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Abstract

Situated within research on language socialization and family language policy, this thesis explores how young children (2–4 years old) learn their heritage language in multilingual, transnational families, and how multilingualism becomes an integral part of family life. It draws on video-ethnographic fieldwork in three bi/multilingual families in Sweden with preschool-aged children where the mothers speak Russian and the parents aspire to raise children multilingually.

Using a multimodal interactional analysis, the three studies identify and examine recurrent language practices that promote the children’s use of the heritage language, Russian, in mother-child interactions. They approach heritage language maintenance as embedded in mundane activities such as home language lessons during collaboratively accomplished chores (Study I), conversational storytelling during mealtime (Study II), and co-narration during literacy events (Study III).

The analyses focus on the interactional organization of language learning agendas and heritage language socialization environments that are initiated by the mothers to scaffold their children’s learning and use of Russian. In particular, this study illuminates various ways to engage the children in collaborative Russian speech production, including mutually enjoyable embodied performances. Moreover, it is shown in detail how high expectations of children as heritage language speakers and learners and educational efforts are interactionally balanced through relational work.

The findings suggest that the realization of family language policy to support heritage language development relies not only on consistent language choice, frequency of language use, and parental strategies and ideologies, but also on how language choice and language use are embedded in the ongoing activity, how activity formats are organized and appropriated by the children, the position of the child as a speaker vis-à-vis the parent, and affective alignments. The study uncovers an interplay of educational, relational, ideological, and pragmatic dimensions of heritage language socialization in the home. In this way, the thesis contributes to a more nuanced understanding of family language policy and children’s emergent multilingualism as integrated in everyday family life.
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1. Introduction

This is a study of how young children, 2–4 years old, learn and use their heritage language in multilingual, transnational families, and how multilingualism becomes an integral part of family life. It offers a detailed exploration of several language-centered practices in which the children and their mothers are engaged in during the course of everyday activities. The thesis draws on video-ethnographic fieldwork in three multilingual families with preschool children in Sweden, where the mothers speak Russian and the parents aspire to raise children multilingually.

The starting point is that language use in multilingual families intertwines with the experience of childrearing that occurs in a specific socio-historical context (Okita, 2002). Unlike most manuals for parents or research that focuses on “successful family language policy” (Schwartz & Verschik, 2013), “input-output” processes (De Houwer, 2007, 2009), or “optimal multilingual outcomes” (Quay & Chevalier, 2019), this study does not go on a quest to find the best strategy of heritage language maintenance and bilingual development. Instead, it attends to patterns of language use as constituted by and as constitutive of family life within the context of family language policy (FLP). FLP encompasses both intentional parental language planning and interactional practices (Fogle & King, 2013; King, 2016; King & Fogle, 2013; Lanza & Vold Lexander, 2019), and has tight links with language socialization inquiry (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014). This approach allows for exploring microprocesses and dynamics between the family’s languages evoked in situ, illustrating multilingual family’s complexities and repertoires (Lanza, 2021), and acknowledging children as socializing actors (Cekaite et al., 2016; Smith-Christmas, 2020). Hence, the primary focus is on the co-creation of interactional environments that enable various opportunities for language learning and position children as multilingual heritage language speakers.

Growing up in multilingual families

A while ago, studies demonstrated that “different bilingual practices form distinct types of sociabilities,” and that language choice itself becomes a

---

1 In this thesis, the term multilingualism is employed as an umbrella term for using more than one named language. The term bilingual refers specifically to the use of two languages.
communicative resource for family members (Aronsson, 1999, p. 290). In the context of globalization, the question of language choice and raising children in multilingual settings comes high on the agenda for a growing number of families (Fogle & King, 2013; Lanza & Li, 2016). Although common in many communities around the world, it is a relatively new phenomenon in a European context (Lanza & Vold Lexander, 2019). These families and their language practices, policies and ideologies vary as their family multilingualism is formed in different ways through their migration journey, for example, through family reunification of labor migrants or intercultural marriage. In fact, family migration accounts for the largest migration flows in the OECD countries (up to 40%), with family formation as a significant driver (OECD, 2017).

To capture the linguistic and cultural diversity in these families, many concepts are used: multilingual transnational (King, 2016; Li, 2012), transcultural (Lanza & Li, 2016), international and interlingual (Yamamoto, 2001), bilingual-bilingual (Meyer Pitton, 2013a; Ogiermann, 2013), mixed-marriage couples (OECD, 2017; Ringblom, 2012), linguistic intermarriage (Piller, 2001), English as a lingua franca couples (Pietikäinen, 2017), and others. The study of multilingual encounters in such families is a way to address current international mobility and urban development (Lanza & Li, 2016). The ways in which these families deal with issues of language choice and use reflect the challenges of a globalized modern world, but are also embedded in the everyday business of running a family life, maintaining relationships and teaching children what is important in specific communities and cultural contexts.

This study uses a language socialization approach that explores how children learn, apprehend and enact their sociocultural environment (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014). It views language as a paramount force of socialization on the premise that “language is social life” as social activities and roles are organized by language (Duranti, 2009, p. 293). From this perspective, a multilingual family is constituted by family members’ use of their multilingual repertoires (Lanza, 2021) as well as “the ongoing, unfolding organization of activities” (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018, p. 3).

To accomplish their daily tasks and build relationships, family members engage in various language practices that evoke specific sociocultural conceptions of language, multilingualism, and linguistic norms. In the process of multilingual language socialization (Fogle & King, 2017; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014), language norms are linked to social norms and ideas on childrearing that are continuously reproduced and transformed in mundane family life. Detailed attention to children’s participation in practices and interactional routines allows for documenting how family language policies are invoked in dynamic moment-to-moment interaction and how they interplay with other dimensions of family life. This dialectical process becomes central for children’s language learning.
Maintenance of the *heritage language*, which is a home language that differs from the dominant community language (Polinsky, 2015), is an important facet of language socialization in multilingual families. Yet, the social context for bilingual language use in transnational families can be different from diaspora communities or minority language groups, where, for example, marriages within an ethnic group are an important factor for maintaining the language (Morris & Jones, 2008). As Ogiermann (2013) points out, members of transnational families meet the “other” language and culture on a more intimate basis, when languages are involved in creating relationships and affiliations. With this in mind, the present study seeks to reveal these intimate dynamics of familial multilingualism with a focus on heritage language maintenance and children’s socialization pathways.

The case analyzed in this thesis provides a rich ground for investigating how children are socialized to use their heritage language in a multilingual family context. Prior research has shown that the mothers’ interests, language competence, and interactional work are crucial for supporting children’s emerging multilingualism (Irving Torsh 2020; Kopeliovich, 2013; Okita, 2002; Said, 2021). The Russian-speaking mothers participating in this study are well educated and have a background in languages and/or education. They have a strong personal and professional interest in their children’s language development and invest a lot of time and resources to support them in becoming confident multilingual speakers. Language-centered practices as a central feature of family talk in middle-class families (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015b) become even more prominent in the context of “mindful multilingualism”. Here we can further explore how families create language and literacy environments where children develop metalinguistic awareness of different languages and their use in different situations very early. Hence, this thesis, uncovers how the interactional work of nurturing children’s language learning and multilingual competence occurs in the midst of childrearing.

**Aims and research questions**

By illuminating heritage language-centered practices in three multilingual families, this study builds upon and seeks to contribute to family language policy research (King, 2016; Lanza & Vold Lexander, 2019) and language socialization work on family life in middle-class families across cultural contexts (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013, 2015a, 2015b; see also Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018).

The overall aim of the study is to explore multilingualism and heritage language maintenance as part of families’ everyday life, with a focus on mother-child interaction as a locus for children’s multilingual and heritage language socialization.
The specific questions are:

- How do multilingual transnational families create language learning environments?
- In what ways do mother-child interactions contribute to heritage language maintenance and socialization?
- How are heritage language practices related to the relational and childrearing aspects of family life?

Making use of the multimodal interactional approach (Goodwin, 2000; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018) and from a language socialization perspective (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014), the empirical studies investigate specific language practices in mother-child interactions. Such dyadic interactions prevailed in the data and created opportunities for the use of Russian, which had implications for the realization of family language policy. Specific attention is given to language-centered practices and resources through which teaching and learning language(s) takes place in home settings. A take on these language practices pinpoints the interplay between the ideological, pragmatic, educational, and relational dimensions of multilingual family talk and children’s heritage language socialization. The study also highlights children’s gradual creative appropriation of the interactional routines and activity formats in the heritage language.

The first study explores the practice of home language lessons and language workout embedded in the mundane family activity of emptying the dishwasher. The second study focuses on the collaborative and embodied aspects of a young child’s bilingual storytelling performances. The third study investigates the use of designedly incomplete utterances as prompts for co-narration in home literacy events.

In all, this work seeks to shed new light on childrearing practices in multinational families and children’s heritage language socialization. It offers an empirical contribution to research on how children learn to use several languages and form linguistic and social competencies through everyday family practices. Furthermore, it adds to the theoretical and methodological approaches to study multilingual interactions as embedded in unfolding activities in everyday family life. Such issues are important to investigate and discuss to deepen our understanding of multilingual speakers, families, and contemporary society.

Outline of the thesis

The first part of this thesis presents the study’s overall theoretical and methodological framework as well as situates its three articles. Chapter 2 explains the theoretical standpoints for understanding the family and multilingualism as situated and accomplished by everyday activities and practices. Here, I
focus on the language socialization approach, emphasizing the bidirectional nature of the process. Afterwards, I define the concepts heritage language and heritage language maintenance in relation to family language policy (FLP). In the final section, I present the analytical grounds for the study of multilingual family life as situated. Chapter 3 offers an overview of research on language learning environments, and language and literacy socialization in home settings, with a focus on multilingual, middle-class families. As I show, much of FLP research so far has focused on the parental strategies in relation to their children’s language outcomes, only cursorily exploring social, relational and emotional dimensions of family multilingualism. Therefore, this study aims to contribute to studying FLP and heritage language maintenance as situated within the unfolding activities and through the lens of language-centered practices to uncover some aspects of “doing multilingual family”. Chapter 4 describes the Russian language landscape in Sweden, language socialization arenas for Russian-speaking children, and forums for Russian-speaking mothers. Chapter 5 presents the study’s methodological approach based on a combination of short-term ethnography with multimodal interactional analyses. It describes data collection, participants, and analytical procedures in detail. In this chapter, I also reflect on methodological and ethical issues, and explain how two articles were co-authored. Chapter 6 presents the summaries of the three articles. In Chapter 7, I condense the results of all three empirical studies in relation to the stated research questions. I also discuss the study’s theoretical and methodological contributions and directions for further research. The summary in Swedish closes the thesis.
This chapter presents the theoretical framework for the study of young children’s multilingualism and heritage language maintenance as a part of families’ everyday life. On the one hand, the framework derives from a language socialization approach (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, 2009, 2014), and a view of human action, knowledge, and family sociality as cooperative, transformative, and interactionally organized (Goodwin, 2013; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018). On the other hand, it draws on family language policy (FLP) research (Fogle & King, 2013; King, 2016; King & Fogle, 2013; Lanza & Vold Lexander, 2019; Lanza & Lomeu Gomes, 2020) that focuses on how parental language planning and management efforts in regards to language use at home are realized in actual practices. These research strands offer conceptions of family and children’s agency, and they feature an ethnographic exploration of situated language use and detailed attention to moment-to-moment unfolding interaction. The chosen perspectives underscore a dynamic relationship between children’s language learning and a family’s social world, and enable an approach to family multilingualism as embedded in everyday practices.

Multilingual family: discursive approaches

There are several ways of conceptualizing the multilingual family as an object of study. Recent FLP theorizes it as a dynamic and fluid system that transforms in relation to time and space (Palviainen, 2020). Following this argument, Lanza (2021) proposes a conception of the family as “a set of relationships within the space of the home” that are “emergent in social interaction” and “negotiated through the multilingual family repertoire” (pp. 764-765). The cornerstone of this view is that the family can be understood as a discursive phenomenon. This means that identities and relationships, roles and rules, rights and responsibilities, intimacy and distance, and authority and autonomy are constructed in everyday interactions and mundane talk (Tannen & Goodwin, 2006; Tannen, Kendall & Gordon, 2007). Language functions as a
resource in the process of family-making (King & Lanza, 2019). In particular, it concerns socialization practices around routine activities that turn into micro-interactional rituals (Sarangi, 2006), ways of positioning oneself and others in daily events (Aronsson, 2006), and sociocultural conceptions of good parenting (Irving Torsh, 2020; see also Gottzén, 2009).

While multilingual middle-class families can be engaged in similar mundane practices and division of household tasks as monolingual families, there is a distinct dimension of using more than one language in their everyday life. Childrearing in multilingual family settings can pose other demands on family members and influence social processes. As Irving Torsh (2020) points out, bilingual parenting is constructed as part of being a “good parent” and also builds on perceptions of different languages’ status and value. Furthermore, language work such as heritage language maintenance can be seen as part of caring work and relationship work (Okita, 2002). Different languages can also be associated with gendered roles, power relations, and what it means to be a family. At the same time, language competence and preference influence how family members establish relationships (Fogle, 2012).

**Multilingual language socialization**

**Language and multilingualism**

There are various ways to define and describe multilingualism in relation to acquisition contexts, domains of use, and degree of linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural competence (Eisenchlas & Schalley, 2020). Central in this thesis is a perspective that defines language as “a powerful semiotic tool for evoking social and moral sentiments, collective and personal identities tied to place and situation, and bodies of knowledge and belief” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, p. 8). In particular, language is looked at “as social practice, speakers as social actors and [language] boundaries as products of social action” (Heller, 2007, p. 1). This approach leaves behind the traditional linguistic conception of language and extends the analysis to the forms, the functions, and the content of language as they constitute and are constitutive of culture (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014, p. 296). Moreover, it sets forth a critique of the so-called monolingual bias in language research (Musk & Cromdal, 2018; Pavlenko, 2005) that treats languages as different linguistic systems and bilingualism as the coexistence of these separate systems (Heller, 2007). Yet, multilingual families themselves seem to orient to different languages (Lanza & Lomeu Gomes, 2020). While I use the terms “Russian”, “Swedish”, “Spanish” and “English” in my analysis, the thesis treats these languages as sets of resources, among other semiotic resources, in the multilingual speakers’ repertoires (Lanza, 2021).
Language socialization

To investigate multilingual practices in families, the present study builds on a language socialization approach that provides both theoretical and methodological foundations for the study of “the sociocultural nexus of children’s communicative development” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, p. 3), i.e., how children learn language while becoming a part of their communities and cultures. In other words, language socialization is the process of getting socialized through language use and to language use (Duranti, 2009, p. 293; Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008).

Ochs (1986) defines socialization as “a covert and overt interactional display to a novice of expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting” (p. 2). More specifically, linguistic features and discursive structures express sociocultural knowledge, belief systems, communicative goals, and expectations of families and other institutions established in a community (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). In other words, they mediate between the interactional moment and the broader sociopolitical structures (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008). A concept of discursive or language practice embraces this relationship as speakers use linguistic and other semiotic resources to create their social reality through participation in such practices. In various types of interactions in multilingual families, “the bilingual child is not only learning a linguistic form but also social meaning attached to the use of these forms as he or she acquires communicative competence” (Lanza, 1997, p. 325).

Discursive structures also organize activities and social events according to this sociocultural knowledge. The participants are expected to recognize these structures, interpret what they are meant to express in a particular context, and then display an understanding of cultural knowledge as well as behave, and speak in culturally-appropriate ways (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2009). It is through recurrent participation in these discursive practices that young children and novices progressively inhabit the culturally specific ways to collaboratively carry out the activities (Goodwin, 2013; Ochs, 1986). Hence, through learning how to read and respond to other participants’ cues about what they are doing and to use language in socially appropriate ways, they acquire communicative and social competence (Ochs, 1986). In other words, “participants must know and understand each other, and the activities they are pursuing together, in ways that make possible the future development of those activities” (Goodwin, 2013, p. 19). These ways include a worldview, tacit knowledge of principles of social order and systems of belief, context-sensitive performance competence, and learning to organize sociocultural information and construct contexts with others (Ochs, 1986, pp. 3, 8). Goodwin (2013) conceptualized this process as “an immediately present semiotic landscape with quite diverse resources that has been given its current shape through the transformative sequences of action that culminate, at this moment, in the current action” (p. 11). Moreover, the ways in which family members
systematically engage in joint practices and work together to build action so that “others can accountably participate in it”, animate the activities and experience of their social world (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018, pp. 31-33).

