studies. It is interesting to note that, although the children were exposed to English in society and tended to use the language even in the home (sometimes against their

parents' wishes), no mother was successful in establishing English-only management with her children (Scenario F). The children seemed unwilling to use English 'under force', particularly not in response to their mothers' wish for them to be a language teacher. This may be linked to Spolsky and Cooper's (1991) 'inertia condition' (as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter), that is, a tendency for people to continue to communicate in the language that they first used together. Similarly, De Houwer (2009:140) and others showed that particularly children in their studies became accustomed to using one language with their parents over time, and felt uncomfortable if their parents changed languages. My data suggests that the children did not want to accept communication breakdowns with their parents speaking English as long as they had the ability and confidence to use their ethnic language.

These case studies provide illustrations for the different management and practice combinations identified in the model in Chapter 3. They suggest that, although each family was in a unique position, equipped with different types and amounts of cultural capital, and faced with children that were willing to different degrees to collaborate with their parents' management, the families all shared common understandings of the importance of their cultural identity for their lives and a desire to transmit (aspects of) their culture to their children. The majority had an impact belief that reinforced the importance of their own language input for their children's language socialisation and many opted for explicit management.

4.4 Case study: Hiwot

This final section provides a case study of one Ethiopian woman, Hiwot, who shows a rather unusual trajectory of ethnic identification and language use over the course of her life. I discuss how her current strong identification with Ethiopian culture contributes to the development of an explicit Amharic-only policy with her children (Scenario A). I outline her language beliefs and cultural identification, her language practices with her children and husband, and her management of these practices. These three aspects strongly interrelate for Hiwot. Although she has relatively little experiential knowledge of Ethiopian culture, her strong cultural identification with Ethiopia and positive beliefs about Amharic lead her to contest her husband's wishes to speak English and to actively teach her children Amharic.

I chose Hiwot's story because, on the one hand, she is at the core of an Ethiopian Orthodox community of practice (Wenger 1998), actively participating in church life, proud of her culture and eager to pass it on to her children. On the other hand, there is a certain sense of hybridity (Bhabha 2012) about her, having lived in New Zealand for half of her life and been socialised into both Ethiopian and New Zealand culture.

4.4.1 Hiwot's cultural identity

30-year-old Hiwot came to New Zealand when she was 15. Although she was a first-generation migrant, her young age at immigration and the 15 years she spent in New Zealand afterwards meant that she was inexperienced with many Ethiopian customs. This changed when she married an Ethiopian who re-socialised her into adopting more Ethiopian practices and values. At the time of our interview, Hiwot self-identified mostly as Ethiopian, but labelled herself African in conversation with New Zealanders. Her anticipation that New Zealanders may not know where Ethiopia is located suggested that labelling not only corresponded to her identification, but that she also accommodated to her interlocutors (see Giles & Smith 1979):

Mostly where I am from, I'm from Ethiopia, even though I live in New Zealand. So wherever I go I call myself Ethiopian, cause that's where I'm from, that's what I look like [laughs] so I call myself Ethiopian. Mostly African. When people ask, I say African. Whereabouts, I say East African.

[Mel: *Why not Ethiopia?*]

'Cause mostly they don't know where Ethiopia is, you have to explain, you have to go all the way, so shortcut I say 'Africa'. Obvious, I look like one, so when they wanna know more I say East Africa, Ethiopia. So yea, I call myself an Ethiopian.

First and foremost, she located herself as Ethiopian "in ethnic space" (Heller 2003:2) and stresses her physical appearance as an African. Along with her overt cultural labelling, her physical engagement with the Ethiopian community involved regular attendance of the Orthodox Church, sending her children to church for Amharic instruction and cultural songs, and meeting other Ethiopian women weekly to socialise at the men's soccer practice. While

her cultural claims may have been ratified by New Zealanders, she admitted that her Ethiopian identity was contested by other Ethiopians when she returned to her country.

[Mel: *When you go to Ethiopia do you feel like you fit right in?*]

Yes, you do, but some places you don't. Like we have New Zealand citizen[ship], you show your passports, you don't have Ethiopian paper, so wherever you go whatever you pay is dollar, they don't take Ethiopian money because you're not one. So on that part I don't feel exactly that I am. I was like "Come on, I'm Habesha, why don't you guys treat me like one", it's like no. So other than that, yes I do fit, I love it.

Hiwot's comment about her New Zealand citizenship suggests that her life also contained an element of cultural hybridity. She expressed this further when she discussed her marriage to an Ethiopian man who had spent most of his life in Ethiopia. Based on other participants' comments, it seemed to be an expectation for community members to marry either within the local Ethiopian community or to find a spouse in Ethiopia. Clyne (2011) considers this typical of immigrant groups whose culture and religion differs markedly from that of the host society. After her wedding, Hiwot was re-socialised by her Ethiopian husband to act according to the norms of her home culture. The following excerpt taken from the interview with Hiwot illustrates points of culturally dependent behavioural differences, such as dining habits and farewell norms, which have changed over the course of her life. I have used boldface for the pronouns to emphasise her shift between *he* (her husband), *you* (generic, mostly referring to Ethiopian norms) and *I* (Hiwot).

[Mel: *Do you think you have changed a bit living here?*]

*Yea, especially when **my** husband came. **He's** like, **he** grew up there, **he's** old enough. And when **I** came here **I** was 15, so it took **us** ages to get to know each other when **we** were living together. Cause in Ethiopia, if **you** see, there is some culture is really strong, when **you** are eating food **you** don't get up until the plate is gone, **you** don't wash your hand, **you** don't talk while **you're** eating, and when old people come, **you** get up and shake hands. That thing **I** don't know, it's like "hi!!"*

*And when **you** have a guest when **they** go out **you** have to go all the way to the door and say bye. And then **I** say bye while **I'm** watching TV and my husband says "**you** don't do that", **I** have to get up. So those kind of things was a bit hard for **me** and for **him** to get to know each other. Look, oh yea, **I'm** habesha, but **I** don't know much about Ethiopia, **you** know. It was hard. It is hard.*

Responding to the question whether her cultural orientation had changed within the last 15 years, Hiwot responded by enumerating a number of cultural differences which positioned her as distant from Ethiopian culture (*that thing I don't know*). Her use of a generic *you* instead of *we* when she discussed norms in the Ethiopian community may have served to distance her from identification with the group (see De Fina 2003; Myers & Lampropoulou 2012), thereby assuming an observer position to her own life, not unlike the Italian woman in Burck's (2004:56) study. By avoiding using *we* in this situation, she potentially maintains a position of distance, of observation, from those who are accustomed to Ethiopian etiquette.

For example, Hiwot recounts how she usually farewelled her guests casually from her couch while watching TV. While New Zealanders have a range of practices for farewell, this seemed to be the norm that Hiwot ascribed to New Zealand in general. It concurs with the preference for informality described for New Zealand society at large (Holmes, Marra & Vine 2011). By contrast, Ethiopian hosts are generally expected to take their guests to the door to send them off. Hiwot reported that her husband verbally corrected her behaviour (*you don't do that*) and that she adapted her behaviour to the postulated norms (*I have to get up*). This indicated that she not only noticed the differences in behavioural practices between Ethiopia and New Zealand, but that she was actively held accountable by her husband to follow them. She seemed willing to change, possibly for the sake of "a coming-to-term with [her] routes" (Hall 1992:4), or for the benefit of living well with her husband, who expected her to follow Ethiopian norms.

The first part of her final evaluation of her story (Labov & Waletzky 1967) brings together the two behaviours/norms only to contrast them again (*I'm habesha, but I don't know much about Ethiopia*), thus allowing her to display a stance of irony toward the situation. This stance was underlined by her loud pitch and frequent laughter, which together with the personal descriptions of her action and insight into her family life projected a highly affective stance and demonstrated that she was very engaged. Another final evaluation (*It was hard. It is hard*) drew her answer to a close. While she never explicitly said whether she had changed or not, her story implicitly conveys that she considered her hybrid practices contested by her Ethiopian husband.

4.4.2 Hiwot's language management strategies and practices

Hiwot and her husband spoke Amharic together, but she reported, with a lot of laughter interspersed, that there was initial disagreement after their marriage when her husband arrived in New Zealand. The reason for this was that he considered her English skills a source of language practice for him. In order to manage their home language situation and state their language preferences, they had an explicit meta-linguistic discussion (Fogle & King 2013). Interestingly, Hiwot spoke a variety of Amharic which was considered by many to be less prestigious, and she preferred to use (Standard) Amharic with her husband. Although they lived in New Zealand, she refused to speak English with him as this did not correspond to her cultural identification with Ethiopia. Her refusal also demarcated her role as his wife as opposed to his teacher.

With my family I speak Amharic, but my husband first time when he came he said to me "Can you talk to me in English?" "No thank you, go to school, I'm not the teacher."

In addition to telling her husband to speak Amharic, Hiwot also affirmed that she wanted her children to learn Amharic:

[Mel: *Is it important for Amharic to be maintained in New Zealand?*]

It is, for our kids in the future it is because that's where they're from, they have to learn, they have to speak. They have to know their language [...].

Based on her wish for her children to speak the language, she introduced explicit Amharic management in the home (Scenario A in my model). Her strong impact belief (De Houwer 1999) underlying this decision may be connected to her own experiences in her youth: over the course of the interview, she expressed her gratitude to her brother who had continued to teach her more Amharic and to uphold her culture after they arrived in New Zealand. The following quote about her explicit language management with her children suggests that she conceptualised teaching her children Amharic as "Visible Work" (Schwartz & Verschik 2013) that requires attention (as opposed to Okita's 2002 "Invisible Work").

[We speak] Amharic, but the boy starts to switch now. But I say 'no, speak in Amharic'. Some of the language that he can't understand I explain it in English and then I go back to Amharic again 'this is what it means in Amharic'. So when he asks me in English, I say next time you want to say this, say it in Amharic, like this. So I teach him, I make him repeat it and next time he says the Amharic word.

She reports that her family used Amharic, but that her son had just started attending childcare and challenging the existing language choices. Hiwot recounted that she used several discourse styles when her son switched to English. For example, she reported using a 'minimal grasp style' (*No, speak in Amharic*) and also a 'repetition style', as she modelled the respective expression to him in Amharic and expected him to use it the following time. She notably used styles located on the left side of Lanza's (2004) continuum opening up a monolingual Amharic context (as argued in Chapter 2). I have shown in Chapter 2 that these styles have been identified as effective for minority language transmission. Similarly, she recounted that whenever her son did not understand her in Amharic, she told him the meaning in English and then repeated the expression in Amharic to provide a model for language use. Her final comments (*I teach him, I make him repeat it*) suggest that she conceptualised the language socialisation process as a conscious teaching process which requires effort and explicit attention (Döpke 1992; Schwartz & Verschik 2013). It proved successful for her as she recounts that her son returned to using Amharic after these interventions.

Nevertheless, Hiwot also explained resorting to English (her dominant language) in moments of anger.

But mostly when I'm angry because he's done something I speak in English.

This coincided with reports by other caregivers who used the language in which they felt most comfortable to express emotional content (Mills 2001; Pavlenko 2004). Interestingly, her use of English usually elicits a corrective response from her husband, who insists she continue to use Amharic with their children.

My husband says 'don't do that, you speak English, how is he gonna learn?' [...] My husband only speaks Amharic, never English, he's good, but he goes out to work, he works a lot.

Her husband's preoccupation with his wife speaking English may be due to the fact, as Sara in Scenario B had noted for her family, that the mothers' language input accounted for much

of their children's Amharic acquisition because many fathers worked long hours and found comparatively less time to teach their children the language.

Overall, Hiwot developed a hybrid identity over the course of her stay in New Zealand, but regained more knowledge of Ethiopian culture later in life by conforming to community expectations and marrying an Ethiopian man. Her strong imagined Ethiopian identity was also reflected in her real-life involvement in the Ethiopian community. Both considerably impacted on her LM efforts and outweighed her lack of knowledge of Ethiopian practices and Amharic language. She displayed a strong impact belief by implementing Amharic-only management with her children to teach them Ethiopian values and behaviour. Her husband's ideologies about teaching her children Amharic and her conceptualisation of language socialisation as a conscious teaching process (Döpke 1992) assisted her language transmission efforts.

4.5 Summary

This chapter has added to and reinforced a number of points in the existing literature about FLP. First, detailed descriptions about participants' cultural identifications have shown that most members of the Ethiopian community involved in the research have a strong cultural identity which positions them as part of the wider Ethiopian community (Anderson 2006). This identity was foregrounded in the labels with which they positioned themselves. Furthermore, it was reinforced through the discursive construction of others, based on language and phenotype (Bucholtz & Hall 2005). The overarching theme of Amharic as a marker of cultural and religious identity, particularly for members of the Orthodox Church (see Clyne & Kipp 2006), has highlighted the strong role of religion in affecting FLP decisions. Differences existed, however, between adults and children concerning imagined identity constructions and the conceptualisation of the role of Amharic. Whereas adults identified mostly as Ethiopian and used Amharic regularly, many children referred to themselves as having a bicultural identity that they alternated in relation to their immediate context (Ward 2013). One girl even constructed this identity without having Amharic proficiency.

Second, the low profile of Amharic in New Zealand society (somewhat unexpectedly) shaped the participants' views that teaching their children Amharic was the responsibility of individual families (as has been claimed by several scholars, e.g. Fishman 1991). The social

environment outside the home offered little institutional support for Amharic maintenance, and this seemed to indicate to them that it was their responsibility as parents to teach the minority language. The families in this research thus exhibited an “impact belief” (De Houwer 1999). Many seemed well-aware of their own responsibilities to raise their children using their ethnic language and many deliberated extensively over their FLPs. I have demonstrated that many of the policies in the home domain, most of which were explicit management attempts, contributed to vital Amharic socialisation and transmission.

Third, I have added rich examples of instances of resistance to parental FLP attempts on the part of the children, who subverted and contested explicit management and became primary agents of LS. These examples add evidence to the growing number of socialisation studies that define children as active socialisation agents (see Tuominen 1999; Luykx 2005).

The next chapter discusses language beliefs in the Colombian community in Wellington and illustrates the different ways in which four families instantiated these beliefs.

5 Family Language Policy in the Colombian Community

5.1 Introduction

The Colombian refugee-background community has had a shorter stay in the Wellington area than the Ethiopian community, with the first members arriving as recently as 2008. A continual influx of Colombians has followed, with roughly two new families arriving every three months. The most recent Census figures (Statistics NZ, 2013 Census ethnic group profiles: Colombians) indicate that 654 Colombians live in New Zealand, 165 of which reside in the Wellington region. This number includes both migrant and refugee-background community members. The groups seem to interact with each other only rarely; many migrants live in Wellington, whereas the refugee-background community is dispersed over two cities in the Greater Wellington Area. Contact among the refugees is frequent, as many mothers meet in English classes in their respective suburbs and provide support to each other with any problems faced. However, due to the lack of a unified organisational structure, no ties exist to keep the fast-growing community united.

Instead of the strong community structure seen in the Ethiopian community, many participants emphasised the role of their family as the main locus of life. As an alternative to sending their children to afternoon sports, common in New Zealand, many mothers recounted that their children generally stayed home after school and spent time with the family. As discussed in Chapter 2, this recurrent *familism* pattern has been noted as distinctive of Hispanic families (Sabogal et al. 1987; Guardado 2008a) and highlights “core values that emphasise loyalty to the nuclear and extended family as a unit and reliance on its members for support” (Guardado 2008b:177).

The family structure of my participants consisted of single mothers in 11 out of the 15 families, and this frequent occurrence of single-parent families was characteristic of the community as a whole. I noted in Chapter 2 that single parenthood was shown to adversely affect minority language transmission in some cases because it typically provided children with less exposure to the ethnic language (see Schechter & Bayley 2002; Hatoss 2013). Additionally, single parenting meant that children were frequently sent to day care at a young age because of parental work commitments, thus potentially speeding up a shift to the majority language (see Schechter & Bayley 2002; Prevoo et al. 2011). However, although

fathers were typically not present, Colombian families often comprised older teenage siblings and grandparents who modelled ethnic language use (see Ruby 2012). The importance of the family in Latino culture and lack of an organised Colombian community placed the responsibility for LM mostly on mothers.

In this chapter, I investigate language beliefs, practices and management in these Colombian refugee-background families in Wellington. After exploring the cultural identities of adults and children as a first indicator of whether they desire the maintenance of their culture and language, I describe their beliefs about Spanish and English. I then discuss language practice and management scenarios in the form of case studies. I argue that although all Colombian families want to raise bilingual children, only a few use explicit measures to transmit Spanish. Due to their recent arrival and the presence of Spanish in the wider Colombian community, other families typically have only a weak impact belief (De Houwer 1999) and are not yet aware that minority language transmission requires explicit parental attention.

5.2 Language beliefs

5.2.1 Cultural identification

High cultural awareness and strong ethnic identities positively affect minority language use (Johri 1998; Gibbons & Ramírez 2004b; Guardado 2008a). Most participants claimed that they felt Colombian only, on the grounds of speaking Spanish and being ‘cheerful’ people. That these were the most commonly mentioned behaviours identifying participants as Colombian suggests language and personality are held as core values (Smolicz 1992).

A few participants claimed a feeling of hybridity. For instance, one participant referred to the label ‘Colombo-Kiwis’ to describe her identity because, although they were essentially Colombian, they had been offered residence in New Zealand. While ethnic hyphenations have been well documented among immigrants in many Western countries, including New Zealand (see Walker 2011a:159), this particular instance was the only mention in my data of a hyphenated identity label. Its rare occurrence suggests that this specific hybrid identity, essentially a supposed ‘Third Space’ (Bhabha 2012), had not yet been established in New Zealand as a perceived identity category for recent migrants.

Nevertheless, participants generally signalled openness towards influences from other cultures. In particular, the parents in Socialisation Scenario B reported that they were willing to leave some of their Colombian networks to integrate into New Zealand society:

Nos gusta ser parte de ellos [nuevo zelandeses]. Y los colombianos quieren la comunidad, quieren estar así, juntarse. Es chévere, es bonito, pero llevamos tanto tiempo por fuera que nos gusta acá, queremos conocer más, que hay más allá de Colombia. Estamos aquí, queremos ver lo que hay aquí.

We like to be part of them [New Zealanders]. And Colombians like to be in community, they want to be like that, get together. It's awesome, it's nice, but we've spent so much time outside of Colombia and we like it here. We want to learn more, that there's more apart from Colombia. We're here, we want to see what there is (to see) here.

While this father still appreciated Colombian culture, he felt prepared to leave the familiar Colombian network to experience New Zealand culture. His actions provided support for his comment as his family upheld little contact with other Colombians while they spent time with his New Zealand colleagues.

Still, even this family, together with most others, wanted to raise their children's awareness of having a Colombian identity. One mother made conscious efforts to inculcate in her children the conviction that they were Colombians despite being born in Ecuador. This parental strategy of involving themselves in their children's identity formation is highlighted by the parents in Guardado's (2008b:176) study as a prerequisite for LM. My participants' intent to provide their children with a strong Colombian identification is possibly rooted in the considerable length of time spent in Ecuador, where the mothers said they were treated as outsiders. The act of enforcing their children's Colombian identity, which was particularly evident during the Soccer World Cup 2014 as whole families passionately supported the Colombian team, was successful in promoting a feeling of cultural belonging.

Surprisingly, however, the participants' cultural identification did not affect their wishes concerning the ethnicity of their children's future spouse. Although some did not show any bias towards either New Zealanders or Colombians for their children's future partners, others clearly stressed their desire to find a Kiwi husband for their daughters, with many comments geared towards the apparent faithfulness of New Zealand men and their willingness to help with domestic chores, as had been observed in local families. These dynamics may be unfavourable to LM which is rendered more difficult through intermarriage (Pilkington 1990; Piller 2001b). For example, accounts from Chilean families in Auckland experiencing LS

have highlighted the increased difficulties for language transmission in such multicultural marriages (Lee 2013).

5.2.1.1 Links between Spanish and Colombian identity

The Spanish language seemed to form an integral part of Colombian culture (see also Schecter & Bayley 1997:526; Shenk 2008) and, like in the Ethiopian community, was the “we-code” (Gumperz 1982) for all adult community members. This link between language and identity is similar to reported perceptions in other immigrant communities (see Pease-Alvarez 2002; Curdt-Christiansen 2009). Most participants claimed that all Colombian children should learn Spanish because of their heritage. For example, one mother asserted that it was descent rather than birth place which imposed the responsibility on their children to learn the language:

Es la lengua natal de nosotros. Aunque un bebé nazca aquí, de todas maneras tiene descendencia, es una persona latina, una persona de habla hispana, entonces debe de aprender.

It's our native language. Although babies are born here, in any case they're of Spanish descent; they're Latinos, Spanish speakers, that's why they have to learn.

This claim of children being born ‘into’ a language regardless of the actual place of birth is frequently found in immigrants’ accounts of their languages. Fought (2003:200) provides the example of a young Mexican American girl whose comments link language use and proficiency with ethnic blood relationship. These beliefs were reflected by many participants who considered Spanish use and transmission as a cultural responsibility.

More specifically, the Colombian variety of Spanish was frequently highlighted as important for cultural identity, focusing on vocabulary items peculiar to it. This coincided with reports discussed in Chapter 1 by researchers who investigated language attitudes in the United States and found that Colombians were those who showed most pride in their particular variety of Spanish (Zentella 2009). When asked to indicate whether she could maintain Colombian culture without Spanish, the following mother, representative of many others, drew attention to specific vocabulary items that were pertinent to Colombian speakers of Spanish:

No, sería difícil porque nosotros tenemos alguna forma de llamarle algunas cosas distintas. Si tú no tienes eso, ya no tienes eso que te identifica como colombiano. Un amigo chileno me dice “ustedes tienen mucho esa forma de hablar, de

No, it would be difficult because we have some different forms of referring to certain things. If you don't have that, you don't have what identifies you as Colombian. A Chilean friend tells me “you guys have this special way of

decir 'parce''', es nuestra forma de decir amigo. O hay una forma que dicen mucho en el Valle donde yo vivo, se pronuncia 'pana', se lo dicen a un amigo. Muchas formas de nosotros los colombianos hablar que nos identifican con nuestra cultura. Si nosotros perdemos el español, perderíamos una parte de nuestra cultura.

speaking, saying 'parce''', that's how we say friend. And there's a word that we often use in the Valle²⁷ where I live, it is 'pana', that's what you call a friend. There are many ways of speaking we Colombians have that identify us with our culture. If we lose Spanish, we'd lose part of our culture.

This mother's account highlighted the role of Colombian Spanish as a core value (Smolicz 1992), reflected in her understanding that Spanish provided cultural identity, along with her statement that losing Spanish would be equal to losing part of their culture. This reflects Schecter and Bayley's claim that the ethnic language is "a necessary social resource for maintaining cultural tradition and ethnic identity" (2002:79).

Moreover, the mother's report of her Chilean friend who identified *Colombianisms* in their speech suggested that she indexes (Bucholtz & Hall 2005) her cultural identity even in interaction with other Spanish-speakers. Although all participants had stayed in Ecuador where they reportedly had to adjust their language to the local variety to be understood, they preferred to draw on their Colombian vocabulary in New Zealand to construct their Colombian identity. A case in point was one mother's desire to teach her children to be *verracos*, a term that she claimed is frequently used in Colombia and that she defined as *fuerte, y trabajadores, y echados para delante* ('strong, and hard-working and moving forward'). Thus, the kind of person she wanted her children to be was encoded in Colombian Spanish and thus captured in the culture (Goddard & Wierzbicka 1995). Comments also frequently surfaced about the peculiarities of Colombian Spanish, even in interactions between individual community members. These findings, which resemble reports about the function of Chilean Spanish in Auckland (see Lee 2013) suggest that the Colombian variety of Spanish was a crucial component of Colombian identity (see Giles & Johnson 1981).

Due to the positive attributes associated with Colombian identity, the strong link between language and identity and the high prestige of Colombian Spanish, Colombians who refused to speak Spanish with other community members generally received negative sanctions:

²⁷ Valle del Cauca, a region in the South of Colombia

Hay mucha gente colombiana con que he tenido la oportunidad de hablar que ahora dice “no, ahora yo soy kiwi”. Por lo menos unas dos personas que me han dicho, “ahora hablo inglés”, incluso que le hablan en inglés. Pero a la mayoría de la gente colombiana no le gusta. No les gustan las personas así porque tienen que ser colombianos porque nacieron en Colombia. La mayoría de la gente colombiana odia la gente que dice “ay no, yo soy kiwi”. Y me digo “por qué me hablan en inglés, yo hablo español, es tonto”.

There are many Colombians with whom I’ve had the chance to speak and who say “no, now I’m Kiwi”. At least two people have said to me “I speak English now” and they even talk to you in English. But the majority of Colombians don’t like that. They don’t like people like that because they have to be Colombian because they were born in Colombia. The majority of Colombians hate those people who say “oh no, I’m Kiwi”. And I ask myself “Why do they speak to me in English, I speak Spanish, it’s stupid”.

This mother’s explanation suggests that the fact that Spanish was held in high regard within the community obligated Colombian community members to use it. Her negative evaluations came to light as she used labels such as ‘hate’ and ‘stupid’ in reference to ‘people like that’. This is reminiscent of Bourhis’ (1979) claim that groups with a high language vitality have more means of negatively evaluating an individual who goes against group norms by giving them “traitor labels” (Giles & Johnson 1987:80). Overall, the perceived importance of Spanish use as an identifying trait reinforced its status as a communal core value and, as in the Samoan community in New Zealand, not using it was “equated with arrogance and negating one’s background” (Johri 1998:251).

5.2.2 Spanish as cultural capital

Many participants also commented on the high status and worldwide usefulness of Spanish considering the scale of countries where it was spoken:

El idioma de español se utiliza en varios países, por ejemplo si se van a México, Chile, España, en todos lugares necesitan español, es necesario. [...] es más territorio que hablan español, el inglés es más poco, porque hay partes también en Brasil, Alemania²⁸ que se entiende el español. Entonces el inglés es necesario también, pero el español me parece mucho más necesario.

The Spanish language is used in various countries, for example if they go to Mexico, Chile, Spain, they need Spanish everywhere, it’s necessary. [...] there’s more territory where Spanish is spoken, less English, because there are also parts of Brazil, Germany [see footnote] where Spanish is understood. So English is necessary too, but I consider Spanish much more necessary.

The high number of Spanish speakers globally (Ethnologue Summary by Language Size) seemed to be an important incentive for learning a language, possibly for use as a lingua

²⁸ The fact that I am German and speak Spanish seemed to have confused at least three participants who thought that Spanish was spoken in parts of Germany.

franca (Mar-Molinero & Paffey 2011). This was most notable with one participant who referred to statistics discussed in her English class and seemed pleased to realise that her children, who spoke English and Spanish, already had command of two of the most widely spoken languages. Her desire for her children to also learn Mandarin, which she positioned as the world's fourth most widely spoken language, shows that she wants her children to be able to communicate with many people in the world. This regard for the high international prestige of Spanish was also held by other Spanish-speaking communities in New Zealand (see Walker 2011a; Lee 2013).

A number of women further noted that their children would one day need Spanish when they visited Colombia, where it represented cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991). They would further need the language to communicate with relatives in Colombia. Esteban's mother Laura (whose practices will be discussed in Socialisation Scenario D) admitted that this was the main motivation for her son to maintain Spanish:

Si [...] no tuviera la familia, de pronto no sería tan indispensable. Pero imagínese de pronto yo llegara a faltar o él quiera ir a visitar la familia que habla español, y es difícil para él, la comunicación, y para mi familia también. Entonces lo mejor para él serían los dos idiomas.

If [...] he didn't have the family, perhaps it wouldn't be so indispensable. But imagine I would perhaps pass away or he would visit the family, who speaks Spanish, and it's difficult for him, communicating, and for my family too. So the best for him would be both languages.

As mentioned in Section 4.2.4, this theme of maintaining an ethnic language for the sake of preserving connections with the extended family is common in LMLS studies and, as for Laura here, frequently figures as the key motivation for LM (e.g. in Guardado 2008b:178).

Given the high global status and usefulness of Spanish, the language is also sought after by a number of New Zealanders. This local interest is reflected in the high number of New Zealand students currently enrolled in Spanish programmes at primary and secondary level (36,586 students according to Education Counts Subject Enrolment 2013). Both children and adults in my study were occasionally asked to teach their language. For example, one child's teacher not only asked his mother for permission to ask him for words in Spanish, but also attempted to use Spanish to write a report to the mother. Another child commented that speaking Spanish publicly at times attracted positive attention from by-standers:

Cuando la familia habla español en la calle, [...] a veces la gente dice “Can you teach me how to speak Spanish” y mis hermanas les enseñan como decir ‘reloj’ y estas cosas. Y entonces dicen “ah, I like to speak Spanish” y así se hacen amigas.

When my family speaks Spanish on the streets, [...] sometimes people say “Can you teach me how to speak Spanish” and my sisters teach them how to say ‘watch’ and those things. And then they say “Ah, I like to speak Spanish” and they become friends.

Research in Australia showed that those parents who spoke a prestigious language were more successful in using it with their children (Yates & Terraschke 2013). The high status of Spanish as a global language may therefore facilitate LM²⁹. Overall the range of countries where Spanish is used, its function as cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991) in Colombia and its important status as a world language contributed to a greater demand for the language, both within and outside the Colombian community, and provided an incentive to maintain the language.

5.2.3 Personal motivations

In particular adults in my study considered Spanish an *Ort der Erinnerung* (place of memory) (Christ 2009:38), that is, a primary means of expression which encapsulates feelings and events important in their lives and was therefore more personal than English. Laura affirmed:

[Asocio español con mi] familia, es toda mi vida porque toda la vida he hablado español, y es como más mío. En cambio el inglés es como algo que llegó, pues tengo que acostumbrarme. No es totalmente mi lengua, no es algo como muy propio.

[I associate Spanish] with my family, it’s all my life because all my life I’ve spoken Spanish, and it’s more mine. In contrast, English is something that arrived, so I have to get used to it. It’s not completely my language, nothing of my own.

In addition, a few mothers expressed great affection toward the aesthetic aspect of their language. This was exemplified by one mother’s comment emphasising the passion encoded in Spanish utterances:

Muchas expresiones que tenemos en español y como colombianos son diferentes de lo que se dice en inglés y lo que se siente en inglés. Entonces quiero que lo sigan sintiendo con esa pasión que tenemos nosotros. Me imagino que es más hermoso decir “te amo hijo de mi alma” a decir “I love you my son”. No sé, decir “te adoro hijo de mi alma” es como más aquí el corazón y de lo que yo soy.

Many expressions that we have in Spanish and as Colombians are different from what you say and feel in English. So I want them to continue feeling with that passion that we have. I imagine it’s more beautiful to say “I love you, son of my soul” to saying “I love you my son”. I don’t know, saying “I adore you, son of my soul” is more [felt] here in my heart and in who I am.

²⁹ Nevertheless, two participants admitted that they did not know whether Spanish (or English) was spoken in other parts of the world and this was therefore not a reason that influenced them to favour either language.

The mother highlighted the personal emotions she felt upon confessing her love for her son in both English and Spanish but perceived the Spanish words were more intense, expressive and appropriate for endearments. Similar feelings were expressed by Lee's (2013) Chilean participants in Auckland. On the one hand, the mother's comment may be linked to her personal experiences of growing up with Spanish. For her, Spanish words were filled with much more content because they created more "multiple traces in memory" (Altarriba 2003:310) than she could create with English words during her short period of using the language. This is backed by findings from Dewaele and Nakano (2013) showing that the multilinguals in their study felt much more emotional and expressive in languages they had learned earlier in life. On the other hand, this mother may have referred to the qualities of the Spanish language, which is (albeit in folk linguistic belief) widely acclaimed for its rich, emotional and colourful expressions. In either case, the Spanish language represented a more effective tool for this mother to express her emotions, contributing to her desire to maintain the language.

The children also declared having affective beliefs (Gibbons & Ramírez 2004a) about Colombia and the Spanish language. These positive beliefs towards the ethnic language are positive indicators of future LM (see Holmes et al. 1993 whose findings I discussed in Chapter 1). Although some of the younger children had never visited Colombia, the majority self-identified as Colombians. For example, seven-year-old José reported that he wanted to speak the language with his own children in the future:

*Los dos, inglés y español porque es bacano
inglés y español también.*

*Both, English and Spanish because English is
awesome and Spanish too.*

Another 11-year-old girl linked her affection for Spanish to greater proficiency (Torras & Gafaranga 2002):

*Porque uno habla y después te hablan y uno
entiende todo a ellas.*

*Because you speak and then others speak to you
and you understand everything they say.*

Given that these children will be key actors in whether Spanish is maintained in their respective families, their positive attitudes were encouraging indicators for continued Spanish use. The fact that the majority of children used Spanish in the interviews may have reflected this positive affect towards the language (Holmes et al. 1993), their cultural identification (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) and (particularly for recently arrived children) their proficiency (Torras & Gafaranga 2002).

