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“People are born to speak, though they are not born speaking.”

(Coulmas, 2005: 1)

1 Introduction

Traditionally, language has been observed as a self-directed system independent of nonlinguistic factors. Following studies in the fields of humanities and social sciences, scholars began to view social aspects of language, which is known by the term *Sociolinguistics*. One way of studying language from a social perspective is through observing it in multilingual and bilingual communities. One outstanding and functional feature of such communities is *code-switching*, that is, multilinguals, and in our case bilinguals, tend to use two different languages and occasionally move from one language to the other one, depending on the situation. There have been many studies regarding the concept of code-switching and its different features during the last century.

1.1 Aim of Study

This study attempts to adopt a sociolinguistic perspective on code-switching in order to investigate the repair patterns in actual conversations between Swedish-Persian bilinguals. The aim is to figure out repair patterns which occur during a bilingual conversation among the first and second generation of Iranians living in Sweden, where Swedish is the national language. The study employs empirical data, video recordings, in order to observe informal, naturally occurring conversation between an originally Iranian mother and her four-year-old son who was born in Sweden. The data are the video recordings of two evenings in the family when the boy plays games, and the family chat and drink coffee. In order to analyze the data, I have used Conversation Analysis (CA) which serves my purposes of analyzing the properties of talk-in-interaction best.

2 Theoretical Background

In this section I am going to throw light on the theoretical background concerning the concept, *bilingualism*. This section includes a definition of bilingualism and its attributes, and
also a definition of code-switching and different approaches towards it, all of which will be discussed in order. Let us start with bilingualism and see who is a bilingual.

### 2.1 Bilingualism

Bilingualism and multilingualism have always been two common facts in the whole world, which arise from the need to communicate with people of different linguistic backgrounds. The study, and more importantly, a fuller understanding of bilingualism did not commence until the 1950s. Since then different understandings of the concept bilingualism have been proposed each of which has given birth to a new and more nuanced definition of the same concept. Among the first definitions given for the concept bilingualism, Bloomfield puts it this way: “the native-like control of two languages” (Bloomfield, 1935: 56). Macnamara, on the other hand, later proposes that “a bilingual is anyone who possesses a minimal competence in only one of the four language skills, listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, in a language other than his mother tongue” (Macnamara, 1967a, cited in Hamers and Blanc, 2000: 6). All these early definitions lack precision; one must know what native-like competence is or who distinguishes what a minimal competence is.

But how do all these early definitions fall short? Macnamara, for example, talks about the minimal competence in one’s mother tongue in which ‘mother tongue’ is a critical word. As Skutnabb-Kangas says the popular criteria are that mother tongue is the language in which one thinks, dreams, and counts (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981: 14). After living in a new language community for a while, one “can be able to use that new language for these functions, even though not all speakers do” (ibid). It is only a matter of personality which distinguishes how fast one starts using the new language for the functions mentioned (ibid). To put it more clearly, the first shortcoming of these early definitions is how they describe the idea of origin. From a sociological point of view “the mother tongue is the language a child learns first” (ibid). Accordingly, a bilingual is one who has learned two languages from the beginning or in parallel from native speakers (ibid: 91). But, how about a language someone has to use the most, for the reasons of work or communication, without it being one’s first language to learn?

The second reason for the weakness of definitions mentioned above is in Bloomfield’s definition where he states the “native-like control of two languages” which is the same concept as competence. From a linguistic point of view mother tongue is defined as “the language a
person knows best” (ibid). A bilingual, then, is someone who has a complete mastery of two languages. Skutnabb-Kangas believes that “definitions of bilingualism are needed to describe and compare bilingual individuals or different situations in which bilinguals find themselves” (ibid: 83). Many bilinguals are better at using a specific language in one specific situation. It depends on how they learned each language and where. If one learned one specific language at school and one has always used it to talk about issues regarding school and work, one would best deal with these in that specific language, regardless of what the mother tongue is.

From a sociolinguistic point of view, one’s mother tongue is “the language one uses most” (ibid: 15). A bilingual, accordingly, is someone who uses two languages in most situations, according to his/her wishes or the demands of the society (ibid: 91). But, what if one spends most of one’s time in a specific situation (at the work place for example) where one has to speak a certain language the whole time regardless of it being the primary language or the mother tongue?

From a social psychological point of view, a mother tongue is “the language one identifies with, the language through which, in the process of socialization, one has acquired the norms and value systems of one’s own group”, i.e. internal identification (ibid: 15). Thus, a bilingual identifies himself with two languages and cultures; and is identified by others as a bilingual speaker of two languages (ibid: 91). This is not a straight forward division, though. As Skutnabb-Kangas puts it:

It is rather making measurements along vertical and horizontal scales; there can be every degree of competence, facility and identification, and at different times the same speaker can operate at different points in the scale depending both on internal and external factors. (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981: 89)

In contrast to the early definitions of bilingualism, Musk believes that “a definition of bilingualism should focus rather on the functions that language performs” (Musk, 2006: 46). In the same vein, Mackey proposes the following definition for bilingualism:

Bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use. It is not a feature of the code but of the message. It does not belong to the domain of langue but of parole. (Mackey, 1962: 51)
According to the latter definition, bilingualism should not be considered as the perfect native-like use of two languages, but instead it should be understood through the function and use of two languages which at some point may change so that it will not be an easy task to decide which language is the dominant language of a bilingual. In accordance with the four criteria mentioned above (origin, competence, use, and identity), Skutnabb-Kangas proposes the following definition:

A bilingual speaker is someone who is able to function in two languages, either in monolingual or bilingual communities, in accordance with the sociocultural demands made of an individual’s communicative and cognitive competence by these communities or by the individual herself, at the same level as native speakers, and who is able positively to identify with both language groups, or parts of them. (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1980b; cited in 1981: 90)

In accordance with the approach used in this study, bilingualism is about the use and function of language rather than its origin, language competence, or even the way one is identified by others (external identification) or identifies oneself (internal identification).