In spite of the asymmetries of knowledge, skills, and power between novices and more experienced members of a community, all participants are seen as agentive of their development and socializing agents in their environment (Cekaite et al., 2016; Ochs, 1986). As Smith-Christmas (2020) argues, there is a highly reflexive relationship between “agency” and “structures”. It includes both “a capacity to act” and “acquiring the sociocultural knowledge (including language) requisite for their capacity to act” (p. 219). Creatively using linguistic and other semiotic resources, children engage in agentive acts that influence the ways of “doing being” a family (Smith-Christmas, 2020), bonding or distancing (Fogle, 2012) as well as shaping family linguistic norms (Smith-Christmas, 2020). As young language learners shape their interactional contexts, they create opportunities for their own learning and socialize adults into meeting their linguistic and interactional needs, discursive practices, and language choice (Fogle, 2012). As children navigate interaction, their language choice and use are agentive both in situations where the language choice is constrained (e.g., by the parental response or own competence), and where it is not (e.g., in compliance) (Smith-Christmas, 2020). In all, they navigate a socializing pathway, which means their engagement in a “process that is simultaneously cognitive/intellectual, affective, social, moral, and personal” (Miller & Fung, 2012, p. 6). As the children achieve and exert agency in their interactions with caregivers, a cultural change of the home practices occurs (Fogle, 2012). Therefore, socialization is viewed as a dynamic bidirectional process and in terms of participation (Smith-Christmas, 2020).

Across cultures, caregivers are influenced by cultural beliefs about childrearing, and they try to ensure that their children are able to display and understand behaviors appropriate to social situations (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2009). Thus, their verbal and non-verbal actions towards children become consistent with these concerns, often manifested as adult scaffolding. Through everyday practices, caregivers facilitate children’s language learning, understanding of and participation in social situations in different ways. In particular, an array of language practices is used, such as instructions with imperative or modal constructions, prompting, repetitions, modifying children’s contributions, and many others (Ochs, 1986).

Discursive practices are, in turn, built by interactional routines, defined by Peters and Boggs (1986) as “sequence[s] of exchanges in which one speaker’s utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants” (p. 81). A speaker’s utterance specifies the content and the form of what is called forth in the next position. In this way, the interactional routines structure socializing situations and facilitate the children’s perception, analysis, and practice of
utterances in a predictable and recurring context with immediate reinforce-
ment (Peters & Boggs, 1986, pp. 80, 93). In the early childhood, they serve as
mini-scripts where both caregiver and child know the “lines” and can initiate
(to a large extent predictable) interactional sequences (Peters & Boggs, 1986).
In the process of language socialization, the child gradually learns how to link,
interweave, and transform such routines. In other words, interactional routines
provide a language learning environment for the child (Ochs, 1986) through
constituting discursive practices that mediate between activities and sociocul-
tural structures.

Family language policy and heritage language maintenance

Family language policy (FLP) offers a framework to investigate discursive
practices and repertoires of the multilingual family. Theoretically, it builds on
sociolinguistic studies of children’s bilingual acquisition (Lanza, 1997), lan-
guage socialization (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014), and language
policy (Spolsky, 2012). Current FLP research explores (i) factors influencing
the language policies of families, (ii) parental strategies, language manage-
ment efforts and their effects, (iii) practices as actual language use, (iv) the
role of child agency, and (v) family as a dynamic and fluid system across time
and space and its complexities (Eisenchlas & Schalley, 2020; King, 2016;
Lanza & Lomeu Gomes, 2020; Lanza & Vold Lexander, 2019).

As Palviainen (2020, p. 237) points out, research usually discusses a “uni-
fied policy” of a family while interactional approaches reveal multiple policies
and ideologies. The current study relates to FLP on the premise that language
use in multilingual families is subject to constant renegotiation that occurs
here and now, which calls for the microstudies of actual practices of how pa-
rental language planning and management efforts are instantiated (Eisenchlas
& Schalley, 2020). With this interest in how caregivers’ sociocultural concep-
tions and intentions in regards to their children’s language use manifest in
everyday practices, FLP intersects with a language socialization approach.
The present study also concerns the pathways of multilingual children’s lan-
guage learning as well as mother-child relational work that occur through their
participation in language practices.

Within the FLP field, there are a host of terms to designate languages that
young children learn and use at home: minority language, first language,
mother tongue language, heritage language, and home language (Eisenchlas
& Schalley, 2020, pp. 22-34). All of them put forth some dimensions charac-
terizing multilingual speakers and various ideological associations. This thesis
uses the term heritage language for the Russian component in focal children’s
multilingual repertoires. Even if Swedish can also be seen as children’s
heritage language it is considered as the mainstream or societal language, according to the research literature.

As Eisenchlas and Schalley (2020) argue, there are some problematic connotations of the term “heritage” as it points to the past rather than present or future. It can also be used as academic or policy jargon, assigning heritage language to speakers born into a particular ethnic community. As the mothers participating in the study expressed a strong-felt connection between their cultural and linguistic heritage as speakers of Russian, I have chosen to foreground this dimension in the thesis.

The term language maintenance refers to “the continuing use of a language in the face of competition from a regionally and socially more powerful language” (Mesthrie & Leap, 2000, p. 253). This definition actualizes a sociolinguistic perspective and a focus on socioenvironmental and psychosocial conditions of language development (Eisenchlas & Schalley, 2020). In addition, it encompasses processes requiring active participation from different generations (Purkarthofer, 2020). In this study, Russian is the heritage language that is being maintained through interactions with the children’s mothers in home settings, among other available socializing pathways (e.g., in the weekend school or mediated communication with their maternal grandparents and other relatives).

Family multilingualism as a situated practice

Participation and a multimodal interactional approach

The dynamic nature of family life manifests “through ways of organizing action within interaction” (Tannen & Goodwin, 2006, p. 408). In Goodwin’s (2006) words, “as family members work together to jointly produce the important events in their lives, differing forms of social organization emerge” (p.515). Analytically, this collaborative work can be understood through the concept of participation. Introduced by Goffman (1981) in Footing, participation frameworks provide a typology of speakers and hearers as various kinds of participants that challenge the traditional speaker-recipient dyad in communication theory. Goodwin and Goodwin (2004) have modified this concept to acknowledge the turn-by-turn dynamics of participation structures within unfolding interactional sequences. They focus on “the practices through which different kinds of parties build action together by participating in structured ways in the events that constitute a state of talk” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004, p. 25). Building on both Goffman’s, and Goodwin and Goodwin’s theorizing on participation frameworks and positionings, Aronsson (1998) suggests a social choreographic analysis of talk that “focuses on moves and changes rather than on prefixed structure” (p. 76).
The principal feature of participation is that participants continuously orient towards each other in a reflexive way, i.e., they display their orientation to what is going on within the activity and adjust their talk and embodied engagement accordingly (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004). Besides talk, an analysis of participation frameworks encompasses the use of other semiotic resources such as gesture, mutual orientation of the participants’ bodies including facing formation, posture and physical alignment, material structure in the environment, and sequential structures of the activities (Goodwin, 2000; Goodwin, 2007; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992). In other words, the analysis needs to consider *multimodality*, which is understood as the mobilization of various resources by the participants for organizing their actions (Mondada, 2016). Accordingly, this thesis attends to participation as an “interactively sustained, embodied field within which utterances are collaboratively shaped as meaningful, locally relevant action” (Goodwin, 2007, p. 45). In addition, the study attends to audience design and performance elements as important aspects of multilingual talk (Aronsson, 2020).

In family life, “[t]he forms of participation frameworks that are constructed afford different ways of sustaining focused interaction, gearing into what someone has said, and displaying to each other how participants are aligned within the activity frame” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 515). Therefore, “[o]btaining joint attention for the performance of tasks often requires the active work of multiple parties to the interaction” (Goodwin, 2006, p. 519).

Analysis of multilingual talk

To analyze bilingual talk of children and mothers, I make use of a multimodal interactional approach following the principles of sequential analysis and attention to interactional details. This approach views multilingual practices such as **code-switching**, as conversational activities (Li, 2002), where the meaning is contingent on its local sequential context (Musk & Cromdal, 2018). Code-switching is defined as an instance when more than one code (languages or language varieties) is used in the same stretch of talk (Musk, 2010). Following Gafaranga and Torras (2002), Fogle (2012) points to the fact that code-switching is not necessarily an alternation between two languages as bilingual language use could be a medium in itself (cf. translanguaging as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” in Garcia, 2009, p. 45). As the mothers’ interactional work is geared towards establishing a monolingual, Russian-speaking context for interaction with their children, I use the terms **code-switching** and **language alternation** that signal relevance of using a different language.

By exploring how heritage language maintenance is accomplished in interaction, the empirical studies highlight how occasional instances of children’s language alternations are dealt with in various ways. In particular, Study I and Study III attend to how the participants orient to and use code-switches in
order to negotiate language choice as well as competing or complementary agendas and projects in the course of unfolding activities. Study II employs the concept of *footing* to approach code-switching as an important device for accomplishing shifts in frames of events in bilingual talk (Cromdal & Aronsson, 2000). Following Goffman (1981), a change in footing is a change in “the alignment we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (p. 4). In other words, code-switching among other paralinguistic and semiotic resources is a “communicative resource whereby bilingual children negotiate the footings and social alignments” (Kyritzis, Tang & Bahar Koymen, 2009, p. 271). In attending to the dynamic moment-to-moment transformations of interaction by the participants, we gain access to how the shifts between different frames of events and alignments are accomplished, and what this means for heritage language and literacy socialization.

To sum up, this study explores how young children, as novices participating in everyday interaction with their mothers, encounter and learn the ways of using their heritage language while accomplishing their mundane activities and the work of being a family (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018). An interactional perspective allows documenting how social relationships and boundaries are established (Li, 2008) but also problematizing the boundaries between languages (Heller, 2007). In this way, language ideology is understood as co-constructed through practices and as related to performance and community building through indexing affiliations (Åhlund & Aronsson, 2015). In moment-to-moment unfolding interaction, speakers, as social actors (Heller, 2007; Li, 2008), socialize one another to use discursive resources, to *do* multilingualism (Kyritzis, Reynolds & Evaldsson, 2010) and to *do* family (Aronsson, 2006). Therefore, the theoretical approach in this thesis encompasses the relation between language use *in situ* and a wider sociocultural context. An ethnographically grounded language socialization perspective offers insights into families’ social worlds evoked in interaction as well as into socializing pathways of young multilingual children.
3. Prior research: Language learning environments and language socialization practices in multilingual families

In exploring multilingualism as an integral part of family life, this thesis will be situated within ethnographic and interactional studies in middle-class families in contemporary urban environments. The empirical studies draw on the two research strands: (i) language socialization practices in Western middle-class families, and (ii) family language policy in multilingual immigrant and transnational families. The first strand uncovers how the parents across cultural settings highly valuing linguistic competencies, engage in language-centered practices with their children. The second concerns various ways in which the parents in multilingual immigrant and transnational families prompt and scaffold their children’s heritage language use and maintenance. By combining the two, the thesis aims to contribute to the study of children’s multilingual heritage language socialization in the home.

Language learning environments in the home

Language learning environments in the home encompass various ways in which languages and literacies are supported in families (Schwartz, 2020). They include material resources such as books and devices (TV programs, educational games, technology, etc.), parental strategies (e.g., establishing family traditions and rituals associated with heritage language, and monitoring of children’s language use), and practices (e.g., story-book reading, storytelling) (Schwartz, 2020; see also Said, 2021). Döpke (1992) also includes contact with a heritage language, consistency of language choice, the need created for the children to use their heritage language, and parental attitudes towards bilingualism and their children’s language development.

Shared leisure activities, daily chores and unstructured mundane interaction are central for how everyday family life is organized, and such activities provide multiple socialization opportunities for children and parents. Apparently, language learning and learning to use languages are accomplished through various forms of family talk and socializing practices or routinized activities such as cleaning practices (Fasulo, Loyd & Padiglione, 2007),
bedtime rituals (Sirotta, 2006), or homework routines (Wingard & Forsberg, 2007). Family mealtime has been studied greatly across cultures and acknowledged as a fruitful site for exploring language socialization and intergenerational talk (Aronsson & Gottzén, 2011; Blum-Kulka, 1997, 2008; Ochs, Pontecorvo & Fasulo, 1996; Pauletto, Aronsson & Galiano, 2017; Sterponi 2009). Moreover, naturally occurring, everyday family interaction is an arena for relationship work and embodied performances to be seen, for instance, in practices of collaborative storytelling or displaying family alignments/disalignments (Ochs & Capps, 2001; see also Burdelski & Evaldsson, 2019). To convey affective stances and calibrate the degree of urgency, caregivers and children use not only verbal resources but also an array of conversational resources such as body positionings, persuasion, promises, repetitions, volume, tempo, and many others (Aronsson, 2006).

In a review of ethnographical studies of talk in postindustrial middle-class families, Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik (2015a, p. 88) suggested that family is a “social achievement”, where everyday practices and socioeconomic and political conditions are converged through talk. Several studies have indeed demonstrated large cultural and class differences between families in the ways in which parents communicate with their children (e.g., Heath, 1983). The understanding that language is crucial for children’s development together with the societal pressures to raise competent and competitive participants in the global marketplace is reflected in the everyday life of middle-class families (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015a).

Caregivers’ ideas about children, language, development, and parenting shape their very way of interacting with children. Sociological and interactional research on contemporary family life in Western countries has indicated a significant change in family practices. It suggests that children are no longer to be seen as objects of socialization but rather as active participants in the arena of democratized intergenerational relationships and “mutual apprenticeship” (Pontecorvo, Fasulo & Sterponi, 2001, p. 340; see also Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011; Aronsson & Gottzén, 2011; Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015a; Oswell, 2013).

In particular, middle-class parents have been shown to engage in enhancing children’s language skills, enriching their vocabulary, and a reflexive communication capacity through practices that allow negotiations, explanations, and comments (Aronsson & Gottzén, 2011; Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013, 2015a, 2015b; Pontecorvo, Fasulo & Sterponi, 2001). Although present in monolingual families, metalinguistic talk appears even more frequently in multilingual families (Blum-Kulka, 1997). Such language-centered practices flag specific language ideologies such as a high value of language(s) and communicative competences as well as the assumption that language learning needs to be practiced and actively supported by caregivers and teachers. In such a context, “practical knowledge entails ‘lessons’ rather than informal apprenticeship” (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015b, p. 73). Accordingly, the three empirical
studies in this thesis pay due attention to the organization of such language-centered practices in multilingual middle-class families and their conceptions of heritage language, through which children are socialized into specific cultural practices as well as toward multilingualism (Blum-Kulka, 1997).

Learning heritage language in multilingual families

With a growing interest in children’s emerging multilingualism, there has been a wealth of research on parental strategies and other factors that influence bilingual language acquisition. However, there has been a notable shift to exploring the social contexts of language learning. According to Lanza (2021), early FLP studies focused on a relationship between parental language ideologies, planning, practices and children’s language outcomes, while more recent work expands the scope to the issues of meaning-making, lived experiences, agency, and identity constructions.

So far, a lot of attention has been paid to different factors influencing parents’ and children’s language choice and children’s multilingual outcomes. Among them are a perceived value of languages (Irving Torsh, 2020), language proficiency (Piller, 2001), and language ideologies (Curdt-ChristianSEN, 2016), if the parents’ languages are different from the societal language, as well as a place of family’s residency, visits to the heritage country, gender, personality, language aptitude, the larger speech community, media, and family dynamics (Quay & Chevalier, 2019, pp. 207-211).