5.2.4 Spanish loss

Although Spanish was connected to many positive themes, some comments suggested that the children were aware of potentially losing the language in the future. Stories circulated in the community of other migrants whose children had forgotten Spanish, and since most mothers expected their children to continue to speak Spanish these served as warning signs (see also Okita 2002:113). Language erosion seemed to have already begun as some children claimed that they no longer remembered certain Spanish words. Moreover, some acknowledged that they were mindful of the possibility of someday forgetting Spanish. Juan suggested:

*Qué tal si nos olvide todo el español y hablamos sólo inglés. Llega uno a Colombia: **hello, how are you?** [laughs] [...]*

[Mel: *¿Les parece normal que vayan a olvidar español y sólo hablar inglés?*]

No ++ un poquito. Vamos a regresar a Ecuador y vamos a hablar nada de español, sólo inglés [laughs].

*How about we forget all of our Spanish and speak only English. You'd come to Colombia: **hello, how are you** [laughs] [...]*

[Mel: *Do you think it's normal that you'll forget Spanish and only speak English?*]

No ++ a little bit. We'll go back to Ecuador, and we'll speak no Spanish at all, only English [laughs].

While the strength of this boy's statement was weakened by his accompanying laughter, which suggests that he could not yet quite see the reality of his proposition, he provided the example of forgetting Spanish as a possible option for the future. The idea of Spanish erosion was reinforced by one mother, who described the possibility of her children forgetting Spanish as a natural process:

Creo que es normal [si ya no hablaran español]. Ellos escogerán si les gusta o no, tampoco puedo presionarlos. Si un día ya no hablan, está bien.

I think it's normal [if they no longer speak Spanish]. They'll choose if they like it or not, I can't force them either. If one day they no longer speak it, it's fine.

While the majority of mothers believed that their children should continue to speak Spanish in the long run, many also believed that the language should remain in the background for the present as their children focused on learning English. Worryingly, one mother reported that her psychologist advised her to solely focus on English at this stage, and she currently suspended teaching her son Spanish on account of this expert advice.

Ahora están enfocados en inglés, pero cuando tengan unos siete años van a poder hablar los dos idiomas. Ahora no les presiono mucho porque un sicólogo me dijo que se van a confundir, van a estar deprimidos.

Now they're focused on English, but they'll be able to speak both languages when they're around seven. Now I don't pressure them much because the psychologist told me that they'll be confused, they'll be depressed.

The mother maintained that her son spoke better English than Spanish, and that, in fact, she no longer understood his Spanish. During the interview he addressed us first in Spanish to ask for a piece of paper but neither his mother nor I understood him. His mother therefore suggested he say it to me in English (with the assumption that my English proficiency would help me understand her son better), and he did so, yet rather unclearly. While a more specific language issue may lie at the core of these communication problems, they may also be indicative of the initial stages of language erosion due to his general lack of Spanish practice.

Anecdotal evidence and previous research suggest that advice from teachers and other authorities to refrain from using the minority language in the home was even more frequent in New Zealand in the past (see Neazor 1991; Crezee 2012). For example, it has been recorded that this (contested) belief also influenced Samoan parents in New Zealand, who thought that speaking their ethnic language in the home would disadvantage their children (Hunkin-Tuileufuga 2001). I discussed the attitudes of the current government about maintaining ethnic languages as well as local linguists' responses in Section 1.2.1. While the background and exact details of this psychologist's piece of advice were unclear, such a viewpoint reflects widely held stereotypes against bilingualism (e.g. as discussed in Gogolin 2009), which posit knowledge of two languages as confusing despite its known benefits (Cummins 1979; Hoff et al. 2012).

This discussion has already suggested that language beliefs concern not only the minority language, but also other languages involved (Spolsky 2004:14). I now describe the participants' beliefs about English.

5.2.5 English as a world language

While Spanish was greatly esteemed for its usefulness and status, English was recognised for its important role in the world and the possibility to communicate with members of many nationalities when using English. For example, Maritza underlined the significance of English in terms of bestowing its speakers with the potential to communicate with a large number of people:

No sé si puede ser más importante el español que el inglés, pero es como la segunda lengua más importante del mundo. Tú hablas inglés y en otro país te pueden entender, en Australia, digamos que hasta en China, en otra parte [...]. La primera lengua más importante es el inglés.

I don't know if Spanish may be more important than English, but it's like the second most important language in the world. When you speak English, they can understand you in a different country, in Australia, let's say even in China, in other parts. [...] The first most important language is English.

In addition, English was considered cultural capital for life in New Zealand (Bourdieu 1991). The power and presence of English as a *de facto* official language of New Zealand highly outweighed that of Spanish. One participant essentially referred to the communication potential of English by indicating that *everyone in Wellington speaks English, but very few people speak Spanish*. All participants recognised that they required knowledge of English to access employment and most types of social activity:

En este país sin inglés no somos nada. Aparte que me gustaría escuchar a mis hijos hablando inglés pues es algo muy importante en este país que tenemos que aprender para salir adelante.

We are nobody in this country without English. Also I'd like to hear my children speak English, because it's something very important in this country that we have to learn to move forward.

Since English was a tool that had linguistic capital in New Zealand and allowed the participants to be connected with many people in their surroundings, all community members were highly motivated to learn the language. One mother highlighted the pride she felt upon hearing her youngest daughter speak English:

[...] un día vino un amigo que también es colombiano, y que habla inglés, aquí en la pieza donde estamos nosotros, y Juliana empezó a hablar puro inglés. Y sentía que lo hablaba como fuera kiwi, lo hablaba bien. [name of older daughter] me decía "yo me río, Juliana hablando inglés, porque no se le entiende nada". Me senté allí y me reía de escucharla. Me decía "habla bien inglés Juliana, es bacano, soy muy contenta".

[..] one day a friend came who's also Colombian and who speaks English, here in the room where we are, and Juliana started to speak only English. I felt that she spoke it as if she was Kiwi, she spoke it well! [name of older daughter] said to me "I'm cracking up, Juliana's speaking English because I can't understand anything". I sat down and laughed while I listened to her. I said to myself "Juliana speaks English well, it's awesome, I'm very happy".

The intensity of the moment for her, highlighted by her detailed description, showed the pride she felt upon hearing her youngest daughter converse in English. Her laughter furthermore revealed her positive emotions about her daughter's English proficiency.

Contrary to the frequent occurrence of 'subtractive bilingualism' for many immigrants whose children shift to English to the detriment of their ethnic language (see Wong Fillmore 1991), all Colombian participants were similar to Guardado's Hispanic participants in Canada in that they desired additive English learning alongside their children's continuous use of and

proficiency in Spanish. All participants had very positive views about bilingualism and considered it a great personal achievement for their children, given that both Colombia and Ecuador are *de facto* monolingual countries. Many also thought that speaking two languages would give their children advantages in life (see also Heller 2003:156; Walker 2011b), especially due to the employment opportunities this offered. One father even commented on the positive visions he had for himself if he ever became bilingual:

Yo soy una persona ya mayor, pero si yo llegara a perfeccionarme en el inglés, volvería a mi país y sería una persona importante. Me darían trabajo en cualquier parte, porque llegan muchos turistas, necesitan intérpretes. Les gusta mucho ir al monte, el que sabe el inglés, en un hotel por ejemplo de alta categoría donde llegan los americanos, lo necesitamos para guía turística.

I'm already an older person, but if I could improve my English, I could go back to my country and be someone important. They'd give me work anywhere because many tourists come and need interpreters. They love to go to the mountains, maybe in a hotel of a high category where Americans stay, we need you as a tourist guide if you know English.

This father's statement highlighted the economic incentive provided by speaking two languages (see Guardado 2008a). The attraction of using his two sources of linguistic capital to relate to English-speaking tourists in his home country compelled him to see bilingualism as a valuable asset.

The children likewise exhibited generally positive attitudes towards English and were conscious of the power associated with the English language and their privileged position as learners of the language. This was expressed in comments such as the following:

*Nos gusta, ya se harto inglés.
Hasta que yo no aprenda el inglés bien, de aquí yo no me quiero ir.
¡Aprender inglés hasta que se acabe!*

*We like it, I already know a lot of English.
I don't want to leave this place until I speak English well.
Learn English till we're finished / till we've mastered it.*

Moreover, one girl reported in English (her language of choice for the interview) that she sometimes almost subconsciously switched to English even in conversations with her Colombian friends:

It makes me like speak English and then -- it happens to her too, she like tries to say something and then she says in English, and then we don't know we're talking English. But then we're like oh we're talking English, people like, they're all looking at us, like "what they're speaking". That happens with Juliana.

While this girl referred to her subconscious switch to English when she talked with her friend Juliana (whose mother voiced her pride about her daughter speaking English), another girl reported using English strategically as a secret language when her friends wanted to keep

secrets from a girl who spoke only a little English. Given the positive affection, increasing proficiency and strategic use, English may even be the emerging language of communication within the second generation. This corresponds to Fishman's (1991) model described in Chapter 1 where the second generation knows the ethnic language but is also highly proficient in the majority language which often becomes their in-group language.

5.2.6 English as a cause of frustration

Nevertheless, many mothers also had mixed feelings towards English, mostly because of their often slow attempts to learn the language that left them feeling disempowered (see also McIlwaine 2005). This was illustrated in the following comment:

Pues el inglés a veces le produce el sentimiento de frustración. Cuando recién llegué una vez me puse a llorar porque la gente me hablaba y yo no entendía. Frustración y a la vez desespero porque uno se dice cuándo será que yo voy a tener una buena forma de hablar inglés, cuando será.

Well, English sometimes produces a frustrated feeling. When I had just arrived, I started to cry once because everyone talked to me and I didn't understand. Frustration and at the same time desperation because you ask yourself when will I ever have a good command of English, when will it be.

This participant recounted that her lack of understanding caused feelings of sadness and frustration as she wondered when she would ever acquire greater English proficiency. Slow rates of English acquisition could perhaps be attributed to the difficult situations many participants had experienced on their flight from Colombia to Ecuador and their adjustment to a very different culture in New Zealand, at times in addition to personal relationship problems:

Yo tengo muchos problemas. Entonces no me entran los estudios [de inglés] porque estoy pensando cómo solucionar esto.

I have many problems. My [English] studies just won't come into my head because I'm thinking about possible solutions.

Given the seemingly overwhelming challenge of learning English, comments about the difficulties encountered when learning English frequently surfaced in conversations among community members and with outsiders. This seems to illustrate the quandary in which many Colombian adults positioned themselves as they encountered difficulties when learning English and yet considered knowledge of English essential for living in New Zealand.

5.2.7 Summary

The discussion above has suggested that Spanish was valued due to both its societal status as well as its function for identity purposes. First, most participants regarded Spanish as an important world language, which allowed them to communicate not only with their fellow country people and families, but also with many others. They believed that Spanish was a sought-after commodity because even New Zealanders took interest in learning the language. (Colombian) Spanish was also seen as a core value and connected with personal history. Some felt strong affection for the language because of its reported expressive strength. Overall, the participants found a number of reasons maintaining Spanish was vital to their identity.

Nevertheless, the language faced an uncertain future in the community. The main reason for this was the role of English as social capital in New Zealand, which rendered English knowledge essential for accessing education, employment and various other social activities. In order to facilitate the acquisition of English for their children, some adults (erroneously) believed that it would benefit their children if they used English in the home and backgrounded Spanish at this stage of their immigration journey. Most children seemed excited about their opportunity to learn English. They occasionally even used the language for communication with other second-generation Colombians. However, both parents and children had aspirations to be bilingual because of its social and economic benefits.

This section has presented some of the beliefs present in the Colombian community about English and Spanish. I now present case studies that provide detailed explanations of FLPs in four Colombian families.

5.3 Language management and practices

This section presents four case studies describing the families' language management and practices. I first provide a general discussion based on the model developed in Chapter 3 about the existence of language management in the Colombian families. After presenting an example of a family with explicit Spanish-only management (Scenario A), I describe two families without explicit management (Scenarios C and D). The last case study deals with a family who unsuccessfully uses explicit strategies to promote English (Scenario E).

The following figure provides an overview of the frequency with which the different scenarios applied to families in the Colombian community. The more saturated the colour, the more families fit the respective scenario.

Figure 5.1 Frequency of occurrence of FLP scenarios in Colombian families

The norm in most families was to have a “laissez-faire policy” (Curdts-Christiansen 2013) or “no-policy policy” (Fishman 2006:318), that is, an absence of language management. In most of these families Spanish was commonly spoken (Scenario C), particularly among older family members whereas their children occasionally used English. For example, one mother’s comment suggests widespread Spanish use in her ten-people household:

No hay persona en la casa que se dedica a hablar inglés. There is no one in the house who devotes themselves to speaking English / who speaks English.

Spanish seemed to be the *de facto* language of communication without any underlying rule. Nevertheless, while the older sisters reported using Spanish whenever their mother was present, the youngest daughter asserted that they sometimes used English with each other when their mother was absent. This provides an example of the children tailoring their language use to overhearers (Bell 2001). Their language choice seemed to stretch across domains as I observed the two youngest siblings (11 and 12 years) using both English and Spanish while playing a game in a Spanish-language church environment. In contrast, their older siblings seemed to mainly communicate in Spanish both at home and in church. This family then used no explicit management, but Spanish use was encouraged by the older members of the household and by accommodating to their mother who was monolingual in Spanish.

The next most frequent scenario was parents trying to introduce explicit management to speak English, but their children did not collaborate (Scenario F). In contrast, only three families in my sample of 15 used explicit Spanish-only strategies (Scenario A), suggesting that many were not yet aware of the danger of LS. While two of the families with explicit management saw a need to speak Spanish at home due to inner convictions and external negative examples (King & Fogle 2006), the third example showed that the parents' adoption of Spanish-only management was triggered by developments within the family (see also Okita 2002:Chapter 6). The mother reported that her daughter, after attending day care for a while, began to speak English at home while playing with her dolls, reading books, and conversing with her parents, thus instilling fear in her that her daughter would forget Spanish. Her daughter's English language use was therefore influential on the development of Spanish-only management for the home, which proved beneficial for the family's LM efforts.

The enactment of family language policies (FLP) will be explored in the following four case studies, which illustrate very different ways in which members within the Colombian community responded to the threat of LS (whether they realised it or not). Every case study has a slightly different make-up, depending on the data available and the most prominent findings for each child and parent. However, in each case I first provide an overview of the family situation, parents' attitudes and type of language management, and then proceed to

describe the child's proficiency, the family's language use as well as the negotiation of Spanish and English between parents and children.

5.3.1 Socialisation Scenario A: Angélica's Spanish-only management

Management	Practices
Spanish-only management	Spanish is typically used

Family members: Angélica (mother), Andrés (father),
Sofía (daughter, age 10), Santiago (son, age 2)
Length of stay: 2 years

It has been suggested that minority languages are transmitted most successfully in families that use explicit management (Kasuya 1998; Tuominen 1999; King, Fogle & Logan-Terry 2008; De Houwer 2009; Kirsch 2012; Fogle & King 2013). This case study illustrating Scenario A shows the dynamics in one of the three families that successfully implemented Spanish use. I base my descriptions on interview data, recordings of home interactions and on-going observations of family interactions. After discussing the family's Spanish-language practices, I explain the English influences on their daughter's language development and their feelings of linguistic insecurity (Labov 1972). I then describe the mother's discourse strategies (Lanza 2004) after her daughter's use of English as well as their reciprocal exchange of cultural and linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1991).

Ten-year-old Sofía was born in Colombia, but left for Ecuador at the age of six. Her family was invited to resettle in New Zealand when she was eight years old. By attending school in Ecuador she had received a first foundation in Spanish literacy and language stabilisation, which placed her in a more favourable position for LM than her two-year-old brother, who was born in New Zealand.

The data revealed that, despite strong societal English influences and Sofía's claims that she was forgetting Spanish, she had good command of the language, and used it in a wide range of situations with her mother. She displayed Spanish proficiency that enabled her to share stories that included past action as well as emotional and idiomatic content (such as *I have to put up with her whining*). In addition, she used gestures to illustrate her point usually associated with Latin Americans, such as clapping into her hands three times in the extract

above to give weight to her descriptions. She asserted that she always knew which language to use:

I see the same faces, so I know they are my mum, my dad, my family. And for my friends I see different faces, so I know they speak English. And the faces I know most is the ones that I speak Spanish with.

Similar to the boy Elliot in Chevalier's study who is motivated to speak Swiss German because it is spoken by those people "to whom he is close and who he sees regularly" (2012:446), the personal family contact that she had had all her life also motivated Sofía to speak Spanish with those closest to her.

Her parents were keen to keep Spanish alive and used explicit Spanish-only management in the home (see also Worthy & Rodriguez-Galindo 2006). Sofía's mother Angélica reported that her English teacher had asked her to converse with her daughter in English daily for one hour to practice her own language skills, but Angélica refused to do so. Although she admitted to mixing a few English words into her Spanish, such as *I'm sorry*, she certainly wanted to be strict about speaking Spanish in the home. Her language ideologies and policies were to some extent shaped by her friends' experiences (see King & Fogle 2006) as she recounted that her Chilean friend, whose daughter no longer spoke Spanish, acted as a negative example because she did not want the same to happen to Sofía. Despite her strict management, however, she doubted that Spanish would continue to be spoken in Wellington if it depended only on her children. Similar to Stoffel's (1988) finding that Serbo-Croatian would soon cease to be spoken in New Zealand if it were not for continued immigration, Angélica thought that Spanish would only continue to be spoken through the arrival of many more Colombians.

5.3.1.1 Spanish socialisation

Sofía received most of her Spanish input at home. Spanish influences from outside her family were restricted to occasional visits from other Colombian families with whose children she reportedly spoke Spanish. One intercultural Colombian-New Zealander family sometimes took her on weekend outings and used a combination of Spanish and English with her. Sofía's family valued 'familism' (Sabogal et al. 1987) and both Angélica and Sofía expressed that they were hesitant about letting Sofía stay for after-school sports activities because they

wanted to spend time together at home. Sofía was almost exclusively exposed to Spanish when interacting with her parents.

Sofía participated in these conversations as addressee, auditor and overhearer (Bell 2001). For example, she was an auditor or overhearer to Spanish interactions between her parents and to infant-directed speech between her parents and her brother. At other times, talk was addressed to her and she mostly used her receptive skills, whereas on other occasions she was strongly engaged in the interaction and used her productive Spanish skills. For instance, Angélica typically used discourse styles involving questions to clarify what she told them or to move the plot forward (see Döpke 1992). This resembles descriptions by Chevalier (2012) about a talkative aunt who assisted her young niece in acquiring a better command of Swiss German through her conversational involvement. The following extract illustrates Angélica's interactional contributions and empathy as Sofía recounts her friendship with one reportedly 'clingy' girl:

S: <i>Pero cuando yo estoy jugando con otra niña y todo eso</i> //claps in hands\	S: <i>But when I play with another girl and so on</i> //claps in hands\
A: /Celosa\	A: /Jealous\
S: <i>Y no con ella, //uff?</i>	S: <i>And not with her, //ouff!</i>
A: /¿Usted siempre\ tiene que salir //con ella?\	A: /You always\ have to play //with her?\
S: <i>/Me tengo que aguantar\ toda la cantaleta que me hace.</i>	S: <i>/I have to put up\ with all her whining</i>
A: <i>Verdad, la cantaletea ¿qué le dice?</i>	A: <i>Really, she complains, what does she say to you?</i>
S: <i>Que por qué no estoy jugando con ella, que ya no la quiero que-</i>	S: <i>That why am I not playing with her, that I don't like her anymore -</i>
A: <i>¿Así le dice? ¿Ya no la quiera? [laughs] Ay que pecado y se pone hacerle como //reclamo.\</i>	A: <i>That's what she says? That you don't like her anymore... oh, my God, so she like //complains.\</i>
S: /Hm.\	S: /Hm.\
A: <i>Ay Dios mío [laughs].</i>	A: <i>Oh my God [laughs].</i>

The dialogue exemplifies the rich co-construction of family interactions during narrative talk (Snow & Beals 2006:57), where Angélica used frequent back-channelling and clarifying questions. The many overlaps in speech indicate that she recurrently interrupted Sofía when she did not understand. Many topics within their interactions were complex and extended over several conversational turns (Snow & Beals 2006:55).

The mother-child interactions also indicated an overlap of the church, school and family domains (see Fishman 1972:87). The family usually attended an English-language church, but private conversations about their faith, for instance those forming part of Sofía's moral socialisation, occurred in Spanish. This was illustrated in the recordings, for example, when

Angélica reacted to Sofía's account that other supposedly 'cool' girls had refused to return her greeting and rolled their eyes when she arrived at school. Angélica instructed her daughter to refrain from anger and continue to greet the girls, thus exhibiting humility and finding favour with God:

A: *Ya sabe qué, mi amor, le digo un consejo, o sea, no se enoje y le dé rabia por las cosas. Viva tranquila, que la persona que vive sin rabias vive con salud. Usted no puede tener rabia mi amor. Y no importa, son niñas que no tienen seguro a Dios en el corazón. Como usted conoce de Dios, mi hija, usted tiene que ser sencilla. No importa, salúdeles todas las veces y ya ¿qué se va a ser?*

S: *Yo no las voy a volver a saludarles a ellas, ¡es NUNCA!*

A: *No, mami, no puede ser así. Pues no importa. Uno gana más siendo humilde. La persona humilde, todo el mundo la quiere. Pero las personas creídas ay [high voice] están tan creídas que yo no las puedo hablar. [...]*

S: *[breathes audibly upset in the background]*

A: *Sí, mi amor. Que no le dé rabia. Es una niña.*

A: *You know what, my love, I give you this advice, don't get angry and don't be upset about these things. Stay calm because the person who lives without anger is healthy. You shouldn't be angry, my love. And it doesn't matter, these girls surely don't have God in their hearts. Because you know God, my girl, you have to be humble. It doesn't matter, greet them every time you see them, what will happen?*

S: *I won't greet them again, EVER!*

A: *No my darling, it shouldn't be like that. Well, it doesn't matter. You're better off if you're humble. Everyone likes a humble person. But arrogant people, oh, [high voice] they're so full of themselves that I can't talk to them. [...]*

S: *[breathes audibly upset in the background]*

A: *Yes my love. Don't be angry. She's just a girl.*

Sofía's mother demonstrated her ability to meet her daughter's locus of attention (Tamis-LeMonda, Bornstein & Baumwell 2001) by providing her with appropriate feedback. She exposed Sofía to talk that combined religious values with moral instruction, spoken in a situation where she was deeply disturbed and upset about the girls' behaviour. This type of responsiveness to children's initiations has been found to be beneficial for language development (Döpke 1992).

Sofía showed her strong productive bilingual abilities (Li 2000:6) as she accommodated her mother's desire for her to speak Spanish and interpreted English school interactions into Spanish. While she tried to play 'high five, in the middle, down low' with her mother in English she also offered explanations of the rules in Spanish, displaying productive bilingualism that comprised her using both English (at school) and Spanish (at home) for the same word fields and functions. In the following extract, Sofía shared with her mother about the best friends' club she had founded at school, and, frequently interrupted by her mother's backchanneling, described the tasks the friends gave each other. These were all originally in English, but Sofía diligently, albeit with brief hesitations, recounted the event in Spanish.

S: Y estamos haciendo como un + club, pues es secreto, de mejores amigas y por eso tene- lo que tenemos que hacer era como + decirle pues, yo le dije al director que tenía + pues no era de verdad + que yo tenía pintura en mi zapato y después teníamos que correr en el //pasto.

A: /Pero hija\ ¿quién les puso a hacer esa tarea?

S: Nancy //y tengo que -

A: /Pero quién es Nancy, ¿la profesora?

S: No. Una amiga / para entrar al club

A: /Y por eso\ no entien- AH justedes están haciendo entre AMIGAS!

S: And we have this club, it's secret, of best friends, and for that we have to like say to someone + like I said to the director that I had paint in/on my shoe and then we had to run across the field.

A: But my girl, who gave you these tasks?

S: Nancy //and I have to -

A: /But who is Nancy, the teacher?

S: No. A friend //to join the club

A: /And that's why\ I don't underst – AH you're doing this with your FRIENDS!

Sofía's high metalinguistic awareness may have helped her to react so sensitively to Angélica's language management. Metalinguistic awareness has been defined as “the ability to objectify language and dissect it as an arbitrary linguistic code independent of meaning” (Roth et al. 1996:258). This was expressed for example as she tried to tell me about her imagined grandchild (her former puppy) when I interviewed her and accidentally said *niece* (which is in form quite similar to Spanish *nieto* ‘grandchild’). At the same time, she asked me whether her word choice was correct and expressed her embarrassment when she realised that she had used a ‘false friend’ (Granger & Swallow 1988). Her high linguistic awareness may have contributed to her conscientious use of both English and Spanish.

A further factor for Sofía's high Spanish proficiency seemed to be her positive family relationships (Tannenbaum & Howie 2002) and mutual funds of knowledge (Moll et al. 1992) with her mother, which have been highlighted as conducive to minority LM. Although Angélica lamented that Sofía hardly talked to her anymore when she came home from school, the recordings showed a trusting mother-daughter relationship. For example, Sofía confided in her mother about a boy she liked. Angélica, in turn, asked Sofía many questions about her day and frequently used terms of endearment (*mi hija, mi amor, mami, mamita*). In addition, both mother and daughter had nicknames for a few of Sofía's classmates, thus showing shared familiarity with Sofía's world. These positive relationships and shared discourses offered space for Sofía to use the ethnic language in a warm and friendly environment.

5.3.1.2 Exposure to English and linguistic insecurity

The previous section focused on Sofía's rich Spanish-language home environment. I here address factors which promoted her exposure to English and her descriptions of linguistic insecurity and language loss.

One strong English influence in the home was media (see also Schechter & Bayley 1997). While Guardado (2002) found that children became interested in the ethnic language when it was present in the family's home, the existence of TV and internet in particular meant that Sofía was able to choose entertainment herself without being directed by her parents. Angélica reported that Sofía usually did not talk much when she returned from school, but instead watched English TV and played computer games. She was skilled in the use of the internet and able to gain access to various forms of English-language media. In addition, she sometimes read books to her parents and brother in English. It was only on weekends that the family watched Spanish movies together. Thus, language socialisation through media and books occurred primarily in English.

Two-year-old Santiago presented a further English influence for Sofía. While he was certainly still very young, explanations for his predominantly English language choice (according to Angélica's reports) may be his immersion into an English-language societal environment from birth, early attendance of childcare (see Oller et al. 2011) and possibly less linguistic awareness compared to the high level exhibited by his sister. He had already begun attending day care when I started my research, and Angélica asserted over the course of data collection that she occasionally found understanding him difficult. Angélica pursued the same explicit Spanish management which she used with Sofía. However, he did not always comply and instead responded in a mixture of English and Spanish. Although she claimed he mostly used English with her, her laughing imitations of his toddler Spanish and my observations indicated that he was also acquiring Spanish.

The recorded and observational data available on Sofía's and Santiago's sibling communication suggests that Sofía used both English and Spanish with her brother. Such use of the majority language is a common scenario for siblings in immigrant families (e.g. Kulick 1992; Tuominen 1999; Pauwels 2005:126; Gafaranga 2010). However, Sofía and her mother explained the siblings' language choice differently. While Sofía claimed that she mostly used Spanish and Santiago answered in English, Angélica confided to me that Sofía predominantly spoke with Santiago in English. It appeared that Angélica used no management strategies for language use between her two children. This is similar to the Tamil parents in Fernandez and Clyne's (2007) study in Australia, who also enforced strict language policies with their children, but tended to avoid interfering in their children's language choice with each other (2007:185), possibly because of the difficulties attached to managing the language choices of

two individuals. Thus, despite mostly Spanish-only use between mother and daughter, the media and sibling communication brought English into the home domain.

Furthermore, the social and institutional context at school restricted Sofía's language choice where she had no opportunity to use Spanish and spent the majority of her time. She was the only Colombian and had a group of English-speaking friends with whom she found it very easy to communicate. During one home interaction, Angélica asked with astonishment whether it was true that Sofía only spoke English at school, and Sofía's exclamation *quién me va a entender si hablo en español* 'who'll understand me if I speak Spanish?' highlights that she recognised the lack of a Spanish-speaking social network at her school.

Sofía also indicated that she was forgetting Spanish and this was presumably due to her reduced Spanish practice (see Hoff et al. 2012). L1 loss, a "general term that covers attrition, incomplete acquisition, language death and even language change" (Montrul 2004:259), is commonly associated with migrants who have reduced input in their L1 and use it only infrequently (Montrul 2004). For example, Angélica sometimes asked Sofía for the meaning of words when watching English movies, but Sofía occasionally could not say them in Spanish even though she understood the English meaning. She explicitly made reference to her L1 loss in the following dialogue:

A: *Yo me siento orgullosa de usted que habla inglés, mi hija. ¿Usted de mí no se siente orgullosa que hable español bien?* [laughs]

S: *Habla mejor español que yo, obvio.*

A: *¿Sí? ¿Usted siente que no habla bien español?*

S: *Uhum.*

A: *¿Por qué?*

S: *No sé, como que se me olvidan las palabras.*

A: *I feel proud that you speak English, my daughter! Don't you feel proud of me that I speak Spanish well?* [laughs]

S: *You speak Spanish better than me.*

A: *Yea? Do you feel you don't speak Spanish well?*

S: *Uhum.*

A: *Why?*

S: *I don't know, 'cause I forget words.*

After joking about Angélica's fledgling English which made both mother and daughter laugh, Angélica voiced pride in her daughter's mastery of English. When asked whether she felt proud of Angélica's knowledge of Spanish, Sofía asserted that Angélica spoke Spanish better and confirmed Angélica's enquiry whether she thought she did not speak Spanish well. She reported forgetting Spanish words when talking with Angélica and calling her grandmother in Colombia and explained that she usually asked how to say the respective word in Spanish.

Sofía's reduced practice of Spanish and high linguistic awareness may have further contributed to a feeling of linguistic insecurity (see Labov 1972). Bourdieu claims that

feelings of linguistic insecurity are produced if the difference “between the recognised norm and the capacity to produce” (1977b:658) is high. Sofía presumably recognised the difference between her Spanish performance and the norms of Standard Spanish and this is expressed in the following interaction which includes further descriptions of the game ‘truth or dare’.

A: *Claro, y ¿qué le preguntan, hija?*
[...]

S: *Me preguntan que si - qué es lo más + uhm + lo más penoso que me ha pasado en la vida, yo no sé.*

A: *Usted dice que no sabe – esa es la respuesta //suya*

S: */No, les\ dijo que me orino los pantalones desde que tenía nueve años.*

A: *Nueve años + //hasta*

S: */No sí\ hasta los nueve años.*

A: *Tenía que haber dicho //desde que + hasta los nueve años*

S: */Por eso, pero lo dije en inglés bien\, pero lo dije en inglés bien //y todos se reían.*

A: */¿Cómo lo dijo en inglés?*

S: ***Uhm I peed in uhm I used to pee in my pants when I was ++ I started to pee in my pants when I was three and uhm + I kept on doing it uhm + till I was nine.***

A: *A mi amor, como así o sea ¿se le da pena eso, claro?*

S: *Claro.*

A: *Of course, and what do they ask you my girl?*
[...]

S: *They ask me what is the most embarrassing thing that’s happened to me in life, I don’t know.*

A: *You say that you don’t know – that’s the answer //xxx*

S: */No, I told\ them that I’ve peed in my pants since I was nine.*

A: *Nine years, //until*

S: */No, yes\ until I was nine*

A: *You should have said //from + until I was nine*

S: */That’s why, but I said it right in English\, but I said it right in English //and everyone laughed*

A: */How did you say it in English?*

S: ***Uhm I peed in uhm I used to pee in my pants when I was ++ I started to pee in my pants when I was three and uhm + I kept on doing it uhm + till I was nine***

A: *Oh my love, how’s that, that’s embarrassing for you, right?*

S: *Of course.*

Sofía displayed embarrassment about her Spanish mistake, and first tried to correct her utterance, thus correcting the language with the highest value in the home domain. Her reaction corresponds to Bourdieu’s (1977b) claim that, first of all, speakers will try to revalue their linguistic product (what they say) by self-correction. In addition, Sofía asserted her knowledge of English, seemingly reliant on the fact that her mother recognised that English was the legitimate language for outside domains. Her occasional insecurity when using Spanish may also be a reason for her preference to use English when watching movies, expressing her feelings and during my interview with her.