A rapidly evolving FLP scholarship signals that many parents in immigrant and transnational families aspire to raise their children multilingually and maintain their heritage language. A large number of studies have examined parental views and reported family language practices, for example, in interviews with parents. Such studies have made a notable investment into uncovering the caregivers’ goals and how their conceptions of language and multilingualism are correlated with family practices by discussing it in terms of “balanced” or “unbalanced” or “effective intergenerational language transmission” (e.g., Curdt-ChristianSEN, 2016, pp. 700, 704; Otwinowska et al., 2021). For instance, King and Fogle (2006) describe American middle-class families as highly valuing bilingualism. The interviewed parents perceived that bilingual competence would contribute to their children’s cognitive development and academic success as well as ensure ties to the parents’ heritage language and culture. Such conceptions influence parents’ efforts to create a bilingual environment for the children and invest in various language learning aids. On the contrary, Spolsky (2012, p. 6) speaks of “parental misconceptions about language”. He supports his claim with an example of Russian-speaking parents (especially fathers) in Israel in Schwartz’s study, who were blinded by their beliefs and could not make accurate judgments about their children’s language situation. Speaking of importance of language ideologies, Lanza and
Svendsen (2007) examined the relationship between social networks, ethnic identity, and language use at the homes of the Filipino families in Norway. They found that even the parents whose close friends and kin were predominantly Filipino used different languages in family communication due to a high value of Norwegian as a societal language and English as an international language.

The mothers in particular have been shown to take main responsibility and play a major role in initiating and engaging children in heritage language and literacy-related activities and practices (Irving Torsh 2020; Okita, 2002; Said, 2021). While their ideologies, language proficiency, interests, and time investments are important, the everyday interactional patterns are crucial, though they are less researched in detail.

Parental strategies: One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL) and beyond

Earlier studies of family language policy and heritage language maintenance in multilingual families focused on caregivers’ input (e.g., De Houwer, 2007; Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Lanza 2009; Mishina-Mori, 2011) in relation to the desired outcome of children’s language use (King, 2016). In particular, parental discourse strategies were found to be a crucial factor for bilingual development and language alternation in young children’s talk.

Among various parental strategies to create a learning environment for the children to become multilinguals, the One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL) principle has received a tremendous attention both in research and popular literature for parents (see, for instance, Cunningham-Andersson, 2011). In a nutshell, when a family chooses to apply the OPOL strategy long-term, each parent speaks a different language with the child. The premise is that this helps children associate and use a specific language with a specific parent, which supports heritage language maintenance (Schwartz, 2020). OPOL has been particularly popular in middle-class families in the Western countries (Döpke, 1992). Many parents have in fact been advised to use this principle, while research shows that it does not guarantee raising bilingual children (De Houwer, 2009). For a long time, the question of how OPOL (and other family language strategies and policy) is practiced in interaction has been one of the hallmarks in the FLP inquiry.

By examining interactional patterns between the parents and their young children in six English-German-speaking families in Australia, Döpke’s seminal study (1992) attempted to answer the question, of what makes OPOL successful in some families while not in others? First, she identified two types of insisting strategies for dealing with children’s inappropriate language choice: (i) non-response-eliciting (translation and incorporated translation), and (ii) response-eliciting (translation plus question, challenging questions,
display/pretense of not-understanding and request for translation). These strategies fall on the continuum of increasing constraint, where high constraint strategies were associated with the children speaking more heritage language. Second, she discussed various discursive features of child-directed speech, pointing to the fact that most moves have a multi-layered function (Döpke, 1992, p. 9). Her findings suggested that the parents’ engagement in a more child-centered type of interaction and attending to the child’s attentional and interactional needs supported the child’s bilingual development. Third, she examined parental utterances for its “teaching properties” such as modelling, rehearsing, patterning, and eliciting as well as “teaching techniques” targeting grammar and vocabulary (Döpke, 1992, pp. 146-148). It was also found that the degree in which the parents are aware of their role of the language teacher is important. Overall, this study highlighted significant efforts on the part of the minority language-speaking parent to adhere to the OPOL principle.

The following studies of bilingual children’s language choice patterns within the OPOL-framework have established that more demanding and constraining responses from the parent to the child’s language alternation (such as explicit corrections and requests for self-repair) resulted in appropriate language choice and more “pure” use of the heritage language with that parent (English-Norwegian-speaking families in Norway in Lanza, 1997; Japanese-English-speaking families in the USA Mishina-Mori, 2011). In line with Döpke’s (1992) findings, Lanza (1997) proposed that parental discourse strategies fall on the monolingual – bilingual continuum and socialize the children into a particular linguistic behavior. Supporting and exemplifying this claim, Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal (2001) showed the impact of the father’s insisting strategies (such as clarification requests) on maintaining his son’s English in the Catalan context. In addition, the father regularly used a specific teaching technique – two English-speaking puppets – to help elicit speech in English and foster a monolingual language environment in a playful way.

While there are many proponents of the OPOL principle, it has been criticized, and its effectiveness has been problematized. As Aronsson (2020) exposed the myths about bilingual learning in family settings, she suggested that the OPOL model may fail because it is somewhat idealized and does not consider a richness of social situations and play with siblings and peers. Danjo (2021) further questioned “the monolingualist dogmas” that lie in the foundation of OPOL.

Research shows that it is difficult for the parents to implement this principle consistently (Döpke, 1992) due to the bidirectional nature of language socialization and especially children’s agency asserted in resistance and negotiations (Fogle & King, 2017). For example, Kheirkhah and Cekaite (2015) examined instances of a focal child’s aggravated resistance when the parents (Iranian immigrants in Sweden) tried to establish a monolingual heritage language context, restricting their children’s language choice and engaging in “informal language instruction” during mealtime conversations. Their
findings suggested that heritage language maintenance is linked to the linguistic and social identity work of family members. Interested in the issues of language learner agency, Fogle (2012) investigated language socialization of Russian adoptees in three US families. In particular, she focused on how the children created the context for their own second language learning through participating in question practices, family language routines and storytelling. Her findings revealed three types of learner agency (resistance, negotiation, and control) that had a significant impact on family dynamics and change of the family language practices over time. In a study of a Japanese-English-speaking family in the UK, Danjo (2021) showed that the children used their linguistic resources creatively in the form of flexible multilingual practices. Such practices undermined the OPOL principle that the mother adhered to. In a study of language socialization practices in Russian-French-speaking families in Switzerland, Meyer Pitton (2013a) found that the negotiation of language choice was integrated into that of behavioral norms (i.e., asking for permission to have a dessert or accounting for not eating food), and therefore is a complex, covert process.

Interestingly, in a study of Spanish-Estonian families in Tallin, Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017) found that crossing linguistic and cultural boundaries in complex multilingual interactions was not such a problem for the parents compared to their rationalizing about the practices. In contrast to Tannenbaum’s (2012) proposal that the OPOL strategy might be a “coping mechanism”, they reminded that reinforcement of strict linguistic boundaries can become a source of tension in the families. As an example, the participating mother in the Kopeliovich’s (2010) study in a Russian-Hebrew-speaking family found her own insisting strategies for maintaining a monolingual environment to be “exhausting”. She felt that she had “lost [the] battle for Russian” (p. 168). At the same time, the children wanted to use Russian with their father who did not intentionally promote the heritage language. Kopeliovich (2010) suggested that the children enjoyed freely choosing the language of interaction as well as liked the content of conversations with their father who also appreciated bilingual language play. This study highlighted the role of emotions in discrepancy between the parental intentions and ideologies and the actual practices in the family.

Another emotional dimension is identified by Danjo (2021) who found that when the heritage language becomes indexical of the time and interaction with the parent, it can be used as a resource for bonding and “un-bonding” between the family members (e.g., code-switching to please the mother, or refusal to tell a story when requested to use the heritage language). All this research points to the fact that OPOL is challenged in interaction and that heritage language maintenance is intertwined with social, relational, and emotional aspects of family life. Yet, these issues have so far been explored only cursively (but see Smith-Christmas, 2018).
A further application of the OPOL principle was demonstrated in research on raising multilingual children in single-parent families. Obied (2010) examined how one-parent families in Portugal created language and literacy environments that supported their children in maintaining English, for example, engaging in conversations around meanings of words in different languages. In a study of Russian-speaking mothers in Finland, Vorobeva (2021) showed that shifts in family configurations such as divorce, re-marriage or visits of non-residential parent caused shifts in family language practices. Both studies argue for viewing family language environments as fluid and related to the relationship dynamics in the families.

In immigrant families where the parents speak the same language, instead of OPOL, the parents aim to maintain their heritage language in the context of the dominant societal language. Documenting the change of the parental heritage language maintenance strategy in her own family over a course of twelve years, Kopeliovich (2013) described an approach that she termed happylingual. It was developed by her and her husband (both are linguists, language teachers, and education researchers), to ensure that their four children would be able to speak Russian living in Israel. This highly ambitious project of multilingual childrearing with clearly stated goals and systematic educational, language-centered, and literacy activities aimed at preserving a positive experience of using Russian and showed respect for the children’s language preferences. For instance, striving for the development of the correct grammatical forms, the parents transformed children’s mistakes in Russian into riddles followed by guided questions. In this way, bilingualism became important in creating enjoyable family communication. Another strategy for dealing with the mistakes concerned children’s written texts. The parents first acknowledged and appreciated the message of the text, and then offered help to improve use of Russian. Using a whiteboard, a computer screen or a pencil to erase and correct the mistakes allowed the children to appreciate the clean and correct version of their text. Even when at first, as Kopeliovich herself recognizes, she resisted using the dual-lingual mode of communication, at times she found it useful, in particular when there was a need to talk with the children about emotional difficulties.

On a similar note, Said and Zhu (2019) and Smith-Christmas (2018) demonstrated a relationship between a flexible FLP and family members’ positive experience using the heritage language. In their study in an Arabic-English-speaking family in the UK, Said and Zhu (2019) examined mealtime conversations as a site for multilingual heritage language socialization and argued for the importance of “a close, caring and loving family relational dynamic” (p. 781). In particular, they showed how in child-centered interactions with laughter, positive assessments, endearments and format tying as well as elements of the “pseudo-Arabic lesson”, the parents created a space for the children to assert their agency for learning and discovery. In such an environment,
the children did not resist being corrected and even attempted using Arabic as a way to get attention or achieve immediate interactional goals.

Among very few, Smith-Christmas (2018) specifically investigated the affective dimension of FLP. She showed how the grandmother (a former Gaelic teacher) integrated language teaching into a child-centered discourse in order to engage her grandchildren into speech production in Gaelic, while establishing positive affective stance toward the heritage language. In particular, the grandmother used questions focused on the child’s experiences, exaggerated intonation, language play and mitigated “any sense of didactism” in Gaelic. She allowed the children to use their language of choice and appreciated children’s engagement. Yet, the same strategy was found to have different effects with different children. While the girl was more responsive to this way of interaction and used some Gaelic, her younger brother (recorded at approximately the same age after several years) expressed a negative stance towards heritage language use. Therefore, the caregivers choosing to preserve a positive valence in interactions, gradually minimized their use of Gaelic with him over time.

In sum, multilingual families create language learning environments that fall on a monolingual-multilingual continuum, where flexible interactional strategies are found to cause less children’s resistance. In their heritage language maintenance efforts, particularly in adhering to the OPOL principle, the caregivers face several challenges: (i) to sustain a monolingual context to foster the minority language, deal with the interruptions of the conversational flow, and foster the positive relationship with the children, (ii) to strive for a high standard of language (correctness, richness, literary expression), protect the child’s motivation and interest in using the language, and appreciate creative bilingual language use, (iii) to invest time and resources in the “language transmission project” and respond to other needs and pressures in the family. The child’s age is a crucial factor in this equation. As children grow older, many studies demonstrate a change in the family practices. Research also witnessed a proliferation of educational activities and language teaching practices that become an important part of children’s everyday life and a way to spend time with their parents (Döpke, 1992; Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015; Kopeliovich, 2013; Meyer Pitton, 2015b; Obied, 2010; Said & Zhu, 2019).

Literacy practices

While literacy environments have been acknowledged in sociolinguistic research as a significant factor for children’s multilingual development and heritage language maintenance, the studies of interactions during literacy activities with simultaneous bilingual children in home settings are still scarce. Previous research has mainly focused on parental communication strategies in relation to the children’s literacy skills development, thus leaving out the
transactional nature of reading interaction and the children’s contributions (Baird, Kibler & Palacios, 2015). As Kabuto (2010) underscores, learning to be bilingual and biliterate goes beyond learning the linguistic aspects of language.

Across cultural settings, parents in middle-class multilingual families use literacy events to enhance children’s language learning. Kopeliovich (2013) described how the parents consistently engaged their children in book reading and other literacy-related educational activities as a way of connecting with a Russian cultural heritage. The children in the study highly valued reading in Russian. Said (2021) showed that through literacy practices, the parents helped their children learn a new orthographic and phonetic system in Arabic. She also highlighted an importance of fostering young children’s interest in reading in the heritage language and ensuring a positive experience. For this purpose, the mother’s educational efforts of correct reading were supported by her use of humor and creativity.

Within a handful of studies of naturally occurring literacy events in multilingual families, code-switching practices have so far received most attention, with a focus on their factors and functions. The text’s language and semantic, structural, and phonological features are found to influence children’s language use during reading interactions (Baird, Kibler & Palacios, 2015; Bauer, 2000; Gregory et al., 2007; Kabuto, 2010). At the same time, code-switching becomes a major resource for the children to shift between different communicative projects and to display alignments (Kabuto, 2010; see also Kyratzis, 2017, on peer-reading interactions).

Similar to the research findings on children’s language alternation and parental strategies, literacy events can be characterized by a tension between creating monolingual or multilingual contexts for children’s language socialization. For example, during bedtime story reading, the parents in Meyer Pitton’s (2013b) study tried to influence their children’s language choice through “explicit language lessons” and school-like instructional sequences. Hence, she argued that story-reading of a book in Russian is “by no means a monolingual Russian interaction as the parents may present or perceive it, but a bilingual Russian-French event” (Meyer Pitton, 2013b, p. 311).

Through the lens of the child’s code-switching instances during bilingual literacy events, Kabuto (2010) showed how the father supported his daughter in developing as a reader. When the child switched to English as a tool to “create a counter-dialogue” the father consistently used Japanese to “pull her back into the text” (Kabuto, 2010, p. 146). Moreover, the parent did not always position himself as an experienced reading partner but also as a supporter who carefully monitored the child’s progress throughout the literacy activity. To do so, he used format tying, corrections and allowed her to solve problems in relation to the text and activity-at-hand. The study highlighted the dynamic nature of the reader’s roles for taking more control and responsibility and advancing readers’ identities. Showing how the father mainly focused on
achieving objectives of the literacy activity, Kabuto (2010) argued for not prioritizing strict monolingual practices but for allowing all available languages to be a mediator of reading interactions. Similarly, Song (2016) highlighted the importance of translinguaging practices in Korean-English speaking interactions during literacy events for developing metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities. The children and the parents in this study used both languages to help clarify and refine meanings, to monitor their children’s understanding and to scaffold their learning.

Towards a study of multilingualism and heritage language maintenance as an integral part of family life

This chapter has witnessed the richness of literature on language learning environments, parental discourse strategies and literacy practices in multilingual families. Increasingly, research underscores the importance of approaching family multilingualism and heritage language maintenance as situated. It also highlights an agentive role of children in creating various language learning environments and sociolinguistic landscapes. However, little attention is still paid to the family members’ lived experiences and how multilingualism is an integral part of family everyday life and what it means for children’s language socialization (King, 2016; Lanza & Lomeu Gomes, 2020). As a matter of overcoming some pitfalls in the FLP approach, recent research has started orienting to family as a dynamic system and to examine how families make sense of multilingualism, how language is woven into family dynamics, and how particular language practices define family’s life and trajectories (King, 2016, pp. 727-728; King & Lanza, 2017, 2019). In particular, there is a need for FLP research to anchor analyses of multilingual repertoires in mundane interactions when family members are engaged in “doing family” (Lanza, 2021, pp. 767-768).

In the review of prior work, I particularly attempted to highlight intersections of FLP and heritage language maintenance with social, relational and emotional dimensions of family life. Yet, very few studies explicitly deal with these issues and focus rather on language development outcomes, instantiations of the FLP in actual practices, or children’s agency. The present study therefore addresses this gap. It seeks to shed new light on the complexity and the dynamics of family multilingualism by bringing insights from language socialization investigations in contemporary monolingual middle-class families (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018; Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, 2015a, 2015b) to FLP research on heritage language maintenance. Ethnographically situated in three “language-mindful”, multilingual transnational families in Sweden and focusing on mother-child interactions in Russian, it explores processes of heritage language maintenance and language socialization as part of everyday
family life. Because Russian and other Slavic languages are underrepresented in language socialization and FLP research, particularly studies of interaction (Thielemann & Kosta, 2013), the thesis also answers that call.
4. A context for the study of Russian-speaking children’s language practices in multilingual families in Sweden

This chapter presents a context for the empirical studies in three multilingual transnational families, where Russian is the children’s heritage language used in everyday interaction. In particular, I will briefly describe the Russian language landscape in Sweden, language socialization arenas for Russian-speaking children, and forums for Russian-speaking mothers.

Multilingual Russian-speaking families in Sweden: communities and heritage language activities

Given the fact that immigration from Russia has been on the rise in the 2010s (Scherbakova, 2021) and that many of the people who left the country were educated and successful (McPhillips, 2016), it is interesting to examine children’s language socialization and family language use in communities where a lot of emphasis is placed on learning and achievement. A Cyrillic alphabet brings another dimension to bilingual literacy and language socialization in the Western European context.

The Russian language is spoken by a relatively small percentage of Sweden’s population – less than 0.5% in 2012 (Parkvall, 2016). Russian speakers in Sweden have various backgrounds, as many come not only from Russia but also from different countries of the former Soviet Union, mainly from the Baltic States, Ukraine, and Belarus. That is why quite a few people who speak Russian in Sweden are multilingual, where Russian could be their first or second language. Therefore, it is problematic to view the group of Russian speakers in Sweden as homogeneous, to tie the language to the nation or ethnicity, or to refer to families where one or both parents speak Russian as “Russian families” or even “Russian-speaking families”. Similar concerns are

---

2 This is a very approximate estimation. The Swedish Central Statistical Bureau (CSB) has information on immigrants from the Soviet Union, Russia and former USSR countries. It also considers a person to have a Russian heritage if one or both parents come from the abovementioned countries. To some extent, these categories and numbers overlap and do not reflect the real number of Russian speakers.
articulated by Solovova (2013) in her study of a Russian complementary school run within an “Eastern European community” in Portugal as the space of overlapping and competing discourses and practices.

As parents’ mother tongues, ethnicity, a country of origin, and language(s) of communication in each family vary, children are exposed to Russian in varying degrees and have different opportunities to learn and practice the heritage language. Beyond the home, the mother tongue instruction in schools, Russian centers of complementary education as well as Russian-speaking parental networks are the main arenas for young children’s heritage language and literacy socialization.

Opportunities for Russian language socialization

According to the Swedish legislation, all children with a foreign background have a right to receive mother tongue (*modersmål*) instruction in preschool and school. However, as of 2020, less than 60% of the students exercise their right, and this number varies in different regions of Sweden (Skolverket, 2020). There is no statistics in regards to how many children have Russian as a mother tongue in Swedish preschools. As to the Swedish elementary school (*grundskola*, years 1-9), 2180 students signed up for Russian as a mother tongue classes in 2012 (Skolverket, 2017). As we can see, the relative number of students with Russian as a home language is rather small. Quality of such education is often debated in the on-line networks for Russian mothers (see below on networks).

Russian complementary schools and hobby centers are quite popular among Russian-speaking families. Their format and tuition vary as they can be run as small private companies, by individual entrepreneurs or by non-profit organizations. Their main aim is to provide opportunities for children of a Russian-speaking descent to learn their heritage language, with a focus on literacy, and to develop other skills and capacities in their heritage language. They can also organize social get-togethers and events in a “Russian style” within the school (e.g., New Year celebration) or for a wider community (e.g., an annual pancake party *Maslenitsa* before the Great Lent leading to Easter).

Many of these weekend schools have programs for preschool children starting as early as two years of age. The families and children participating in this study took part in such programs. A typical curriculum includes Russian, mathematics, dance, arts and crafts, and activities fostering early intellectual development (chess, experiments, logic games, etc.). Typically, parents choose one or more courses from the curriculum package. Some schools are also open for older children between 7-12 years old, offering programs oriented primarily towards school subjects such as mathematics and natural

---

3 Skolverket, personal communication, 1 March, 2017
sciences. Because the celebration of events with elements of performance and demonstration of the Russian language skills is an integral part of the social life of these schools, many of them involve children and parents in theater activities.

Another branch of Russian complementary education in Sweden includes sport clubs, creative studios, and private instruction in music or art for example. Interestingly, some music studios, as well as sport clubs in gymnastics and figure skating market themselves as having Russian ownership, coaches, and methods of training, but where the language of instruction is Swedish. This speaks of a high evaluation and appreciation of intellectual, sport, science, art, and music achievements associated with the “Russian school” of training in these areas. At the same time, these spaces are open for Swedish-speaking children who are keen on practicing and developing skills in sports or arts.

Last but not least, Russian language maintenance and fostering of the children’s interest towards Russian language and culture involves creating a language learning environment in the home through a significant investment in literacy resources. There are several popular offline and online Russian bookstores in Sweden that offer a wealth of school materials and literature in Russian, with a focus on children’s literacy and intellectual development.

Parents’ networks

Parental networks are of a special significance for contextualizing the findings of the study, and all the participating mothers are members of at least one such network and take part in the discussions on supporting Russian language use at home.

There are several online forums for Russian-speaking women where they can find support and discuss the issues of family language use and multilingual childrearing. One of them is a closed Facebook group for Russian-speaking mothers in Sweden. It is an active community that has grown from about 1700 members in 2015 to 3300 in 2017, and to 4800 in 2021. Some of the frequent themes that are up for discussion concern children’s intellectual and language development, ways to manage communication with multilingual children, and how to maintain Russian as a language actively used by the children. This group is also a platform for sharing information about family events in Russian and for encouraging Russian-speaking get-togethers.
5. Method, data and analysis

Short-term ethnography and a multimodal interactional approach

To examine language socialization practices in multilingual families, the study adopted the principles and procedures of video-ethnographic research combined with the methodologies for microanalysis of everyday talk.

According to Ochs and Schieffelin (2008), the methodological principles of language socialization research are: (i) “Systematically collecting and analyzing a corpus of young children’s spontaneous utterances recorded at periodic intervals” and (ii) “Documenting the sociocultural ecology of children, including prevailing and historically rooted beliefs, ideologies, bodies of knowledge, sentiments, institutions of social order, and practices that organize the life worlds of growing children within and across social settings” (pp. 4-5). To identify the recurrent practices of a community, such research typically follows a small number of participants over time (Miller & Fung, 2012).

The present study qualifies for short-term ethnography (Pink & Morgan, 2013). It is characterized by intensive excursions into participants’ lives, where video observations are used in order to create “a depth of data and immersion” (Pink & Morgan, 2013, p. 353). It involves getting to know participating families and their experiences with a focus on activities, practices and tacit elements of everyday life. In this way, the present study differs from classical language socialization studies that immersed themselves in the everyday life of a specific community for a long time in order to capture the ideological and sociocultural dimensions of children’s language socialization. It is designed to capture everyday interactions and examine language practices in contemporary middle-class families at a specific point in time in order to uncover cultural orientations (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014; cf. Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018).

As a native Russian speaker, I decided to conduct fieldwork using my language skills and cultural knowledge. Yet, the primary research interest lies in the process of young children’s multilingual socialization in family settings rather than in explorations of a specific linguistic community. A particular attention is given to identifying and analyzing families’ communication patterns in relation to ongoing activities and how nurturing learning environments are organized and sustained. Analyses of these patterns provide insights about
sociocultural understandings of both multilingualism and childrearing in the families participating in the study. The findings are further discussed in relation to other cross-sectional studies in middle-class families.

Unlike much of the sociolinguistic FLP research of family language practices that relies on parental interviews, this study documents and analyzes naturally occurring interactions. This enables a focus on the bidirectional nature of language socialization and the situated dimensions of family life. Hence, video-recorded data is used to explore in detail daily family routines as “lived experiences” (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018, p. 9). Moreover, such data is dynamic and context-rich, which makes it possible to answer process-oriented questions (Le Baron et al., 2018) and analyze not only talk but also “the visible and haptic performances of bodily actions as discursive performances” (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018, p. 13). As multimodality, embodiment, materiality and sequence are central features of video data (Le Baron et al., 2018), the thesis employs a multimodal interactional approach to situated practices (Goodwin, 2000) and considers these dimensions in the analysis of the selected episodes in the three articles.

Video-based research in three families

The study began in early 2015. In order to find participants, I posted a note in Russian (Appendix A) in the Facebook group for Russian-speaking mothers in Sweden. Families were invited to take part in the research project investigating how young children in multilingual families learn languages. The main criteria for recruitment of the participants were that Russian should be one of the family languages and that the families should have preschool-aged children. Five mothers showed an interest in participating in the study and discussed the possibility with their partners/fathers of the children. The fathers received information in English (Appendix B). Three families agreed to participate in the study. In this sense, the participants were self-selected and interested in the topics of children’s emerging multilingualism.

Here, I would like to underscore that I did not particularly look for nuclear middle-class families as I was aware of the complexity of modern family formation and various family types. Recently, there has been a strong critique that much of FLP research was conducted in nuclear middle-class families in the Western countries (Palviainen, 2020). What has been overlooked, is that in a number of studies that fall under the umbrella of “middle-class families”, language researchers in fact documented and examined practices with their own children (e.g., Bauer, 2000; Filipi, 2015; Juan & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Kabuto, 2010; Kopeliovich, 2013). In other cases, the participating caregivers had prior knowledge of the topic or were language teachers (e.g., Smith-Christmas, 2018). This raises the question of access to the field. As it is quite difficult to conduct ethnographical studies and naturalistic video-recordings
in the home, the families may volunteer to participate because they have some understanding of and interest in the issues in focus. In this thesis, the participating mothers are also professionally interested in linguistics, education, and children’s language learning. This could be the reason that educational activities and language-centered practices are frequent in such language- and multilingualism-mindful families.

Participants
The profiles of the participating families reflect a variation of middle-class, dual-earner (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018; Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013) family constellations (such as families with one child, with siblings or twins), and socio-linguistic environments (living in a multilingual or predominantly Swedish area, in the large city, suburbs, or a small town). The following descriptions of the families are informed by short informal interviews with the parents and ethnographic participant observations, with a focus on family language practices and the children’s language use.

The mothers participating in this study have educational backgrounds in linguistics and/or education. They come from different countries of the former Soviet Union, but have Russian as a mother tongue. They all speak at least four languages, including fluent English, Swedish, and another foreign language to various degrees. They have a strong personal and professional interest in their children’s language development and invest much time and resources to support their children in becoming confident multilingual speakers.

Family Andersson. Amanda (2;4) speaks Swedish most of the time and is encouraged to use Russian with her mother. When she speaks Russian, she often code-switches to Swedish. During the week, Amanda attends a Swedish-speaking preschool. On most weekends, the parents take her to a Russian program for children, which is a couple of hours away from the home. Both parents are in their mid-thirties. The mother has a linguistic background from her home country, and then she studied further and worked in Sweden for about 10 years. She has Russian as a mother tongue and speaks three foreign languages fluently. The father has Swedish as a mother tongue and is fluent in English. The language of family communication is Swedish, and so is the dominant linguistic environment. The family lives in a small town in Sweden with a rather homogenous population, with very little contact with Russian or languages other than Swedish. The mother and Amanda regularly talk to the Russian-speaking grandparents via Skype and see them on average once per year.

Family Bergman. Twins Lisa and Alex (3) mainly speak Swedish with each other, with occasional switches to Russian. While Lisa usually tries to speak Russian to her mother, Alex prefers using Swedish. However, at the age of
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4 The children’s ages are given at the beginning of the study.
four Alex became very interested in learning how to read and write in Russian. A Russian and English teacher with a doctorate degree in linguistics, the mother has lived in Sweden for two years. The father’s mother tongue is Swedish, he speaks English fluently and some Russian. The parents communicate with each other mainly in Swedish, with some occasional use of English and Russian, but they address the children in their respective mother tongue. The parents are in their mid-thirties, and they have lived and worked in several countries. Before the children were born, the parents read literature on multilingual children’s language development and discussed their plans to support simultaneous trilingualism (Russian, Swedish, and English). The family lives in the suburbs of a large city in Sweden. The heritage language (Russian) is systematically and intentionally practiced through interaction with the mother. In addition, it is used in organized activities such as meetings with Russian-speaking friends, visiting relatives, watching cartoons or reading books in Russian. The children regularly communicate with their Russian-speaking grandparents via Skype and see them about once per year. They are enrolled in a Swedish preschool during the week. During the first stage of data collection, they attended several hours of classes in a Russian weekend school. In addition to a special attention to Russian, English is introduced as well through literacy practices and social activities inside and outside the home.

Family Garcia. Anton (2;7) seems to understand Russian and Spanish, but does not speak much yet. At the age of 4;8 (during the second stage of data collection) he spoke some Russian and Spanish. His older sister Marina (5;10) fluently speaks Russian, Spanish and Swedish, uses some words in English and has a genuine interest in languages. At the age of six and a half, she could read and write in Swedish, Russian and Spanish. The parents are in their early forties, and have been living in Sweden for about twenty years. A native Russian speaker, the mother speaks six foreign languages and has a background in linguistics and education. The father’s native language is Spanish, and he speaks English and Swedish as well. The parents communicate with each other in Spanish, and use their mother tongue to talk to the children. Marina addresses the parents in their respective languages, with no instances of language alternation (as documented in the data). Anton uses Spanish to address his father, and both Russian and Spanish to address his mother. He did not interact much with his older sister during the data collection, but according to the mother, Marina addresses him in Russian. The family lives in a multicultural urban area. In the kindergarten and school that Anton and Marina attend, many children have a mother tongue or home language other than Swedish. At school, the children receive home language instruction in both Spanish and Russian (which is a rare case), and Marina also attends a Russian learning center for children on weekends.
Data collection

The fieldwork was conducted in two stages, and the data corpus comprises approximately 54 hours of video-recorded material.

The first set of data was collected during the spring of 2015, providing 36h of video-recordings. To ensure a systematic way of data collection (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008), I followed the plan (see Appendix B) and visited two selected families here called Family Bergman (7 visits) and Family Garcia (6 visits) on evenings during the week and afternoons on the weekends. Each time when I met the families (except for the first introductory meeting), I recorded ongoing activities for several hours using one small video-camera on a tripod, which allowed me to follow the children to different spaces in their homes. I also conducted short informal interviews with a focus on the family’s everyday life, typical activities, routines, and language use. While I mostly observed interaction taking notes, sitting somewhere in the corner of the room to be less intrusive, I sometimes participated in the family meals as the family’s Russian-speaking guest.

Because the Family Andersson lived in a different part of the country, I was able to be with them only two days in the beginning and one day in the end of the fieldwork. During the three months between my visits, the family video-recorded their daily activities themselves, using the research camera on a tripod. The parents followed my instructions not to choose specific episodes but to capture ongoing family activities during several hours both on weekdays and weekends, preferably according to the schedule. They also kept a journal of days and times when the recordings were made.

During this stage of the fieldwork, I got to know the families and documented their everyday activities. As yet, no specific focus was set on either certain family practices or how the children used their family languages. The primary goal was to follow the children and document their language use in the home.

Table 1. Data collection Stage I: participants and recorded data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Family languages</th>
<th>Recorded time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andersson</td>
<td>Amanda (2)</td>
<td>Swedish, Russian</td>
<td>15h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Lisa (3), Alex (3)</td>
<td>Swedish, Russian, English</td>
<td>11h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Anton (2), Marina (5)</td>
<td>Spanish, Russian, Swedish</td>
<td>12h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up fieldwork was conducted in two years, in the spring of 2017. This time, two out of three families chose to participate in the study. I visited families Bergman and Garcia in the beginning and in the end of fieldwork. During the two-three weeks between the visits, the parents were instructed to film by themselves, focusing on specific activities such as reading, playing, and mealtimes to collect more material illuminating language practices and interactional routines that became the focus of the study. In addition, informal interviews with the mothers were conducted. This data set comprises approximately 18h of video-recordings.

Table 2. Data collection Stage II: participants and recorded data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Family languages</th>
<th>Recorded time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Lisa (5) Alex (5)</td>
<td>Swedish, Russian, English</td>
<td>9h 43m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Anton (4) Marina (7)</td>
<td>Spanish, Russian, Swedish</td>
<td>8h 24m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the material in this study includes video-recorded observations, participant observations described in the field notes, and interviews with the parents. Semi-structured open-ended and informal interviews were conducted in English with the mother and the father in the Andersson family, and in Russian with only mothers in the Bergman and Garcia families. In addition, during the process of video-observations, the mothers in all families occasionally shared their thoughts on multilingual language development of their children and explained, for example, their choice of books or activities. While video-recorded observations constitute the main data corpus for the analysis, other ethnographic material informs and contextualizes the analyses.