5.3.1.3 Angélica’s discourse styles

The interaction above further illustrates Angélica’s use of direct modelling as well as her flexibility in reacting to her daughter’s language use. First, she corrected her daughter stating *you should have said* and provided her with the correct Spanish form. This is similar to the Kaluli mothers in Papua New Guinea described by Schieffelin (1986) who used the word

elena ‘say like this’ to directly instruct their children what to say and how to say it. However, given Sofía’s embarrassment, Angélica, seemingly having in mind the well-being of her daughter, provided a temporary space for English by inviting Sofía to say exactly what she said to her friends. This example, although it is the only occurrence on the recordings, is suggestive of a pattern that is maybe more widespread in the family. Despite Angélica having strong wishes for her daughter to speak Spanish and using explicit language management, she did not adhere to this rigidly. Instead, given her daughter’s defensive stance about her mistake in Spanish, she showed flexibility and occasionally modified her explicit Spanish management to cater for her daughter’s needs.

Angélica most frequently used a repetition style (Lanza 2004) after Sofía switched to English. By doing so, she made efforts to provide Sofía with the correct form in Spanish when she struggled to express herself. The following extract shows how Sofía described a game which she and her friends played at school. After she mentioned the name of the game in English, Angélica offered a Spanish term which Sofía then continued to use.

S: *Y jugamos **truth or dare**. Es como que usted tiene que decir verdad y tiene que decir + pues como jugar + como + hágame...*

A: *La verdad o la mentira.*

S: *Ay, **truth***

A: *¿Que le haga cómo?*

S: ***Truth or** + No, tiene que coger algo de eso, papel o tijera + y después si dice que verdad o algo que la mande a hacer uno.*

A: *Ah ¡una penitencia!*

S: *Sí. **Truth or** + [laughs] Ah bueno tijera. **Truth or dare** [...] **truth or dare** + YES! Ah, ¿quiere verdad o penitencia?*

A: *¿Qué?*

S: *Verdad o penitencia ¡escoja!*

S: *And we played **truth or dare**. It’s like you have to say truth and you have to say then + it’s like playing + like + do this*

A: *Truth or lie.*

S: *Ah, **truth**.*

A: *How do I do it?*

S: ***Truth or** + No, you have to choose one of these, scissors + and then you say either truth or someone sends you to do something.*

A: *Ah, a punishment!*

S: *Yes. **Truth or** + [laughs] Ah but scissors.*

***Truth or dare** [...] **Truth or dare** + YES! Ah, do you want truth or punishment?*

A: *What?*

S: *Truth or punishment, choose!*

Sofía told her mother about a game she played at school and referred to the game in English (*truth or dare*). Angélica seemed to understand the meaning of truth and offered her a tentative Spanish translation *la verdad o la mentira* ‘truth or lie’. When Sofía described the consequences of choosing ‘dare’, Angélica refined the translation by offering the word *penitencia* ‘penalty’. Although not an exact translation, it served the purpose of providing a term which further described the game procedures. Sofía then began to play the game with Angélica using the English wording ‘truth or dare’, presumably imitating how they had

played the game at school. She subsequently adopted Angélica's suggestion of *penitencia* when directly addressing her.

Angélica's decision to model Spanish words to Sofía differed from that of other mothers who had higher English proficiency (see Socialisation Scenario C in 5.3.2, for example), which rendered offering Spanish translations less crucial for their understanding. These mothers typically used a move-on style (Lanza 2004) and only sometimes reacted to the linguistic shift. Moreover, their children did not always adopt their mothers' repetitions. This may be explained by Pauwels' claim that children's knowledge that their interlocutor can understand may reduce their efforts to use the ethnic language (2005:126). In contrast, Sofía's language choice was constrained as Angélica was unlikely to understand her if she spoke English. She therefore willingly accepted and adopted her mother's language modelling. Despite the fact that Angélica did not have high English proficiency she was thus still able to obtain 'mutual funds of knowledge' (Moll et al. 1992) with her daughter because of Sofía's ability to tell her stories in Spanish.

Angélica also used a repetition style and metalinguistic feedback to correct Sofía's Spanish. In the following extract, Sofía hesitated as she noticed that she had used an incorrect word for 'sports' in Spanish:

S: *Y tenía que escribir un reporte en los* + [rising intonation] :**sportes**..

A: ¿**Es**//**port**?

S: /DEPOR\\TES!

A: *Deportes* [laughs] ¡*Se le equivo- se equivocó usted!*

S: **Esportes** + *deportes* [laughs]

A: [laughs]

S: *Ah bueno, uhm, deportes + algo de los esportes + y tiene que ser largo. Y yo no quiero hacer la verdad, qué pereza.*

S: *And I had to write a report in* + [rising intonation]:**sportes**..

A: ¿**Es**[**port**]?

S: [**SPORTS**]!

A: *Sports* [laughs]. *You made a mistake!*

S: **Esportes** + *sports* [laughs]

A: [laughs]

S: *Oh well, sports + something about esportes + and it doesn't have to be long. But actually I don't want to do it, I feel lazy.*

Angélica followed Sofía's utterance with a request for clarification by repeating the word (e)*sportes*, this time with prothetic addition of /e/ typical of Spanish L1 speakers (Carlisle 1991). However, before Angélica could finish, Sofía already corrected herself as the Spanish word *deportes* occurred to her. Angélica's subsequent metalinguistic comment (*you made a mistake!*) drew explicit attention to the fact that Sofía had forgotten a Spanish word, and both reacted to the incident with laughter, Sofía seemingly embarrassed. She then repeated both the mistake (*esportes*) and the Spanish word (*deportes*), and continued her story, using

esportes again (as opposed to *deportes*, the correct form). Thus, despite her high linguistic awareness and self-correction, she finally used the more English-sounding word, which suggests a strong influence of English on her production of Spanish.

5.3.1.1 Reciprocal exchange of capital

Children of migrant parents often become language and cultural brokers (Valdés, Chavez & Angelelli 2003). The traditional picture of parents who transmit cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991) to their children changes as the distribution of such capital flows in both directions. While Angélica possessed the traditional adult capital and also culture-specific capital, Sofía had more opportunities to acquire the cultural and linguistic capital of New Zealand at school. In reciprocal exchanges in their interactions, she introduced Angélica to local New Zealand concepts. When direct translation was not possible, Angélica and Sofía engaged in meaning negotiation processes in Spanish to arrive at a common understanding despite their different frames of reference. For instance, Angélica came to understand the English concept of *netball* through repeated questioning in Spanish.

S: Como ella tiene **netball practice**, después de lo que comamos ella está todo el tiempo practicando netball .

A: //¿Qué es **netball**?\\

S: /Porque hay\\ juegos.

S: Basquetbol.

A: Ah ya ya.

S: Parecido, casi igual.

A: Uhum es basquetbol?

S: No.

A: //¿Qué será?\\

S: /Parecido parecido **netball**.\\

A: ¿Hacen cestas no más?

S: Sí.

S: Because she has **netball practice**, she always practices netball after we eat.

A: //What is **netball**?\\

S: /Because there are\\ games

S: Basketball.

A: Ah yea yea.

S: Similar, almost the same.

A: Uhum, is it basketball?

S: No.

A: //What could it be?\\

S: /Similar similar **netball**.\\

A: They only have baskets?

S: Yes.

Sofía's mention of netball practice led to a meaning negotiation sequence, which Pica (1992:200) defines as "an activity that occurs when a listener signals to the speaker that the speaker's message is not clear and the speaker and the listener work linguistically to resolve this impasse". Upon hearing the lexical item netball, Angélica indeed signalled to Sofía that she had not understood (*what is netball?*). Sofía provided her with a comparable concept more well-known in Colombia (*basquetbol*), which Angélica then followed up with another clarification request (*they only have baskets?*) (Long 1980). Sofía confirmed this and thus

resolved the meaning negotiation sequence through which Angélica acquired greater understanding of a local concept.

While this negotiation revolved for the most part around the concept of netball as part of New Zealand culture, other interactions dealt more explicitly with the unequal distribution of linguistic capital between mother and daughter³⁰. For example, when I first visited the family with my English-speaking husband, Angélica tried to speak English, and occasionally Sofía told us *What she wants to say is....* She thus assumed the role of a language broker (see Valdés, Chavez & Angelelli 2003) between Angélica, who was attempting to apply her English language skills, and us as guests, who probably represented the English-speaking world (see Schecter & Bayley 1997:525). The family dynamics changed as Angélica positioned herself as a learner by asking Sofía to teach her more English.

A: *¿Va a ser una niña más + más - ayudarle más a la familia? Sabe que nosotros - yo por lo menos no hablo bien inglés. Usted me tiene que ayudar, mi hija ¿huh?*
S: [quietly] *Sí, lo prometo.*

A: *Will you be a daughter who helps her family more? At least I don't speak English well. You have to help me, my girl, huh?*
S: [quietly] *Yes, I promise.*

Angélica explicitly urged Sofía to help her parents with their English. This promise was fulfilled shortly after, when Angélica asked Sofía to teach her how to say *Can you please cut your son's nails*. The episode originated from an experience at day care where her son was scratched by another toddler, and Sofía was asked to interpret this sentence for her mother (it remains unclear whether she actually did so). Upon their return home, Angélica sought more autonomy by asking her daughter to teach her how to say it:

³⁰ Another participant expressed her concerns about the reciprocal exchange of linguistic capital even more explicitly by using terms such as 'boss' and 'girl' to highlight the altered family hierarchy:

No ayudo con el inglés, ellos me enseñan a mí. Es otra parte frustrante cuando uno llega aquí. Yo era antes la jefa de la casa. Pero después ellos me traducían a mí, o sea, yo no hablaba. Ellos eran los que traducían a muchas personas y me sentía como yo no soy la niña, yo soy la mamá de esta casa.

I don't help [them] with English, they help me. That's another frustrating thing when you arrive here. Before, I was the boss in the house. But then they translated for me, I mean I couldn't speak. They were the ones who translated for many people and I felt like I'm not the girl, I'm the mother in this house.

<p>S: <i>Yo dije "Can you please cut the kid's nails?"</i> A: <i>Que qué?</i> S: <i>Could you please cut the kid's other nails.</i> A: [imitating gibberish] <i>Así le escucho yo.</i> <i>¿Cómo se dice? Would you please -</i> S: <i>Cut.</i> A: <i>Cut.</i> S: <i>The nails + son uñas, //nails.</i> A: <i>/Nails\, the nails + the kid?</i> S: <i>Nai- the kid's nail</i> A: <i>The kid's nail + que would you please ay no</i> <i>[laughs].</i> S: <i>Could you please -</i> A: <i>Could you please cut the nail the kid?</i> S: <i>The children nails, //kid's\ nails.</i> A: <i>/The children\ kid's nails //¿Nails\ es la uña?</i></p> <p>S: <i>/Prime-\ Sí. Primero niños, después nails.</i> A: <i>Would you please + would you please cut +</i> <i>the + kids the nails + yea?++ bueno.</i></p>	<p>S: <i>I said "Can you please cut the kid's nails?"</i> A: <i>Said what?</i> S: <i>Could you please cut the kid's other nails.</i> A: [imitating gibberish] <i>That's how I understand</i> <i>you. How do you say that? Would you please -</i> S: <i>Cut.</i> A: <i>Cut.</i> S: <i>The nails + that's nails //nails.</i> A: <i>/Nails\, the nails + the kid?</i> S: <i>Nai- the kid's nail</i> A: <i>The kid's nail + that would you please oh no</i> <i>[laughs].</i> S: <i>Could you please -</i> A: <i>Could you please cut the nail the kid?</i> S: <i>The children nails, //kid's\ nails.</i> A: <i>/The children\ kid's nails //¿Nails\ is the</i> <i>nail?</i> S: <i>/Fir-\ Yes. First kids, then nails</i> A: <i>Would you please + would you please cut +</i> <i>the + kids the nails + yea?++ good.</i></p>
--	--

The interaction contains a teaching sequence in which Sofía was positioned as a teacher and Angélica as a student. At first Sofía shared the whole sentence with Angélica, which Angélica failed to understand or repeat. Consequently, Sofía broke down the sentence into separate words. Angélica acquired linguistic capital as Sofía taught her the phrase, corrected her, modelled the correct order of the possessive, then provided metalinguistic feedback about the word order, and finally stopped correcting her (although the sentence structure was still somewhat wrong). At the end, however, after Angélica's request for feedback (*yea?*), Sofía failed to provide further comments. While the reasons for this are unclear, she may have been overly challenged by the role reversal and demand to provide her mother with English instruction.

The previous section has outlined the role reversal taking place as Sofía and Angélica exchanged different types of capital, with Sofía often conveying cultural and linguistic capital pertaining to New Zealand to her mother. Overall, although Sofia's Spanish skills may have deteriorated as a result of limited exposure to the language (Hoff et al. 2012), this was not immediately apparent in the recordings of the home interactions in which she engaged in complex conversation embedded in a trusting relationship with her mother. Still, Sofia's reduced exposure to Spanish seemed to affect her confidence as she repeatedly asserted that she was forgetting a lot of Spanish and that she felt insecure speaking the language. However, as a result of her mother's insistence on using Spanish and her modelling of Spanish words

using Lanza's (2004) repetition style, she appeared to be able to conduct conversations about various school and home domain topics.

As discussed at the beginning of this Section (5.3), very few Colombian families in my data used explicit language policies. Scenario B, where the parents have management strategies to use the majority language but the children fail to cooperate, do not apply to any Colombian families at this stage. The next case study describes a family without explicit management, who used Spanish for the majority of their interactions, but whose son also incorporated a considerable number of English words.

5.3.2 Socialisation Scenario C: Daniela and Eduardo's 'move-on' style

Management	Practices
No management	Spanish is typically used

Family members: Daniela (mother), Eduardo (father),
David (son, age 4), Juan (son, age 15)

Length of stay: 3 ½ years

Four-year-old David lived in the outskirts of Wellington with his parents Daniela and Eduardo and his 15-year-old brother. The family was originally from Bogotá, Colombia, but spent three years in Ecuador where they had set up their own business and where David was born. Upon arrival in New Zealand in early 2010, he was only a few months old. All family members were Spanish monolinguals. Although both parents wanted David to maintain Spanish, they had a weak impact belief (De Houwer 1999) and a 'laissez-faire policy' (Curd-Christiansen 2013a). These are two factors likely to promote English use given the societal influence of the majority language (see Tuominen 1999; Pérez Báez 2013). The parents frequently opened up a bilingual context in the home because their usual reaction to David's code-switches was to 'move on' the conversation in Spanish (Lanza 2004).

5.3.2.1 Spanish socialisation

Daniela and Eduardo agreed that it was important that David should continue to speak Spanish because it was the language of his country and part of his heritage (Schechter & Bayley 1997). Daniela imagined that they would always use Spanish simply for practical reasons because they understood each other best in Spanish. Presumably because this was so

obvious, they had never attempted to enforce Spanish use through management and used a laissez-faire policy (Curdtt-Christiansen 2013a).

No hay regla, tra- intentamos hacerlo para ayudarme a mí con el inglés, pero no funcionó [laughs] [...] entonces ya, dejamos que fluya así.

There's no rule, we tried to do it in a way that he would help me with my English, but it didn't work [laughs] [...] so yea, we just let it flow.

Daniela reported that she had interrupted the general pattern of no management for a short while when trying to create explicit management for David to speak English. She wanted to shield herself from Spanish to improve her English, and given David's ease of communication in English she considered him a source of English practice. This is an example of Scenario E, exemplified below by Maritza's conscious attempts to introduce more English use into the family. In Daniela's case, however, it was only a one-time verbal request to her son, to which he replied with laughter and refusal because she was his mother and in his eyes presumably a Spanish-speaker. This is similar to the reaction De Houwer's (2009) daughter showed when her mother spoke a different language with her from the one to which she was used. Likewise, despite Daniela's request, David continued to speak mostly Spanish. While his refusal hindered his mother's attempts to practise English, it proved beneficial for his Spanish development.

Overall, David typically used Spanish in interaction with his parents and only sometimes filled in English words. His Spanish phrases included the use of different tenses and aspects, question-answer sequences, requests and commands. Given that he was only a few months old upon arrival in a *de facto* English-speaking country, he could only have acquired the Spanish language from his family and a few other Spanish-speaking friends. His proficiency underscored the remarkable influence of his family on his language development that Fishman (1991) identified as essential for LM.

A contributing factor to David's language development was the parents' use of a child-oriented style (Döpke 1992). David was frequently encouraged to participate in conversations with his parents, and invitations to recount the day's events were common (such as Daniela saying *y entonces, cuéntame más, ¿que hiciste hoy en el día?* 'so tell me more, what did you do today?', or the father asking *¿que hiciste en la casa de Gabriela?* 'what did you do at Gabriela's place?'). This socialisation style involving a richness of questions is typical of child-directed speech (Beals & Snow 2002) and has been commonly found in Hispanic

families (Ervin-Tripp & Strage 1985; see also Blum-Kulka 1997 for North American families).

David was also exposed to Spanish conversations in his family. Especially in migratory contexts where the only language input children receive is speech addressed to them, they may experience difficulty with grammatical and pragmatic aspects, such as using pronouns, understanding irony and assuming different speaker roles (Blum-Kulka & Snow 2002a:6). They may also not be used to registers and styles used in communication among adults. Nevertheless, children who participate in multi-party interactions as addressees and overhearers (Bell 2001) are exposed to a wider range of structures and styles (see for example the contributions in Blum-Kulka & Snow 2002b). Whereas David's parents and older brother simplified their Spanish when talking to David (Snow & Ferguson 1979), they used a more elaborate style and dealt with more complex topics when talking to each other. This access to other Spanish conversations directly exposed David to adult topics, discussions of everyday problems and simple and complex narratives about past and future events (Snow & Beals 2006:53). All these contributed to furthering his knowledge of different Spanish styles and registers.

5.3.2.2 English use in the family

Along with Spanish, David also employed an approximately equal amount of English and Mixed utterances, in which he code-switched intra-sententially. The recordings showed that these two types constituted almost one third of his utterances suggesting that his home domain represented a bilingual context. His parents had commented previously that David spoke a mixture of Spanish and English and *especially when the words [were] shorter he prefer[red] to say them in English*. Overall, similar to the children in Pan's (1995) study, David used more English and code-switching than his parents, especially for nouns. For example, David referred to *spiderman* in English, although the term *Hombre Araña* [man spider] is widespread in Spanish-speaking countries.

D: Hay *spidermans*, okay, hay *spiders*.

E: Hay muchas arañas //xxx\.

D: /Sí.\

D: There are *spidermans*, okay, there are *spiders*.

E: There are many spiders //xxx\.

D: Yes.

Typically thinking and talking about *spiderman* in English probably helped David to retrieve the English lexeme ‘spider’ more easily, so that he inserted it into an otherwise Spanish phrase (see Oller et al. 2011).

David also differentiated between interlocutors (see Quay 2008). He occasionally used English with his father in particular, but less frequently with his mother. His choice was exemplified in the following turns addressed at his father and his mother respectively while the family made cupcakes:

[to father] *Daddy, I like (from jelly)! [laughs loudly]*
 [to mother] *Mami, quiero comer un apito³¹ de esto, de chocolate.*

[to father] *Daddy, I like (from jelly)! [laughs loudly]*
 [to mother] *Mami, I want to eat a bit of this, of the chocolate.*

In this extract, David initiated two new topics and produced two uninterrupted utterances, one addressed to his father and one to his mother, both initially marked by a direct summons. While the utterance directed at the father was in English, he addressed his mother in Spanish. Given that the father used more English with David than the mother, David’s interlocutor-specific choices may be related to the respective parent’s language choices with him (see below) (De Houwer 2007; Genesee, Boivin & Nicoladis 1996; cf. Genesee, Nicoladis & Paradis 1995). It may also reflect his understanding of his parents’ degree of integration into local society and language proficiency. His father spent more time outside the home integrated into New Zealand society, whereas the mother only worked in occasional cleaning jobs.

Both Daniela and Eduardo occasionally mixed English into their Spanish when they spoke with David. They were less stringent with their Spanish use than other minority language-speaking parents who interacted almost entirely in their ethnic language (e.g. Comeau, Genesee & Lapaquette 2003; Chevalier 2012). Eduardo used English more often, which may be linked to the fact that he worked in an English environment. When I collected the recordings from the family, he expressed that he was used to living in New Zealand now and emphasised the effect on his language habits: *uno se da cuenta que uno, en cuanto al idioma, uno cambia bastante* ‘you notice that you change a lot in terms of language’. In contrast, Daniela only rarely practiced her English, and David’s refusal to speak English might have discouraged her from using the language. The parents’ occasional use of a mixed code is

³¹ The parents explained that David often used *apito* to mean *poquito* ‘a little bit’.

relevant given findings that parental language choice strongly impacted on their children's minority language proficiency (see Hakuta 1991). Those Mexican-American parents in Hakuta's study who spoke Spanish in the home had children who were more proficient in Spanish. It is therefore possible that Daniela and Eduardo's frequent switches to English may have negatively affected David's Spanish proficiency.

These switches usually occurred in the form of short formulaic sequences (Wray 2002), borrowings, colours and intensification of requests. The parents used English sequences within Spanish discourse, such as *good boy* and *Es*³²*time to sleep*. In addition, they filled empty slots in these with Spanish lexical items. For example, Daniela used *Es time to comer* 'It's time to eat', where a Spanish lexical item filled the slot in an English sequence (see Schmitt & Carter 2004:6, 7). Moreover, perhaps as a result of a lexical gap (Goodz 1994; Nicoladis & Secco 2000), Daniela used the borrowing *lunchbox*, embedded into the phrase with a Spanish article.

E: [...] *Ahí la mamá trae la maleta.*
 Dan: *Y el lunchbox.*
 D: [quietly] *El lunchbox?*

E: [...] *And there mummy brings the backpack.*
 Dan: *And the lunchbox.*
 D: [quietly] *The lunchbox?*

The term *lunchbox* might be a conceptual lexical gap which had only come into use after the family's move to New Zealand, where children usually take a lunchbox to school. This lexical gap was supported by accounts from another participant, who found it emotionally difficult to send her children away with a small lunchbox, whilst in Colombia she would give them fully cooked meals of rice and beans. This was reflective of the difference between the New Zealand habit of taking small meals for lunch, in contrast to the greater importance attributed to lunch in Colombia.

Furthermore, the parents usually referred to colours in English because they claimed that David recognised them more easily. This is perhaps a result of having learned them at day care, like De Houwer's (2009) three-year-old informant who preferred to express colours in the majority language (see also Oller et al. 2011). In addition, the parents occasionally switched to English seemingly to intensify their requests during transactional talk (Blum-Kulka 2002:91). Daniela used this style especially frequently, perhaps because she, as his

³² It is unclear whether they used Spanish *es* 'it is' or whether this represented final consonant cluster reduction in *it's*, common for Spanish speakers of English (Bayley 1994) as well as for native speakers.

mother, had the main responsibility of raising David. On occasions of great resistance, Daniela incorporated English into her requests.

*Abre la boca. + Por favor David. + **You promise me** ++ **You promise me.***

*M: Open your mouth. + Please David. + **You promise me.** ++ **You promise me.***

Similar to what has been shown about the practices of bilingual families in Finland and Israel (Moin et al. 2013), Daniela used her language switch as a ‘contextualisation cue’ (Gumperz 1982) to “wake up” (Moin et al. 2013:73) the child’s attention. After her failed attempts in Spanish to persuade David to eat, she resorted to English as a means of strengthening her request. Interestingly, her language change finally elicited a reaction from David. Perhaps Daniela believed that the English language had more affirmative strength and thus gave more weight to her exhortation. Alternatively, the sequential organisation of having two languages juxtaposed may have achieved a statement-enforcing effect (Auer 1995), so that a language switch reinforced her request.

Overall, the parents’ use of English in the home interactions probably socialised David into using both languages together (Genesee, Boivin & Nicoladis 1996), as indicated by his large range of English utterances. Similar to Zentella’s (1997) observations in New York City, a mixed code may thus be the unmarked language choice within the family especially for David.

5.3.2.3 Parental discourse styles

To investigate this further, this section examines Daniela and Eduardo’s immediate reactions to David’s English use. Although they could not remember who advised them, they were told that instead of correcting David, it was better to repeat his utterances in Spanish (Lanza’s (2004) “repetition strategy”). Nevertheless, the way they explained their reactions to his code-switching implied that, instead of repeating, they simply moved the conversation on in Spanish. Depending on their feedback in this immediate language context (Lanza 2004), they may either signal to David that his code-switching is acceptable or that he is expected to switch back to Spanish (as discussed in Section 2.2.3.3). David’s switches to English with his parents elicited different discourse styles from them as represented in the following chart (size of circle reflects frequency of use):

Figure 5.2 Daniela and Eduardo's discourse styles (based on Lanza 2004 and King & Logan-Terry 2008)

Daniela and Eduardo exclusively used styles on the right side of the continuum, which Lanza (2004) would argue create a bilingual context signalling to the child the acceptability of using English. David's parents most typically used the move-on style as they indicated their understanding but continued to use Spanish (Lanza 2004:265). They occasionally inserted his English phrases into their Spanish responses (King & Logan-Terry 2008) and also code-switched. Only very rarely did they repeat David's utterances in Spanish. Overall, their typical use of the move-on style accompanied by occasional expansions signalled a clearly bilingual context to David. The following extract illustrates such a move-on style as David and Eduardo are playing a game:

D: *I gonna fall down.*

E: *No te caigas, ven.*

D: *I gonna crash.*

E: *Y qué me cuentas como- ¿Qué hiciste en la casa de Gabriela?*

D: *I gonna fall down*

E: *Don't fall, come!*

D: *I gonna crash*

E: *And what can you tell me, what did you do at Gabriela's place today?*

After David's first switch to English, Eduardo used a move-on style as he carried on the topic but responded in Spanish. David did not seem to perceive Eduardo's language choice as a request for him to use Spanish; instead, he continued to use English, and Eduardo initiated a new topic in Spanish.

As I discussed in Section 2.2.3.2, a wealth of terminology exists to describe such scenarios, with each term drawing attention to a distinct aspect of the process. First, as mentioned above, a move-on style is one possible answer to the child's code-switching from a parental discourse perspective. If parents consistently use a move-on style combined with the child's use of English, the result is an interaction in which two languages are used side-by-side, a so-called 'dilingual interaction' (Saville-Troike 1987; see also Pauwels 2005:126) or 'parallel mode' (Gafaranga & Calvo 2001). These two terms direct attention to the emerging product, that is, an interaction involving two different languages. Some researchers have directed the

focus onto the children by referring to ‘language negotiation’ (Auer 1984) and a ‘medium request’ sequence (Gafaranga 2010), presupposing that, whether conscious or subconscious, the bilingual conversation may effect a language change. For example, while David and Daniela made muffins, a bilingual interaction emerged through Daniela’s use of the move-on styleover for six turns until a new topic was initiated:

D: *Mamá, look, is one missing.*

Mami, + look, is one missing.

Dan: *Sí, pero no cabe eso, no alcanzo.*

[change of topic as David, Eduardo and Daniela talk together in Spanish] [...]

D: *Come on, you can do it, mummy!*

M: *Ya se acabó.*

D: *Pero is one missing right there!*

M: *Pero no hay más. Toca dejarlo así.*

D: *Mum, look is one missing.*

Mami look is one missing.

Dan: *Yes, but it doesn’t fit, I don’t have more.*

[change of topic as David, Eduardo and Daniela talk together in Spanish] [...]

D: *Come on, you can do it, mummy!*

M: *It’s already finished.*

D: *But is one missing right there!*

M: *But there are no more. We have to leave it like this.*

David excitedly drew his mother’s attention to the fact that she needed to put more chocolate sprinkles on the cake and in the interaction that followed, a medium request sequence (Gafaranga 2010) emerged in which David implicitly, but actively, insisted on using English. These medium requests only occurred in the direction of English, but the parents typically responded in Spanish without giving in to David’s implicit request.

Only rarely did the parents code-switch after David used English. One reason for doing so was their typical repetition of David’s utterances, usually in the language used by David. Ratifying his use of English and incorporating the English item in their speech meant that their response opened up a bilingual context (see King & Logan-Terry 2008).

D: *Papi + [shouts] YEA, WE DID IT*

DADDY!

E: *We did it yea.*

D: *Ganamos both game.*

E: *Ganamos both game.*

D: *Daddy + [shouts] YEA, WE DID IT*

DADDY!

E: *We did it yea.*

D: *We won both game.*

E: *We won both game.*

The above example illustrated Eduardo’s repetition of two of David’s utterances, one of them completely in English and one of them with an intra-sentential code-switch. The wider context showed, however, that the parents sometimes repeated the word in Spanish at a later point. For example, while the father first echoed both *spider* and *back* in English in the following interaction, he later used Spanish *espalda* to refer to ‘back’:

D: *Papi mira, papi mira, ¡yo tengo un spider aquí en mi back!*

E: *No tienes un spider en tu back, no.*

D: *Sí, como ésta, + como ésta, papá, + como ésta, papá.*

E: *Pero spiderman no tiene en la espalda, si, ¿no?*

D: *Sí, + spiderman tiene spiders, ¡mira!*

E: *Pero no en la espalda. ++ En la espalda no tiene nada.*

D: *Daddy look, daddy look, I have a spider here on my back!*

E: *You don't have a spider on your back, no?*

D: *Yes, like this one, + like this one daddy, + like this one, daddy.*

E: *But spiderman doesn't have one on the back, right?*

D: *Yes, + spiderman has spiders, look.*

E: *But not on his back. ++ He doesn't have anything on his back.*

The father may have repeated the English words to affirm his son's utterance, as did the caretakers in King and Logan-Terry's (2008) study. His eventual switch back to Spanish, however, suggests that he ultimately aimed to model the Spanish words.

Although most of the parents' switches were indeed expansions that incorporated the English word into a Spanish utterance, Daniela and Eduardo sometimes followed David's language choice and produced whole utterances in English.

D: *Daddy, I'm this one. //I'm this one daddy, I'm this one. ++ I'm this one daddy, I'm this one daddy.*

/[parents talk to each other in Spanish]\\

E: *Yea, you're the spoon. ++ Pero no la [drawls] riegues.*

D: *Daddy, I'm this one. //I'm this one daddy, I'm this one. ++ I'm this one daddy, I'm this one daddy.*

/[parents talk to each other in Spanish]\\

E: *Yea, you're the spoon. ++ But don't [drawls] spill it.*

In this extract, Eduardo did not directly repeat David's code-switch. However, after discussing a different topic with Daniela briefly, thereby treating David as an unrati ed participant (Goffman 1976), he elaborated David's utterance by adding in English *yea, you're the spoon*. These code-switches represented a very small amount of the parents' responses.

Daniela and Eduardo's frequent use of discourse styles located on the right side of the continuum may have contributed to David's perception of their interactions as a bilingual context where both Spanish and English were appropriate. He continued to use mostly Spanish, but switched to English occasionally either for complete phrases or in the form of intra-utterance code-switching. However, David's active command of Spanish suggests that the parents may have changed their discourse style only recently. This is possible as they were monolingual in Spanish initially, whereas they later acquired English as an additional resource. In addition, David's increased knowledge of English over time as he attended day care may have contributed to their more bilingual approach, as has been documented in a number of other cases (see discussion in Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal 2001:82; Prevoo et al.

2011). Such a change in their interactional discourse style could help to explain David's skilled and predominant use of Spanish, while at the same time providing an explanation for his frequent switches to English.

In summary, David appeared to have a good command of Spanish enabling him to express a number of his thoughts and actions. This was remarkable given that he acquired most of his skills through communication in the home in an immigrant context, and it may be a reflection of the rich and child-directed Spanish input he received from his family. Daniela and Eduardo occasionally introduced English into the interaction, at times seemingly without pattern and at other times for the purpose of referring to colours or intensifying their request. They generally reacted to David's code-switching with a move-on style, signalling their understanding and then proceeding in Spanish. In addition, they expanded on his code-switches in Spanish, incorporating the English word(s). Although they never produced longer stretches of talk in English, they occasionally also yielded to his implicit language request (Gafaranga 2010).

The next case study describes a mother whose child largely used English as a result of a lack of language management.