Researcher’s role and reflections on video-ethnography

While video-ethnography brings many advantages to capturing family interaction in situ, it has consequences for the process of data collection and analysis. One of the central issues is that entering a private space with a camera is a kind of intrusion as both researcher’s presence and camera’s presence influence the social landscape of the setting. During the fieldwork, my intention was to take an observer position as much as possible. I attempted to be distant from what was going on by placing the camera on the tripod in the corner of the room, finding a place to sit and write notes, not staring directly at the participants or initiating conversations. If the children went to another room, I followed them with a camera and quietly settled there. However, as I was
introduced to the children as a family’s guest and their mother’s Russian-speaking friend, I had to be involved in some practices such as greetings, occasional chats with the mothers, short responses to the children, and even participated in the family meals. I also shared information about my work, family, and children, which possibly helped mitigate the perceived distance or hierarchy between the researcher and family members. Therefore, my role fell on the continuum between observer and participant in the family daily activities.

The combination of video-recording by the researcher and self-recordings provided an opportunity for the families to control to some extent the degree of intimacy they chose to share in the study. The parents were informed that the camera could be turned off at any time during the recording, for example, at a sensitive or tense moment. While the parents did not request this, once I myself stopped the recording and left the room as I judged an instance of a child’s uproar as sensitive and let the mother have a moment of privacy and be fully present with her child. Even if I tried to follow the children from one activity to another, I did not enter the space of bathrooms or when the clothes were changed. In these ways, I dealt with ethical dilemmas related to corporal privacy, nudity, and gender, raised by video-based research (Aarsand & Forsberg, 2010).

As Goodwin and Cekaite (2018) point out, “video-ethnography does not assume observer objectivity” (p. 11). Selecting what to film and how to film was already a researcher’s choice. Sometimes I had to choose what child to follow. Sometimes I used a “zoom” function to bring the participants closer in the frame and capture in detail facial expression or body movements.

Overall, the recordings made by the families were rather similar to mine as they captured mundane activities (mealtime, book reading, play, etc.). Yet, I am aware that both when I was filming and when the parents filmed themselves the dynamics of what was going on could be influenced by the presence of the camera (cf. Aarsand & Forsberg’s, 2010, study of family life when the parents hardly ever showed any expressions of intimacy, upset or conflict between themselves).

Furthermore, I noticed a difference in the process of preliminary analysis of the excerpts that the families filmed themselves. In such cases, I had no access to an immediate ethnographic context of the activities during recording. My own observations and writing of fieldnotes during the recording were important when approaching the recorded data later.

Data analysis and procedures

Drawing upon the analytical procedures used in a language socialization approach (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008) and ethnography of family life (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018), I will start this section by identifying and contextualizing recurrent family activities and routines. Then, I will describe the
procedures for the microanalysis of the data. Specific attention will be given to the multimodal organization of interaction (Goodwin, 2000; Mondada, 2018) and the challenges of transcription (Hepburn & Bolden, 2014). I will also discuss some of the analytical premises for presenting the study’s findings, concerning ethnographically informed analysis of multilingual heritage maintenance and language socialization in the home.

Data description and recurrent family activities and routines

Following a language socialization approach, discursive practices and interactional routines were identified ethnographically so that they could be analyzed linguistically (Peters & Boggs, 1986). Ethnography also made it possible to relate verbal behaviors under study to those performed in other situations (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2009, p. 314).

During the first stage of data collection, a typical evening of a weekday in the families could look like:

- Coming back home from preschool around 16.30-17.30.
- The parent(s) started preparing dinner while the children were engaged in play (individually or together) or watched TV/used the iPad.
- Dinner around 18.00. Dinner could be served only for the children or for the whole family. This varied between the families, and sometimes depended on the situation (for example, when the father was still at work the mother prepared a simpler meal for the children). In the Garcia family, the parents preferred to eat dinner after the children had gone to bed.
- After dinner, the parents suggested an activity for the children to engage in and entertain themselves, most often together with at least one parent (reading books, watching TV, painting, puzzles).
- Around 19.30, the parents initiated preparations for bedtime (brushing teeth, putting on pajamas, going to the bedroom, picking up a book and reading). In the Garcia family the five-year-old child stayed up till later, until 21.00 according to the parents. I usually left around 20.00-20.30.

On a typical weekend afternoon, the families were usually at home after some morning activities outside the home (e.g., Russian learning center, swimming, library, shopping, playing outside). Typical activities were snack time, meal preparation, watching TV, and play.

During the data collection, rarely were both parents at home or in the same space with the children. On a number of occasions when I was video-recording, one parent was at home with the children while the other stayed late at work, or went on a trip, or was engaged in their own activity in another part of the house. Alternatively, the father could go shopping or to the doctor’s appointment with one child while the mother would stay at home with the
other. According to the parents, even if they valued “the whole family” time, they usually planned “shifts” and “time slots” for taking care of the children and doing other work- or hobby-related activities. This scenario is in accordance with what other studies of middle-class families have shown (cf. Swedish families in Gottzén, 2009; American families in Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013). In particular, Gottzén (2009) highlighted several household strategies, such as alternating or multitasking, that the parents employed for managing time and accomplishing “involved parenthood”.

At the same time, the children were almost never left completely on their own while parents were engaged in something else. At least one parent kept an eye on what was going on and often talked to the children about the ongoing activities. Such division of labor between the parents with different mother tongues provided possibilities for the children to practice one language at a time. In my material, the children spent much of the time with the mother and were prompted to speak Russian, even if I also have recordings of activities with the fathers. Such schedule and structure of family activities often provided opportunities to apply the One-Parent-One-Language strategy (Döpke, 1992). Therefore, all the three studies focus on instances of this type of interaction. During the second stage of the data collection, the children were older and, therefore, less supervised by the adults and spent more time in free play with each other (in the Bergman family) or with toys.

In the first stage of data collection, I observed recurrent activities that the children participated in.

Table 3. Activities and daily routines

| • Free play (with toys, with siblings, with parents) |
| • Playing board games |
| • Reading books/literacy events |
| • Watching TV |
| • Dancing |
| • Using iPad |
| • Arts and crafts, usually initiated and instructed by the mother (e.g., everyone paints) |
| • Acting as a parent’s helper (mostly in the kitchen, cooking) |
| • Practical activities: washing hands, getting ready for a meal, getting ready for bed, picking up toys, etc. |
| • Snack time |
| • Meal time |

Based on my observations, field notes, and first viewing of the recordings, I identified and logged recurrent patterns of language use, language features and
language-centered practices within the activities. This preliminary analysis served as the first step towards the three studies.

Table 4. Language-centered practices and language features

- Narratives of personal experiences: re-telling and discussing what family members did during the day or what they are going to do (went to the doctor, to the library; what happened in preschool)
- Home language lessons
- Adult-initiated and child-initiated explanations (What is this? This is…).
- Naming objects in several languages/prompts for naming
- Description of the ongoing actions
- Counting
- Singing and singing along
- Comments about language use
- Requests for translation
- Language play
- Code-switching/language alternations
- Designedly incomplete utterances
- Diminutives
- Explicit and embedded corrections
- Embodied performances
- Onomatopoeic sounds

Multimodal interactional analysis of multilingual mother-child interaction

While there was a wealth of language-centered practices and interesting interactional phenomena in the data, I chose to investigate naming practices, conversational storytelling and book reading in Russian, which constitute the foci of the three studies. They were recurrent across families and embedded in everyday activities, even though they had a specific spin in each family. Ethnographical interviews and observations helped see that the mothers did attempt to use a language policy (speak Russian to the children) and specific strategies to carry out the activities in Russian. Yet, this policy was reflexive to the children’s communicative styles and their engagement in the activity-at-hand.

While this study does not focus on code-switching *per se*, it is a language practice that makes the children’s multilingualism and the caregiver’s response to it, relevant. In other words, this practice is important for understanding local heritage language socialization environments and FLP-in-interaction. In particular, the degree of constraint and ways of dealing with children’s
code-switching are constitutive of parental heritage language maintenance strategies as well as the participants’ relational work and shared emotional experience. Therefore, the selection of focal practices and excerpts in all three articles was to some extent based on whether there were instances of code-switching. Overall, the frequency and patterns of language alternation differed in the families. Amanda (2;4) in the Andersson family often alternated between Russian and Swedish; Alex (3) in the Bergman family code-switched to Swedish much more than his twin sister Lisa; Anton (2;7; then 4;8) in the Garcia family could use both Spanish and Russian in interactions with his mother, but did not code-switch during the analyzed Russian literacy event.

From that point, I worked closely with one study at a time. Each time, I went through the data again and selected clips relevant for illuminating the phenomena in focus. From those episodes, I selected excerpts for the detailed analysis that were first transcribed verbatim and then following standardized conventions (see section on transcription). These excerpts were inspected many times and presented at data sessions with fellow researchers in the CLIP group (Studies in Childhood, Learning and Identities as Interactional Practices) at Uppsala University. In line with the theoretical and methodological standpoints of a multimodal interactional approach, I tried to ensure an emic perspective, i.e., “a culture-specific account” and “an account meaningful to actors themselves” (Silverman, 2013, pp. 255, 305). The ethnographic knowledge informed the analysis of the interaction by contextualizing the interpretations of what was going on in a particular speech event from the perspective of the speakers (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2009).

From the very beginning, my attention was drawn to the prevalence of prompts for naming and questions during various activities across families. These various ways to elicit speech production in general and in Russian in particular were pervasive across all three families. The recurrent nature of these language practices reflects the child-centered, learning-centered, and language-centered agendas in middle-class families (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013, 2015a, 2015b). As I explored previous research on family language socialization in monolingual and multilingual settings and engaged with the preliminary analysis, I chose to focus on a practice called home language lessons and to investigate its sequential development and the interplay of educational, relational, and pragmatic dimensions. An example of typical Western middle-class families’ “education-relevant family routines” (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2013), is recurrent during mundane activities such as mealtime (e.g., Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015; Said & Zhu, 2019) or book reading (e.g., Meyer Pitton, 2013b). The analyzed episode comes from the Bergman family and is embedded in the mundane task where the mother and the three-year-old daughter are engaged in the collaborative multilayered activity of emptying the dishwasher and talking about what each item is called in Russian.

The next study continued the line of inquiry of how the mother and the child make use of various semiotic resources, including sets of linguistic
features in Russian and Swedish, to collaboratively carry out an activity. Conversational storytelling is an important practice in the family discourse, where the parents tell stories to the children, tell stories about the children and the children tell stories to the parents. In Western middle-class families, it is common that the parents elicit the stories as part of scaffolding children’s language development and also for “doing family” (see Fogle’s, 2012, analysis of the routine of asking about the day). In mother-child interaction in the three participating families, pursuing a story was a way to use and maintain the heritage language. A single case was selected from the Andersson family, as the focal child regularly engaged in the spontaneous telling of personal experiences in an interactional environment that nurtured her enthusiastic contributions. The two selected storytelling episodes occurred during the mundane activities (eating a meal and dressing) and, therefore, are analyzed in relation to that.

Finally, I turned to the literacy practices because book-reading activities were central in each home, and literacy topics stood out in the parental interviews. Each family invested much time and resources in creating nurturing literacy environments, regularly engaging in shared reading and encouraging the children to interact with texts of their own. The data was very rich and captured children’s encounters with various types of texts, such as storybooks, picture books, activity books, sets for story dramatization, magazines, audiobooks, and posters. I made clips of all such encounters and logged them. I noticed that designedly incomplete utterances (DIUs, Koshik, 2002) were recurrently used during storybook reading episodes in all three families to prompt engagement in the literacy activity and co-narration in the heritage language. Five excerpts were selected for a detailed analysis striving for a fair representation of how DIUs are used in all the families during literacy events.

In sum, all three studies examined recurrent language practices in mother-child interactions that fostered learning and offered various ways for the children to use the heritage language: Russian. Since I viewed family life as moment-to-moment unfolding activities, the selected language-centered practices were analyzed as embedded in these mundane activities. The analyses focused on the sequential organization of the activity, i.e., turn-by-turn unfolding talk and how it was coordinated with the bodily actions of the participants (Goodwin, 2000). The analysis of the participation frameworks, i.e., in what ways the participants reflexively position themselves in relation to each other and to what is going on during the activity, was crucial in approaching heritage language maintenance and children’s emerging multilingualism as part of relational work embedded in everyday family life. Moreover, I examined in detail the activity’s design and the ways in which a number of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and phonetic linguistic features in the heritage language, Russian, were made relevant and practiced in mother-child interactions. Building on the understanding of language socialization as a bidirectional process, the children’s contributions were also acknowledged. In particular, I demonstrated a gradual appropriation and creative development of the activity’s format by
the children. In this way, the analyses uncovered the interactional environment for children’s multilingual socialization and underscored its collaborative and situated nature.

Transcription and translation

Researchers’ choices in relation to transcription and translation are an important part of the analytical work, reflecting theoretical, methodological, and practical considerations. As this study’s primary interest was in investigating the interactional environment for children’s heritage language socialization, I followed the conversation analytic (CA) transcription conventions to demonstrate the sequential unfolding of talk-in-interaction in a greater detail. This way also enabled the analysis of the participation frameworks, and it illuminated specific linguistic features of turn design in Russian or other languages that participants made relevant. In Study I, I used a modified version of the conventions developed by Jefferson (2004). The transcripts in Study II and Study III were extended by adding a system for transcribing multimodality developed by Mondada (2018) and included line drawings made from video frames to visually represent analytically-highlighted, embodied actions. The transcripts evolved and were refined during the close collaboration with the co-authors of the research papers.

The multilingual nature of the data posed many challenges to transcription (Hepburn & Bolden, 2014). To present talk in Russian, I used a Roman transcription system for the Cyrillic alphabet of the Library of Congress without diacritics (see Bolden, 2004). Even if Hepburn and Bolden (2014) advocate using a three-line transcription (i.e., original talk, a morpheme-by-morpheme English gloss, and an idiomatic English translation) I have chosen not to include a morpheme-by-morpheme translation for the sake of readability and because it was not essential for the present analyses.

In some cases, when grammatical features were made relevant in Russian it was not possible to capture them in translations to English (for example, the endings of substantives in different cases). Nevertheless, such instances were noted, explained and considered in the analysis. The participants’ pseudonyms were carefully chosen with an attempt to preserve cultural associations and the number of syllables. In this way, it was possible to document grammatical modifications (e.g., diminutive forms of the children’s names) and mispronunciations (e.g., skipping a syllable in Amanda’s name, in Study II) of personal names.
Making claims about multilingual language socialization in the home

The approaches used in this thesis – language socialization and family language policy – require linking the micro-details of family interactions and discursive structures to broader patterns of sociocultural life. The three studies in this thesis identified and explored in detail how specific language practices in mother-child interaction that are embedded in mundane activities supported heritage language maintenance and socialization. The next step was to discuss the sociocultural conceptions of multilingualism and family life that were evoked through these practices.

Establishing such linkages and claims presents a methodological challenge for a researcher. Critiquing a number of studies on multilingual practices and identity for not moving beyond the interactional level to a full-scale analysis of social life and meaning, Bucholtz and Hall (2008) asked a question: what sort of analytic work is necessary to move from one level to another? In order to identify how linguistic structures are linked to interactional moves and how these in turn index ideologies, social structures, and cultural processes, we need ethnographic knowledge (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008).

When analytical segments for transcription were located contextually (i.e., recurrent practices and interactional routines), they were interpreted using my knowledge of the families’ life worlds (Hamo, 2004). The fact that heritage language-centered practices are recurrent in mother-child interaction tells us about their significance. When presenting findings in the three studies, I related them to previous research on language practices in contemporary Western monolingual and multilingual middle-class families. This step helped make connections between the specific ways of heritage language maintenance in three participating families and a broader understanding of social orientations towards children’s multilingualism and childrearing.