5.3.3 Socialisation Scenario D: Laura's failed teaching attempts

Management	Practices
No management	English is typically used

Family members: Laura (mother), Estefanía (daughter, age 15),
 Ana (daughter, age 17), Esteban (son, age 3)
 Length of stay: 1 ½ years

Three-year-old Esteban was born in Ecuador and arrived in New Zealand at the age of two. His family included his mother Laura and his two teenage sisters, who had spent their formative years in Spanish-speaking countries and used Spanish when speaking with Esteban (see Barron-Hauwaert 2010:54). While Laura used no explicit language management, she regularly used Spanish with her older daughters, which meant that Esteban was exposed to Spanish conversation although he was raised by a single parent (see Yates & Terraschke 2013:119). Laura also cared deeply about Esteban's current and future ability to speak

Spanish. Disregarding the fact that language skills are usually maintained through practice (see e.g. Yamamoto 2001), she asserted that *lo importante es que sepa cómo se llaman las cosas en español* ('the important thing is that he knows what things are called in Spanish') even if he did not always decide to use Spanish. Based on her statement, she may have been aiming for receptive Spanish proficiency for her son, but this was not corroborated by her wish to enable him to speak with his extended family in Colombia. Like Daniela in the previous case study, she adopted a laissez-faire policy (Curd-Christiansen 2013).

5.3.3.1 Spanish socialisation

Despite her overall lack of management, Laura provided occasional Spanish lessons for her son (see Tamis-LeMonda & Rodriguez 2008). In general, these lessons served to strengthen Esteban's Spanish skills, which Laura felt very confident about. When asked if she was ever worried about communication with him in the future, she denied this and accentuated her own influence on her son's proficiency:

<p><i>No, porque yo sé que el habla perfectamente el español, entiende. Si yo sigo constantemente enseñándole los dos idiomas, entonces no.</i></p>	<p><i>No, because I know that he speaks Spanish perfectly, he understands. If I continue to constantly teach him both languages, then no.</i></p>
---	---

Laura's comment highlights both her appreciation of Esteban's Spanish proficiency and her awareness of her own responsibility to teach him Spanish. She claimed that although he occasionally had difficulty pronouncing Spanish words, he understood everything. Moreover, she reported that he differentiated between English- and Spanish-speaking interlocutors by generally converging with their language choice (see Giles & Smith 1979) and that she deduced from this that he knew the difference between the two languages. Her explicit teaching methods (see Döpke 1992) involved pointing out words in two languages:

<p><i>Mas yo le digo 'zapatos' en español, los 'shoes' en inglés, entonces le enseño como la diferencia.</i></p>	<p><i>And I tell him 'zapatos' in Spanish, 'shoes' in English, so I teach him the difference.</i></p>
--	---

On other occasions, she deliberately exposed him to Spanish media which allowed him access to vocabulary (see Lin & Siyanova 2014). She claimed for example that he learnt the numbers in Spanish from cartoons. These efforts signalled her involvement in her son's

Spanish development and underscored her perception of minority language socialisation as ‘Visible Work’ (Schwartz & Verschik 2013) and a deliberate teaching effort.

Despite Laura’s claims that Esteban learnt in this way, her teaching methods may not have furnished the expected results. When asked by his mother on the recording to say colours and numbers, Esteban knew the term for the colour ‘grey’ only in English and also had difficulty counting in Spanish (whereas he could easily count aloud in English). Admittedly, he was only three years old and many children learn terms for colours and numbers only later.

Moreover, he may have had more receptive than productive proficiency, a finding quite common for children learning an additional language (see Ollers et al. 2011). As David’s family in the previous case study had argued, Esteban too may have been more familiar with numbers and colours in English because he frequently used them at childcare. Nevertheless, Laura claimed that she taught her son these words, and he seemingly could not express them in Spanish. Thus, Esteban’s actual productive proficiency and Laura’s assertions about his high Spanish fluency and the success of her teaching efforts were incongruent.

One way to account for Esteban’s failure to perform in Spanish is by drawing attention to the strong English influence in his life. Throughout the whole observation period, he heard English occasionally from his mother and sisters, but his main English influence occurred at childcare. Laura reasoned that speaking English at childcare was good for him.

<i>Acá lo que se necesita aprender es el idioma, es el inglés, y todo el mundo habla inglés, entonces es necesario que primero el inglés.</i>	<i>What he needs to learn here is the English language, and everyone speaks English, so it’s necessary for him to first learn English.</i>
---	--

Laura also indicated that she sometimes used a move-on style and let Esteban speak English without correcting his language choice. For example she recalled that he often said *I’m going toilet* and *what*, and she freely let him say those words in English, thus providing a bilingual context (Lanza 2004).

Research found that many parents were so pleased that their children engaged in interaction that language choice was secondary and they often refrained from correcting them (see Goodz 1994; King & Logan-Terry 2008). It seemed that Laura wanted to encourage Esteban to continue speaking and therefore valued his contributions more than she was bothered by his choice of the majority language. This is in fact reflective of the different agendas of people involved in this research. As a sociolinguist, I was naturally interested in the families’

language use; however, the families generally cared about many different aspects such as the child's happiness, comfort, nourishment and education, clearly suggesting that monitoring language choice was simply not their highest priority.

5.3.3.2 Language negotiation

Although Laura conveyed a positive impression of Esteban's Spanish proficiency, the recordings provide the overall impression that Esteban understood his mother's questions, but that he could not respond to them in Spanish. Laura asked him many questions to elicit information about his day, but Esteban only engaged in her conversation efforts reluctantly, and instead often remained silent or laughed. Esteban's involvement in this interaction was limited to four (Spanish) words (*bien, nada, sí, no* 'good, nothing, yes, no') which he produced at appropriate places in the conversation. However, it is unclear at this stage whether he was simply unwilling to talk (he might have been tired after spending a long day in childcare) or whether he was unable to produce more utterances in Spanish.

L: Esteban, ¿cómo le fue en la guardería hoy?

E: Bien.

L: ¿Bien? ¿Y se portó bien?

E: [no audible answer]

L: Y ¿qué más hizo?

E: Hm.

L: ¿Jugó?

E: Sí, sí.

L: Sí. Ah ya. Y ¿usted estuvo hablando esta semana con su tía?

E: Sí.

L: Y ¿qué le contó su tía?

E: Nada.

L: ¿Nada le contó?

E: No.

L: Pero ella me estaba diciendo que usted le estaba hablando mucho inglés.

*E: // [laughs] *

*L: /Hm? *

L: Esteban, how was childcare today?

E: Good.

L: Good? And did you behave well?

E: [no audible answer]

L: And what else did you do?

E: Hm.

L: Did you play?

E: Yes, yes.

L: Yes. Ah ya. And did you talk to your auntie this week?

E: Yes.

L: And what did your auntie tell you?

E: Nothing.

L: She told you nothing?

E: No.

L: But she told me that you spoke a lot of English with her.

*E: // [laughs] *

*L: /Hm? *

The extract provides data on Laura's interactional behaviour, suggesting that Laura spoke fast and gave Esteban little "wait time" (Cazden 1990) to let him answer before she repeated her question or moved topic. Researching teachers' behaviour in classrooms, Cazden showed that wait time of about three seconds after a teacher's question considerably increased the length and complexity of the students' answers. In contrast, waiting less than three seconds typically

produced less complex answers. Equally in the home domain, a lack of wait time, indicative of fast-paced interaction, may inhibit more complex utterances by the child.

This observation is particularly relevant here because through Esteban's early exposure to English in day care Spanish is likely to have become his less dominant language (see Chumak-Horbatsch 2008) and interactions may therefore require more response time (see Sandoval et al. 2010). In fact, his language preference may have shifted between the time that I interviewed his mother and the actual recordings of his speech a few months later. Laura's reported satisfaction with Esteban's Spanish performance contrasted with her later claim that she found recording him difficult because he usually spoke English. The influence of English on Esteban's speech production was more obvious on other recordings when he attempted to contribute more elaborately to the interaction in Spanish. He mixed both Spanish and English, with English usually being the dominant language in the interaction.

L: *Está orinado. ¿Se orinó o no en el baño?*
 Ves, ¿se orinó en los pantalones?
 E: No.
 L: *Y en la cama ¿por qué se orina?*
 E: **No I no orina in the cama.**
 L: **No? Yes.**
 E: **No.**³³
 L: **Yes, sí.**
 E: No.
 L: **Sometimes.**
 E: No.
 L: **Yes.**
 E: No.
 L: **Why not?**
 E: **I'm a** </kirititi/?>.
 L: *Sí, pero usted a veces se orina en la guardería.*
 E: **Me? No.**
 L: *¿Qué?*
 E: **I only do it in the toilet**
 L: *Ah ya. Porque los niños que se orinan en la en la cama + ¡uy no!*
 E: **They are ba//by\.**
 L: */Son chiquitos\\ claro.*
 E: **And the baby go in the big sandpit.**

L: *You've peed in your pants. Did you pee in the bathroom or not? See, did you pee in your pants?*
 E: No.
 L: *And why do you pee in bed?*
 E: **No I don't pee in the bed.**
 L: **No? Yes.**
 E: No.
 L: **Yes, yes.**
 E: No.
 L: *Sometimes.*
 E: No.
 L: **Yes.**
 E: No.
 L: *Why not?*
 E: **I'm a** </kirititi/?>.
 L: *Yes, but sometimes you pee at childcare.*
 E: **Me? No.**
 L: *What?*
 E: **I only do it in the toilet.**
 L: *Ah ya. Because those children that pee in bed + oh no!*
 E: **They are //baby\.**
 L: */They are little ones\\ of course.*
 E: **And the baby go in the big sandpit.**

At the beginning, Esteban drew on both Spanish and English to convey that he did not urinate in his bed. Both languages have a similar surface structure for *No I no orina in the cama*, which means that the identification of the matrix language requires investigation beyond the

³³ The language assigned to the negation depended on whether a diphthong or monophthong was produced.

surface structure. It is therefore noteworthy that the English elements furnish a negator, a pronoun, a preposition and an article, thus making English the ‘matrix language’ by virtue of its use for most function words (Myers-Scotton 1997). In contrast, Esteban used mainly Spanish content words, such as the verb (incorrectly copying the polite second singular inflection from Laura’s question) and noun. It is difficult to differentiate whether he used a Spanish negation structure or simply a Spanish negator because Spanish and English both negate only pre-verbally. Given that Spanish furnished more content words, it is more likely to be the less dominant, embedded language (Myers-Scotton 1997). The only structural influence from Spanish is the use of the definite article *the* before *cama*, an article not required in the English structure (‘in _ bed’ vs. ‘en la cama’). Although Esteban made initial efforts to insert Spanish, he reasoned with his mother exclusively in English at the end of the extract, which led to dilingual discourse (Saville-Troike 1987).

Laura combined different discourse responses (Lanza 2004) when David used English. The extract illustrates her use of code-switching (*No? yes!*), a move-on style (*Ah ya. porque los niños que se orinan...*), repetition (*Son chiquitos, claro*) and minimal grasps (*Qué?*). These styles are located along Lanza’s continuum (described in Chapter 2), opening up both monolingual and bilingual contexts. However, the minimal grasp responses may not have represented requests for Esteban to switch. Instead, Laura may have expressed her sincere lack of understanding and asked Esteban to clarify. Most notably, her discourse responses did not effectuate a switch to Spanish.

Although Esteban never explicitly asked for a language change, his requests occurred implicitly through language negotiation (Gafaranga 2010). The recordings showed that he often opted for English and Laura agreed to conversations in a dilingual style (Saville-Troike 1987; Gafaranga 2010). However, since Laura was still learning English and found understanding him difficult, Esteban’s language choice at times led to communication breakdowns. This is exemplified in the following dialogue between the two:

L: Y en la escuela en la guardería ¿qué hace?

E: Ran.

L: Hum?

E: Ran.

L: Rent?

E: RAN! ran [laughs]

L: ¿Qué es eso?, que yo no le entiendo.

E: /Mehem mehemai/ escuela

L: Hm uhuh.

L: And at school – at day care – what do you do?

E: Ran.

L: Hm?

E: Ran.

L: Rent?

E: RAN! Ran [laughs]

L: What’s that, I don’t understand you.

E: (unclear) school.

L: Hm uhuh.

Laura asked Esteban what he did at childcare, and he explained that he ‘ran’. His English language choice first of all leads to a meaning negotiation sequence, where, as Gass and Selinker define it, “participants need to interrupt the flow of the conversation in order for both parties to understand what the conversation is about” (1994:209). Laura requested clarification (Long 1981) (*‘hum?’*), and after Esteban simply repeated *ran*, she tried to obtain a confirmation check by asking *rent?* (Long 1980:81,82). As an answer to this, Esteban raised his voice and shouted ‘ran’, subsequently recapping it at quieter volume. Laura then used another clarification request, or minimal grasp strategy (Lanza 2004), saying *what’s that, I don’t understand you* to elicit another repetition from him, possibly again in English or in Spanish. Esteban’s response was unclear, but he ended it saying *school* in Spanish, which suggests that he tried to accommodate to Laura’s language choice. However, this was unsuccessful because her falling intonation, the tone of her voice and her initiation of a new topic suggests that she had not understood his comment by the end of the exchange.

Overall, Laura made efforts to teach Esteban both English and Spanish by pointing out differences in vocabulary and by directing his media exposure to cartoons in Spanish. Her socialisation style was child-centred involving questions and simple content, but she moved on quickly whenever Esteban did not react immediately, thus possibly stifling his attempts to answer in Spanish. Esteban tried to speak Spanish at times, but it seemed that he lacked sufficient vocabulary to make himself understood. The interactions between mother and son reflected that he might no longer have felt comfortable speaking Spanish. He communicated in English most of the time, which contributed to communication breakdowns.

The next case study exemplifies an attempt to promote English use within the family.

5.3.4 Socialisation Scenario E: Maritza’s English management

Management		Practices
English-only management		Spanish is typically used
Family members:	Maritza (mother), son (age 3), son (age 7), daughter (age 10), son (age 13)	
Length of stay:	1 ½ years	

Three families in my sample attempted to deliberately introduce English into the home domain. Maritza’s efforts to change language use in her family from the minority to the majority language were particularly remarkable. She arrived in New Zealand one-and-a-half

years ago with her four children now aged three, seven, ten and 13. All were monolingual in Spanish, and she reported that they found living in New Zealand and speaking English difficult, and that her seven-year-old son experienced many language problems due to his low English proficiency. Maritza's persuasion that they needed to use more English in the home was based on the perceived need for her children to use English at school (see also Okita 2002:118), and the *status quo*, namely that they only spoke Spanish in her home, which in her view impeded them from learning English fast enough:

Ellos no quieren ver nada ni noticias en inglés, si hay muñequitos quieren ver en español y es muy constante el español en la casa, y es más lo que pasan en la casa de lo que pasan en la calle con la gente inglesa.

They don't want to see anything, not even news, in English. If there are cartoons, they want to see them in Spanish, and Spanish is very constant in the house. And also they spend more time in the home than on the streets talking to English people.

This fear may seem logical to some extent for immigrant families who feel overwhelmed by their lack of understanding in the host country. However, as previously noted, this reduction of input in each language in bilingual situations does not significantly reduce the speed that children attain proficiency in either language (Hammer et al. 2012; Hoff et al. 2012; Meakins & Wigglesworth 2013). On the contrary, one can clearly build on the skills in the minority language as “common underlying proficiency” may facilitate acquisition of the majority language (Cummins 1979; 2000). Cognitive effects of bilingualism lead to, over time, bilinguals outperforming monolinguals in certain tasks (Bialystok & Feng 2009). However, given that this information was not available to Maritza, she opted to introduce English into the home because she believed that extensive Spanish use may hinder her children's acquisition of English.

Her disappointment that the children were exposed to and preferred Spanish, and her persuasion that English needed to be spoken in home, effectively matches what has recently been stated in a report by the New Zealand Office of Ethnic Affairs (Internal Affairs 2014). The report suggests that it is ultimately beneficial for children to practice the majority language in the home because it allegedly enables them to integrate faster. However, academic scholarly research clearly indicates that this is contentious. Contrary to popular belief, children may benefit from rich socialisation in the minority language in the home and a separation between home and school language (a so-called ‘cleft-habitus’ in Bourdieu's 2007:69 terminology) is not linked to any negative results (Cummins 1984:44). While the

Office of Ethnic Affairs report was only published after I collected my data, Maritza's quotes indicates that such contested thinking is already present in immigrant families and official reinforcement of it may be detrimental to the health of minority languages.

Alongside the main statement of the report, Maritza also recognised that the linguistic capital of New Zealand society is English (Bourdieu 1991) and use of the language is essential to access various types of social, educational and economic opportunities:

Porque yo sé que el español es la lengua nativa de nosotros, pero el problema es que nuestro español no nos sirve de nada y nosotros estamos en un país donde se habla inglés. Y nosotros tenemos que aprender inglés para podernos desempeñar [...].

Because I know that Spanish is our native language, but the problem is that Spanish doesn't help us at all, and we're in a country that speaks English. And we have to learn English to manage life [...].

Maritza appeared to believe that both Spanish and English are valuable, but she considered that in their current location only English was useful. As a result, she engaged with creative language socialisation attempts and used media, games and general persuasion to provide her children with opportunities to speak English. For example, she reported transforming her children's enjoyment for watching movies into a language learning opportunity (Lin & Siyanova 2014):

[...] pues, ver una película y una serie animada es una diversión para ellos, como entretenimiento, porque nosotros no salimos a ningún lado. [...] entonces lo único que puedo hacer es - si es una película, la vamos a poner en inglés para que se involucren bastante con el idioma.

[...] well, watching movies and cartoons is fun for them, like entertainment, because we don't go anywhere. [...] so the only thing I can do is that when we watch a movie, I can put it on in English so that they can get involved with the language.

Given the rich socialisation opportunities at the dinner table (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1997), Maritza tried to foster an atmosphere of speaking English when the family came together to eat: *a veces les digo "vengan a comer y hablen en ingles"* ('sometimes I tell them "come to eat and speak English"'). In addition, she even introduced games to promote her children's acquisition of English:

Algunas veces algunas cosas yo pronuncio en inglés, y a veces hacemos un ejercicio en casa. Digo vamos a aprender tantas palabras y todo eso, y al final de la semana quien me lo diga yo le doy un premio.

Sometimes I pronounce some things in English, and sometimes we do exercises at home. I say we're going to learn so-and-so many words and so on, and I give a prize to who can say them to me at the end of the week.

Her ten-year-old daughter, who was living with her Spanish monolingual father at the time of the interview, remembered the incentives offered for performing well in English:

Con mi mama siempre hablé español. A veces hacía estudios, ella tapaba los libros y uno tenía que decir las palabras de memoria. Y si uno lo decía, le compraba una caja de chocolates. Pero nunca gané una.

I always spoke Spanish with my mother. Sometimes she did studies [in English], like she covered the books and you had to say the words by heart. And if you said them, she bought you a box of chocolates. But I never won one.

Her daughter, who never actually won a box of chocolates, suggests that Maritza's attempts to direct language choice were not always well received. Likewise, Maritza recalled her children's negative reaction to introducing English into the home:

A veces he tratado que hablemos inglés en casa, pero "ay no, no me hable, que no le entiendo".

Sometimes I've tried for all of us to speak English in the house, but "oh no, don't speak to me, I don't understand you".

While Maritza clearly emphasised the need to teach English, she did not consider it essential to undertake Spanish LM efforts. It seemed that as a result of Spanish supremacy in the home, she took Spanish for granted and adhered to an ideology that it could not be lost:

Yo creo que es muy difícil que pierdan el español. Me parece algo imposible. [...] por el momento lo veo imposible que entre los colombianos suceda esto.

I believe that it's very difficult that they lose Spanish. It seems impossible to me. [...] at the moment I consider it impossible that something like that would happen among the Colombians.

For example, she did not believe that her children needed Spanish classes at this stage:

Aquí no. Porque estamos en la edad de que aprendan el inglés y no el español.

Not here. Because we're at a stage where they have to learn English, not Spanish.

She argued that even the other students and teachers at school complained about the Colombian students' constant use of Spanish and their frequent laughter, as their inability to understand made them feel insecure. Maritza reported that the mothers met the teachers and willingly agreed that their children should only speak English at school out of respect for the other students in the class. Furthermore, they asked the teachers to enforce this rule. Thus, they contributed to the development of English-only management at the school and further limited Spanish socialisation opportunities.

Although Maritza emphasised the need to use English, she claimed that the language situation was different for younger children or those who were born in New Zealand. She admitted that

she experienced communication breakdowns (Wong Fillmore 1991) with her youngest child as he occasionally brought home new English words that she did not understand:

El más pequeño a veces me dice algunas cosas en inglés y no le entiendo, el más bebecito. Todo el resto, los otros no, sólo el más pequeño a veces se viene con cosas nuevas de la guardería y algunas cosas. Pues yo no le entiendo y le digo pues que sí porque yo no entiendo nada.

The smallest sometimes says some things to me in English and I don't understand him, the little one. The rest, all the others not, only the little one sometimes comes home with words from childcare and some things. Well, I don't understand him and I usually say 'yes' to him because I don't understand anything.

Maritza expressed her worry about communication with her three-year-old son because of his use of English in the home and her inability to understand. As noted above, research has documented the dangers of children losing their competence in the ethnic language if they are exposed to the majority language at an early age (see Montrul 2008). Due to Maritza's little knowledge of English, her son's use of the majority language actually hindered communication and impaired their mother-son relationship. Furthermore, Maritza planned to visit her mother in Colombia once she obtained New Zealand citizenship, and she feared that her youngest son would by then have forgotten Spanish.

Overall, however, her concern about his Spanish erosion was overshadowed by her strong conviction that her older children needed to acquire the majority language, possibly because she perceived their language difficulties as a hindrance to their smooth integration into the school system (Baetens Beardsmore 2003). This view contributed to her use of diverse methods to introduce English in the home domain for all, including her youngest child.

5.4 Summary

Overall, many Colombian families had strong ethnic identities which they imparted to their children (Guardado 2008b). They considered the Colombian variety of Spanish a source of pride and a core value integral to their cultural identity (Smolicz 1992). Nevertheless, many mothers focused on their children's acquisition of English, also a world language and (contestably the only) cultural capital for New Zealand (Bourdieu 1991). This was evidenced by the low rate of explicit Spanish management (Scenario A only applied to three families and Scenario B to none) and occasional English use in the home even by parents. The lack of emphasis on teaching Spanish may, arguably, be explained by the early stages of their

migration journey because many children had not yet shown signs of shifting away from Spanish.

The four case studies exemplified several issues that arose in the family language management situation. First of all, the explicit management in Sofia's family coupled with a communicative family culture yielded high LM results as the ten-year-old girl was able to speak about a range of topics with her parents. It was beneficial that her previous attendance of school in Ecuador had provided her with a good Spanish foundation. However, her fluency concerned not only topics that were familiar to her from life in Colombia and Ecuador, but also became evident in her accounts of new games and friendship issues that arose in the New Zealand context. Still, signs of linguistic insecurity (Labov 1972) foreshadowed potential future communication problems as Sofia asserted that she increasingly preferred using English over Spanish.

In contrast to the explicit management in Sofia's family, four-year-old David's parents "let it flow" (see Curdt-Christiansen 2013). Despite their casual attitude, David had a surprisingly good command of Spanish, especially considering the fact that he arrived in New Zealand as a baby and regularly attended English-language day care. His parents used English occasionally and typically ratified his English use with a move-on style (Lanza 2004).

Three-year-old Esteban's family provided another example of a laissez-faire policy. However, Esteban's Spanish abilities were more limited than David's, and he seemed to be able to express his ideas clearly only in English. Although his mother reported that she had tried several Spanish teaching strategies, the results of these were not obvious. Her socialisation style was theoretically conducive to his Spanish development, but his early attendance of day care to enable her to attend English class may have been a factor accounting for an increased shift to English. In addition, Laura may have given Esteban only little wait time, with which Esteban would have had the opportunity to explain his thoughts. Consequently, Laura and Esteban experienced occasional communication breakdowns during their bilingual conversations (Saville-Troike 1987) where she used Spanish and he replied in English.

The final case study illustrated Maritza's deliberate attempts to promote the use of English within her family through TV exposure, games and constant encouragement for her children to engage with the language. She applied highly creative socialisation methods to provide space for her children to use English. Her behaviour suggests that she had a strong impact

belief (De Houwer 1999) as she acted upon her conviction that her home language strategies exerted influence on her children. Despite her efforts, however, her children met these activities with resistance. In addition, her younger son had just started to attend day care and brought significant amounts of English into the home, contributing to communication breakdowns as his mother sometimes failed to understand him. By focusing on promoting English for the benefit of her older children, Maritza seemed to overlook the fact that she was the main source of Spanish for them.

All the case studies suggested that the actual home language practices were co-constructed between parents and children, each of whom acted as agents in the bilingual socialisation process (Luykx 2005). For example, Angélica's strict Spanish-only management seemed effective and Sofía was willing to communicate in Spanish despite strong English influences. By contrast, Maritza clearly used several creative strategies to promote English use amongst her family, but the children resisted these efforts and the strategies proved less effective. Although neither Daniela nor Laura had implemented explicit policies, Daniela's son acquired a lot of Spanish during his childhood in New Zealand, whereas Laura's son clearly preferred English and struggled to complete Spanish sentences. These examples suggest that children exert considerable influence on the outcome of language management strategies.

An examination of the effect of parental discourse styles (Lanza 2004) on children's language choice across three case studies can only be suggestive. Parents' conventional use of minimal grasp or repetition styles seemed to be effective signals for creating a monolingual context where the ethnic language was used. For example, Sofía's mother used repetitions after her daughter's infrequent use of English to model the Spanish word. Being highly linguistically aware, Sofía generally adopted the Spanish word for further utterances. Nonetheless, parental discourse styles seemed to have little effect on David's and Esteban's language choices. David used both Spanish and English, but his parents most frequently moved on after his code-switches. Given this is not a longitudinal study, it is not possible to know whether the parents have continually been using the move-on style, or whether this is a recent development contingent on their (and their children's) further acquisition of English. Esteban's mother Laura used many minimal grasp strategies, which according to Lanza (2004) and others would have created a monolingual context. However, Esteban rarely seemed to understand these minimal grasp styles as requests to use Spanish, but instead continued to use English. The context suggests that Laura's response was in fact rather an expression of sincere lack of understanding in response to her son's continued use of a

language that she did not fully understand. Given these three different scenarios, discourse styles seemed to impact the children's language use to some extent, but they were contingent on other aspects of the socialisation process. This corresponds to Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal's conclusion that the father in their study was successful not only in encouraging minority language use through the use of monolingual discourse strategies, but also in "creat[ing] a micro-linguistic environment for the child which was conducive to language acquisition in general" (2001:84).

Overall, this chapter has highlighted the significant influence of parental FLP decisions on their children's bilingualism. Dynamic and flexible Spanish-only policies coupled with creative socialisation strategies yielded positive bilingual outcomes. However, many individual factors were involved in the socialisation process and no one-size-serves-all parental strategy existed to secure successful bilingual outcomes. Socialisation practices sometimes did not correspond to a mother's stated desire of wanting to transmit the ethnic language (see also King & Logan-Terry 2008; Kopeliovich 2010). The practices of those parents who consciously made linguistic choices and became linguistic role models for their children suggested that an impact belief (De Houwer 1999) was an important intervening variable contributing to the success of bilingual childrearing. A combination of parents' impact beliefs, child-oriented discourse (Tamis-LeMonda & Rodriguez 2008) and teaching of the minority language (Döpke 1992) appeared to contribute to better bilingual outcomes for the children. These topics are discussed further in Chapter 6, which addresses the research questions and analyses similarities and differences in the two communities.

6 Discussion

The previous two chapters have used reported, observed and recorded data from the 28 participating Ethiopian and Colombian refugee families in Wellington to describe in vivid detail their language beliefs and practices. The analysis indicates that beliefs about the minority languages were similarly positive in both communities. All parents wanted their children to speak the minority language and considered it a core value (Smolicz 1992). Nevertheless, individual families implemented minority language transmission efforts differently, and significant differences were also found between the two communities. The stronger concern in the Ethiopian community about their children's continued use of and proficiency in the ethnic language contributed to greater use of explicit language management than in the Colombian community. In this chapter the three research questions provide the structure for a discussion of the issues raised about language beliefs, management and practices. Offering potential reasons for similarities and differences between the communities and individual families, I aim to provide insights into language maintenance and language shift (LMLS) dynamics that go beyond these two communities and the local context.

The first research question concerns language beliefs in the communities and their connection to cultural identifications. Bourdieusian (1991) concepts of field, habitus, capital and doxa (as discussed in Chapter 2) allow the historical and societal processes that shape different language beliefs to be assessed from a more critical perspective. The second research question concerns the families' awareness of their responsibilities for minority language transmission, and the nature of language management in the family context. I link explicit management and monolingual discourse styles (Lanza 2004) to the existence of an impact belief (De Houwer 1999), which in turn is primarily influenced by three key variables. I address the third research question by investigating influences on parents' and children's co-construction of home language practices.

6.1 Research question 1: What language beliefs exist in the ethnic communities and how are these connected to cultural identity claims?

Based on an understanding that beliefs are shaped by historical and societal processes I begin the discussion arguing that the participants operate in two linguistic fields (Bourdieu 1990) in which their habitus (Bourdieu 1990) is shaped. I then discuss the way their habitus generates beliefs about the existence and value of linguistic and symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1990).

6.1.1 Bourdieu's view of the relationship between societal markets and immigrant families

Bourdieu recognises that minority languages generally represent low linguistic capital, but claims that there are specific contexts in which they may be used. Hence, although society has a dominant structure that reproduces the state of English as legitimate language, there are certain gaps, Bourdieu postulates, where the market structure can be subverted in favour of the ethnic language – namely “in family life” (1991:261) and among “socially homogeneous speakers” (1991:261) (which may refer to people from the same ethnic background). He admits that “it is also true that the unification of the market is never so complete as to prevent dominated individuals from finding, in the space provided by private life, among friends, markets where the laws of price formation which apply to more formal markets are suspended” (1991:71). Nevertheless, he maintains that “despite this, the formal law, which is thus provisionally suspended rather than transgressed, remains valid and it re-imposes itself on dominated individuals once they leave the unregulated areas” (1991:71).

The quotes suggest that Bourdieu views society as a marketplace that regulates the value of languages but is suspended when momentary gaps open up where people use their ethnic languages. Some have contested Bourdieu's notion of a unified marketplace and suggest that different institutions (such as families, schools and the ethnic communities) offer differing values for the languages involved (Milroy & Milroy 1992). Likewise, I claim here that instead of a gap in society where societal valuations do not apply for a brief period, the ethnic community rather represents a separate linguistic marketplace, which is influenced by the structures of the societal marketplace, but may accord languages a different value.

The findings show that the societal market has the greatest effect on language use because all participants stressed their feeling of urgency to learn English because of the high linguistic capital it represented and the access to social, cultural and economic life it provided. The Ethiopian and Colombian families experienced a “hysteresis effect” (Bourdieu 1960) as they entered a new field (New Zealand society) in which their previously formed habitus did not endow them with the same social position they had held previously. In response, Bourdieu suggests, “agents” (here: immigrants) may either conserve or transform the structure of the field (1995:39), practices that Bourdieu refers to as orthodoxy or heterodoxy respectively. I identified a third reaction: migrants also created their own fields with their own valuation of capital and sheltered themselves from societal influences. I show that Ethiopian and Colombian community members are invested in two fields relevant to their linguistic choices: the society and the community (see Blackledge 2010) and outline these three responses below.

6.1.1.1 Orthodoxy

One response meant that the migrants learned the language of the host society to accumulate capital of higher value. This corresponds to Bourdieu’s concept of orthodoxy, as they invested themselves in the field and reproduced the existing structures. By doing so, their habitus changed³⁴. As noted in Chapter 1, English is the language with the highest value in New Zealand society. Both communities held positive attitudes towards English and considered it necessary for life in New Zealand for their children (if not for themselves). As refugees, they had little opportunity to return to their countries and considered it crucial that their children learn English because of the dominant role of English in New Zealand society. Their behaviour is similar to that of the former Spanish refugees in Britain described by Pozo Gutierrez (2007). This deeply reflects the type of linguistic domination that Bourdieu claims is reproduced as the dominated members of society follow the market structures. The migrants’ use of English in interaction with other New Zealanders because of its higher symbolic capital reinforced the legitimacy of the language (see Bourdieu 1977). This contrasted with the lower value the Ethiopian community perceived Amharic possessed in

³⁴ Although Bourdieu’s theory has been criticised for being deterministic, Bourdieu made room for a change of habitus by saying that “habitus [can] be practically transformed by the effect of a social trajectory leading to conditions of living different from initial ones” (1990:116). Other researchers have further testified to a change of habitus (see Lee and Kramer 2013; Yang 2013). Given that part of the habitus is a conscious decision, Jo (2013) argues that a transformation of the habitus is likely if the individual strategically aims to acquire new types of capital to reach a more advantaged position in the new field.

society. Ethiopians generally had no expectation that New Zealanders should learn Amharic or that it should be taught at schools, reportedly due to the lack of economic incentive to speak Amharic as well as the small size of the community in New Zealand.