Collaboration and co-authorship

Two of the three articles that comprise this thesis are co-authored with my supervisors. Here, I would like to comment on the process of collaboration and co-authorship. When conversational storytelling was chosen to be a focus of Study II, I selected the suitable excerpts from the dataset and prepared a first draft of the transcription and analysis where collaborative embodied performances became prominent. As the work progressed, Ann-Carita Evaldsson suggested that footing could be a well-suited analytical tool to approach a collaborative organization of storytelling. Consequently, bilingual talk in this study is analyzed as an important resource for the child to accomplish shifts in footings. In Study III, I was responsible for identifying the recurrent practice (DIU use as prompts for co-narration during literacy events), analytical
focus, theoretical grounding, literature review, and a first round of transcription, analysis, and discussion. Helen Melander Bowden supervised this work, and she also nuanced the multimodal transcription and made line drawings of the still images.

Ethical considerations

The study followed the guidelines on ethical principles for research of the Swedish Research Council (2011/2017). The parents were informed about the aims and procedures of the study (see Appendix B) and that they had a right to withdraw their participation at any time. In our discussions, I made it clear that there was absolutely no intention to evaluate or compare them personally, their parenting styles or family life. The focus was on identifying the patterns of language use in multilingual families and heritage language maintenance. Agreeing to participate in the study, they signed a consent form (see Appendices C-D). Other adults who happened to be in the home during the fieldwork and appeared in the recordings such as grandparents were informed about the study by the parents. They did not sign the consent form, and therefore this material was not used in the study.

I greatly appreciate the families’ interest and willingness to open their homes for video-ethnographic research and their trust. As I entered a private space, the participants’ privacy was of highest priority in this ethnographic study. To protect participants’ identification, all personal names and geographical locations were anonymized. Due care was given to what details about their everyday life and language use were shared in the study. Instead of screenshots, line drawings are used in the publications.

While some ethical considerations during the process of data collection were presented in the section on researcher’s role and reflections on video-ethnography, here I further discuss ethical principles of conducting ethnographic research involving children. Viewing children as competent social actors engaged in bidirectional processes of language socialization, my analytical focus was on children’s participation in everyday activities and language-centered practices in interaction with their mothers. In this way, “ethical symmetry” (Christensen & Prout, 2002, p. 478), when the researcher applies the same principles conducting a study with children and adult participants, could be achieved. During fieldwork, I could also maintain this principle as I was engaged in a researcher-participant relationship with the mothers and the children in a similar way. This means that I was paying attention to what was going on in the family as a whole and showed interest in and respect to the parents and children in equal degrees.

However, obtaining the children’s consent to participate in the study differed from the formal procedures with the caregivers due to the children’s young age. When I met the families for the first time, the mothers introduced
me to the children and explained that I was going to video-record what they were doing with a camera. As the children most likely had prior experiences of being filmed and photographed, this did not seem to cause any particular response. Overall, I approached the ethical principle of obtaining children’s consent as “an ongoing process” (Harvey & Lareu, 2020, p. 25; see also Graham, Powell & Taylor, 2015). In practice, this meant that I was attuned to any indications that the focal child did not want to be observed or experienced distress. Thus, I was prepared to stop video-recording or to leave so that the children could have a possibility to withdraw their participation. Such situations did not occur. Some children showed more interest in interacting with me and being filmed, while others were quite indifferent and occupied by their daily activities.

As an analyst, facing dilemmas of representation (Hamo, 2004), I made decisions about what would be representative for patterns of language use in each family and how to share it with the readers. Analyses of the participants’ verbal and embodied conduct were based on repeated viewing of the video-recordings and detailed transcriptions, and informed by the ethnographical observations and interviews with the parents. In this way, I strived to do justice to the data and to the participants. The study’s results are my interpretations of discursive data (Silverman, 2013) related to the previous research in the field.
6. Summary of studies

Study I

This study answers a recent call in family language policy (FLP) research, to investigate heritage language maintenance as instantiated in actual practices and as an integral part of family life. It examines language socialization practices embedded in mundane family activities in a context of Russian-Swedish mother-child interactions. The analytical focus is on one such practice, home language lessons. The term lesson is borrowed from the school setting as it grasps interactional routines that in some respects resemble an asymmetric situation of a teacher teaching/instructing students (cf. Forrester, 2009). While informal language lessons are common in middle-class families where the parents attempt to enhance their children’s language skills and reflexive communication capacity (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015b), they are also found to be important in multilingual settings, both in classrooms (e.g., Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004, 2005) and family talk (e.g., Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015; Meyer Pitton 2013b). The present study investigates the organization and accomplishments of a variety of home language lessons in multilingual families, which is here termed language workout. It features several moves that are typical for classroom discourse and intimate child-directed speech, and is employed to support heritage language maintenance.

The study employs a language socialization approach (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014) that calls for an ethnographically grounded interactional analysis of everyday practices. The selected data come from the Bergman family, where the three-year-old twins speak Russian and Swedish, the mother tongues of the mother and the father respectively. The parents attempted to use the One-Person-One-Language (OPOL) strategy, which was supported by a schedule of “shifts” and “time slots” that the parents had planned for taking care of the children and doing other work- and hobby-related activities. The analyzed activity is an example of a common practice when the parent-child interaction is focused on both accomplishing a task (for instance, eating or preparing a meal) and practicing the heritage language, Russian, with the mother.

In the chosen episode, the mother and her daughter (3;1) are engaged in emptying the dishwasher and naming the objects at hand. The analyses focus on the sequential organization of the activity, where I attend to turn-by-turn unfolding talk and how it is coordinated with the bodily actions of the participants (Goodwin, 2000). First, I examine the activity’s design and the ways in
which a number of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and phonetic linguistic features are targeted and practiced in interaction. Second, the child’s contributions are acknowledged and the child’s gradual appropriation of the activity’s format is analyzed.

The results of the study show how the turn-structure of the collaborative activity of emptying the dishwasher – taking one item after another and putting it away – provided a focus of joint attention and an opportunity to talk about each item. One of the central questions “What is this?” prompted naming of the shown object and became a starting point for further elaborations about the object’s properties (e.g., colors, belonging, place), what actions were being accomplished (e.g., putting an item away) as well as correct language use (e.g., word search, grammatical forms, requests for translations). In other words, the language-centered practice of language workout was simultaneously framed as a task- and a heritage language-oriented activity – an ambitious project for a three-year-old to learn and use a rather advanced linguistic repertoire in Russian. Consistently mobilizing a teacher-talk register (e.g., corrections, questions with known answers, hyper-articulation) and a parent-talk register (e.g., diminutives, prosodic variations, mimicking, laughter), this practice dialectically invoked educational and intimate, task- and language-oriented dimensions. The playful mode of the activity allowed for the camouflaging of the educational agenda that concerned language choice and language use.

The findings have revealed that the realization of language policy in bilingual families relies not only on parental input and language choice (cf. Lanza, 1997; Mishina-Mori, 2011), but also on the position of the child as a speaker and learner vis-à-vis the parent and the ways in which the child is invited to put the target language into use. While family language policy research has primarily uncovered how children challenge family language norms, this study highlights a format that allows for educational, affective, and engaging exploration of bilingual language use with young children in the home.

Study II

This study explores a young child’s (2;6) spontaneous participation in the activity of telling personal experiences in the context of bilingual mother-child interactions. A particular focus is on how children, from an early age, manage to launch and pursue their telling as highly tellable through the participants’ collaborative orientations to narratives as embodied performances (see Duranti & Black, 2011; Ochs & Capps, 2001).

Previous research has shown that children’s participation in storytelling activities across cultures is a dialogical joint accomplishment. In middle-class families, caregivers were found to employ an array of practices such as questions, elicitations, clarifications, and expansions to support the child’s telling, whereby the child is oriented to as a knowledgeable teller. Furthermore, social,
emotional, and cultural aspects were important in the co-production of the tellable story, in particular, evaluative elements of the emotionally salient events (Miller & Fung, 2012; Miller & Sperry, 1988). Yet, very little thus far is known about how young bilingual children are socialized to conversational storytelling.

The selected data come from the Andersson family where the focal child, Amanda, regularly engaged in the telling of personal experiences in a bilingual (Russian-Swedish) environment that nurtured her spontaneous and creative contributions. For detailed analyses, two naturally occurring storytelling episodes were chosen that were embedded in other ongoing mundane activities: mealtime and dressing. Each episode consists of an unfolding trajectory of collaboratively performed storytelling activities in mother-child interaction that coheres to the focal topic of emotionally compelling experiences.

Goodwin and Goodwin’s (2004) approach to Goffman’s (1981) notion of participation and footing is used in the analyses of the production format and the formation of participation frameworks in storytelling. The analytic framework implies that participants in the telling of a story can transform the actions of self and others to perform laminated actions through assembling semiotic resources that extend beyond the structures of talk.

The findings exemplified how a young child skillfully managed to launch and perform a highly tellable bilingual storytelling in close collaboration with her mother. In dynamic moment-to-moment interactions, the dramatized storytelling emerged, offering opportunities for the co-participants’ playful embellishment and reflexive awareness of the verbal and embodied elements in the telling. The shifts in footing from serious to playful and imagined frames of events involved main keying resources such as animations, reenactments, prosodic actions, sound effects, gestures, affect displays, exploitations of language form, and code-switching. Similar to the speech eliciting strategies in monolingual middle-class families, the mother’s communicative work supported Amanda’s improvised telling. Yet, this interactional work also modeled and promoted the use and learning of the heritage language, Russian, while allowing the child’s fluid bilingual contributions. The study moreover shows how the co-produced storytelling rested on the participants’ emotional involvement in terms of finely-tuned, embodied uptakes and affective alignments.

Study III

The focus of this study is on how a specific type of prompts – designedly incomplete utterances (DIU, Koshik, 2002) – is recurrently used during the course of literacy events by mothers in multilingual middle-class families in order to engage their children in collaborative reading activities in the heritage language. The aim is to analyze (i) the ways in which DIUs are used as
prompts for co-narration in mother-child reading interactions, and (ii) how children recognize, respond to, and exploit the DIU structure during literacy events.

DIU’s principal design feature is that the utterance is withheld before completion, while cues as to what answer is required from the recipient are provided. Loaded with prosodical, grammatical, and syntactical cues to help complete the utterance, they may serve as a distinct invitation for the child to engage in the caregiver’s project. While known for performing many functions in learner-centered talk, DIUs’ pedagogical benefits can be contradictory as they do scaffold learning but also may coerce or inhibit student participation (Netz, 2016). In addition, DIUs differ in their transparency (Margutti, 2010), i.e., are recognizable in various degrees. The study has nuanced this research conversation by showing how DIUs became a powerful means of dealing with the complexity of the literacy activity – a situation that is typical for parent-child interaction in Western middle-class families. The analyses have specifically highlighted interactional work required from the mothers to launch and uphold the literacy project in Russian as a competitor with the other things that the children were interested in.

The selected data was collected in three multilingual families where the mothers speak Russian and the parents created print-rich and interaction-rich literacy environments. Many of the texts were poems or folk tales that the mothers knew by heart. As the study demonstrates, these texts and the ways of reading were also well-known to the children. Focusing on identifying and analyzing specific patterns of language use in situated literacy events, it was observed that DIUs were recurrently used during storybook reading episodes. The multimodal interactional analyses showcased five excerpts where DIUs were employed by the mothers as prompts for co-narration in the heritage language in the course of different types of literacy activities. The findings have uncovered a multifaceted use of this device that helped engage the children in co-narration. In particular, DIUs were used as part of home language lessons and literacy practices with a focus on naming and speech elicitation in Russian, embodied routines involving choral production and collaborative completions, and engagement in poetic oral performance.

The results have demonstrated how DIUs were embedded in an ongoing literacy activity in relation to: (i) text features (rhythm, rhyme, parallel structures), (ii) materiality (pictures, stickers, wooden characters), (iii) embodied participation frameworks (gestures, spatial arrangements, managing turn-taking; coordination of multiple projects), (iv) hierarchy of speakers and its reversibility, and (v) other language practices such as corrections, repetitions, questions, IREs, and code-switching. In other words, prompting for co-narration with help of DIUs encompassed many other dimensions of heritage language use besides lexical. The findings also suggest that DIUs, as prompts for co-narration, were important for heritage language and literacy socialization in several ways. As this device was consistently used by the mothers to engage
the children in the literacy project and sustain a monolingual context of inter-
action (Lanza, 1997), it created a routinized and therefore recognizable format
of the activity that the children creatively appropriated. DIUs also played an
important role not only for eliciting speech production in Russian but also for
socializing the children into an oral mode of interacting around written texts,
and, in particular, recitation of folk tales and poetry.
7. Concluding discussion

This thesis has approached the study of children’s emerging multilingualism and heritage language maintenance in transnational families as part of families’ everyday life through focusing on mother-child interactions during mundane activities. Building on a discursive understanding of family and family life as ways of participating in unfolding activities and collaborative organization of action, the three studies explored in detail a selection of heritage language-centered practices. From a language socialization perspective, such practices constitute a language learning environment for young children in transnational families. Video-ethnographic research and multimodal interactional analyses uncovered some ways in which the nurturing language learning environments are organized and sustained in the process of young children’s multilingual heritage language socialization.

Nurturing heritage language learning environments

Extending previous research on the social contexts of multilingual language acquisition and family language policy (FLP), this thesis illustrates that parental discourse strategies are contingent on what is happening during the course of an activity (e.g., emptying the dishwasher, telling a story, or reading) and the child’s participation.

The ways in which the One-Person-One-Language (OPOL) principle and heritage language maintenance are practiced in interaction, focusing on parental response strategies to children’s code-switching, have been a central issue in the FLP and literature on young children’s multilingual development. The findings of the present study suggest that children’s code-switching and parental responses need to be examined as a resource among many others that the participants use to accomplish the activity-at-hand. It is an important nuance that the mothers’ interactional goal was not merely getting the children to speak Russian, but rather engaging them in and sustaining joint activities in the heritage language. The mothers’ notable efforts to maintain a monolingual context of interactions created language learning environments where the children were socialized not only to the importance of speaking Russian and correct use of it but also to various dimensions of language use such as exploiting activity formats and managing multiple projects.
Overall, to handle children’s language alternations, the mothers mainly used “embedded medium requests” (Gafaranga, 2010) with very few explicit requests for translations. Embedded corrections served the purposes of signaling the preferred language of interaction and also to model correct language forms. In many cases, corrections were mitigated by format tying, use of diminutives, gentle prosody, and playful embodied gestures such as mimicking without directly addressing deficits in the child’s language competences.

In particular, I showed that some instances of children’s language alternations or mistakes in grammatical forms in Russian were explicitly corrected by the mothers, while others were not. The multimodal interactional analysis uncovered how the mothers in such instances were attuned to the embodied actions of the children and the activity-in-progress. Here we can see a tension between striving for correctness and teaching a “proper”, standard register in Russian, while encouraging and appreciating the children’s speech production in the heritage language and getting things done in a collaborative manner. This claim is supported in the interviews with the participating mothers. On the one hand, we hear “The linguist in me never sleeps, nor does the teacher,” and, on the other hand, “I do this [foster Russian] in a natural way”.

A focus on the activity at hand showed that code-switching was used to negotiate not a language choice per se but rather in relation to the ongoing communicative projects. As a response to Alex’s code-switching to Swedish during a literacy event (Study III), the mother pursued the correct answer to her question in Russian with the help of designedly incomplete utterances (DIUs) and repetitions in order to stay onboard with the project of reading poems. The child’s resistance to complete the DIU and naming the objects in Russian did not escalate as it was handled with the help of the DIU structures and positioning the child as a competent speaker. In another episode in Study III, when Anton resisted completing the mother’s DIU and instead launched a parallel project, she took up his contribution and temporarily merged it with the main literacy project. Thus, the results paint a more nuanced picture of the child’s resistance and the ways in which the mother – a skillful and interested co-participant – may handle it. It can then be argued that a nurturing heritage language learning environment is characterized not only in relation to the parental linguistic input but also the coordination between the frames of different communicative projects at hand, embodied participation frameworks and caregiver’s monitoring and attunement to the children’s contributions, and progression of the activity and the material environment.

In the literature on children’s emerging multilingualism and FLP, there is a general tendency to see children’s language alternations as undesirable because they may lead to a language shift. Multimodal interactional analyses of the code-switching instances in the three case studies have revealed that from the mothers’ perspective code-switching offered language teaching potential and a means to return to the project at hand in the heritage language. Moreover, the child’s language choice that was unexpected for the parent within a
ritualized routine created laughter and amusement. Code-switching was also used by the mothers and the children as a resource to shift between the frames of different communicative projects, and to, in concert with prosodic and embodied resources, carry out a collaborative storytelling performance (Study III).