6.1.1.2 Heterodoxy

As a second response, the migrants attempted to contest the existing structures by elevating their ethnic language to a higher position. This constitutes a heterodox response in Bourdieu's terms, i.e. they (arguably unintentionally) set out to challenge the *status quo* of the field, the societal marketplace. Many Colombian participants were convinced that Spanish was an important language for New Zealanders to learn because of its high prestige as a world language (see Mar-Molinero 2011). Furthermore, many mothers desired that more New Zealanders should learn to speak Spanish because they found it difficult to learn English. Participants expressed their desire for Spanish to be used in society, and received overt confirmations about the prestige of Spanish when other members of society, such as friends, neighbours and teachers, asked them to be taught the language. Their agency in promoting this wish was an initial (even if mostly symbolic) step towards subverting the ideology that English was the only legitimate language for use in the societal marketplace (Bourdieu 1977) and undermining the hegemony of English in New Zealand (Gramsci 2011).

6.1.1.3 Creation of their own field

Bourdieu proposes two responses: orthodoxy and heterodoxy. My analysis suggests a third possibility. Migrants created their own field where the ethnic language had high value and where they followed their habitus of speaking it and remained the "ruling class". Many women in my research decided to stay within their respective communities because they lacked English proficiency, the linguistic capital that would grant them access to the societal field. They used their ethnic language and reported that they hardly ever spoke English in their daily lives. Particularly in the Ethiopian community, as discussed below, this creation of a field where Amharic had high value was assisted by their religious and "transnational habitus" (Guarnizo 1997; Vertovec 2009).

Religion was deeply engrained in the Ethiopian culture and the participants' religious habitus impacted on language use and attitudes mainly in two ways. First, the religious activities (church services, Bible studies and prayer, annual church festivals) were regularly carried out in Amharic, which provided the ethnic language with social value and further incentive to use

it (see Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Woods 2004). Similar effects have been noted in other ethnic religious communities (see Barkhuizen & Knoch 2005; Al-Sahafi & Barkhuizen 2006). Further, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church imparted values to the community members as it promoted the ideological view of Amharic as a sacred language (see Karan 2011). In particular, the fact that both language and religion were core values and ideologically related strengthened the symbolic capital of Amharic. This is similar to the reported core values in the Macedonian community in Australia (see Clyne & Kipp 2006).

Access to another social space where Amharic was held in high regard was provided through the Ethiopians' transnational habitus. Ethiopian families maintained strong transnational ties with their home country (see Habecker 2012) and frequently used Amharic in an environment that accorded it high linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1977) as the official language. Nevertheless, they also recognised their children's need to speak English due to its instrumental value of granting access to education and social life in New Zealand.

There seemed to be no particular patterns for participants to choose one response over another. However, it is likely that these three responses affected the participants' cultural identification due to their transformative effect on the migrants' habitus, which I discuss in the next section.

6.1.2 Relationships between culture and language

Bourdieu suggests that the concepts of habitus helps to explain the reproduction of culture and may be defined as “the way society becomes deposited in persons in the form of lasting dispositions, or trained capacities and structured propensities to think, feel and act in determinant ways, which then guide them” (Wacquant 2005:316). The participants' immersion in specific societal contexts ‘conditioned’ (Bourdieu 1990:53) their world view and, more specifically, certain beliefs about their cultural identifications (see Mu 2014). The effects on participants' cultural identification and perceived link between culture and language differed significantly between the first and second generations.

Both Ethiopian and Colombian first generation adults' habitus seemed strongly shaped by their respective cultures and they reproduced the dispositions that were inculcated into them when growing up. Strongly felt links to the ethnic culture were also expressed by the first generations of many other migrant communities in New Zealand (see Holmes et al. 1993; Lee 2013). This suggests that the initial habitus developed in childhood has strong and durable

effects, providing identification for first-generation migrants. Even though participants from both communities acknowledged the influence of New Zealand culture on their behaviour, their habitus mostly generated practices traditionally associated with Ethiopian and Colombian culture. Despite the Colombians' shorter length of residence in New Zealand, relatively more participants displayed a hybrid identity (Bhabha 2012) as they stressed their positive affect for New Zealand, mostly linked to the safety and the academic and economic chances offered to them. This attitude stresses migrants' agency as they step out of their structured dispositions to embrace facets from the new field (see Norton 2013) and gradually transform their habitus.

The second generation showed diverging degrees of identification with their parents' home country. This difference to their parents' strong identification may be explained by the smaller proportion of life to date spent in the home country, meaning a more equal influence on their habitus from both cultures. The topic generated complex discussions in the Ethiopian community, where a number of children claimed that they felt at home within both Ethiopian and New Zealand cultures. A few teenagers from the 1.5 generation expressed disappointment because they perceived that some Ethiopian children felt no pride in Ethiopia (see Giles & Johnson 1987:80). Many children had arrived in New Zealand at a young age and remembered little from their country. The strong influence of societal values through the school and peer groups (Harris 1995) appeared to contribute to a redefinition of their cultural heritage, as some children constructed a hybrid identity rather than reproducing the typical Ethiopian or Colombian identity that they associated with their parents. Nevertheless, others, and this concerned Ethiopian children in particular, alternated their identities (Ward 2013) and emphasised their strong perceived belonging to both their ethnic and New Zealand culture.

This contrast in cultural identification was also reflected in adults' and children's attitudes to language use. Amharic and Spanish represented symbolic capital for first-generation migrants of the Ethiopian and Colombian communities respectively. Adults from both communities typically considered their ethnic language as integral to their culture, and many first-generation participants had developed emotional attachments to the language which they had used all their lives. This perception of language as a core value echoes findings from other studies in which migrants argued that their language was a strong component of their culture (see Schechter & Bayley 1997; Zentella 2009). The strong link was emphasised by the negative evaluations that members of both communities gave those who refrained from using

their ethnic language. As shown in other studies (e.g. Hatoss 2013), the perception of language as indexical of cultural identity provided a great motivational factor for LM.

Personal histories predispose individuals to hold certain values and preferences and may account for adults' and children's diverging language preferences (see Bourdieu 1990). Referring to Maira's (2002) study, Blackledge argues that "second-generation youth culture becomes a site of struggle to define the authenticity of the heritage in relation to local and global practices" (2010:130). Whereas pride, affection and emotional attachment towards the ethnic languages were articulated by adults in both communities, children seemed to have a more pragmatic view on language use dependent on context. Despite the children's strong identification with their ethnic cultures, English gained importance in their interactions over the course of my fieldwork. This corresponds to Clyne and Kipp's (1999) findings that core values for several ethnic groups in Australia seemed to change over two generations. However, although their surrounding linguistic marketplace changed after immigration, their habitus of speaking Spanish did not follow this change abruptly; instead, English only gradually displaced Spanish. This resembles findings for many other New Zealand communities, where children's preferred use of English provided some evidence for incipient language shift, while interaction with adults still furnished an incentive to use the ethnic language (see Holmes et al. 1993; Starks, Harlow & Bell 2005).

6.1.3 Summary of response to research question 1

The first research question addressed the language beliefs in the two communities and their link to the participants' cultural identity. Both communities had developed a mix of beliefs that valued both the societal and their own languages. All participants agreed that English had high value in society and represented cultural capital. Ethiopians tended to conform to the sociolinguistic norms through which English is the legitimate language in New Zealand and Amharic is confined to the home. Still, the community created comprehensive fields for Amharic use (through language management in the Orthodox Church and transnational ties). By contrast, Colombians believed their language had high capital value in New Zealand. A few Colombians tried to extend Spanish beyond their ethnic community and introduce it into the societal field by informally teaching the language to New Zealanders. As reported in other studies, the close link between culture and language in both communities provided an incentive to use the ethnic language. This was reinforced particularly in the Ethiopian community, where language linked to not only cultural but also religious identity. The

Orthodox Church additionally created a social space where explicit Amharic-only management was adopted. Nevertheless, an unlinking of language and culture, which essentially means that ethnic belonging can be expressed in other languages, may contribute to accelerated LS (see Smolicz 1992).

The next section explores how language management was used in the family context.

6.2 Research question 2: To what extent do parents assume responsibility for their children's language socialisation and what are their management strategies?

The analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 indicates that while both communities held positive attitudes towards their languages, they displayed varying awareness of their own role in transmitting the ethnic languages. Similar to the interest in LM strategies of the Russian community in Israel described by Kopeliovich (2009), Ethiopian participants were typically keen to discuss Amharic transmission. The Colombian community members, by contrast, generally showed less interest in LM. Although they occasionally commented that it was problematic that some children forgot Spanish words, few community members offered solutions. This lack of LM discourse is reflected in the low proportional use of explicit management by Colombian families, whereas Ethiopian families typically used explicit management, as depicted in Figure 6.1 below. The colours for the two communities are the same as in the previous two chapters, with green used for the Ethiopian community and blue for the Colombian community. Again, the more saturated the colour, the more families fit the respective scenario³⁵.

Figure 6.1 Distribution of practice and management scenarios in both communities

³⁵ Given the dynamic nature of FLP, these categorisations depend on a number of circumstantial factors. While the exact depth of saturation is therefore only suggestive, the model appropriately reflects tendencies within the two communities.

This graphic shows that Ethiopian parents typically use management strategies directing their children to speak Amharic (Scenario A), whereas Colombian parents typically have no such explicit management strategies (Scenarios C and D). In this section I offer explanations for this. I discuss how Ethiopian and Colombian families manage their home language practices and show how an impact belief as the intervening variable can transform language beliefs into practices and encourage the use of explicit management strategies (see Saunders 1988; De Houwer 1999; Pérez Báez 2013). As discussed in Chapter 2, “impact belief” refers to the parents’ awareness that their linguistic choices in the home served as a model for their children’s language use.

I further argue that my participants’ impact belief was shaped by a number of factors, including the societal status of their language, their experiences as refugees and their length of residence in New Zealand (see Figure 6.2).

6.2.1 Impact beliefs and the use of explicit management strategies

The mothers in my study held diverging impact beliefs. Mothers at one end of the continuum showed no obvious impact belief as they did not relate their children’s language use to their home language practices (see Kulick 1992). This was expressed through the use of “laissez-faire policies” (Curdtt-Christiansen 2013a) and discourse styles that encouraged bilingual language use. It became even more obvious as they introduced explicit English-only management despite wishes to have a child proficient in the minority language. Their parental responses to code-switching (see Lanza 2004) typically acknowledged the child’s use of English and even sometimes endorsed it further as parents also used English in response. Having neither language management strategies nor discourse styles that encouraged minority language use, the family did not recognise their influence on their children’s language development.

Other mothers had a weak impact belief, expressing that their own language use was in some way important to their children’s language development but that it was sufficient if they simply continued to use their ethnic language in the home. This was typically expressed in statements such as “My child won’t forget Spanish/Amharic as long as we speak it at home”, regardless of the actual quantity and quality of interactions with their children. These statements reflect a common theme running through my data, namely the families’ belief that language transmission was a ‘natural’ part of child rearing that they considered deserved less

attention than topics such as child discipline and nutrition. Colombian mothers in particular highlighted these topics more often than language, because New Zealanders' attitudes towards disciplining children³⁶ and the type of food they typically cooked differed markedly from the Colombian participants' habitus for these practices. Language was considered only one part of the complex child rearing process (see also Okita 2002) and not necessarily the most important part.

At the other end of the continuum were mothers with a strong impact belief, who had reflected deeply on their language use, their reactions to their children's diverging language choices and other LM strategies that would influence language transmission. Parents in my study who had an impact belief and recognised the challenges of minority language transmission in an immigrant situation typically introduced an explicit management strategy in favour of either the minority or the majority language.

Use of these explicit strategies was also affected by cultural parenting values, which accounted for firm measures in some families of enforcing the minority language.

Authoritative parenting styles have been documented for both Latino and Ethiopian families (see Gebrekidan 2012; Varela et al. 2013). For example, Varela and associates highlight that Latino parenting styles generally "emphasize greater unquestioning obedience and respect for authority" (2013:172). This endows the parents with more authority to manage their children's language use (see Spolsky 2009:15). Since Ethiopian parents in particular were aware of their role in minority language transmission, strict enforcement of language rules was common and children were expected to follow these. Ethiopian parents most often provided direct and explicit feedback after the children's code-switching (as described by Lanza 2004). They reported that they asked their children to repeat their utterance in Amharic and accepted momentary communication breakdowns in favour of the correct language choice. Authoritative parenting styles were also common in the Colombian community but the focus was much more on non-linguistic issues.

The existing family language policy (FLP) research usually describes a continuum ranging from parents forcing their child to use a particular language on the one hand (thus using explicit management strategies) through to leaving the decision about language choice to the child. For example, studies of Navajo families (Spolsky 2002) and anecdotal evidence from a

³⁶ See discussion in Hatoss (2013:Chapter 8) that highlights the complexities of parents losing their authority as they are forced to adjust to local ways of disciplining children.

few German-speaking families in New Zealand suggest that these families refrained from forcing their children to use a particular language. This contrasts with findings in my study, where Ethiopian parents in particular tended to insist that their children use the ethnic language (as evidenced also in the explicit management in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, where community members reminded children of the Amharic-only rules once they spoke English). However, I did not learn about any non-linguistic measures to strengthen these directives (such as those discussed in Chapter 2). Nevertheless, parents generally had strong opinions about their authority to influence their children's language choice.

A number of families I observed had parents with a strong impact belief who wanted their children to speak the minority language. Yet they were hesitant to shut the child down by insisting on the use of a particular language and instead preferred to have their children speak to them in any language (King & Logan-Terry 2008). Many families therefore used move-on styles (Lanza 2004), thus (unintentionally) endorsing their children's code-switching by ratifying their English contributions. Thus, parents desisted in correcting their children's language choices because of their very natural wish to encourage them to speak.

6.2.2 Influences on the development of an impact belief

This research has indicated that parents need to give explicit attention to language development if they want their children to maintain their ethnic language in an immigrant situation. The analysis suggests that the following factors in particular influence parents in how they affect the parents' likelihood of developing an impact belief: the societal status of the ethnic language, the families' refugee trajectory and length of residence. This is illustrated and discussed below.

Figure 6.2 Factors affecting the development of an impact belief

Mothers with an impact belief generally recognised that their children were likely to acquire English sufficiently outside the home (as one Ethiopian mother stated ‘*Cause English they will learn it anytime*’). Both parents with and without English knowledge promoted explicit minority language strategies and cited ideological reasons. Although they knew that their children needed to know English because they lived in New Zealand, they believed that society was going to take care of this, while their role as mothers was to foster development in the minority language.

Societal language ideologies concerning the usefulness and prestige of the minority language seemed instrumental to the development of an impact belief. Although Yates and Terraschke (2013) record the rather unsuccessful outcomes of their participants’ attempts to transmit minority languages with a low status in Australia (see Spolsky 2009:19), my data shows that this lack of prestige had a positive effect on parental transmission efforts. The Ethiopian community in particular became aware they were responsible for transmitting their ethnic language in the home because of their belief that Amharic had no prestige status or communicative value in New Zealand. The lack of societal support for Amharic strengthened their understanding that they were the ones responsible for LM.

Another factor impacting on the families' efforts to transmit their minority languages was the nature of their refugee trajectory. All participants reported they experienced culture shock due to the distance between their cultures and the one they experienced in New Zealand. However, the refugee experiences differed between the two communities. Ethiopians were typically brought from their home country to be united with their family members in New Zealand and they were welcomed and cared for by an established Ethiopian community. The important role of these ethnic social networks, particularly in response to the challenges and effects of a refugee trajectory, has been recognised for successful refugee resettlement (see Elliott & Yusuf 2014). Colombians, in turn, arrived after a long refugee journey via Ecuador, where the majority experienced severe hardships and discrimination for a number of years and required psychological support upon arrival in New Zealand. At least in the early years, when the Colombian community was still small, they could not count on the support of a strong community. While the communities provided different degrees of support for dealing with past experiences and current cultural adjustments, these challenges diverted the refugees' attention from deliberately reflecting on their language behaviour. These experiences also differentiated these two groups from other families whose bilingual childrearing practices are documented in the literature and who typically had an established and higher socioeconomic standing, which facilitated their efforts (see Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal 2001; Okita 2002; Kirsch 2012; Fogle & King 2013; Kopeliovich 2013).

Furthermore, the families' length of residence in New Zealand typically influenced language management, and the main impact concerned parents' recognition that minority language transmission required conscious effort. The Ethiopian families in my study, who had arrived as early as 1999, had spent a considerably longer time in New Zealand than the Colombians, who arrived as recently as 2008. Their longer length of residence encouraged them to reflect on LM practices and become more aware of the dangers of LS because they could see their children using less Amharic over time. By contrast, the lack of impact belief in many Colombian families, reflected in the typical absence of language management strategies, was most likely linked to the recent arrival of the Colombian community in New Zealand and their wish for their children to acquire the majority language quickly. They tended to take their children's continued Spanish language use for granted, and the belief that Spanish was "in the blood" supported their assumption that their children would always speak it. Somewhat justifiably, these mothers did not actually consider LS a problem (yet), because their children spoke Spanish well and had not yet reached a point of showing substantial

signs of language loss (Montrul 2004). Length of residence also influenced the children's minority language proficiency, though, as Terraschke and Yates note for the Australian context, this was "not a simple linear relationship" (2013:114). Although many participants in my study who had spent almost ten years in New Zealand were rather unsuccessful in transmitting their ethnic languages, other examples showed that families could still succeed if they planned their language policy deliberately.

6.2.3 Dynamic nature of language management

The importance of length of residence on the development of an impact belief was reflected by the fact that a number of families changed their language management strategies over time. This is again illustrated best with examples from Ethiopian families who had spent more time in New Zealand. Not a single family proposed to implement home language management and followed this through uncompromisingly. Instead, family members moulded their FLP as they adapted language practices and rules to the changing circumstances (see Okita 2002:Chapter 6; Schecter & Bayley 2002). For example, children's changing language choices or increased proficiencies contributed to the evolution of language policies (see Caldas 2012; Fogle & King 2013). I identified a common FLP trajectory, shown in Figure 6.3, which was a change from no explicit management, where the children typically spoke the minority language, via no explicit management where children used both the majority and the minority languages, to explicit language management where children typically used the minority language.

No management,
child typically uses ethnic language

No management,
child typically uses English

Explicit minority language management,
child typically uses ethnic language

Figure 6.3 Typical FLP trajectory

Overall, this trajectory suggests that parents' understanding of their own role in minority language transmission changed over time. Their children's increased use of English seemed to act as a "wake-up call" which motivated them to intervene with more explicit management strategies. However, particularly for the last stage it was necessary that the children had acquired the ethnic language when they were young (as discussed before). If they did not have sufficient knowledge of their ethnic language and/or felt insecure about speaking it, they continued to use English despite their parents' attempts to introduce explicit management in the third phase.

6.2.1 Summary of response to research question 2

The research question concerned the degree of parents' awareness of their responsibilities in transmitting their ethnic language to their children and the type of management strategies they used. Language management varied across families and communities. Explicit management was much more common in the Ethiopian families and this was linked to their impact belief as they realised that they were accountable for their children's minority language acquisition. Their recognition was likely influenced by their longer length of residence in New Zealand and the perceived low societal status of Amharic. It was further affected by their relatively smooth refugee trajectory which gave them the opportunity to join their families in New Zealand, where they received support from their ethnic community. Colombian families, by contrast, typically did not recognise the danger of language shift presumably due to their short length of residence. The hardships of their refugee trajectory further meant for some families that less attention was given to the linguistic issues of child rearing. Since they regularly encountered the language in their community and regarded it as prestigious at the societal level, they tended to regard Spanish acquisition as a natural process that did not require deliberate teaching efforts.

While authoritative parenting styles affected the degree to which the parents enforced minority language use, particularly in the Ethiopian community, other parents were hesitant to correct their children's language choice because they valued their children's contributions over correct language choice. Overall, while the typical trajectory of FLP began with no management, the data indicates the importance of providing a minority language foundation while the children are still young (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, Cummins 2000).

The discussion so far has shown that parents had different preconditions for language transmission given a number of structural characteristics that constrained them. At the same time, however, they showed agency as some defied and contested their positions in the field and took charge of their parental duties for minority language transmission. In the next section I explore the key influences on the joint implementation of FLP by parents and children.

6.3 Research question 3: What key influences affect the co-construction of home language practices by parents and children?

Parents lay the most influential groundwork for their children's language acquisition in the home and the previous section has suggested that this early language acquisition is important for children's later minority language development. In this section I highlight the influence of the school on children's language development and discuss the implications for home socialisation practices. I then discuss cultural influences on childrearing practices and highlight the children's engaged conversational involvement, particularly in families that displayed strong parent-child relationships (Tannenbaum & Howie 2003). The final section emphasises the children's role in co-constructing language practices (Luykx 2005).

6.3.1 Influences on home language practices

Family and school are the main contexts where linguistic dispositions are acquired (Bourdieu 1991:62). Hence, the immigrant child is exposed to diverging practices and values ascribed to languages – those that are present in the societal marketplace and those that are demonstrated in the child's home. Bourdieu emphasises the vital role of the school in the child's socialisation journey:

“This new experience tended practically to “de-realise” the values transmitted by the family and to turn affective and economic investments no longer towards the reproduction by the single individual of the position occupied by the line in the social structure.”

(Bourdieu 2012 translated in Grenfell 2004:120)

The children in this situation experienced a cleft-habitus (Bourdieu 2007:69), that is, a strong discrepancy between the influence of the school system and that of their family on their habitus. Constant exposure to the majority language at school is likely to change their minority language proficiency (see Hoff et al. 2012) and lead to a “competence-related preference” (Torrás & Gafaranga 2002) to use English, which trickles more and more into the home domain (see Wong Fillmore 1991). Researchers have stressed how important it is for parents to understand and respond to the impact of school and peer group on their children's minority language development (Canagarajah 2008; Caldas 2012; Spolsky 2012:6).

Therefore, the main challenge for the parents in my study was, once their children attended school, to continue to provide playful, attractive and persuasive strategies to encourage minority language use in the family context.

A common concern for parents displaying an impact belief (particularly Ethiopians) was therefore the decision whether and when they should send their children to day care. Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) claim that early childhood interactions within the family shape the habitus, which represents a “durable disposition”. Some young children acquired a great amount of their ethnic language and some mothers feared that this proficiency would become lost as their children spent most of their time in day care. Typically those mothers who could afford to stay home waited until the child was at least three and could officially go to kindergarten instead of enrolling the child at an earlier age.

Other mothers showed an impact belief, but did not have the necessary resources, knowledge and time to socialise their children into becoming fluent minority language speakers when they were young. Language acquisition research shows that children with a solid early foundation in their ethnic language did much better at maintaining their proficiency later on (see Cummins 2000). Since their children had never fully acquired a good command of the ethnic language, these mothers struggled to enforce use of the language later on. Hence, parents who wanted their children to have proficiency in the minority language were more successful if they encouraged use of the language while the child was still young.

This sometimes presented a problem especially for single parents. Families in my study with children who had no or very little minority language proficiency were those whose children had started attending day care early and received minority language input from only one parent (in single-parent families and two-parent families using the OPOL strategy (Grammont 1902)). As discussed in Chapter 2 for other communities (see Schecter & Bayley 2002), the pressures of single parenting often meant that children in my data started attending day care as early as six months while their parents went to work. Those children typically showed weaker minority language proficiency when I interviewed them, which corresponds to findings for children who receive reduced input at a young age (see Montrul 2008:123). The combination of reduced input through early day care attendance and only one parent speaking the minority language may thus be another factor accounting for unsuccessful language transmission.

By contrast, other parents experienced that spending more time with their children and developing close relationships was beneficial for successful language transmission. Tannenbaum and Howie regard these “family factors as central to language maintenance” (2002:420) and Luo and Wiseman argue that “[c]hildren who are close to their parents tend to follow their parents’ attitudes regarding ethnic language” (2000:310). It was clear from observations and recordings of parent-child interactions that children who were close to their parents frequently engaged in conversation and entrusted them with their everyday experiences. As they asked their parents for advice and shared important events, they practiced their minority language skills and learned about values and practices from their ethnic culture.

Few parents, however, engaged in active minority language teaching efforts (see Döpke 1992; Tamis-LeMonda & Rodriguez 2008). Participants tended to believe that while learning English and learning literacy in the ethnic language required active teaching efforts, teaching oral proficiency in the ethnic language was superfluous. For those who attempted to teach their children the ethnic language, their favourite resources seemed to be media such as DVDs and YouTube clips. Paradoxically, however, teaching activities seemed to be stronger where mothers wanted their children to learn the majority language. Some mothers realised that teaching English required explicit attention and overt strategies such as the use of creative games and explicit instruction (see Döpke 1992).

Cultural practices, discussed earlier in terms of their influence on language management, came to bear on language socialisation styles too. Most remarkable was the value of familism (Sabogal et al. 1987) in both communities which meant children spent a lot of time interacting with their parents. Moreover, Colombian participants in particular displayed rich narrative talk (Snow & Beals 2006:57), a feature which is recognised – albeit in folklinguistic terms – as typical of Hispanic families (see Ervin-Tripp & Strage 1985). The lively interactions documented in some of the Colombian case studies and the children’s strong interactional involvement, discussed as beneficial for minority language management (see Chevalier 2012), helped the children consolidate their Spanish skills.

Researchers have noted that parenting practices tend to undergo changes after migration (see Renzaho, McCabe & Sainsbury 2011). Interestingly, the fact that Ethiopian families (often involuntarily) adopted some New Zealand norms for child rearing contributed to enhanced opportunities for minority language transmission. Whereas children in Ethiopia reportedly

“respectfully” left the room when visitors arrived (see Poluha 2004), some participants complained that children now stayed in the room when the parents interacted with visitors. Nevertheless, staying in the room with visitors serendipitously provided the children with more opportunity to be exposed to adult conversation in Amharic. Furthermore, the Ethiopian custom of keeping silent at the table when eating seemed to change in New Zealand, which provided the children with enhanced communication opportunities during mealtimes. These cultural differences seemingly produced intergenerational conflict, as children were influenced by their peers’ behaviour (see Harris 1995) and transgressed Ethiopian cultural norms. Although many parents complained about these changing values, these may have helped their children to engage in adults’ conversations in the ethnic language and contributed to LM.

Research has suggested that children are more likely to use the ethnic language when their mother has low proficiency in the majority language (see Fishman 2001; Hua & Li 2005; Barkhuizen 2006), and I found some evidence to support this claim. As represented in Figure 6.1 above, even children in whose families there was no explicit management often used the minority language (Scenario C). A number of children used the minority language without being explicitly told to and noted that they did so out of respect for their mothers, who had only low English proficiency. However, I also found evidence suggesting that some children used English with them although the mothers did not understand. This suggests that the relationship between the mothers’ English proficiency and their children’s minority language use is not straightforward and needs further investigation.

6.3.2 Children’s agency

Children actively contributed to language management as they negotiated language choice (Gafaranga 2010) and became influential actors in the implementation of FLP (Tuominen 1999; Luykx 2005; Canagarajah 2008). The children’s agency was also expressed through orthodox or heterodox home practices (in Bourdieu’s terms), as they collaborated with or challenged the existing practices of reproducing cultural heritage in the home. Children’s heterodox practices sometimes led to explicit management being abandoned in favour of a “*laissez-faire*” policy (Curd-Christiansen 2013). Their contestation of existing language management sometimes meant that their parents’ practices deviated from their beliefs and the stated management even before they consciously changed their management (see King & Logan-Terry 2008).

Whether the children collaborated or not also depended on how explicitly the intended language management was expressed. As noted in Chapter 2, Bourdieu's theory seems to presuppose that individuals are aware of the field relations and the value of their respective capital. However, parents sometimes expressed management only with hesitation, for example as a one-time request to speak the ethnic language or in the way of minimal grasp styles (Lanza 2004) after the child's code-switching, which however left it unclear whether the child was simply supposed to repeat or to change language. As a result, it is likely that some children failed to understand the differential value which their families allocated to English and the minority language (see Fogle 2013) and that this contributed to their unintended heterodox practices that subverted the existing language management.

Another facet of the children's agency was noted by Valdés, Chavez & Angelelli (2003) in their conceptualisation of children as "language brokers". While many parents in my study rejected the idea of asking their children to interpret for them, they benefitted from their children's possession of societal cultural capital in other ways. Reciprocal exchanges of knowledge took place as parents imparted their children with knowledge about their ethnic culture, and their children introduced them to local concepts (such as sports and the school system) and linguistic capital pertaining to New Zealand, thereby acting as language teachers for their parents (see Luykx 2005).

Another influence on language practices was the children's degree of metalinguistic awareness (Roth et al. 1996), which differed greatly across the participants. A few children were highly aware of their ability to speak two different languages, as evidenced by their ease in switching, telling puns and self-correcting their own mistakes. Others seemed to speak English and their respective minority language without paying much attention to their linguistic production. Families with highly linguistically aware children were particularly successful in raising them bilingually, no doubt influenced by their keen interest in language use.

The presence of siblings seemed to further impact on children's minority language development, although the direction of this influence was not conclusive from the data. In the absence of any siblings, one girl developed very high minority language proficiency whereas another girl failed to learn the minority language and the mother reasoned that this failure occurred because she was an only child. Some children with younger siblings engaged more with the minority language because it seemed more common for younger pre-childcare

children to speak the minority language and older children sometimes accommodated their language choices. In other cases, however, the influence worked the other way round so that older school children used English with their younger sibling in the home. In some families, parents refrained from interfering with their children's language use with each other, presumably due to the high effort of controlling several children's speech (see Fernandez & Clyne 2007:185). Although the direction of this influence is not clear, these findings reinforce the role of siblings in the child's minority language acquisition.

6.3.3 Summary of response to research question 3

The research question asked about the key influences on the way parents and children co-constructed their language practices. The strong influence of the school, recognised in literature and clearly visible in my research as the children accommodated to their peer groups' language choices (Harris 1995), required parents to pay increased attention to their home language practices. This even resulted in some parents' making the decision to send their children to day care as late as possible. Their socialisation styles were influenced by cultural values and patterns of behaviour, such as familism (Sabogal et al. 1987) and abundant narrative talk. Children also benefitted from close relationships with their parents that allowed them access to their ethnic culture and language (Tannenbaum & Howie 2002). Children with mothers that had low English proficiency were more likely to use the ethnic language, but the effect seemed to depend on other variables as well. The examples of children's agency in this study show that it is necessary to recognise children as powerful agents in the creation of FLP.

6.4 Summary

Overall, both communities identified strongly with their own culture, though most Ethiopian children also identified with New Zealand culture. Likewise, the ethnic language was a core value for both first-generation Ethiopians and Colombians, but, similar to findings about Spanish, Arabic and Chinese in Australia (see Clyne & Kipp 1999), this typically changed for the second generation. While beliefs about the legitimacy of English were similar for both communities, an important factor was whether the minority language presented linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1991) at the societal level. I discussed in answers offered to research questions 1 and 2 (with slightly different viewpoints) that the communities held different opinions about the usefulness of their ethnic languages in New Zealand. This affected both

their impact belief (De Houwer 1999) concerning home language management and their way of dealing with immersion in a new field (New Zealand society). Since Spanish is a popular language in New Zealand, Colombian mothers expressed the hope that use of Spanish by the wider population could both facilitate communication with New Zealanders and encourage children to maintain the language. This elevation of the language to a higher status transformed Spanish into symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991). Conversely, Ethiopian parents saw no support for Amharic outside the home. Instead, the lack of recognition for Amharic at a societal level seemed to reinforce the idea that responsibility for LM was on them and that this needed to occur inside the home. This lack of opportunities effectively reinforced the need for private instruction and use of the language in the home.

Two other factors in particular seemed to be central to parents' development of an impact belief. One factor was length of residence in New Zealand (see Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977), i.e. whether parents had already observed their children move away from using the minority language. Another factor was the parents' refugee experiences before coming to New Zealand. Their recovery from traumatic events meant that their attention was typically diverted from their children's linguistic development, which was often considered a natural "by-product" of child-rearing.