Such variety of functions of language alternations is inherent in the complexity of the activity that itself is part of culturally shaped discursive fabric of family life. Even if the mothers intended to apply the OPOL principle and skillfully worked to engage their children into Russian speech production during everyday activities, responses to children’s language use occurred within a larger framework of what constitutes “good parenting”. In particular, it concerns child-centered and age-appropriate orientations that afford specific modes of engagement and playfulness (cf. Döpke, 1992; Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Kopeliovich, 2013; Said, 2021; Said & Zhu, 2019; Smith-Christmas, 2018). Therefore, nurturing heritage language environments also include pragmatic, relational, and childrearing dimensions. On this note, the study also raises the question of what ways the explored language-centered practices and interactional dynamics are unique to multilingual families. By showing how children’s heritage language learning and use are embedded in relational and childrearing matrix of family life, the study underscores that FLP dilemmas are present in everyday life of contemporary multilingual middle-class families in relation to the parental role as an educator in the home.

Heritage language-centered practices

Similar to monolingual and multilingual middle-class families across cultural settings, the mothers in this study were keen on fostering children’s language development and scaffolding speech production, including oral and written modes. Throughout the thesis, I refer to such practices as language-centered. Elsewhere referred to as “didactic strategies” (Kazakovskaya & Balčiūnienė, 2012), “pedagogical techniques” (Döpke, 1992), “instructional” and “adult-to-child lessons” (Forrester, 2009) as well as home language lessons (Meyer Pitton, 2013b; Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015), they reflect an overall educational drive present in everyday life of middle-class families. These “forms of pedagogy” practiced in the family (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018, p. 187) include a variety of language practices and discursive devices to elicit and maintain conversations with children (e.g., interrogatives, repetitions, reformulations, corrections, designedly incomplete utterances, prompts, metalinguistic talk, and others).

Study I focused specifically on such a practice that I termed language workout. As it is embedded in a collaborative activity of emptying the dishwasher – and naming items – it targets specific linguistic features in Russian
(lexical items, the rule of congruence between forms of nouns and adjectives, cases of nouns, possessive pronouns, and expanding question format). By being fine-tuned to the child’s engagement in the activity and using a number of mitigation strategies (format tying, diminutives, prosody), it invokes a positive emotional experience. Similarly, Study II showed how the child’s spontaneous telling of a compelling story was scaffolded by her mother. This interaction also contained subtle elements of home language lessons, in the verbal and non-verbal unpacking of the meaning of the words. At the same time, a role of affective alignments and embodied performances were found to be crucial to help the child pursue her telling. In Study III, the mothers employed DIUs to engage the children in co-narration in Russian and delicately balanced between their supportive and coercive functions (Netz, 2016). In many instances, the mothers used the “teacher talk register” with a slowed tempo, vowel lengthening, empathic stress, pauses, repetitions, embedded corrections, and known-answer questions to draw attention to important linguistic features in Russian (e.g., correct grammatical forms and lexical items). The common denominator is that the mothers oriented to the child’s participation in the activity, ensuring a joint focus of attention (Goodwin, 2006; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018), and orchestrated the shared experience as enjoyable (cf. Döpke, 1992; Kopeliovich, 2013; Said & Zhu, 2019; Smith-Christmas, 2018).

A close look at the activity formats and interactional routines has demonstrated a complexity and multiple layers of each activity, where the pragmatic dimension (a task at hand) and language learning were merged, and talk turns were coordinated with task turns. This finding is similar to what Meyer Pitton (2013a) showed when eating a meal (interactional task) and using a heritage language (educational task) to coexist in the process of language socialization.

In all three studies, I also highlighted the ritualized, game-like elements that allowed for engaging the children into the activity as well as the mothers’ project of Russian speech production (e.g., naming items when emptying the dishwasher, amplifying embodied dramatization during the storytelling, and consistent use of DIUs as invitations to co-narration). Due to such ritualization, the young children appropriated and creatively exploited the formats of these language-centered practices.

Furthermore, a focus on practices has uncovered interactional details of heritage language maintenance. Multimodality and analyses of embodied participation are more than a methodological choice as these phenomena are important in the production of activity formats and therefore, use of the heritage language. The multimodal interactional analyses demonstrate how the mothers maintained Russian and strived for correctness and richness, simultaneously positioning the young child as a language learner, competent conversational partner and participant in the activity.
Language-centered practices and relational and childrearing aspects of family life

This study sought to contribute to a deeper understanding of how multilingualism, FLP, and heritage language maintenance become an integral part of family life. An overall reflection is that high expectations of children as heritage language speakers and learners and educational efforts were interactionally balanced through relational work. For a long time, the “forms of pedagogy” in the family existed in the form of apprenticeship and caregivers’ overt and covert displays of appropriate ways of behavior (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015b). The ambitious educational agendas in contemporary middle-class families, including enhancing language learning and heritage language maintenance in multilingual families, meet the child-centered praxis.

The parents put in a lot of effort to engage the children in such educational communicative projects, and then sustain them and manage the eventual resistance. This is an energy-craving and challenging project. Therefore, when school-like practices and structures (e.g., IREs, corrections, reformulations) enter family talk, they can manifest as insisting strategies at a risk of the child’s resistance (cf. Kheirkhah & Cekaite, 2015) or strategies for creating intimacy and entertainment with the help of playfulness, laughter, format typing, prosody, gaze, embodied gestures, diminutives, positive assessments, mimicking, and mirroring (cf. Smith-Christmas, 2018). In such a context, even play may become parenting work (cf. Gordon, 2008).

The study has illuminated several ways in which this balancing of educational and relational work was accomplished in mother-child interactions. First, the speakers (mothers in particular, but also children) used linguistic and discourse features that helped convey affective stances. For example, Russian diminutives (Study I, Study II) in child-directed speech were important for emotional and relational work as well as for accomplishing complex projects in the course of the activity. Code-switching was also an important resource to mark alignments or disalignments that may produce bonding or distancing. At the same time, similar to occasional mistakes and lapses in child’s language competence, language alternations may serve creative purposes and produce instances of parental amusement (Studies I - III).

The typical childrearing activities were also bearing potential for socialization into cultural dimensions closely related to language use. For example, reading canonical texts of the Russian and Soviet children’s literature (Study III) that the mothers knew by heart, introduced the children into the world of literature important for the Russian speaker as well as created heritage language learning environments. Overall, the recurrent nature of the language-centered practices that promoted children’s speech production in Russian, witnessed of its high value for the mothers who, as known from the interviews, also wanted their children to appreciate Russian cultural heritage in the form of classical music, art, literature, and folklore. Yet, the parents in all families
underscored that Russian was a part of their families’ multilingual repertoire that could be beneficial for living and working in a globalized world with many international contacts. In this way, heritage language maintenance in the home occurred within the context of Swedish as the majority language and the awareness of other languages and cultures. By participating in the heritage language-centered practices with their mothers, the children in the study were socialized into how to do everyday life (i.e., carry out everyday activities) in Russian in addition to other languages (Swedish or Spanish) with their fathers or when both parents are doing things together. The children were also aware that their mothers spoke several languages. In all, the mother-child interactions in Russian provided opportunities for the children not only to acquire linguistic features, communicative genres, and cultural competence of being a Russian speaker but also for cultural exposure and emotional bonding with their mother. As a locally created “context of culture” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2011), such encounters constitute part of a multilingual family’s world.

Contributions and implications for further research

Ethnographically situated in three multilingual transnational families in Sweden, the present study has offered an example of how young children are socialized to use their heritage language – a process that embraces linguistic, educational, ideological, relational, and childrearing dimensions. While it is not possible to generalize the results for other multilingual families and populations, the thesis aspired to generate new knowledge on language-centered and embodied practices in everyday life of multilingual middle-class families and their role in creating heritage language environments. I have proposed to describe such practices in caregiver-child interactions as a nurturing language environment that encompasses language teaching efforts and interactional work for affective alignments and a shared family experience. The findings have suggested that the realization of family language policy to support heritage language development relies not only on consistent language choice (Mishina-Mori, 2011), frequency of language use (De Houwer, 2009), or parental strategies (Schwartz, 2020) but also on how language choice and language use are embedded in the ongoing everyday activities, how activity formats are organized and appropriated by the children, the position of the child as a speaker vis-à-vis the parent, and affective alignments.

By foregrounding a pragmatic dimension of heritage language use in multilingual families, the thesis also offers theoretical and methodological contributions to the study of FLP and children’s emerging multilingualism. Despite the fact that the monolingual bias in sociolinguistic research has been increasingly criticized and researchers instead focused on speakers’ multilingual repertoires, it is still challenging to analyze multilingual talk without referring to the named languages (Danjo, 2021). Some studies have found a solution in
applying the concept of *translanguaging* that underscores the fluidity of how the speakers use various resources in the process of their meaning making (see Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2019). However, in the actual analyses of multilingual family practices researcher’s attention often goes to how the participants alternate between the language codes. A focus on the organization of unfolding everyday activities and use of a multimodal interactional approach allows showing exactly how linguistic features that are associated with different languages are used as resources in fine-tuned concert with body and material environment in order to accomplish a relevant action. This way of “overcoming a logo-centric version of communication” (Mondada, 2016, p. 336) contributes to a dismantling a “monolingualist dogmatism” (Danjo, 2021) and acknowledging a creative and coordinated assemblage of various resources by the speakers participating in situated social events.

While some FLP studies did focus on specific everyday activities as an important arena for language socialization, there has rarely been a due reflection on how children’s emerging multilingualism and heritage language maintenance are actually related to the activity format. When we build on an understanding of family life as ongoing, unfolding activities (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2018), then we can see how multilingual talk and heritage language-centered practices often arise within and are embedded in the context of situated activities. While it is not possible to make claims about the focal children’s multilingual development in the future, the study underscores a need to extend the analyses beyond linguistic and discursive features to include the embodied interaction and activity formats as crucial for socializing heritage language speakers. A view of multilingual language competence can thus be extended to ways of participation as well as appropriation and exploitation of the activity formats to collaboratively accomplish daily tasks. Attending to this process, future explorations of families’ multilingual talk and instantiations of FLP in practices would be more attuned to the interactional dynamics of everyday family life.

Recently, the FLP field has witnessed an increasing interest in exploring the emotional realm, but as of yet there exists a lack of systematic theoretical and methodological grounding. Much of the earlier research documented tensions and challenges of bilingual childrearing, and conflict and stressful experiences of family members in relation to use of several languages. This led, for instance, de Houwer (2015, 2017) to coin the term *harmonious bilingual development* emphasizing the importance of positive emotional experiences in relation to heritage language maintenance and familial bilingualism. However, I find her proposition that “well-being is at risk if parents and children address each other in different languages” (De Houwer, 2017, p. 169) problematic as it does not appreciate the fluidity of language use and does not account for family members’ emotional work as accomplished in interaction. Similar to a handful of other FLP studies (Said & Zhu, 2019; Smith-Christmas, 2018), this thesis has argued that the child-centered discourse and an...
orientation to shared emotional experiences contribute both to relationship-building and heritage language learning. In this way, the present study contributes to the discussion of well-being in relation to heritage language use in multilingual families, and answers the chicken-egg question posed by Said and Zhu (2019): “Does a positive experience of [family members with the heritage language] influence an open FLP?” Or “does a flexible FLP create a positive experience?” (p. 782). The multimodal interactional analyses have called attention to the dilemma of balancing pragmatic, ideological, educational, and relational dimensions of FLP in interaction. The findings have extended the previous work that emphasized the “doubled-edged sword nature” and reflexivity of FLP (Smith-Christmas, 2018, p. 143), when the caregivers use discourse strategies for preserving positively colored interactions and opting-out strategies linguistically conductive to language maintenance.

For exploring emotional experiences in FLP further, more research is welcome on spontaneous mundane language creativity in multilingual family interactions. Even instances of children’s language alternations and mistakes (often seen as undesired in FLP) may become a source of adult’s amusement and positive affect (Studies I-III). All three studies in this thesis have highlighted the importance of paralinguistic resources such as prosody (onomatopoetic sounds, exaggerations, sound play) and dramatic embodied gestures to create playful engagements during mundane activities with young children. Therefore, I argue that such instances are an important way of “doing being a multilingual family” that has been so far overlooked in FLP research but somewhat more explored in monolingual middle-class families. By bringing such a perspective to the FLP inquiry, this study has showed how multilingualism and heritage language maintenance can be part of families’ quality time, nurturing relationships, and language learning environments.
Svensk sammanfattning

Denna sammanläggningsavhandling består av tre video-etnografiska studier i tre flerspråkiga familjer med yngre barn som växer upp i Sverige där mammorna har ryska som modersmål. Studien avser att utveckla kunskap om hur flerspråkighet och familjers språkpolicy (family language policy) kan vara en del av familjers vardagsliv. Därför fokuserar den på språkcentrerade praktiker som är integrerade i vardagliga aktiviteter och bidrar till upprätthållandet av ett kulturarvspråk (heritage language).

Introduktion och syfte


Det övergripande syftet med avhandlingen är att undersöka yngre barns flerspråkighet och upprätthållande av kulturarvspråk som en del av familjers vardagsliv, med ett fokus på mor-barn interaktion som arena för barns flerspråkighets- och kulturarvspråksocialisation.

Specifika forskningsfrågor är:
- Hur skapas språkliga lärandemiljöer i flerspråkiga familjer?
- På vilka sätt bidrar mor-barn interaktion till upprätthållande av ett kulturarvspråk i och genom språksocialisation?
Hur är språkcentrerade praktiker relaterade till relationsskapande och barnuppofostran?

För att besvara dessa frågeställningar är avhandlingens tre empiriska studier fokuserade på hur olika språkcentrerade praktiker är inbäddade i vardagliga aktiviteter: språklektioner i hemmet (home language lessons), kollaborativa berättandepraktiker samt uppmanningar till berättande under bokläsningsaktiviteter med hjälp av DIU (designedly incomplete utterances, på svenska avsiktligt ofullständiga yttranden). Resultaten pekar på ett samspel mellan ideologiska och pragmatiska, pedagogiska och relationella dimensioner när det gäller yngre flerspråkiga barns språksocialisation i hemmiljö. Studien belyser också hur barnen gradvis approprierar och utvecklar interaktionella rutiner som är relaterade till vardagliga aktiviteters format.

Tidigare forskning

Avhandlingen bygger på etnografiska och interaktionella studier av diskursiva praktiker i medelklassfamiljer. Eftersom studien särskilt intresserar sig för hur språkinlärningsmiljöer som främjar flerspråkighet och upprätthållandet av ett kulturarvspråk skapas i vardaglig interaktion i hemmet, knyter den an till forskning om språksocialisation i enspråkiga familjer. Den visar hur barnen lär sig språk genom att delta i vardagliga aktiviteter som till exempel att äta middag, städa, göra läxor. Det betonas också att barn i medelklassfamiljer ofta blir engagerade i olika typer av samtal och språkliga praktiker som förhandlingar, förklaringar, kommentarer och liknande, som frammar barns språkutveckling och språkliga medvetenhet (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015a, 2015b).

Forskning om family language policy (familjespråkspolicy) i invandrar- och transnationella familjer har hittills mest fokuserat på föräldrarnas strategier för att främja barns språkfrämjning och upprätthållandet av kulturarvspråk. I fokus har främst varit de faktorer och diskursiva praktiker som påverkar flerspråkighetsutveckling hos barn. Strategin One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL, på svenska en-förälder-ett-språk), det vill säga när föräldrar uppmanas att strikt prata sina respektive språk med barnen, har lyfts fram som en viktig strategi bland västerländska medelklassfamiljer. Flera studier belyser hur det restriktiva förhållandet till ett språk med en förälder har vissa positiva effekter för barnens språkbruk (Döpke, 1992; Garau & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Lanza, 1997; Mishina-Mori, 2011). Samtidigt har det också påvisats att OPOL inte garanterar en balanserad flerspråkighetsutveckling (De Houwer, 2009), och även kan få motsatta och oönskade konsekvenser som exempelvis spänningar mellan familjemedlemmar (Danjo, 2021; Khierkhah & Cekaite, 2015; Kopeliovich, 2010; Soler & Zabrodskaja, 2017). Nyliga FLP studier har undersökt sociala, relationella och emotionella dimensioner av hur familjers språkpolicy utspelar sig i praktiken (t.ex., Said & Zhu, 2019; Smith-

Sammanfattningsvis efterfrågas fler studier om familjers språkpolicy som tar hänsyn till familjedynamiker. Denna avhandling syftar till att bidra till insikter om språkcenterade praktiker i mor-barn interaktion såsom inbäddade i vardagliga aktiviteter och utgörande en integrerad del av familjelivet.