The range of factors mentioned in this chapter shows that parents can be in varying starting positions for minority language transmission. It is the examples of agency taken by individual mothers that highlight the responsibility of parents to make conscious efforts for minority language transmission. Examples show that transmission efforts are most effective while the children are still young and have the capacity to build a good language foundation (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Cummins 2000).

Furthermore, the thesis has emphasised the central role of children in the creation of FLP. Even in families where parents assumed authority over their children's language use, the implementation of minority language management depended on the children's collaboration. Both their willingness and ability to accommodate to their parents' wishes contributed to the language practices of the families. The home was also a place where parents and children exchanged capital (Bourdieu 1991), grounded on their differing expertise with New Zealand and Ethiopian/Colombian culture, and where children could impart linguistic knowledge to their parents. As such, they were active collaborators who established FLP together with their parents.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This thesis is a response to international demands for research on the family as a domain where language policy is instigated (Spolsky 2012). It has addressed the issue of minority language transmission in two refugee communities in New Zealand showing the diverse ways in which family language policy (FLP) is implemented. The research has contributed to the growing field of FLP by investigating how family language dynamics determine whether the ethnic language will be maintained in the future or whether communities will experience a shift to the majority language, a pattern typically observed in migrant communities (see Fishman 1991).

Rich ethnographic data from my involvement with the two communities was obtained through observations, interviews and recordings of naturally-occurring interactions between mothers and their children. These yielded valuable insight into the home domain, an area usually closed off to the public, and my rapport with the community members further facilitated the analysis of the data. Based on an understanding of language being firmly embedded in social practices (Bourdieu 1977) and using an expanded version of Spolsky's (2004) language policy model, my research questions addressed the beliefs community members held about their ethnic languages and English, their strategies for home language management and the co-constructed nature of family language practices.

A number of Bourdieusian concepts further provided the theoretical framework to describe and analyse the language maintenance and shift (LMLS) situation of both communities in Wellington. While habitus, capital and doxa provide appropriate tools with which to analyse the refugees' responses to societal language ideologies, the data also challenged the model and led me to suggest an additional component to account more comprehensively for my participants' actions.

Following the identification of a research gap into LMLS in Wellington lasting more than a decade, this study has also filled a geographical gap in previous research by investigating Ethiopian and Colombian refugee families in Wellington, New Zealand. In addition, families from refugee backgrounds have previously been under-researched in a field that has

predominantly focused on language socialisation in middle-class families (Baker 2006:127). Ethiopians and Colombians currently constitute the most vital refugee-background communities in Wellington. The communities differ along a few important variables, most notably length of stay and status of their minority language in New Zealand, rendering interesting a comparison of their family language policies.

I first investigated parents' beliefs towards the different languages and towards minority language transmission. Then I differentiated the combinations of language practices and management into six scenarios, and provided case studies of family language policies. Although minority language attitudes were generally positive and many participants identified strongly with their cultural background, the transmission of the minority language seemed to require a so-called impact belief which meant that parents were aware of their responsibilities of transmitting the language to their children. While Colombian families typically doubted that their children would ever forget Spanish, Ethiopian families were more aware that the responsibility for the survival of Amharic in Wellington rested largely on their shoulders. Nevertheless, all families expressed a strong desire for their children to learn English in order to acquire the linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1991) of the New Zealand marketplace.

This final chapter synthesises the findings of my research and outlines its methodological, theoretical and practical contributions. I also suggest topics for further research.

7.2 Research findings

My overall research question addressed the nature of FLP which Ethiopian and Colombian parents pursue to transmit their ethnic language to their children. Dynamics at the family level deserve particular attention in a migrant context where the ethnic language has little representation outside the home. I was interested in the beliefs that members of the two communities held about their ethnic language and English, the parents' awareness and instantiation of their role as language transmitters, and the influences on the co-construction of language practices by parents and children. I followed Spolsky's (2004) model with a tripartite division of language policy into beliefs, management and practices. I conducted analyses first for the Ethiopian community (Chapter 4) and then the Colombian community (Chapter 5). I then compared the findings from both communities and discussed the implications for the implementation of FLP (Chapter 6).

The first research question concerned language beliefs the community members held about their ethnic languages and English, addressing in particular the influence of cultural identification on language beliefs. Most first-generation participants identified strongly with their respective ethnic community and considered their ethnic language a core value (Smolicz 1992). They wanted their children to speak Amharic and Spanish respectively because these were the languages of their home country integral to communication with the extended family. Ethiopian participants emphasised their religious beliefs that elevated Amharic as a ‘sacred language’ (Karan 2011). The local Orthodox Church encouraged the parents to raise their children in Amharic and provided a social space for Amharic use outside the family. Colombian participants valued Spanish especially as an international language with high prestige. This belief accorded the language symbolic value (Bourdieu 1991) and encouraged the families to use it confidently even at a societal level. Participants particularly highlighted the Colombian variety of Spanish with which they indexed their cultural identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). While the second generation of both communities also strongly identified with their parents’ culture, some children’s decreased ethnic language proficiency suggests an unlinking of language and cultural identification across generations.

The second research question explored the parents’ awareness of their responsibility in transmitting their ethnic language to their children and their strategies for home language management. The findings differed for the two communities. Overall, parents did not necessarily enact their positive minority language beliefs by deliberately socialising their children into use of the minority language. Some believed that their children would develop proficiency in the minority language regardless of their language use in the home, whereas others considered that they were even responsible for their children’s acquisition of English. An “impact belief” (De Houwer 1999) appeared to be a crucial intermediate component for successful minority language transmission, meaning that parents believed that their language use impacted on their children’s linguistic choices. Most Colombian families used no language management strategies. They mostly displayed “laissez-faire” strategies (Curdts-Christiansen 2013a) and did not interfere with their children’s language choices. In contrast, many Ethiopian parents used explicit management strategies, such as telling their children to use only Amharic in the home. They typically had an impact belief, which was revealed in their claims that passing on Amharic was the responsibility of each family. The different impact beliefs of the two communities appeared to be due to three main factors: the societal status of their ethnic language, their refugee trajectory and their length of residence in New

Zealand. Although these factors were no clear predictors for an impact belief, they seemed to explain why Ethiopians typically assumed more control of their minority language transmission.

The third research question explored the influences on the co-construction of language practices by parents and children. School was shown to exert significant influence on the children's linguistic choices, and a few parents used explicit teaching methods to impart to their children knowledge of their ethnic language. Lively and frequent interactions particularly in the Colombian community provided the children with more exposure to their ethnic language. This was also evidenced by shifting cultural practices in the Ethiopian community which gave the children the opportunity to engage in more conversations with adults. Children contributed considerably to the establishment of FLP, supporting Luykx' (2005) claim that children may reverse the traditional socialisation hierarchy and become the key socialisation agents who initiate language shift within a family.

7.3 Methodological implications

Among my contributions to methodology were my use of linguistic ethnography (Rampton 2007), my intermediate position vis-à-vis the community as a "friendly outsider" (Greenwood & Levin 2006:124), the inclusion of children as interviewees, and the use of recordings of naturally-occurring interactions between mothers and children that facilitated access to the usually hidden home domain. This last method is particularly innovative in the New Zealand context where surveys and interviews have been the main data collection methods in previous LMLS studies.

My research is located within the methodological field of linguistic ethnography (Rampton 2007). This approach was adopted for several reasons. First, it was most suitable for approaching my participants in a sensitive way by establishing rapport first. This careful method was important because they were refugees in New Zealand with "high settlement needs" (Choummanivong, Poole & Cooper 2014:89) whose vulnerability was shaped by their past experiences (see Birman 2005). Second, ethnographic fieldwork helped me understand the community dynamics in greater detail as I became immersed over a length of time.

Much ethnographic investigation is conducted from either an insider or an outsider perspective, and my research provides an example of a dynamic negotiation of these two roles. My general role as an outsider to both ethnic communities enabled access to

participants who sometimes appeared more willing to share opinions with people who were not members of their communities. My outsider position further encouraged them to discuss events that insiders might take for granted. However, this position was negotiated as my frequent interactions especially with the Colombian participants reportedly changed my status to “adopted member” of the community. Moreover, my similarity as a fellow recent migrant to New Zealand, my familiarity with Ethiopian and Latin American culture and (Spanish) language, and my positioning as equal with many participants in terms of gender and religion permitted me to negotiate rapport and trust and develop a more emic perspective.

This was facilitated by my use of recordings of home interactions. These recordings filled an important methodological gap by providing insight into naturally-occurring language use. A number of studies highlight the disparities between reported language use and actual language practices (see Goodz 1994; Schwartz 2008). The mothers’ willingness to record their children’s home interactions therefore corroborated and refined the reported data. While my ethnographic observations assisted my recognition of typical language choices, these recordings provided data that could be analysed at a more interactional level. Since mothers recorded their children when I was not present, the recordings also reduced the “observer’s paradox” (Labov 1972). Overall, the analysis of recorded interactions permitted a more sophisticated understanding of the way different family members negotiated language choice.

The inclusion of children in the research not only allowed me to obtain information from the future bearers of LM, but also proved innovative in the New Zealand context where LMLS research had chiefly focused on parents. The data I obtained from children using observations, recordings and interviews yielded useful information about their language beliefs and views of the FLP process.

7.4 Theoretical implications

My research has made a number of theoretical contributions. I have introduced a model for classifying FLP scenarios and applied an extended version of Bourdieu’s concepts of orthodoxy and heterodoxy to refer to migrants’ responses to their immersion in a new sociolinguistic context. My research has further provided evidence for the importance of an impact belief, the social embeddedness of FLP and the role of religion in language transmission and underscored children’s agency that affected minority language transmission.

I provided a model for categorising FLP scenarios to facilitate the analysis. This model identifies the use or non-existence of explicit family language policies and further indicates whether they are geared towards the use of the minority or the majority language.

Additionally, the model connects these options with language practices that do or do not correspond to the proposed management. Thus, the model allows for parents not endorsing their stated management or for weakening of the parents' resilience due to their children's resistance. It offers a balanced classification instrument, providing a framework for classifying the emerging combinations of language management and practices, while avoiding prescribing the different ways in which language management must be articulated and thus allowing space for a range of language practices.

I have also applied Bourdieu's (1977a) concepts of orthodoxy and heterodoxy in a migrant context and added another dimension to his framework. This represents to my knowledge the first application of this part of Bourdieu's theory to a LMLS context. As outlined in Chapter 2, his model posits doxa as the unquestioned rule, with orthodoxy representing actions that reconstitute the doxa, and heterodoxy applying to actions that contest the doxa. One response to my participants' immersion in the sociolinguistic structures of New Zealand was for them to 'reproduce' the societal structures by accepting English as the legitimate language and confining their ethnic language to the home domain. This represented an act of orthodoxy in Bourdieu's terminology. Another response was to contest the existing structures, as particularly Colombian participants introduced Spanish into the public field by teaching Spanish and expressing their wishes for more New Zealanders to use Spanish. This became evident in their accounts of promoting their language amongst friends, teachers and neighbours and confidently using it in the public domains. These actions may be described using the concept of heterodoxy. A third response that I identified was the creation of the participants' own ethnic field where they separated themselves from society and attributed high value to their ethnic languages. I identified the Ethiopian community as a community of practice (Wenger 1998) whose members were involved with one another to such a degree that contact with English-speaking New Zealanders was reportedly (almost) completely absent for a number of women in particular. Instead, Amharic was used within their community as a sign of solidarity and celebration of diasporic culture. Overall, Bourdieu's concepts provided a historical and critical approach to the perpetuation of language beliefs and their foundation for language practices.

I also identified an impact belief (De Houwer 1999) as an important intervening variable for successful language transmission. Contrary to what one might expect, some parents who strongly identified with their home culture and wanted their children to do the same did not necessarily engage in active efforts to teach the minority culture and language. While most parents spoke the minority language in the home, many still underestimated their degree of responsibility for minority language transmission in a situation where English was used in all other domains. Those parents who were aware of their responsibility for their children's language use, however, made active efforts to provide a sound basis for minority language use in the home. They seemed to recognise that their children's linguistic development depended on their own socialisation strategies in the home and they could not rely on societal efforts. This supports De Houwer's (1999) suggestion that an impact belief is needed for successful minority language transmission.

My findings contradict the traditional understanding of language socialisation as a predominantly top-down process (e.g. as implied in Schieffelin & Ochs 1986) and demonstrate children's agency (Luykx 2005). The children's active role in language transmission became obvious through my research, with examples illustrating how they subverted and contested explicit language management. Their individual linguistic awareness and interaction with their siblings were further influences on the FLP process. These findings support Hornberger and Johnson's (2007) assertion that all family members actively shape language management. One girl from the Ethiopian community even reversed the process as she socialised her parents into majority language use, providing evidence for Luykx' (2005:1409) reference to children as socialising agents "when adults adapt their language behavior in accordance with the perceived sociolinguistic needs of their children, and when these adaptations then persist beyond adults' interactions with the child". This theoretical insight therefore warrants deeper future focus on the children's socialising power on their parents and siblings.

Furthermore, evidence was provided for the strong social embeddedness of family language policy (Mühlhäusler 2002). Both parents and children formed their language beliefs through interaction with other societal actors, and saw aspects of their practices and management reinforced or corrected by these. This was exemplified by a mother who stopped promoting Spanish in the home in response to the advice from a psychologist, but it was also reflected by children's perception of the high vitality of their language because they encountered interest from teachers and friends. FLP was also an act of identity (Le Page & Tabouret-

Keller 1985) as families positioned themselves in ethnic space through the use of particular management strategies. Ideologies outside the home therefore considerably affected the families' language beliefs, practices and management.

Data from the Ethiopian community particularly highlighted religious influence on minority language use (see Fernandez & Clyne 2007; Gogonas 2012). The crucial role of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church in offering a domain external to the home where Amharic possessed high value and was the legitimate language boosted the vitality of the language (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977). Ethiopian Orthodox religion was furthermore shown to foster positive beliefs about Amharic, mostly due to its status as a "sacred language" (Karan 2011) and to its widespread use in the church. This relatively unexplored influence of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church parallels reports of the Greek Orthodox Church being vital for Greek maintenance in New Zealand (Verivaki 1990; Holmes et al. 1993). Religious enforcement of Amharic through explicit language policies as well as the sacred value and usefulness of the language complemented home-internal attempts at language transmission. Membership in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church was therefore a vital motivation for LM.

7.5 Practical implications

Practical implications emerge from my comprehensive data collection methodology. My discussion of Scenario A highlights concrete examples of "success stories" of language policies being translated into practice. The focus on micro-linguistic aspects shows the process of language maintenance or shift occurring as family members engage in interactional sequences, while also providing context for this negotiation of language choice.

First, I recounted details of how families established language management strategies and followed these with practices that either reflected or contested them. How children contributed was one key influence on the success of the parents' management. The instantiation of the policy was effective depending on individual aspects, such as the children's linguistic awareness, or circumstantial factors, such as parents' or children's changed language proficiencies, the presence of siblings or the children's entrance into day care.

Second, my research has confirmed the crucial role of parental discourse strategies (Lanza 2004), which have been found to be an important variable for the children's choices to use the ethnic language (see Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal 2001; Chevalier 2013). While the effects

of parents' responses to their children's use of an undesired language were not straightforward, my case studies suggest that "minimal grasp responses" (Lanza 2004) or repetitions of the word in the ethnic language are most effective for encouraging the children to use it. It was very common for parents to use a move-on style and engage in dilingual discourse (Saville-Troike 1987) where they used the two languages in parallel fashion with their children. Although parents often felt positive about modelling the ethnic language in this way, their responses essentially ratified the children's contributions in the majority language and ignored the linguistic issue.

Third, along with several publications about bilingual child rearing for a general audience (see Cunningham 2011; Baker 2014) my research has indicated that minority language transmission needs planning and guidance. My recorded family interactions indicate that those parents who provided their children with rich socialisation opportunities and discussed children's topics of interest in the minority language appeared more likely to raise bilingual children successfully. Providing the children with wait-time (Cazden 1990) was another important strategy as those parents who actively granted their children time to join the conversation generally generated positive results.

This linguistically based evidence should be provided to migrant parents in an accessible way to enable them to make informed decisions about minority language transmission. The detailed descriptions together with my established connections in both the Ethiopian and Colombian communities suggest that a first step in applying this research could be to hold workshops for ethnic community members emphasising the importance of maintaining ethnic languages and providing illustrations of successful language management and practices. Even in the course of the research as mothers were questioned about their socialisation strategies, one Colombian participant recognised that it would be a step towards LS if her daughter stopped speaking Spanish. She added that she had never thought that maintaining the language was part of her responsibility. Providing these workshops will give ethnic communities the opportunity to reflect on how to overcome obstacles and successfully raise bilingual children in an immigrant situation if they so wish.

The finding should furthermore be of interest to policymakers. Since the early 1990s, several voices have asked for the introduction of an official language policy (e.g. Waite 1992; Kaplan 1993; Harvey 2013). While the general acculturation climate in New Zealand has changed positively to embrace multiculturalism, previous research has shown that migrants tend to

feel unsupported in their attempts to maintain their languages (e.g. Walker 2011a). In light of failed attempts to encourage the establishment of an official language policy for New Zealand, the situations faced by the different refugee families that are laid out in this thesis are likely to provide an informative and detailed basis for future steps to foster linguistic diversity at the state level.

7.6 Suggestions for future research

While this research has provided insight into many different facets of FLP and the recordings of mother-child interactions have provided valuable data on language transmission, there is need for more detailed case studies of both communities. Since no research existed about either of the two communities it was necessary to conduct exploratory research first to identify the community members' attitudes, perceptions and dynamics. Further research can hopefully build on these foundations and devote more time to investigating dynamics within individual families to more fully account for language choice and parenting decisions.

The case studies have also suggested that language use among siblings may be highly influential. It has generally been suggested that older siblings tend to affect LS (Hua & Li 2005), but whether their influence always works in the direction of shift is unclear (Kopeliovich 2009; Schwartz 2010). The difficulties of obtaining actual language data of conversations between siblings no doubt accounts for the only limited number of studies conducted on this subject.

The recordings of naturally-occurring mother-child interactions in three Colombian families have provided valuable insights into intergenerational language negotiation. Similar recordings for Ethiopian families are clearly desirable. Despite the fact that many Ethiopian participants reported that they used Amharic with their children, I witnessed code-switches to English during my ethnographic fieldwork. The items concerned were mostly short routine phrases (*please, thank you, love you*), possibly reflecting a cultural influence on word choice since some languages use these items less frequently (see Guerin 2007; e.g. Amharic: Debela 1995:173). In addition, the children code-switched for culturally-specific items (such as *acorn*) and other nouns and adjectives, which they inserted into Amharic matrix sentences. Further research which uses recordings of naturally-occurring home interactions in the Ethiopian community is thus needed, with Amharic-speaking researchers being able to provide further comments about observed socialisation strategies.

Moreover, the influence of single parenting on the establishment of FLP deserves greater attention. My research has highlighted that single parents face special struggles with transmitting their ethnic language. These were largely related to the restricted time they can typically spend with their children and their children's early exposure to the majority language in childcare (see Schechter & Bayley 2002; Montrul 2008). Future studies will hopefully focus on the dynamics for minority language transmission in single-parent families.

My focus on mothers was warranted by their typically influential role in the upbringing of their children in several ethnic communities. However, the role of fathers in language transmission is under-researched (but see Kim & Starks 2009). Despite the fact that they typically spent less time with their children than the mothers in the two communities, Kim and Starks' research has suggested a very strong influence from fathers on their children's language choice. I broadened the "mother" category to the person most responsible for child-raising, thus including one aunt, uncle and grandmother, and I also included fathers in the data presentation (where fathers were present and data was available), but future studies will hopefully furnish further insight into the effects of fathers' language choices on their children's language use and preferences.

7.7 Closing remarks

My research has shown that parents often lacked awareness of their linguistic duties and were unfamiliar with strategies for teaching their child the minority language well. Given the ethical responsibilities of researchers (see Jacobsen & Landau 2003) I aim to use the relationships I have established and offer advice to migrant families who participated in my study and to members of other ethnic communities to encourage them to preserve their ethnic languages. The lack of discourses about bilingual child-raising in the two communities meant that those wanting to invest in bilingualism faced a solitary experience. I suggest that the establishment of a network which encourages parents to share their experiences in bilingual socialisation would be a useful step in bringing individual experiences together to inform other community members. This will hopefully contribute to a linguistically rich future for New Zealand where children have the opportunity to become proficient bilinguals as they receive solid home education in their ethnic languages.

References

- Aalen, Lovise. 2011. *The politics of ethnicity in Ethiopia: Actors, power and mobilisation under ethnic federalism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Adlam, Patrick Lewis. 1987. *Language and identity: A sociolinguistic survey of the Indonesian speech community in Wellington, New Zealand*. Victoria University of Wellington MA Thesis.
- 'Aipolo, 'Anahina & Janet Holmes. 1990. The use of Tongan in New Zealand: Prospects for language maintenance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11(6). 501–521.
- Altarriba, Jeanette. 2003. Does cariño equal “liking”? A theoretical approach to conceptual nonequivalence between languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 7(3). 305–322.
- Anae, Misatauveve Melani. 2012. Samoans - culture and identity. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
- Andrews, Jane, Prue Holmes & Richard Fay (eds.). 2013. Special issue: Researching multilingually. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 23(3).
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2010. Interpreter-mediated interaction as bilingual speech: Bridging macro-and micro-sociolinguistics in codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14(4). 466–489.
- Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages - crossdisciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115–136. Cambridge: CUP.
- Augoustinos, Martha & Danielle Every. 2007. The language of “race” and prejudice. A discourse of denial, reason, and liberal-practical politics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 26(2). 123–141.
- Austin, John Langshaw. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. 2003. Who’s afraid of bilingualism? In Jean-Marc Dewaele, Hugo Baetens-Beardsmore, Alex Housen & Li Wei (eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baetens-Beardsmore, Hugo. 1982. *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin. 1992. *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin. 2006. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin. 2014. *A parents’ and teachers’ guide to bilingualism*. 4th ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Barac, Raluca & Ellen Bialystok. 2012. Bilingual effects on cognitive and linguistic development: Role of language, cultural background, and education. *Child Development* 83(2). 413–422.
- Barkhuizen, Gary. 2006. Immigrant parents’ perceptions of their children’s language practices: Afrikaans speakers living in New Zealand. *Language Awareness* 15(2). 63–79.

- Barkhuizen, Gary P. & Ute Knoch. 2005. Missing Afrikaans: “Linguistic longing” among Afrikaans-speaking immigrants in New Zealand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26(3). 216–232.
- Barnard, L.F. 1996. *To make a house of a tree: impact of Chilean refugee women’s ethnic identity*. Auckland University MA Thesis.
- Baron-Epel, Orna, Giora Kaplan, Ruth Weinstein & Manfred S. Green. 2010. Extreme and acquiescence bias in a bi-ethnic population. *The European Journal of Public Health* 20(5). 543–548.
- Barron-Hauwaert, Suzanne. 2010. *Bilingual siblings: Language use in families*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1992. *Intimations of postmodernity*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Bayley, Robert. 1994. Consonant cluster reduction in Tejano English. *Language Variation and Change* 6(03). 303–326.
- Bayley, Robert & Sandra Schecter (eds.). 2003. *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Beaglehole, Ann. 2013. *Refuge New Zealand: A nation’s response to refugees and asylum seekers*. Otago: Otago University Press.
- Beals, D.E. & Catherine Snow. 2002. Deciding what to tell: selecting and elaborating narrative topics in family interaction and children’s elicited personal experience stories. In Catherine Snow & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.), *The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*, 15–32. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bell, Allan. 2001. Back in style: Reworking audience design. In Penelope Eckert & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 139–169. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bell, Allan. 2014. *The guidebook to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bell, Allan & Andy Gibson. 2008. Stopping and fronting in New Zealand Pasifika English. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 14(2).
- Benton, Richard. 2001. RLS in Aotearoa / New Zealand 1989–1999. In Joshua Aaron Fishman (ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*, 423–450. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Berardi-Wiltshire, Arianna. 2009. *Italian identity and heritage language motivation: Five stories of heritage language learning in traditional foreign language courses in Wellington, New Zealand*. Massey University PhD Thesis.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 2012. *The location of culture*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Bialystok, Ellen. 2001. Metalinguistic aspects of bilingual processing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 21(1). 169–181.
- Bialystok, Ellen, Fergus I.M. Craik & Gigi Luk. 2012. Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 16(4). 240–250.
- Bialystok, Ellen & Xiaojia Feng. 2009. Language proficiency and executive control in proactive interference: Evidence from monolingual and bilingual children and adults. *Brain and Language* 109(2). 93–100.
- Birman, D. 2005. Ethical issues in research with immigrants and refugees. In Joseph E. Trimble & Celia B. Fisher (eds.), *The handbook of ethical research with ethnocultural populations and communities*, 155–178. London: SAGE.
- Blackledge, Adrian. 2010. Linguistic ethnography. In Michael Grenfell (ed.), *Bourdieu, language and linguistics*, 121–146. New York: Continuum.
- Blom, Jan-Petter & John Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In John Joseph Gumperz & Dell H. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, 407–434. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Blommaert, Jan & Dong Jie. 2010. *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. *Dinner talk: cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 2002. "Do you believe that Lot's wife is blocking the road (to Jericho)?"': Co-constructing theories about the world with adults. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka & Catherine Snow (eds.), *Talking to adults. The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*, 85–116. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Catherine Snow. 2002a. Editors' introduction. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka & Catherine E. Snow (eds.), *Talking to adults. The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*, 1–12. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Catherine Snow. 2002b. Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1960. *The Algeria*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977a. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977b. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16(6). 645–668.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, 241–258. New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2007. *Sketch for a self-analysis*. Polity.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2012. *Le bal des célibataires: crise de la société paysanne en Béarn*. Points Essais.
- Bourdieu, Pierre & Jean Claude Passeron. 1990. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. SAGE.
- Braun, Virginia & Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2). 77–101.
- Bres, Julia De. 2004. Intergenerational attitudes towards Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand. *Wellington Working Papers in Linguistics* 16. 1–20.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 1995. From Mulatta to Mestiza: Passing and the linguistic reshaping of ethnic identity. In Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated: language and the socially constructed self*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4-5). 585–614.
- Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2008. All of the above: New coalitions in sociocultural linguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4). 401–431.
- Burck, Charlotte. 2004. *Multilingual living*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Cabo, Diego Pascual Y & Jason Rothman. 2012. Multilingualism and identity. *The encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Caldas, Stephen J. 2006. *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in monolingual cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Caldas, Stephen J. 2012. Language policy in the family. In Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*, 351–373. Cambridge: CUP.
- Caldas, Stephen J. & Suzanne Caron-Caldas. 2002. A sociolinguistic analysis of the language preferences of adolescent bilinguals: Shifting allegiances and developing identities. *Applied Linguistics* 23(4). 490–514.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2008. Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(2). 143–176.

- Carlisle, Robert S. 1991. The influence of environment on vowel epenthesis in Spanish/English interphonology. *Applied Linguistics* 12(1). 76–95.
- Cavallaro, Francesco. 2005. Language maintenance revisited: An Australian perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal* 29(3). 561–582.
- Cazden, Courtney B. 1990. Differential treatment in New Zealand: Reflections on research in minority education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 6(4). 291–303.
- Central Statistical Agency, Ethiopia, Census 2007.
(http://www.csa.gov.et/images/documents/pdf_files/regional/CountryLevel.pdf accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Chacko, Elizabeth. 2003. Identity and assimilation among young Ethiopian immigrants in metropolitan Washington. *Geographical Review* 93(4). 491–506.
- Changemakers Refugee Forum. 2008. Standards for engagement. Guidelines for central and local government, and NGOs working with refugee background communities.
- Chevalier, Sarah. 2012. Active trilingualism in early childhood: the motivating role of caregivers in interaction. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 9(4). 437–454.
- Chevalier, Sarah. 2013. Caregiver responses to the language mixing of a young trilingual. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 32(1). 1–32.
- Cho, Grace. 2000. The role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships: reflections from a language minority group. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24(4). 369–384.
- Choummanivong, C, GE Poole & A Cooper. 2014. Refugee family reunification and mental health in resettlement. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 9(2). 89–100.
- Christ, Herbert. 2009. Über Mehrsprachigkeit. In Ingrid Gogolin & Ursula Neumann (eds.), *Streitfall Zweisprachigkeit – The bilingualism controversy*, 31–49. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Chumak-Horbatsch, Roma. 2008. Early bilingualism: children of immigrants in an English-language childcare center. *Psychology of Language and Communication* 12(1). 3–27.
- Clark, Eve V. 2003. *First language acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Clyne, Michael. 2011. Multilingualism, multiculturalism and integration. In Michael Clyne & James Jupp (eds.), *Multiculturalism and integration. A harmonious relationship*. Canberra: ANU E Press.
- Clyne, Michael G. & Sandra Kipp. 2006. *Tiles in a multilingual mosaic: Macedonian, Filipino and Somali in Melbourne*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Clyne, Michael & Sandra Kipp. 1999. *Pluricentric languages in an immigrant context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cochran, Moncrieff, Mary Larner, David Riley, Lars Gunnarsson & Charles R. Henderson Jr. 1993. *Extending families: The social networks of parents and their children*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cohen, Robin. 2008. *Global diasporas: An introduction*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Comeau, Liane, Fred Genesee & Lindsay Lapaquette. 2003. The modeling hypothesis and child bilingual codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 7(2). 113–26.
- Computers in homes Porirua. 2010. Computers in homes Porirua: Colombian family graduation, 2010, 27 September. <http://cih-porirua.blogspot.co.nz/2011/01/colombian-family-graduation-course-37.html> accessed 30/10/2014.

- Coupland, Nikolas. 2010. "Other" representation. In Jürgen Jaspers, Jef Verschueren & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *Society and language use*, 241–260. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Crezee, I. 2012. Language shift and host society attitudes: Dutch migrants who arrived in New Zealand between 1950 and 1965. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16(4). 528–540.
- Crezee, Ineke. 2008. *I understand it well, but I cannot say it proper back: language use among older Dutch migrants in New Zealand*. Auckland University of Technology PhD Thesis.
- Cui, Bao-Hui. 2012. *The differential attitudes of parents and children towards Chinese as a heritage language in a New Zealand context*. Auckland: University of Auckland MA Thesis.
- Cummins, James. 1979. Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research* 49(2). 222–251.
- Cummins, James. 1984. *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, Jim. 2000. *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cunningham, Una. 2011. *Growing up with two languages: A practical guide for the bilingual family*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2009. Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy* 8(4). 351–375.
- Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2013a. Negotiating family language policy: Doing homework. In Mila Schwartz & Anna Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 277–295. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2013b. Family language policy: sociopolitical reality versus linguistic continuity. *Language Policy* 12(1). 1–6.
- Dabène, Louise & Danièle Moore. 1995. Bilingual speech of migrant people. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages - crossdisciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 17–44. Cambridge: CUP.
- Danby, S., L. Ewing & K. Thorpe. 2011. The novice researcher: Interviewing young children. *Qualitative Inquiry* 17(1). 74–84.
- Davies, Charlotte Aull. 2012. *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Davis, Karen & Donna Starks. 2005. Four factors for Cook Islands Māori language maintenance. In Allan Bell, Ray Harlow & Donna Starks (eds.), *Languages of New Zealand*, 298–321. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Debela, Nega Worku. 1995. *Minority language education with special reference to the cultural adaption of the Ethiopian community in South Australia*. University of Adelaide PhD Thesis.
- Debela, Nega Worku & R. Milosh. 1995. Language maintenance in the Armenian and Ethiopian communities in South Australia. *Educational Practice and Theory* 17(2). 51–61.
- Dept of Labour: New Faces, New Futures. 2009. (http://www.dol.govt.nz/publications/research/lisnz/lisnz-main_12.asp accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Der Avoird, T. Van, P. Broeder & G. Extra. 2001. Immigrant minority languages in the Netherlands. *The other languages of Europe*, 215–242. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Dewaele, Jean-Marc & Li Wei. 2013. Is multilingualism linked to a higher tolerance of ambiguity? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16(1). 231–240.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc & Seiji Nakano. 2013. Multilinguals' perceptions of feeling different when switching languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(2). 107–120.
- Dijk, Teun A. Van. 2011. Discourse and ideology. In Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE.
- Djité, Paulin G. 2011. Language policy in Australia: What goes up must come down? In Catrin Norrby & John Hajek (eds.), *Uniformity and diversity in language policy: Global perspectives*, 53–67. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Döpke, Susanne. 1992. *One parent, one language: an interactional approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: OUP.
- Duff, Patricia A. 2006. Beyond generalizability: Contextualization, complexity, and credibility in applied linguistics research. In Micheline Chalhoub-Deville, Carol A. Chapelle & Patricia A. Duff (eds.), *Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple perspectives*, 65–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1897. *Le Suicide*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Language variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Education Counts Subject Enrolment. 2013. (http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/schooling/july_school_roll_returns/subject-enrolment accessed on 20/10/2014).
- Edwards, John R. 1985. *Language, society, and identity*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ehala, Martin. 2011. Hot and cold ethnicities: modes of Ethnolinguistic Vitality. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32(2). 187–200.
- Elliott, S. & I. Yusuf. 2014. “Yes, we can; but together”: social capital and refugee resettlement. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 9(2). 101–110.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan & Amy Strage. 1985. Parent-child discourse. In Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*, 67–77. Academic Press London.
- Ethnologue Colombia. 2014. (https://www.ethnologue.com/country/co/default/***EDITION*** accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Ethnologue Ethiopia. 2014. (http://www.ethnologue.com/country/et/default/***EDITION*** accessed 30/10/2014).
- Ethnologue Summary by Language Size. (<http://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/size> accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Extra, Guus & Ludo Verhoeven. 1999. Immigrant minority groups and immigrant minority languages in Europe. In Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Bilingualism and migration*, 3–28. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Extra, Guus & Kutlay Yağmur. 2010. Language proficiency and socio-cultural orientation of Turkish and Moroccan youngsters in the Netherlands. *Language and Education* 24(2). 117–132.
- Fairburn-Dunlop, Peggy. 1984. Factors associated with language maintenance: The Samoans in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 20(2). 115–128.
- Fantini, Alvino E. 1985. *Language acquisition of a bilingual child: a sociolinguistic perspective (to age ten)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Ferguson, Beth. 2011. *The Bhutanese refugee resettlement journey*. Wellington: Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.
- Fernandez, Sue & Michael Clyne. 2007. Tamil in Melbourne. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28(3). 169–187.
- Fina, Anna De. 2003. *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique* 1(2). 67–88.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. *Language in sociocultural change*. Stanford University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1989. *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2001. From theory to practice (and vice versa): Review, reconsideration and reiteration. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*, 451–483. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2002. “Holy languages” in the context of societal bilingualism. In Li Wei, Jean-Marc Dewaele & Alex Housen (eds.), *Opportunities and challenges of bilingualism*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2006. Language policy and language shift. In T. Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*, 311–328. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Charles Albert Ferguson & Jyotirindra Das Gupta. 1968. *Language problems of developing nations*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fogle, Lyn. 2013. Family language policy from the children’s point of view: Bilingualism in place and time. In Mila Schwartz & Anna Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 177–200. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Fogle, Lyn & Kendall King. 2013. Child agency and language policy in transnational families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 19(0).
- Fought, Carmen. 2003. *Chicano English in context*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fought, Carmen. 2006. *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gafaranga, Joseph. 2010. Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society* 39(02). 241–270.
- Gafaranga, Joseph & Maria-Carme Torras i Calvo. 2001. Language versus Medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5(2). 195–219.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press.
- Ganassin, Sara & Prue Holmes. 2013. Multilingual research practices in community research: The case of migrant/refugee women in North East England. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23(3). 342–356.
- Gao, Fang. 2012. Imagined identity of ethnic Koreans and its implication for bilingual education in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(3). 343–353.
- García, Ofelia. 2012. Ethnic identity and language policy. In Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*, 79–99. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gardner, R. C. & W. E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Gardner, Sheena & Marilyn Martin-Jones. 2012. *Multilingualism, discourse, and ethnography*. New York/London: Routledge.

- Garner, Mark, Christine Raschka & Peter Sercombe. 2006. Sociolinguistic minorities, research and social relationships. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27(1). 61–78.
- Garrett, Paul B. & Patricia Baquedano-López. 2002. Language socialisation: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31(1). 339–361.
- Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gass, Susan M. & Larry Selinker. 1994. *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gebrekidan, Abay. 2012. *Parenting in the context of immigration: A cross-cultural investigation among Ethiopian immigrant parents in Sweden*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Genesee, Fred, Isabelle Boivin & Elena Nicoladis. 1996. Talking with strangers: A study of bilingual children's communicative competence. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 17(04). 427–442.
- Genesee, Fred, Elena Nicoladis & Johanne Paradis. 1995. Language differentiation in early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language* 22(03). 611–631.
- Ghimenton, Anna. 2013. Reading between the code choices: Discrepancies between expressions of language attitudes and usage in a contact situation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 0(0). 1–22.
- Gibbons, John & Elizabeth Ramírez. 2004a. Different beliefs. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 23(1). 99–117.
- Gibbons, John & Elizabeth Ramírez. 2004b. *Maintaining a minority language: A case study of Hispanic teenagers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Giles, Howard, Richard Yvon Bourhis & D.M. Taylor. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In Howard Giles (ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic.
- Giles, Howard & Patricia Johnson. 1981. The role of language in ethnic group relations. In J.C. Turner & Howard Giles (eds.), *Intergroup Behaviour*, 199–243. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Giles, Howard & Patricia Johnson. 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68. 69–100.
- Giles, Howard & Philip Smith. 1979. Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Giles, H., D. Rosenthal & L. Young. 1985. Perceived ethnolinguistic vitality: The Anglo-and Greek-Australian setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(3-4). 253–269.
- Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka. 1995. *Key words, culture and cognition*. Philosophica 55(1). 37–67.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. Replies and responses. *Language in Society* 5(3). 257–313.
- Gogolin, Ingrid. 2009. *Streitfall Zweisprachigkeit*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Gogonas, Nikos. 2012. Religion as a core value in language maintenance: Arabic speakers in Greece. *International Migration* 50(2). 113–129.

- Goodkind, J. R. & Z. Deacon. 2004. Methodological issues in conducting research with refugee women: Principles for recognizing and re-centering the multiply marginalized. *Journal of Community Psychology* 32(6). 721–739.
- Goodz, Naomi S. 1989. Parental language mixing in bilingual families. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 10(1). 25–44.
- Goodz, Naomi S. 1994. Interactions between parents and children in bilingual families. In Fred Genesee (ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*, 61–81. Cambridge: CUP.
- Grammont, Maurice. 1902. *Observations sur le langage des enfants*. Paris: Melange.
- Granger, Sylviane & Helen Swallow. 1988. False friends: a kaleidoscope of translation difficulties. *Langage et l'Homme* 23.
- Green, Elliott. 2011. Decentralization and political opposition in contemporary Africa: evidence from Sudan and Ethiopia. *Democratization* 18(5). 1087–1105.
- Greenwood, Davydd James & Morten Levin. 2006. *Introduction to action research: Social research for social change*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Grosjean, Francois. 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Guardado, Martín. 2002. Loss and maintenance of first language skills: Case studies of Hispanic families in Vancouver. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 58(3). 341–63.
- Guardado, Martín. 2006. Engaging language and cultural spaces: Latin American parents' reflections on language loss and maintenance in Vancouver. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics (CJAL)/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée (RCLA)* 9(1). 51–72.
- Guardado, Martín. 2008a. *Language socialization in Canadian Hispanic communities : ideologies and practices*. University of British Columbia PhD Thesis.
- Guardado, Martín. 2008b. Language, identity, and cultural awareness in Spanish-speaking families. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 40(3). 171–181.
- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo. 1997. The emergence of a transnational social formation and the mirage of return migration among Dominican transmigrants. *Identities Global Studies in Culture and Power* 4(2). 281–322.
- Gudykunst, William B. & Karen L. Schmidt. 1987. Language and ethnic identity: An overview and prologue. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6(3-4). 157–170.
- Guerin, Pauline. 2007. Language and refugees: Beyond mere cultural miscommunication. In Janet Holmes, Margaret MacLagan, Paul Kerswill & Martin Paviour-Smith (eds.), *Researching Language Use and Language Users*, 85–98.
- Guerin, Pauline & Bernard Guerin. 2007. Research with refugee communities: Going around in circles with methodology. *The Australian Community Psychologist* 19(1). 150–162.
- Guion, Lisa A., David C. Diehl & Debra McDonald. 2011. Triangulation: Establishing the Validity of Qualitative Studies. <http://www.rayman-bacchus.net/uploads/documents/Triangulation.pdf> accessed on 30/10/2014
- Gumperz, John Joseph. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- György-Ullholm, Kamilla. 2010. *Same mother tongue - different origins : Implications for language maintenance and shift among Hungarian immigrants and their children in Sweden*. Stockholm: Stockholm University PhD Thesis.
- Habecker, Shelly. 2012. Not black, but Habasha: Ethiopian and Eritrean immigrants in American society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35(7). 1200–1219.
- Hakuta, Kenji. 1991. *Distinguishing between proficiency, choice and attitudes in questions about language for bilinguals*. Stanford Center for Chicano Research.
- Hall, Stuart. 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. In Jonathan Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference*, 222–237. Lawrence & Wishart.

- Hall, Stuart. 1992. The question of cultural identity. *Modernity and its futures*. 273–316.
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique. 2008. Plurilingual Latin America: Indigenous languages, immigrant languages, foreign languages - towards an integrated policy of language and education. In Christine Helot & Anne-Marie de Mejia (eds.), *Forging multilingual spaces. Integrated perspectives on majority and minority bilingual education*, 58–108. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hammer, C. S., E. Komaroff, B. L. Rodriguez, L. M. López, S. E. Scarpino & B. Goldstein. 2012. Predicting Spanish-English bilingual children's language abilities. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 55(5). 1251–1264.
- Hammersley, Martyn & Paul Atkinson. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Harris, Judith Rich. 1995. Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review* 102(3). 458.
- Harvey, Sharon. 2013. Revisiting the idea of a national languages policy for New Zealand: How relevant are the issues today? *The TESOLANZ Journal*.
- Hatoss, Anikó. 2013. *Displacement, language maintenance and identity: Sudanese refugees in Australia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hatoss, Aniko & Terry Sheely. 2009. Language maintenance and identity among Sudanese-Australian refugee-background youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30(2). 127–144.
- Held, David, Anthony G McGrew, David Goldblatt & Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford University Press.
- Heller, M. & M. Martin-Jones (eds.). 2001. *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Heller, Monica. 2003. *Crosswords: Language, education and ethnicity in French Ontario*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hoare, Richard David. 1991. *Samoan language maintenance within the Aukilani (Auckland), Niu Sila (New Zealand) community*. University of Otago MA Thesis.
- Hoff, Erika, Cynthia Core, Silvia Place, Rosario Rumiche, Melissa Señor & Marisol Parra. 2012. Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language* 39(1). 1–27.
- Hoffmann, Charlotte. 1985. Language acquisition in two trilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(6). 479–495.
- Holmes, Janet. 1997. Keeping tabs on language shift in New Zealand: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 18(1). 17–39.
- Holmes, Janet & Allan Bell. 1988. Learning by experience: notes for New Zealand social dialectologists. *Te Reo* 31. 19–49.
- Holmes, Janet, Meredith Marra & Bernadette Vine. 2011. *Leadership, discourse, and ethnicity*. Oxford: OUP.
- Holmes, Janet, Mary Roberts, Maria Verivaki & 'Anahina 'Aipolo. 1993. Language Maintenance and Shift in Three New Zealand Speech Communities. *Applied Linguistics* 14(1). 1–24.
- Hornberger, Nancy H. & D.C. Johnson. 2007. Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 41(3). 509–532.
- Houwer, A. De. 1999. Environmental factors in early bilingual development: the role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In Guus Extra & L. Verhoeven (eds.), *Bilingualism and migration*, 75–95. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Houwer, Annick De. 1990. *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Houwer, Annick De. 2007. Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28(03). 411–424.
- Houwer, Annick De. 2009. *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hua, Zhu. 2008. Duelling languages, duelling values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(10). 1799–1816.
- Hua, Zhu & Li Wei. 2005. Bi- and multilingual language acquisition. In Martin Ball (ed.), *Clinical sociolinguistics*, 165–179. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hulsen, Madeleine, Kees de Bot & Bert Weltens. 2002. Between two worlds. Social networks, language shift, and language processing in three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2002(153). 27–52.
- Hulsen, Madeleine Elisabeth Helena. 2000. *Language loss and language processing: Three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand*. Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen PhD Thesis.
- Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, G. 2001. Pasefika languages and Pasefika identities: Contemporary and future challenges. In C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley & M. Anae (eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The evolving identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Hurtado-Roberts, Laura. 2002. Some reflections on the integration of Latin American communities into New Zealand society, through the example of “arcoiris.” http://www.devnet.org.nz/conf2002/papers/Hurtado-Roberts_Laura.pdf.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W.C. Sturtevant (eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior*, 13–53. Washington: The Anthropology Society of Washington.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1981. *“In vain I tried to tell you”: essays in Native American ethnopoetics*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Immigration New Zealand. 2013. Refugee resettlement factsheet. New Zealand Immigration Service Web Site.
- Internal Affairs. 2014. Language and Integration in New Zealand. <http://ethnicaffairs.govt.nz/sites/default/files/files/LanguageandIntegrationinNZ.pdf>.
- Jacobsen, Karen & Loren B. Landau. 2003. The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration. *Disasters* 27(3). 185–206.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2012. *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jakich, Miranda. 1987. The Yugoslav language in New Zealand. In Walter Hirsh (ed.), *Living languages: Bilingualism & community languages in New Zealand*. Heinemann.
- Jaspaert, K. & S. Kroon. 1993. Methodological issues in language shift research. In Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Johri, Roopali. 1998. *Stuck in the middle or clued up on both? Language and identity among Korean, Dutch and Samoan immigrants in Dunedin*. University of Otago PhD Thesis.
- Jo, Hyejeong. 2013. Habitus transformation: Immigrant mother's cultural translation of educational strategies in Korea. *Asia-Pacific Education, Language Minorities and Migration (ELMM) Network Working Paper Series*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Jones Díaz, Criss. 2011. Children's voices. Spanish in urban multilingual and multicultural Australia. In Kim Potowski & Jason Rothman (eds.), *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English-speaking societies*, 251–281. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Joudi Kadri, Rose. 2009. *Resettling the unsettled: the refugee journey of Arab Muslims to New Zealand*. Auckland University of Technology PhD Thesis.
- Juan-Garau, Maria & Carmen Pérez-Vidal. 2001. Mixing and pragmatic parental strategies in early bilingual acquisition. *Journal of Child Language* 28(1). 59–86.
- Kanno, Yasuko. 2000. Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3(1). 1–18.
- Kanno, Yasuko & Bonny Norton. 2003. Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2(4). 241–249.
- Karan, Mark E. 2011. Understanding and forecasting ethnolinguistic vitality. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32(2). 137–149.
- Kasuya, Hiroko. 1998. Determinants of language choice in bilingual children: The role of input. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2(3). 327–346.
- Kasuya, Hiroko. 2002. Bilingual context for language development. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka & Catherine E. Snow (eds.), *Talking to adults. The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition*, 295–325. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kim, Sun Hee Ok & Donna Starks. 2009. The role of fathers in language maintenance and language attrition: the case of Korean–English late bilinguals in New Zealand. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13(3). 285–301.
- King, Kendall & Lyn Fogle. 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, Kendall, Lyn Fogle & Aubrey Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5). 907–922.
- King, Kendall & Aubrey Logan-Terry. 2008. Additive bilingualism through family language policy: Strategies, identities and interactional outcomes. *Calidoscópio* 6(1). 5–19.
- Kingsley, Leilarna Elizabeth. 2010. *Language policy in multilingual workplaces: Management, practices and beliefs in banks in Luxembourg*. Victoria University of Wellington PhD Thesis.
- Kipp, Sandra & Michael Clyne. 2003. Trends in the shift from community languages: insights from the 2001 Census. *People and Place* 11. 33–41.
- Kirsch, Claudine. 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.
- Kloss, H. 1966. German-American language maintenance efforts. In Joshua A. Fishman, V. Nahirny, J. Hofman & R. Hayden (eds.), *Language loyalty in the United States*, 206–252. The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Komondouros, Markos & Lisa McEntee-Atalianis. 2007. Language attitudes, shift and the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Greek Orthodox community in Istanbul. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28(5). 365–384.
- Kopeliovich, Shulamit. 2009. *Reversing language shift in the immigrant family: a case study of a Russian-speaking community in Israel*. Berlin: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller.
- Kopeliovich, Shulamit. 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.
- Kopeliovich, Shulamit. 2013. Happylingual: A family project for enhancing and balancing multilingual development. In Mila Schwartz & Anna Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 249–275. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Kortesluoma, Riitta-Liisa, Maija Hentinen & Merja Nikkonen. 2003. Conducting a qualitative child interview: methodological considerations. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 42(5). 434–441.

- Kulick, Don. 1992. *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kuncha, Rekha M. & Hanoku Bathula. 2004. *The role of attitudes in language shift and language maintenance in a new immigrant community: A case study*. Auckland: AIS Centre for Research in International Education.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William & Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: oral version of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*, 12–24. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Lambert, Wallace E., Robert C. Gardner, H. C. Barik & Kenneth Tunstall. 1963. Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 66(4). 358–368.
- Languages in Aotearoa New Zealand. 2013. Royal Society of New Zealand. (<http://assets.royalsociety.org.nz/media/Languages-in-Aotearoa-New-Zealand.pdf> accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2004. *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2007. Multilingualism and the family. In Peter Auer & Li Wei (eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*, 45–68. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lave, J. & E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lawrence, Jody. 2007. *Placing the lives experience(s) of TB in a refugee community in Auckland, New Zealand*. University of Auckland PhD Thesis.
- Leek, Robert H. 1996. The Dutch and their language in New Zealand. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Lee, Sarah. 2013. *Spanish language maintenance and shift among the Chilean community in Auckland*. Auckland University of Technology PhD Thesis.
- Leopold, Werner F. 1939. *Speech development of a bilingual child: a linguist's record*. Northwestern University.
- Lin, P.M.S. & A. Siyanova. 2014. Internet television for L2 vocabulary learning. In D. Nunan & J.C. Richards (eds.), *Language learning beyond the classroom*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Li Wei. 1993. Mother tongue maintenance in a Chinese community school in Newcastle Upon Tyne: Developing a social network perspective. *Language and Education* 7(3). 199–215.
- Li Wei. 1994. *Three generations, two languages, one family: language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li Wei. 2000. Dimensions of Bilingualism. In Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader*, 3–22. New York/London: Routledge.
- Li Wei. 2012. Language policy and practice in multilingual, transnational families and beyond. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(1). 1–2.
- Long, Michael H. 1981. Input, interaction, and second-language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 379(1). 259–278.
- Luo, Shiow-Huey & Richard L. Wiseman. 2000. Ethnic language maintenance among Chinese immigrant children in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 24(3). 307–324.

- Luykx, Aurolyn. 2005. Children as socializing agents: Family language policy in situations of language shift. *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1407–1414.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 2014. *The CHILDES project tools for analyzing talk – electronic edition. Part 1: The CHAT transcription format*. Carnegie Mellon University.
- Maira, Sunaina. 2002. *Desis in the house: Indian American youth culture in New York City*. Temple University Press.
- Makihara, Miki & Bambi Schieffelin. 2007. Cultural processes and linguistic mediations: Pacific explorations. In Miki Makihara & Bambi Schieffelin (eds.), *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies*, 3–29. Oxford: OUP.
- Mann, Steve. 2011. A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 32(1). 6–24.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare & Darren Paffey. 2011. Linguistic imperialism: who owns global Spanish? In Manuel Diaz-Campos (ed.), *Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, 747–764. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mawji, Rahim. 2013. The Orthodox Church in the Ethiopian diaspora. (www.youtube.com/watch?v=c20r2B11YYY accessed on 30/10/2014)
- May, Stephen. 2011. *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. 2nd edition. New York/London: Routledge.
- McCaffery, J. J. & P. Tuafuti. 2003. Samoan children's bilingual language and literacy development. In R. Barnard & T. Glynn (eds.), *Bilingual Children's language and literacy development*, 80–107. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, Teresa L. 2014. *Ethnography and language policy*. New York/London: Routledge.
- McEntee-Atalianis, Lisa J. & Stavros Pouloukas. 2001. Issues of identity and power in a Greek-Cypriot community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22(1). 19–38.
- McIlwaine, Cathy. 2005. Coping practices among Colombian migrants in London. (<http://www.geog.qmul.ac.uk/docs/staff/4402.pdf> Accessed on 30/10/2014). London: Queen Mary, University of London.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1962. *The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man*. University of Toronto Press.
- Meager, Zoe. 2005. *The home of exile: Housing the Auckland Ethiopian refugee population*. University of Auckland MA Thesis.
- Meakins, Felicity & Gillian Wigglesworth. 2013. How much input is enough? Correlating comprehension and child language input in an endangered language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(2). 171–188.
- Mejía, Anne-Marie De. 2006. Bilingual education in Colombia: Towards a recognition of languages, cultures and identities. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal* 8. 152–168.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam & Nancy Niedzielski. 1994. Resistance to creolization: An interpersonal and intergroup account. *Language & Communication* 14(4). 313–330.
- Michaelis, Susanne, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.). 2013. *The atlas and survey of pidgin and creole languages*. Oxford: OUP.
- Mills, Jean. 2001. Being bilingual: Perspectives of third generation Asian children on language, culture and identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 4(6). 383–402.
- Mills, Jean. 2005. Connecting communities: Identity, language and diaspora. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8(4). 253–274.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Language and social networks*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Milroy, Lesley & James Milroy. 1992. Social network and social class: Toward an integrated sociolinguistic model. *Language in Society* 21(1). 1–26.
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. 2014. Migration Trends Key Indicators Report: June 2014. <http://www.dol.govt.nz/research/migration/monthly-migration-trends/14jun/index.asp> (accessed on 22/10/2014).
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2010. Latin America: A revised approach. <http://www.mfat.govt.nz/Foreign-Relations/Latin-America/0-LASF-as-approved-by-cabinet-2010.php> accessed on 30/10/2014.
- Mirvahedi, Seyed Hadi. 2014. *Language policy, language practices and language shift in Tabriz*. Victoria University of Wellington PhD Thesis.
- Moin, Victor, Ekaterina Protassova, Valeria Lukkari & Mila Schwartz. 2013. The role of family background in early bilingual education: The Finnish-Russian experience. In Mila Schwartz & Anna Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 53–82. (7). Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Moll, L., S. Díaz, E. Estrada & L. Lopes. 1992. Making contexts: The social construction of lessons in two languages. In S. Arvisu & M. Saravia-Shore (eds.), *Cross-cultural literacy*, 339–366. New York: Garland Press.
- Montrul, Silvina A. 2004. Convergent outcomes in L2 acquisition and L1 loss. In Monika S. Schmid, Barbara Kopke, Merel Keijzer & Lina Weilemar (eds.), *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*, 259–280. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Montrul, Silvina A. 2008. *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mous, Maarten. 2003. Loss of linguistic diversity in Africa. In Mark Janse & Sijmen Tol (eds.), *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches*, 157–170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mu, Guanglun Michael. 2014. Heritage language learning for Chinese Australians: the role of habitus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(5). 497–510.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 2002. *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*. London/New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Myers, Greg & Sofia Lampropoulou. 2012. Impersonal you and stance-taking in social research interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(10). 1206–1218.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1997. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Clarendon Press.
- Nakanishi, Nobuko. 2000. *Language maintenance and language shift in the Japanese community of Auckland: A study of the interaction between the sojourners and the immigrants*. University of Auckland MA Thesis.
- Neazor, Catherine. 1991. Language maintenance and shift in the Wellington Polish community. *Wellington Working Papers in Linguistics* 3. 36–55.
- Nicholas, Sheilah E. 2011. “How are you Hopi if you can’t speak it?”: An ethnographic study of language as cultural practice among contemporary Hopi youth. In Teresa L. McCarty (ed.), *Ethnography and language policy*, 52–75. New York/London: Routledge.
- Nicoladis, Elena & Fred Genesee. 1998. Parental discourse and codemixing in bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2(1). 85–99.
- Nicoladis, Elena & Giovanni Secco. 2000. The role of a child’s productive vocabulary in the language choice of a bilingual family. *First Language* 20(58). 3–28.
- Norton, Bonny. 2013. *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Ochs, Elinor. 1988. *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Okita, Toshie. 2002. *Invisible work: Bilingualism, language choice, and childrearing in intermarried families*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- O’Leary, Zina. 2010. *The essential guide to doing your research project*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE.
- Oller, D. Kimbrough, Linda Jarmulowicz, Barbara Z. Pearson & Alan B. Cobo-Lewis. 2011. Rapid spoken language shift in early second-language learning. *Language and literacy development in bilingual settings*, 94–120. Guilford Press.
- Ordóñez, Claudia Lucia. 2011. Education for bilingualism in international languages in a monolingual sociolinguistic context. *Lenguaje* 36(2). 353–384.
- Page, Robert Brock Le & Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: CUP Archive.
- Pan, Barbara Alexander. 1995. Code negotiation in bilingual families: “My body starts speaking English.” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16(4). 315–327.
- Park, S. M. & M. Sarkar. 2007. Parents’ attitudes toward heritage language maintenance for their children and their efforts to help their children maintain the heritage language: A case study of Korean-Canadian immigrants. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 20(3). 223–235.
- Paul, James C.N. 2000. Ethnicity in Ethiopia and Eritrea. In Yash Ghai (ed.), *Autonomy and ethnicity: Negotiating competing claims in multi-ethnic states*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt & Jonathan M. Watt. 2012. Language policy and religion. In Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pauwels, Anne. 2004. Language maintenance. In Alan Davies & Catherine Elder (eds.), *The handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 719–737. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pauwels, Anne. 2005. Maintaining the community language in Australia: Challenges and roles for families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8(2-3). 124–131.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 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.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2006. *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pavlenko, Aneta & Adrian Blackledge. 2004. Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In Aneta Pavlenko & Adrian Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pease-Alvarez, Lucinda. 2002. Moving beyond linear trajectories of language shift and bilingual language socialization. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 24(2). 114–137.
- Pene, Gina, Marisa Peita & Philippa Howden-Chapman. 2009. Living the Tokelauan way in New Zealand. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 35. 79–92.
- Pérez Báez, Gabriela. 2013. Family language policy, transnationalism, and the diaspora community of San Lucas Quiavini of Oaxaca, Mexico. *Language Policy* 12(1). 27–45.
- Peuronen, Saija. 2013. Heteroglossia as a resource for reflexive participation in a community of Christian snowboarders in Finland. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(3). 297–323.
- Phinney, J. S., G. Horenczyk, K. Liebkind & P. Vedder. 2001. Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(3). 493–510.

- Phinney, J. S., I. Romero, M. Nava & D. Huang. 2001. The role of language, parents, and peers in ethnic identity among adolescents in immigrant families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 30(2). 135–153.
- Phipps, Alison. 2013. Linguistic incompetence: Giving an account of researching multilingually. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23(3). 329–341.
- Pica, T. 1992. The textual outcomes of native speaker/non-native speaker negotiation. In Claire Kramsch & Sally McConnell-Ginet (eds.), *Text and context: cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study*, 198–237. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Pilkington, Jane. 1990. Mixed marriages and language maintenance: some Samoan data. *Wellington Working Papers in Linguistics* 1. 28–36.
- Piller, Ingrid. 2001a. Private language planning: the best of both worlds? *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 2. 61–80.
- Piller, Ingrid. 2001b. Linguistic intermarriage: Language choice and negotiation of identity. In Aneta Pavlenko, Adrian Blackledge, Ingrid Piller & Teutsch-Dwyer (eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning and gender*, 199–230. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Plimmer, C. 1994. Language maintenance and shift in the Italian community of Wellington. *Wellington Working Papers in Linguistics* 6. 83–104.
- Poluha, Eva. 2004. *The power of continuity: Ethiopia through the eyes of its children*. Nordic Africa Institute.
- Pozo Gutiérrez, Alicia. 2007. From neglect to re-discovery: Language and identity amongst Spanish migrants in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 19(3). 205–230.
- Prevoo, Mariëlle J.L., Judi Mesman, Marinus H. Van Ijzendoorn & Suzanne Pieper. 2011. Bilingual toddlers reap the language they sow: ethnic minority toddlers' childcare attendance increases maternal host language use. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32(6). 561–576.
- Quay, Suzanne. 2001. Early trilingual development. In Jasone Cenoz & Fred Genesee (eds.), *Trends in bilingual acquisition*, 149–200. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Quay, Suzanne. 2008. Dinner conversations with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language* 28(1). 5–33.
- Quiroz, Blanca G., Catherine E. Snow & Jing Zhao. 2010. Vocabulary skills of Spanish—English bilinguals: impact of mother—child language interactions and home language and literacy support. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14(4). 379–399.
- Rampton, B. 2007. Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(5). 584–607.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, Ben. 2006. *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rampton, Ben, Karin Trusting, Janet Maybin, Richard Barwell, Angela Creese & Vally Lytra. 2004. UK linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper. Unpublished, http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/organisations/lingethn/documents/discussion_paper_jan_05.pdf accessed on 30/10/2014.
- Renzaho, A. M. N., M. McCabe & W. J. Sainsbury. 2011. Parenting, role reversals and the preservation of cultural values among Arabic speaking migrant families in Melbourne, Australia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35(4). 416–424.
- Ribetti, Marcella. 2007. The unveiled motivations of violence in intra-state conflicts: The Colombian guerrillas. *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 18(4). 699–720.

- Rivera. 1997. *Contra viento y marea. Social work paradigm on dual pressures faced by Latin American women*. Massey University MA Thesis.
- Roberts, Mary Lucy. 1999. *Immigrant language maintenance and shift in the Gujarati, Dutch and Samoan communities of Wellington*. Victoria University of Wellington PhD Thesis.
- Roberts, Mary Lucy. 2005. Immigrants' attitudes to language maintenance in New Zealand. In Allan Bell, Ray Harlow & Donna Starks (eds.), *Languages of New Zealand*, 248–270. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Roer-Strier, Dorit & Roni Strier. 2006. The role of home and school in the socialization of immigrant children in Israel: Fathers' views. In R. Kirova & L. Adams (eds.), *Children in transition: Effects of global migration on the young*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 2011. Identity and multilingualism. *Bilingual youth. Spanish in English-speaking societies*, 7 – 30. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ronjat, J. 1913. *Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne H. Champion.
- Roth, Froma P., Deborah L. Speece, David H. Cooper & Susan De la Paz. 1996. Unresolved mysteries: How do metalinguistic and narrative skills connect with early reading? *The Journal of Special Education* 30(3). 257–277.
- Rubin, Herbert J. & Irene Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. 3rd edition. London: SAGE.
- Ruby, Mahera. 2012. The role of a grandmother in maintaining Bangla with her granddaughter in East London. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(1). 67–83.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. & Kenji Ima. 1988. The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network Scholarly Paper.
- Sabogal, Fabio, Gerardo Marín, Regina Otero-Sabogal, Barbara Vanoss Marín & Eliseo J. Perez-Stable. 1987. Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 9(4). 397–412.
- Al-Sahafi, M.A. & Gary Barkhuizen. 2006. Language use in an immigrant context: The case of Arabic in Auckland. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics* 12(1). 51–69.
- Sahele, Samson. 2005. *Giving voice to refugee youth. An exploratory study of education issues for Ethiopian, Somali, Eritrean, Iraqui and Oromo students in Wellington schools*. Refugee ChangeMakers.
- Sallabank, J. 2010. The role of social networks in endangered language maintenance and revitalization: The case of Guernesiais in the Channel Islands. *Anthropological Linguistics* 52(2). 184–205.
- Sallabank, Julia. 2012. Diversity and language policy for endangered languages. In Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*, 100–123. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sanchez-Castro, Olga & Jeffrey Allan Gil. 2008. Two perspectives on language maintenance: The Salvadorian community in Queensland and the Spanish community in South Australia. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture* 26(1). 80–92.
- Sandoval, Tiffany C., Tamar H. Gollan, Victor S. Ferreira & David P. Salmon. 2010. What causes the bilingual disadvantage in verbal fluency? The dual-task analogy. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 13(02). 231–252.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2005. The conditions and consequences of professional discourse studies. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2(3). 371–439.