**Teoretiska och metodologiska utgångspunkter**


*Family language policy* grundar sig delvis i språksocialisationsteori, delvis i sociolingvistiska och psykolinvistiska teorier om flerspråkighet, och delvis i språkpolicystudier. FLP fokuserar på flerspråkiga familjers praktiker och repertoarer. Ett av intresseområdena är hur språkpolicy, inklusive föräldrarnas
strategier för att upprätthålla kulturarspråk, manifesteras i vardaglig interaktion och vad detta leder till. Denna avhandling delar detta intresse och analyserar i detalj kulturarspråkcenterade praktiker i mor-barn interaktion för att få syn på hur yngre barn socialiseras till flerspråkighet som en del av barnuppföstran och relationsbyggande som dynamiska processer.

Ett centralt antagande i avhandlingen är att både familjeliv och flerspråkighet är situerade och formas i interaktion (jmf doing family och doing multilingualism). I synnerhet konstitueras de genom familjemedlemmarnas deltagande i olika aktiviteter. De olika studiernas analyser fokuserar på deltagande strukturer, så kallade ramverk för deltagande (participation frameworks) där deltagarna på ett reflexivt sätt orienterar sig mot varandras bidrag inom ramen för en pågående aktivitet (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2004; Goodwin, 2006). Sådana analyser omfattar inte bara verbala bidrag utan också andra semiotiska resurser (gester, prosodi, m.m.) som deltagarna använder för att utföra sina handlingar. Detta diskuteras i termer av multimodalitet (multimodality, Mondada, 2016). När det gäller analyser av flerspråkigt tal, används oftast begreppen kodväxling (code-switching) och språkalternering (language alternation), begrepp som också förekommer i avhandlingen.

Avhandlingen baseras på korttids etnografiskt arbete (short-term ethnography, Pink & Morgan, 2013) som kombinerades med videospärrningar av vardaglig interaktion och språkcentrerade praktiker i tre medelklass familjer med yngre barn som växer upp i Sverige. Ett gemensamt drag är att mödrarna i alla familjer pratar ryska och intresserar sig för barnens språkutveckling. Fältarbete utfördes under några månader i två steg där jag som forskare och familjerna själva spelade in naturliga förekommande interaktion under såväl vardagar som helger, enligt en plan (se bilaga B). Det totala videomaterialet omfattar cirka 54 timmars videobehandlingar. Informella intervjuer med föräldrarna användes även som stöd för att contextualisera analyserna av video-data.

Analysen började med att identifiera och beskriva typiska aktiviteter och språkcentrerade praktiker som främjade en enspråkig kontext för arvspråksocialisation identifierades och valdes ut för närmare analys: språklektioner i hemmet, kollaborativa berättandepraktiker och uppmaningar till deltagande och berättande under bokläsningsaktiviteter. Efter upprepade datagenomgångar valdes ett mindre antal excerpter ut och transkriberades i detalj med utgängspunkt i samtalsanalytiska konventioner (Jefferson, 2004; Mondada, 2018). De multimodala analyserna av interaktion innebär en beskrivning och tolkning av den sekventiella utvecklingen av deltagarnas handlingar inom ramen för en pågående aktivitet.
Särskilt uppmärksammas de sätt på vilket språkcentrerade praktiker organiseras, vilka språkliga, kroppsliga och materiella resurser som används samt om och i så fall hur barnen approprierar aktiviteternas format.

Avhandlingens studier

Studie I


Resultaten kan sägas bredda forskning om familjers språkpolicy och kulturarvspråksocialisation genom att visa betydelsen av att studera språkliga praktiker som inbäddade i vardagliga aktiviteter, istället för att enbart fokusera på barns språkval, kodväxling och föräldrars respons på dessa. Till skillnad
från många studier som belyst barns motstånd och förhandlingar om familjens språknormer, uppmärksammar studien ett kollaborativt, pedagogiskt, affektivt och engagerande sätt där barnet under lekfulla former kunde utforska bruket av ett kulturarvspråk.

Studie II

Den andra studien handlar om ett flerspråkigt barns (2;6) spontana deltagande i en kollaborativ berättandepraktik i interaktion med sin mamma, som genomgående talar svenska och ryska. Syftet är att undersöka hur yngre barn kan lansera och utveckla berättelser om personliga erfarenheter som ett förkroppsligat framträdande (embodied performance, se Duranti & Black, 2011; Ochs & Capps, 2001).


Dataurvalet kommer från den familj där barnet som här kallas Amanda deltar i flerspråkiga berättandeaktiviteter med sin mamma samtidigt som de gör andra saker: åter middag och klä på sig. De valda exemplen följer hur två berättelser som kretsar kring känslomässigt viktiga händelser utvecklas och byggs upp i samspel mellan barn och förälder.


De multimodala interaktionsanalyserna visar hur dramatiserade berättelser gradvis framträder i interaktion och hur deltagarna på ett reflexivt sätt orienterar sig emot varandras språkliga och även lekfulla kroppsliga berättelseinslag. Analyserna visar hur deltagarna för att utföra shifts in footing från allvar till lekfullhet och fantasi samt för att skifta mellan olika temporala ramar, använde en uppsättning av resurser som animeringar, prosodiska drag, ljudeffekter, gester, affekt, språklek och kodväxling. I likhet med andra studier i medelklassfamiljer som visat på hur föräldrar kan stötta sina barn att berätta om upplevelser och erfarenheter, uppmärksammar denna studie det skickliga kommunikativa arbete som barnet med hjälp av mamman utför. Dock finns också en annan dimension av språkligt lärande i aktiviteten. Samtidigt som mamman tillåter Amanda flexibla rysk-svenska språkalternering förhåller hon sig till kulturarvspråket ryska som primärt språk, och främjar därmed en
enspråkig berättandepraktik. Vidare betonar resultaten att det situerade skapandet av berättelser vilar på deltagarnas emotionella samspel i form av förkroppsligande upptag och affektiva förhållningssätt.

Studie III


DIU-design går ut på att ett yttrande avsiktligt lämnas ofullständigt, samtliga som det erbjuder prosodiska, grammatiska och syntaktiska ledtrådar för att kunna slutföras av en annan deltagare i interaktion, mest typiskt en elev. Detta är ett vanligt sätt att bjuda in barnen att delta i aktiviteter som har en språksocialisationspotential. Tidigare forskning visar hur DIU:er åt ena sidan kan utföra olika funktioner som stödjer lärandeprocessen. Åt andra sidan, kan de hämma barnens eller elevens deltagande genom att tvinga dem till vissa handlingar (Netz, 2016). Dessutom kan DIU:er vara transparenta i varierande grad (Margutti, 2010), det vill säga med avseende på hur lätt det är att genomskåda hur yttrandet ska slutföras. Denna studie vidgar tidigare forskning genom att belysa flera andra funktioner och design-drag hos DIU när de används i interaktioner med yngre flerspråkiga barn i bokläsningsaktiviteter.

Data i studien kommer från alla tre familjerna där föräldrarna i samtliga fall skapade rika literacy-miljöer både i form av materiella resurser och praktiker. Många böcker som mammorna läser med sina barn på ryska är klassiska texter från den sovjetiska och ryska litteraturen som de deltagande mammorna och barnen är välbekanta med och även kan utantill. När jag gick igenom videospelingarna observerade jag att DIU:er var en förhållandevis vanligt förekommande språklig struktur som användes under literacy-aktiviteter. Fem exempel på olika literacy-aktiviteter där mammorna använde DIU:er på olika sätt för att involvera sina barn i läsaktiviteter och i synnerhet i att berätta på ryska, valdes ut för detaljierade multimodala analyser av mor-barn interaktion.

Studiens resultat visar hur DIU:er är inbäddade i en pågående literacy-aktivitet i relation till: (i) text (rytm, rim, parallella strukturer), (ii) materialitet (bilder, träfigurer), (iii) förkroppsligade deltagarstrukturer (gester, spatiala arrangeremang, turtagnings, samordning av flera lokala projekt), och (iv) andra språkliga praktiker som korrekioner, upprepningar, frågor, Initiering-Respons-Evaluering-strukturer och kodvåxling. Med andra ord omfattade samproduktion av bokläsning och berättande inte bara lexikala drag utan också många andra dimensioner av språkbruk. Dessutom visar studien att DIU:er blev till ett viktigt verktyg för mammorna för att involvera barnen i ett ”ryskt” literacy-projekt och ett kraftfullt sätt att upprätthålla en enspråkig kontext för interaktion (jfr. Lanza, 1997). Den återkommande användningen av
DIU:er skapade en viss rutin och ett format för aktiviteterna som barnen kände igen och kunde utnyttja på ett kreativt sätt. Slutligen spelade detta diskursiva verktyg en viktig roll inte bara för att stöta barnens talproduktion på ryska utan också för socialisation till muntlig framställning av sagor och poesi.

Avslutande diskussion

Denna avhandling har närmat sig yngre barns flerspråkighetsutveckling och kulturarvspråkssocialisation i medelklassfamiljer genom att utforska språkcentrerade praktiker inbäddade i vardagliga aktiviteter. I sin helhet bidrar avhandlingen till kunskap om den roll som språkliga och kroppsliga praktiker spelar i flerspråkiga familjer, där föräldrarna strävar efter att nära och upprätthålla en av föräldrarnas förstaspråk.

Tre empiriska studier har visat att familjernas språkpolicy-i-interaktion också beror på vad som händer under själva aktiviteten och på barnens deltagande. Dessutom är den tätt förknippad med den barncentrerade diskurs som ingår i familjernas föreställningar om det goda föräldraskapet (jmf Gottzén, 2009) och motsvarande praktiker. Resultaten understryker betydelsen av att family language policy (FLP)-forskning i studiet av språkpolicy och kulturarvspråk, utvidgar sitt intresse bortom föräldrars strategier och responser på barns kodväxling (dvs input) för att också inkludera analyser av kroppsliga praktiker och aktivitets format. En språksocialisationsansats med fokus på multimodal interaktion har visat på en ytterligare komplexitet hos flerspråkiga praktiker i hemmet, som inkluderar pedagogiska, relationella, ideologiska och pragmatiska dimensioner.

I stort sett var ett framträdande drag att mödrarnas pedagogiska och kulturarvspråksstimulerande insatser balanserades med ett skickligt kommunikativt arbete för att upprätthålla intima relationer med sina barn och skapa en positiv emotionell stämning. I detta avseende kan närande språkliga lärandemiljöer (nurturing language learning environments) förstås som inkluderande familjemedlemmarnas interaktionella arbete för att dela affektiva erfarenheter och förhållningssätt. Detta fynd går i linje med ett växande intresse inom FLP för emotionella dimensioner och familjedynamik och öppnar en spännande väg för framtida språksocialisationsforskning i flerspråkiga sammanhang.


Мамочки, отзовитесь!

Я учусь в аспирантуре на факультете образования университета Уппсалы и работаю над диссертацией на тему, как дети учат и используют язык в семьях, где говорят по-русски и по-шведски.

Известно, что семья очень сильно влияет на то, как дети осваивают язык. Однако совсем немного исследований фокусируются именно на том, как дети изучают языки через самые обычные дела и взаимодействие в семье: за ужином, в игре, во время выполнения домашних заданий и т.д. В частности, очень интересно и важно узнать, когда и как дети и родители переключаются с одного языка на другой, а также какой язык используется, когда дети учатся, как себя вести и выражать свои мысли и чувства.

Вы сможете узнать об этом больше, помогая нашему исследованию!

Сейчас я собираю материал и ищу семьи, которые хотели бы принять участие в исследовании:

- Любой тип семьи (двоих родителей; один родитель; одну неделю у мамы – одну у папы)
- Семьи, в которых есть дети от 2 до 12 лет.
- Семьи, где говорят на русском и шведском языках.

Метод исследования – видео-этнография (видео-документация). Я буду снимать на камеру процесс взаимодействия и общения детей в каждой семье в течение определённого времени. С вашей стороны не требуется никаких дополнительных усилий или подготовки. По желанию вы можете производить съёмку сами с помощью нашего оборудования.

Время съёмки в течение двух-четырех недель (дни выбираются по согласованию):
- 4 рабочих дня, приблизительно 4 часа во второй половине дня,
• 2 выходных дня, приблизительно 4-6 часов во второй половине дня.

Вся информация об участниках исследования и видеоматериал совершенно конфиденциальны, и хранятся в сейфе нашей научной группы CLIP- Studies of Childhood, Learning and Identities as Interactional Practices, университет Уппсалы http://forskning.edu.uu.se/clip/index.htm.

Я очень надеюсь, что вам интересно принять участие в этом исследовании. Если у вас есть любые дополнительные вопросы, я буду рада на них ответить olga.kuvaldina@edu.uu.se или по тел. 073 xxx xx xx.

Заранее спасибо!
Самые добрые пожелания,
Ольга
Hello Russian-speaking mamas!

I am a PhD student at the Department of Education, Uppsala University, and I’m working on my thesis about how children learn and use language in the Russian- and Swedish-speaking families.

We know that family plays a great role in how children learn languages. But few studies actually focus on how children learn languages through natural everyday family activities such as mealtime, homework, play, and others. For example, it is very interesting and important to understand when and how parents and children switch between the two languages, and what languages are engaged as children are learning how to act and how to express themselves.

You have a chance to learn more about this by helping us!

At the moment, I am collecting material and looking for families who would like to take part in this research project:

- All types of families and family constellations.
- Families with at least two children, age 2-12 years old.
- Families where Russian and Swedish are spoken.

The research method of my study is video ethnography (video documentation). I will be filming the process of interaction and communication in each family during a limited time. The research will not require any extra efforts from your part.

If you wish so you can also do the filming yourself (equipment will be provided).

Filming will be done during 2-4 weeks, as agreed:

- 4 weekdays, approximately 3 hours in the afternoon
• 2 weekend days, approximately 4-6 hours in the afternoon.

All information about participants and video material will be strictly confidential, with limited access and kept in the safe of our research group CLIP - Studies of Childhood, Learning and Identities as Interactional Practices, Uppsala University. http://forskning.edu.uu.se/clip/index.htm.

I hope that you find this interesting and will participate in this research project. If you have any further questions, you are most welcome to contact me at olga.kuvaldina@edu.uu.se.

Thank you in advance!
Kind regards,
Olga
Appendix C. Consent letter

Uppsala, March 2015

Samtykesförmulär/ Consent form for participants
Information letter

Project: Language socialization in Russian and Swedish speaking families

I am a PhD student at the Department of Education, Uppsala University, and I’m working on my thesis about how children learn and use language in bilingual/multilingual families.

We know that family plays a great role in how children learn languages. But few studies actually focus on how children learn languages through natural everyday family activities such as mealtime, homework, play, and others. For example, it is very interesting and important to understand when and how parents and children switch between the two languages, and what languages are engaged as children are learning how to act and how to express themselves.

In this part of the study, families with children between 2 and 6 years old will participate.

The research method of this study is video-ethnography (video-documentation). I will be filming the process of interaction and communication in each family during a limited time. The research will not require any extra efforts from your part. If you wish so you can also do the filming yourself (equipment will be provided). Filming will be done in your home during several afternoons, upon agreement.

The results of the study will be presented in research articles, conferences and a doctoral dissertation. All names and personal information will be changed so that it is not possible to identify the participants. Access to the video material will be strictly limited to our research group CLIP – Studies of
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With this letter I would like to obtain your written consent that you and your children agree to participate in this study. Please sign the enclosed form. You should be also informed that you have a right to stop participating in the study at any time.

Kind regards,

Olga Kuvaldina
Appendix D: Consent form

Samtykesförmlär/ Consent form for participants

Project: Language socialization in Russian and Swedish-speaking families

I have received information about the research. I agree to participate and give permission for my child/children to participate in the study.

Child’s name_______________________________________

Child’s name_______________________________________

Parent____________________________________________

Signature Full name

Parent____________________________________________

Signature Full name

Date____________________ City_______________________
Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis
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