- Saunders, George. 1988. *Bilingual children: From birth to teens*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1987. Dilingual discourse: the negotiation of meaning without a common code. *Linguistics* 25(1).
- Schechter, Sandra R. & Robert J. Bayley. 1997. Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(3). 513–541.
- Schechter, Sandra R. & Robert J. Bayley. 2002. *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en El Norte*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. & Elinor Ochs. 1986. Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 163–191.
- Schiffman, Harold F. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Schmitt, Norbert & Ronald Carter. 2004. Formulaic sequences in action: An introduction. In Norbert Schmitt (ed.), *Formulaic sequences. Acquisition, processing and use*, 1–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schwartz, Mila. 2008. Exploring the relationship between family language policy and heritage language knowledge among second generation Russian–Jewish immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29(5). 400–418.
- Schwartz, Mila. 2010. Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. *Applied Linguistics Review* 1. 171–192.
- Schwartz, Mila & Anna Verschik. 2013. *Successful family language policy: Parents, children and educators in interaction*. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Sercombe, Peter, Mark Garner & Christine Raschka. 2006. Editors’ introduction to “Sociolinguistic research – who wins? Research on, with or for speakers of minority languages.” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27(1). 1–3.
- Shameem, Nikhat. 1994. The Wellington Indo-Fijians: Language shift among teenage new immigrants. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15(5). 399–418.
- Shameem, Nikhat. 1995. *Hamai log ke boli: Our language. Language shift in an immigrant community: the Wellington Indo-Fijians*. Victoria University of Wellington PhD Thesis.
- Shenk, Elaine. 2008. Choosing Spanish: Dual language immersion and familial ideologies. In Mercedes Nino-Murcia & Jason Rothman (eds.), *Bilingualism and linguistic identity*, 221–256. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shohamy, Elana Goldberg. 2006. *Language policy: hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Smidt, Wolbert. 2010. The Tigrinnya-speakers across the borders: Discourses of unity and separation in an ethnohistorical context. In Markus Hoehne & Feyissa Dereje (eds.), *State borders and borderlands in the Horn of Africa*, 61–84. London: James Currey.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2014. Being socialised into language shift: the impact of extended family members on family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(5). 511–526.
- Smith, Hilary Anne. 2014. Re: Report: Language and integration in New Zealand (2013).
- Smolicz, J. 1981. Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4(1). 75–90.
- Smolicz, J. J. 1992. Minority languages as core values of ethnic cultures. In Willem Fase, Koen Jaspaert & Sjaak Kroon (eds.), *Maintenance and loss of minority languages*, 277–306. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Smolicz, J. J., M. J. Secombe & D. M. Hudson. 2001. Family collectivism and minority languages as core values of culture among ethnic groups in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22(2). 152–172.

- Snow, Catherine E. & Diane E. Beals. 2006. Mealtime talk that supports literacy development. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 2006(111). 51–66.
- Snow, Catherine E. & Charles A. Ferguson. 1979. *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Souza, Ruth De. 2012. *Doing it for ourselves and our children: Refugee women on their own in New Zealand*. Refugee Services Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2002. Prospects for the survival of the Navajo language: A reconsideration. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 33(2). 139–162.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2004. *Language policy*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2009. *Language management*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2012. Family language policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(1). 3–11.
- Spolsky, Bernard & Robert Leon Cooper. 1991. *The languages of Jerusalem*. Clarendon Press.
- Starks, Donna. 2005. Other languages of New Zealand: Introduction. In Allan Bell, Ray Harlow & Donna Starks (eds.), *Languages of New Zealand*, 241–247. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Starks, Donna, Ray Harlow & Allan Bell. 2005. Who speaks what language in New Zealand? In Allan Bell, Ray Harlow & Donna Starks (eds.), *Languages of New Zealand*, 13–29. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Starks, D., M. Taumoevalau, A. Bell & K. Davis. 2005. Language as a marker of ethnic identity in New Zealand's Pasifika communities. In James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad & Jeff MacSwan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 2189–2196. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Statistics NZ, 2013 Census ethnic group profile Ethiopians.
(http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/ethnic-profiles.aspx?request_value=24792&tabname=Populationandgeography accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Statistics NZ, 2013 Census ethnic group profiles: Colombians.
(http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/ethnic-profiles.aspx?request_value=24780&tabname=Populationandgeography accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Stavans, Anat. 2012. Language policy and literacy practices in the family: The case of Ethiopian parental narrative input. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(1). 13–33.
- Stavans, Anat, Elite Olshtain & Gil Goldzweig. 2009. Parental perceptions of children's literacy and bilingualism: The case of Ethiopian immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30(2). 111–126.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1). 31–57.
- Stoessel, S. 2002. Investigating the role of social networks in language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 93–132.
- Stoffel, Hans-Peter. 1981. Observations on the Serbo-Croatian language in New Zealand. *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 1. 53–64.
- Stoffel, Hans-Peter. 1996. The Dalmatians and their language. In Robert H. Leek, Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

- Sun, Susan. 1999. The New Zealand-born Chinese community of Auckland: Aspects of language maintenance and shift. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4(2). 1–14.
- Surus, Sarah. 1985. *The Polish language in Auckland, New Zealand: A study of lexical transfers and their integration in the speech of bilingual Polish migrants within a sociolinguistic frame of reference*. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Swain, Merrill & James Cummins. 1979. Bilingualism, cognitive functioning and education. *Language Teaching* 12(01). 4–18.
- Tagoilelagi-LeotaGlynn, Fa'asaulala, S. McNaughton, S. MacDonald & S. Farry. 2005. Bilingual and biliteracy development over the transition to school. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8(5). 455–479.
- Tajfel, H. & J.C. Turner. 1979. An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Takeuchi, Masae. 2006. *Raising children bilingually through the “one parent-one language” approach: A case study of Japanese mothers in the Australian context*. Peter Lang.
- Talmy, Steven. 2011. The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics* 32(1). 25–42.
- Tamis-LeMonda, Catherine S., M. H. Bornstein & L. Baumwell. 2001. Maternal responsiveness and children's achievement of language milestones. *Child Development* 72(3). 748–767.
- Tamis-LeMonda, Catherine S. & Eileen T. Rodriguez. 2008. Parents' role in fostering young children's learning and language development. *Encyclopedia of the Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development (CEECD)*.
- Tannenbaum, Michal. 2003. The multifaceted aspects of language maintenance: A new measure for its assessment in immigrant families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6(5). 374–393.
- Tannenbaum, Michal. 2009. What's in a language? Language as a core value of minorities in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(6). 977–995.
- Tannenbaum, Michal & Pauline Howie. 2002. The association between language maintenance and family relations: Chinese immigrant children in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 23(5). 408–424.
- Taumoefolau, Melenaita, Donna Starks, Karen Davis & Allan Bell. 2002. Linguists and language maintenance: Pasifika languages in Manukau, New Zealand. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41(1). 15–27.
- Te Kete Ipurangi. 2007. Official languages. (<http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/Official-languages> accessed on 30/10/2014 accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Te Puni Kokiri. 2006. Te oranga o te reo Māori 2006. The health of the Māori language in 2006. (<http://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/in-print/our-publications/publications/the-health-of-the-maori-language-in-2006/download/tpk-2008-health-maori-language-2006.pdf> accessed on 30/10/2014).
- Teshome, Selome E. 2004. *“Habesha girls”: Conversations on race, identity and culture. An interview of first generation Ethiopian women in Seattle, Washington*. Washington State University MA Thesis.
- Torras, Maria-Carme & Joseph Gafaranga. 2002. Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual service encounters in Barcelona. *Language in Society* 31(4). 527–548.
- Tuominen, Anne. 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140(1). 59–76.

- UNHCR. 2014. 2014 UNHCR country operations profile - Colombia.
<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/page?page=49e492ad6>.
- United Nations. 1992. Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. Resolution. 47/135.
<http://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/guideminoritiesdeclarationen.pdf>
 accessed on 30/10/2014.
- Vaccarino, Franco & Ute Walker. 2009. Fostering multiple literacies in a linguistically diverse Aotearoa New Zealand: A family biliteracy perspective. *International Journal of Learning* 15(11).
- Valdés, Guadalupe, C. Chavez & C. Angelelli. 2003. A performance team: Young interpreters and their parents. In Guadalupe Valdés (ed.), *Expanding definitions of giftedness: The case of young interpreters from immigrant countries*, 63–97. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Varela, R. Enrique, Laura A. Niditch, Lauren Hensley-Maloney, Kathryn W. Moore & C. Christiane Creveling. 2013. Parenting practices, interpretive biases, and anxiety in Latino children. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* 27(2). 171–177.
- Vasquez, O. A., L. Pease-Alvarez, S. M. Shannon & L. Moll. 2007. *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexicano community*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Verivaki, Maria. 1990. *Language maintenance and shift in the Greek community of Wellington, New Zealand*. Victoria University of Wellington MA Thesis.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Vine, Bernadette, Gary Johnson, Jennifer O'Brien & Shelley Robertson. 2002. Wellington archive of New Zealand English transcriber's manual. *Language in the Workplace Occasional Papers* 5.
- Wagaw, Teshome G. 1999. Conflict of ethnic identity and the language of education policy in contemporary Ethiopia. *Northeast African Studies* 6(3). 75–88.
- Walker, Ute. 1995. *Bilingualism in German-born immigrant children in New Zealand. A case study*. Massey University MA Thesis.
- Walker, Ute. 2011a. Linguistic diversity as a bridge to adjustment: Making the case for bi/multilingualism as a settlement outcome in New Zealand. *Language policy for the multilingual classroom: Pedagogy of the possible*, 149–173. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Walker, Ute. 2011b. The role of community in preserving Spanish in New Zealand. In Kim Potowski & Jason Rothman (eds.), *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English-speaking societies*, 331–354. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ward, Colleen. 2013. Probing identity, integration and adaptation: Big questions, little answers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 37(4). 391–404.
- Ward, Colleen & James H. Liu. 2012. Ethno-cultural conflict in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Balancing indigenous rights and multicultural responsibilities. In Dan Landis & Rosita D. Albert (eds.), *Handbook of ethnic conflict*, 45–69. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Warren, Susan, Sharon Harvey & Miriam Meyerhoff. 2014. Re: Report on Language and Integration. Letter written on 28 April 2014.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen Ann & Matthew C. Bronson. 2013. The intersections of language socialization and sociolinguistics. In Robert Bayley, Richard Cameron & Ceil Lucas (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Weldeyesus, Weldu Michael. 2009. *Language socialization and ensuing identity construction among Ethiopian immigrants in metropolitan Denver*. University of Colorado PhD Thesis.

- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, Margaret & Jonathan Potter. 1992. *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation*. Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, Claire & Martine Powell. 2001. *Guide to interviewing children: Essential skills for counsellors, social workers, police lawyers*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Wilson, Nicholas Andrew. 2011. *Leadership as communicative practice: the discursive construction of leadership and team identity in a New Zealand rugby team*. Victoria University of Wellington PhD Thesis.
- Winter, Joanne & Anne Pauwels. 2000. Gender and language contact research in the Australian context. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21(6). 508–522.
- Wong Fillmore, Lily. 1991. When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6(3). 323–346.
- Woods, Anya. 2004. *Medium or message?: Language and faith in ethnic churches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Woolard, Kathryn Ann. 2007. Bystanders and the linguistic construction of identity in face-to-back communication. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*, 187–208. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Worthy, Jo. 2006. Como si le falta un brazo: Latino immigrant parents and the costs of not knowing English. *Journal of Latinos and Education* 5(2). 139–154.
- Worthy, Jo & Alejandra Rodriguez-Galindo. 2006. “Mi hija vale dos personas”: Latino immigrant parents’ perspectives about their children’s bilingualism. *Bilingual Research Journal* 30(2). 579–601.
- Wray, Alison. 2002. *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Yamamoto, Masayo. 2001. *Language use in interlingual families: A Japanese-English sociolinguistic study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Yates, Lynda & Agnes Terraschke. 2013. Love, language and little ones: Successes and stresses for mothers raising bilingual children in exogamous relationships. In Mila Schwartz & Anna Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 105–125. Dordrecht/New York: Springer.
- Yu, Shanjiang. 2005. *Family factors in bilingual children’s code-switching and language maintenance: A New Zealand case study*. Auckland University of Technology PhD Thesis.
- Yu, Shanjiang. 2010. How much does parental language behaviour reflect their language beliefs in language maintenance? *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 20(1). 1–22.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual. Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 2009. “Dime con quién hablas, y te diré quién eres”: linguistic (in) security and Latina/o unity. In Juan Flores & Renato Rosaldo (eds.), *A companion to Latina/o studies*, 25–38. Oxford/New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Appendix One: Human Ethics Committee Consent Form

Phone 0-4-463 5676
Fax 0-4-463 5209
Email Allison.kirkman@vuw.ac.nz

MEMORANDUM

TO	Melanie Revis
COPY TO	Janet Holmes Meredith Marra
FROM	Dr Allison Kirkman, Convener, Human Ethics Committee
DATE	14 June 2012
PAGES	1
SUBJECT	Ethics Approval: 19320 Language maintenance and shift in the Ethiopian and Colombian refugee communities in Wellington

Thank you for your application for ethical approval, which has now been considered by the Standing Committee of the Human Ethics Committee.

Your application has been approved from the above date and this approval continues until 30 November 2014. If your data collection is not completed by this date you should apply to the Human Ethics Committee for an extension to this approval.

Best wishes with the research.

Allison Kirkman
Human Ethics Committee

Appendix Two: Participant Information Sheet

Title of project: **Language maintenance and shift in the Colombian and Ethiopian refugee communities in Wellington**

Researcher: Melanie Revis

The purpose of this study: I am a PhD student in Linguistics at Victoria University and I am studying how Colombian and Ethiopian immigrants in New Zealand maintain their community languages (Spanish and Amharic). My focus is an exploration of patterns of language use and beliefs about language. Since the research involves human participants, ethics approval has been obtained from the university.

What happens in the study: My study includes recordings and observations of families, as well as a questionnaire about language use and attitudes. 8 families will be given an electronic recorder to record a few hours of their family conversations at home. I am also interested in having conversations about the participants' attitudes and experiences with using their mother tongue in New Zealand. In addition, I will be looking for 15 mothers and 15 children between the ages of 4 and 10 to talk through a questionnaire about their language use and attitudes, for which more information will be provided in due time.

What are the costs to you as a participant: The researcher understands that the participants will give their time, either for an interview or for recording a few hours of their interaction at home (total approximately 8 hours over 1 month), and that this might be a burden to the families.

What are the benefits of the study: The results of this study will be made available to the Colombian and Ethiopian communities in writing and will provide suggestions for the maintenance of Spanish and Amharic in New Zealand.

How is your privacy protected: All names will be changed so that confidentiality is secured and no participant can be identified from the data. The recordings and notes will be stored safely on the researcher's computer in password protected files and will only be used for the purposes of this research. If participants decide to withdraw in the course of the study, there will be no consequences and all files will be deleted. You are free to withdraw within 6 weeks of finishing the recordings, interviews or completing the questionnaire.

If you have any questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at 022-6481756 or melanie.revis@vuw.ac.nz, or my supervisors, Professor Janet Holmes and Dr Meredith Marra at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Rooms 301/404, Von Zedlitz Building, Victoria University of Wellington, phone (04) 463 5600.

Melanie Revis

Appendix Three A: Interview Schedule with Ethiopian mothers

1. Background

- When is your birthday?
- Which city were you born in? Where were you raised?
- When did you come to New Zealand?
- Have you spent time outside of your country before coming here?
- Have you gone back to Ethiopia or (country of refuge) since you came here?
- What is your level of education? What language was your education in?
- Did you know English before you came to NZ? Where did you speak or hear it? How often?
- How many family members live in your house?
 - How old are they?
 - Which languages do they speak?
- What do your children do in their free time?
- Who are their friends?

2. Linguistic proficiency

- In your opinion, how proficient are you in English on a scale from 1 to 10 (speak, understand, write, read)?
- How about in Amharic (speak, understand, write, read)?
- How proficient would you say are your children in English on a scale from 1 to 10? (speak, understand, write, read)
- How about in Amharic?

3. Social networks

- Do you have contact with your family?
 - In New Zealand?
 - Abroad? (where)
 - How often?
 - What languages do you speak together?
- Where and how often do you meet other Ethiopians in New Zealand?
- Have you travelled in New Zealand? Was it to visit other Ethiopians?
- Who cares for your children when you don't have time?
- Who do you talk to when you need advice? emotional support?
- From whom would you borrow money? Who would you lend money to?
- With whom do you play sports?
- Dances, parties, movies?
- Do you practice any religion? How often?
- Are you involved with any Ethiopian association?
- How satisfied are you with your friendships and activities here?
- How do your friendships and activities compare to those in Ethiopia or (country of refuge)?

4. Linguistic ideologies and attitudes towards Amharic maintenance and bilingualism

- What are your feelings about Spanish? About English?
- How important do you think it is ...
 - to speak English when you live in New Zealand?
 - for Amharas to speak Amharic in New Zealand?
- Do you think ...
 - Amharic should be maintained in New Zealand?
 - Amharic will survive in New Zealand? How?
- Which language is most important for your children at the moment?

- How about in the future? Do you think your child will still use Amharic then?
- How important is it to you that your children continue speaking Amharic?
- Do you think your children should attend official Amharic classes?
- Do you think all Amharic-speaking Ethiopians here should teach their children Amharic?
- How would you feel if your children ...
 - couldn't speak Amharic?
 - didn't want to speak Amharic?
- Have you ever worried about ...
 - your communication with your children?
 - other family members' (grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins) communication with your children?
- Do you find it important that your children learn English?
- What do you think about bilingualism?
- What do you think your child thinks about bilingualism?
- Which languages would you like your family to speak in the future?
- Should the government only support Māori-English bilingualism? More support for other languages?
- Have you ever spoken with your husband about which languages you speak at home?
- Do you have rules?

5. Ethnic identity

- Which cultural group do you feel you belong to?
- With which language do you identify yourself?
- Do you want this to change in the future? Why/why not?
- Is it important for you which culture you practice in your home with your family? Examples?
- Do you believe your family has developed a new culture since you've left your country?
- Is Amharic important for keeping up your cultural identity?

6. Children's language use patterns

- Which languages do your children's friends speak? Where are they from?
- Do your children have contact with other Amharic-speaking children?
- Do your children speak Amharic or English with other children who can speak Amharic?
- If both, can you recognize when they rather use Amharic and when they use English? Do they switch?
- Do you think your children are losing Amharic? If so, why do you think they are losing it?
- Are your children trying to speak Amharic?
- Have you done something to help your children practice Amharic?
- If not, do you have plans for the future to do so?
- Have you helped your children to learn English?
- Which language do you speak with your children?
- Which language do your children speak with you?
- Which language do your children use when they speak with each other?
- What would you recommend for other parents to do if they want their children to be bilingual?

7. School information

- How are your children doing at school?
- Do they ever speak Amharic at school?
- Has the school given any support for Amharic?
 - If not, would you like the school to support the use of Amharic?
- Do you think it might be bad for your children's education if you speak Amharic at home?

8. Parents' language use patterns

- Do you speak Amharic here in New Zealand? With whom?
- Do you read the newspaper in Amharic?
- Do you watch movies/TV in Amharic?
- How many hours do you spend on the internet every day? In which language?
- Are you a member of *Facebook* or another internet community?
- Do you sometimes mix languages when you speak?
- Who do you speak English with?

9. Integration

- Do you feel affected by what you have experienced when you fled Ethiopia?
- What were some of the challenges when you came to New Zealand?
- Have you overcome the challenges now?
- Have you experienced racism?
- What do you think about New Zealand culture?
- Do you feel welcome in New Zealand?

Appendix Three B: Interview Schedule with Colombian mothers

1. Trasfondo

- ¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?
- ¿De qué ciudad viene?
- ¿Ha pasado tiempo fuera de su país antes de venir aquí?
- ¿Qué tipo de educación tiene? En qué idioma?
- ¿Hablaba/escuchaba inglés en su país o en otro país antes de venir?
 - ¿En qué situaciones?
- ¿Cuándo llegó a Nueva Zelanda?
- ¿Cuántos miembros de familia hay en su casa?
 - ¿Qué edad tienen?
 - ¿Qué idiomas hablan?
- ¿Qué hacen los niños en su tiempo libre?
- ¿Tienen muchos amigos/as?
- ¿Qué idioma hablan las demás personas que viven en el barrio?

2. Competencia lingüística

- ¿Qué le parece ...
 - su competencia en inglés en una escala de 1 a 10? (hablar, entender, escribir, leer)
 - su competencia en español en una escala de 1 a 10?
 - la competencia de su hijo/-a en inglés en una escala de 1 a 10?
 - la competencia de su hijo/-a en español en una escala de 1 a 10?

3. Redes sociales

- ¿Cuánto contacto tiene con su familia y amigos en NZ/ en el extranjero? Con quién?
- ¿Participa en eventos / viaja a otros lugares donde se encuentra con más colombianos?
- ¿Tiene su hijo/hija contacto con otro hispano-hablantes?
- ¿Quién cuida a su hijo/-a si Ud. no tiene tiempo?
- ¿A quién se dirige Ud. si necesita consejo / apoyo emocional? ¿Qué tipo de consejo?
- ¿De quién se prestaría dinero y a quién prestaría dinero?
- ¿Con quién hace deporte?
- ¿Bailar, fiestas, películas?
- ¿Asiste Ud. a algún tipo de religión?
- ¿Qué nivel de satisfacción tiene con sus amigos y con las actividades que tiene aquí?
- ¿Cómo se comparan sus amistades y actividades aquí con los que tenía en Colombia o Ecuador?

4. Ideologías lingüísticas y actitudes hacia el mantenimiento del español y el bilingüismo

- Cómo se siente
 - acerca del español?
 - acerca del inglés?
- ¿Cómo ve el inglés en la comunidad?
- ¿Cómo ve el español en la familia/comunidad/mundo?
- ¿Cree que vale la pena conservar el español en casa en Nueva Zelanda?
- ¿Cree que el español va a sobrevivir en Wellington?

- ¿Cuál idioma piensa usted es más importante para sus hijos en este momento?
- ¿Y en el futuro? ¿Qué expectativas tiene respecto a la necesidad de usar el español?
- ¿Qué idiomas le gustaría que su familia hablara en el futuro? ¿Le gustaría que en su familia se usara más de un idioma?
- ¿Piensa que sólo el bilingüismo en inglés-maori debería ser valorado y apoyado por el gobierno?
- ¿Piensa que debería haber más apoyo para bilingüismo en otras lenguas?
- ¿Le gustaría que su hijo/-a continuara a hablar español? ¿Qué importancia tiene?
- ¿Le parece importante que su hijo/-a aprenda inglés?
- ¿Piensa Ud. que su hijo/-a debería atender cursos oficiales de español?
- ¿Le parece que todos los colombianos aquí deberían saber hablar español?
- ¿Le parece que es importante para los demás colombianos enseñar español a sus hijos?
- ¿Cómo se sentiría ...
 - si su hijo/-a ya no supiera hablar español?
 - si su hijo/-a ya no querría hablar español?
- ¿Tendría ventajas su hijo/-a si fuera bilingüe?
- ¿Cómo cree que su hijo/-a opinaría sobre ventajas de ser bilingüe?
- ¿Está preocupado/a acerca de la comunicación ...
 - que tiene su hijo con Ud.?
 - que tiene su hijo con miembros de la familia (abuelos, tíos, primos)?

5. Identidad étnica

- ¿A qué grupo cultural siente que pertenece? ¿Con qué idioma se identifica?
- ¿Desea que eso cambie en el futuro? ¿Por qué (no)?
- ¿Es la identidad cultural de su hogar importante para usted? ¿Para su familia?
- ¿Es el español importante para conservar su identidad cultural?
- ¿Cree que su familia ha desarrollado o esta desarrollando una nueva identidad cultural?

6. Patrones de uso lingüístico del hijo / de la hija

- ¿Qué idiomas hablan los amigos/as de su hijo/-a? ¿De qué etnicidades son? ¿Países de origen?
- ¿Tienen sus hijos/as muchos amigos/as que hablan inglés?
- ¿Tienen amigos/as hispano-parlantes?
- ¿Se hablan en español entre ellos?
- ¿Si sus hijos/as usan ambas lenguas, ve usted algún patrón de uso cuando habla una lengua o la otra (inglés / español)? ¿Mezclan los dos idiomas?
- ¿Piensa usted que sus hijos/as están perdiendo el español?
- ¿Tratan sus hijos/as de hablar en español?
- ¿Ha hecho algo para ayudar a sus hijos/as retener el español?
- ¿Tiene planes para el futuro respecto a esta situación?
- ¿Hace algo para ayudar a su hijo/-a con el inglés?
- ¿Cada día, cuánto tiempo pasan hablando inglés sus hijos/as? ¿Con quién?
- ¿Cada día, cuánto tiempo pasan hablando español sus hijos/as? ¿Con quién?
- ¿Les habla en español o en inglés?
- ¿Sus hijos/as le hablan en inglés o español?
- ¿En qué idioma hablan sus hijos/as entre ellos?

- ¿Si piensa que sus hijos/as están perdiendo su primera lengua, existen ciertos factores que cree que han contribuido a la pérdida del idioma?
- ¿Si los padres y madres desean que sus hijos/as sean bilingües, qué les aconsejaría para promoverlo?

7. Información escolar

- ¿Cómo les va en la escuela a sus hijos/as?
- ¿Hablan español sus hijos/as en la escuela?
- ¿Le gustaría que sus hijos/as hablaran español en la escuela?
- ¿Se apoya el uso del español en la escuela de sus hijos/as?
- ¿Si no se apoya, entonces, le gustaría a usted que hubiera algún tipo de apoyo para el uso del español?
- ¿Le parece que utilizar el español en casa le hace daño a la educación de sus hijos?

8. Uso del español por parte de los padres

- ¿Habla español aquí en Nueva Zelanda? ¿Con quién?
- ¿Lee el periódico en español?
- ¿Ve películas en español?
- ¿Es Ud. miembro de facebook o otras redes sociales en la web?
- ¿Cuánto tiempo pasa en el internet cada día?
- ¿A veces mezcla los dos idiomas en una frase o en una conversación?
- ¿Ha regresado a su país u otro país de habla español?
- ¿Jamás ha hablado con su pareja sobre qué idioma habla en casa con su pareja, sus hijos/-as y con otras personas que viven en su casa?
- ¿Tiene reglas?

9. Integración

- ¿Le parece que lo que ha vivido en Colombia le está afectando aquí?
- ¿Ha experimentado su familia dificultades con el idioma durante el proceso de adaptación a la sociedad en Nueva Zelanda?
- ¿Ha logrado su familia sobrepasar esos desafíos?
- ¿Han habido dificultades culturales? ¿Existe algo cultural con lo cual su familia ha tenido que luchar?
- ¿Se sienten bienvenidos en esta sociedad?
- ¿Han experimentado racismo?
- ¿Que piensa de la cultura de Nueva Zelanda?

Appendix Four: Interview Schedule with Children

- Where were you born?
- When is your birthday?
- What did you do today?
- What do you like / don't like doing during the week?
- Do you watch movies?
 - In what language?
 - What movies are there in Amharic/Spanish that you watch?
 - How much time do you spend watching movies?
- What kind of music do you like to listen to?
 - When do you usually listen to music?
- Do you meet up with friends sometimes?
 - What are your friends' names?
 - Where are they from?
 - What languages do you speak together?
- Do you ever forget words in Amharic/Spanish?
- Do you like Amharic/Spanish?
 - What do you like about Amharic/Spanish?
- Do you like English?
 - What do you like about English?
- Which language do you feel most comfortable in to express your feelings when you are angry? happy? sad?
- Do you always know which language to use to a person?
- Can you talk with your family in Africa/Colombia? How do you feel when you talk with them in Amharic/Spanish?
- Do you have friends here who speak Amharic/Spanish?
 - How old are they?
 - Where are they from?
- What language do you speak with your parents?
 - Do you ever change between English and Amharic/Spanish when you speak with your parents?
 - How about with your brother/sister?
 - In what situations do you switch to English when you talk with them?
 - Do you ever wish your parents would speak English with you?
- How might Amharic/Spanish help you (be important to you) in your future life? Work? Studies?
- What's the most difficult thing about Amharic/Spanish?
- Are you proud of knowing Amharic/Spanish?
- If you have children one day, do you want them to speak Amharic/Spanish with you?
- Do you read books/comics/picture books/anything in Amharic/Spanish?
 - by yourself?
 - (if they show me an Amharic/Spanish book) Where is your book from?
- Do you use the internet/computer?
 - What kind of games do you play on the internet/computer?
- Do you write letters? emails? chat?
- What do you think about ...
 - NZ playgrounds?

- NZ houses?
- New Zealand schools?
 - Do you like it when your parents visit your school? Why/why not?
- What can you remember about Africa/Colombia?
- Do you want to go back to Africa/Colombia one day?
- What do you like about living in Africa/Colombia?
- Where would you rather live?
- Are you in touch with friends from Africa/Colombia?

Appendix Five A: Consent Form (English)

Consent to Participation in Research

Title of project: **Language maintenance and shift in the Colombian and Ethiopian refugee communities in Wellington**

Researcher: **Melanie Revis**

Tick relevant statements:

- ☐ I have read (or have had read to me) and understood the information provided about this research project.
- ☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.
- ☐ I understand and agree that I will record about 2 hours of interaction each week in my family for 1 month.
- ☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or on behalf of my daughter/son, or any information that I have provided for this project at any time within 6 weeks after the data has been provided. If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant recordings or transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.
- ☐ I agree, also on behalf of my daughter/son _____, to take part in this research and that the results may be used for research and publications/presentations.
- ☐ I understand that my child will also be asked to agree to participate in this research.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

Project supervisors' contact details:

Prof Janet Holmes

Room 301, Von Zedlitz Building

Victoria University of Wellington

Phone: 04 463 5614

Dr Meredith Marra

Room 404, Von Zedlitz Building

Victoria University of Wellington

Phone: 04 463 5636

Appendix Five B: Consent Form (Spanish)

Consentimiento para participar en la investigación

Título del proyecto: El mantenimiento y cambio del español en la comunidad de refugiados colombianos en Wellington

Investigadora: Melanie Revis

Marca las frases que aplican:

- ☐ Estoy enterada y comprendo la información provista sobre esta investigación.
- ☐ He tenido oportunidad de hacer preguntas y de recibir respuestas.
- ☐ Entiendo y estoy de acuerdo en que la investigadora observará para ver cuáles idiomas hablamos y cuándo y con quién los utilizamos.
- ☐ Entiendo y estoy de acuerdo en que grabaré 2 horas de conversación en mi familia cada semana por un mes.
- ☐ Entiendo y estoy de acuerdo en que voy a participar en una entrevista sobre el mantenimiento del español en Nueva Zelanda.
- ☐ Estoy de acuerdo con participar en esta investigación, también en representación de mi hijo/hija _____, y que los resultados se puedan utilizar para investigaciones, publicaciones y presentaciones.
- ☐ Entiendo que mi hijo/hija también será invitado a participar en esta investigación.
- ☐ Estoy enterado/a de que puedo retirar mi participación en esta investigación y también la de mi hijo/hija, incluso cualquier información que he provisto por este proyecto, teniendo como límite seis semanas después de proveer los datos. En este caso, entiendo que todas las grabaciones y transcripciones, o partes de éstas, serán destruidas.

Firma: _____

Nombre: _____

Fecha: _____

Detalles de las directoras de tesis:

Prof Janet Holmes
Oficina 301, Edificio Von Zedlitz
Victoria University of Wellington
Teléfono: 04 463 5614

Dr Meredith Marra
Oficina 404, Edificio Von Zedlitz
Victoria University of Wellington
Teléfono: 04 463 5636

Appendix Six: Transcription conventions

Adapted from Vine et al. (2002) and CHILDES transcription guidelines (MacWhinney 2014)

The first letter of a word is capitalised at the beginning of sentences. Utterances end with a full stop, an exclamation mark, or a question mark.

YES	Capitals indicate emphatic stress
[laughs]	Paralinguistic features, descriptive comments
+	Shorter pause within the context of the conversation
++	Longer pause within the context of the conversation
-	Incomplete or cut-off utterance
wha-	Hyphen indicates cut off word, both self-interruption and other speaker interruption
[...]	Section of transcript omitted
xxx	Unintelligible words
[voc]	Untranscribable noises
(well)	Transcriber's best guess at unclear speech
[<i>comments</i>]	Editorial comments italicised in square brackets

Simultaneous speech:

//	Indicates start of simultaneous or overlapping speech in utterance of “current” or “first” speaker.
\	Indicates end of simultaneous or overlapping speech in utterance of “current” or “first” speaker.
/	Indicates start of simultaneous or overlapping speech in utterance of “incoming” or “second” speaker.
\\	Indicates end of simultaneous or overlapping speech in utterance of “incoming” or “second” speaker, e.g. A: I'd like to come as well. //Is\ that okay? B: /Yeah.\\