2.1.1 Bilingualism as a Societal and Individual Attribute

Bani-Shoraka uses two complementary approaches to present bilingualism which as she says are “two sides of the same coin”: one is the aspect which an individual is bilingual (individual bilingualism) and the other one is the aspect which a community of speakers are bilingual (societal bilingualism) (Bani-Shoraka, 2005: 25).

Societal bilingualism refers to a situation where two languages are being used in a society, both of which some individuals are able to use in order to communicate with other members of that society. Societal bilingualism arises as a result of different language contacts and different social groups, social class, ethnicity and other interpersonal factors in communication. Different languages may meet for example in “border areas between states” or as a result of “political events” or migration (Hamers and Blanc, 2000: 274). The latter reason is the focus of this study, which is about the language of the Iranian families who have migrated to Sweden for political reasons.
In contrast to societal bilingualism, which is a group-based view of bilingualism, individual bilingualism concerns the study of different behaviors a bilingual individual has. As Baker states, the difference between individuals depends on their “language ability and language use” which he also refers to as the “degree and function” of each language (Baker, 2001: 3). Moreover, an individual becomes bilingual for various reasons including: having parents who speak different languages, living in a society where two languages are being used for communication, having migrated to a different linguistic community, and having parents who speak a language other than the one spoken in the majority society. The focus of this study is on the last two reasons, i.e. a Persian family who has migrated to Sweden and their son who was born in Sweden, but who has parents who speak a language other than Swedish. One outstanding feature of individual bilingualism is the use of more than one language variety or code within one conversation, which has been studied under the title of code-switching.

2.1.2 Language Choice

As a result of societal bilingualism and different language contact situations, one faces various alternatives which one can choose between according to the situation. Bani-Shoraka puts it more clearly: “speakers in any language community who enter diverse social situations have a repertoire of speech alternatives which shift with the situation” and about the choice she continues this way: “a bilingual speaker can choose between two languages, or the varieties available within them, or both” (Bani-Shoraka, 2005: 30). A family may include several members each of whom is in touch with some other domains outside the family, which can result in a linguistically diverse situation within the family domain. The diversity of the situation can vary according to the family’s background and whether or not the language spoken in the family is the same as the majority language spoken in the society. If the language spoken in the family is the same as the majority language of the society and not a minority language, for example, the family domain is less diverse and more stable and vice versa.

2.1.3 Code-Switching

As it was mentioned above a very common feature of bilingual talk is the “occurrence of language alternation” which is commonly referred to as code-switching (Musk, 2006: 47). But, here, the question may be why ‘code’ is used in the concept ‘code-switching’ rather than language-switching? Bani-Shoraka says that “codes in conversation are social constructs and do
not necessarily correspond to what linguists would recognize as distinct languages or dialects” (Bani-Shoraka: 2005: 39). She also believes that what linguists would consider as two different languages may be considered as “two dialects of the same language or different languages” by the bilingual speaker (ibid). In other words, “the systems that are utilized concurrently in linguistically complex situations are not always languages in the common sense of the word (Coulmas, 2005: 109). Auer looks at this from a members’ perspective and suggests that one should observe bilingual speech this way: “there are two sets of co-occurring variables between which participants alternate in an interactionally meaningful way, and then proceed to seeing them as belonging to or constituting two codes” (Auer, 1998: 13). This is where one can see the need for a term which can cover both varieties of languages.

2.1.3.1 Perspectives on Code-Switching

Auer defines two perspectives on code-switching as sociolinguistic and grammatical. The first one deals with the “relationship between social and linguistic structure” and the second one deals with “syntactic constraints on intrasentential code-switching” (ibid: 3). Sociolinguistic perspectives on code-switching are divided into two categories: an “organizational approach” and an “identity-oriented approach” (Musk, 2006: 56). As he notes an “organizational approach focuses on the management and sequential organization of conversation, i.e. viewing code-switching as a contextualization cue” (ibid). This approach is used in this study because CA is the tool utilized here in order to analyze the data; and the reason is that a CA approach restrains the analyst’s interpretation and instead allows him to make his interpretations based on the mutual understanding of the interlocutors as it is shown in their behavior (Auer, 1984: 6). An identity-oriented approach, on the other hand, “emphasizes the metaphorical link between language and the social identity of speakers” (ibid). This requires analysts to make a connection between code-switching and identity i.e. in my case of study, for example, the interlocutors would start being Swedish as soon as they code-switched into Swedish. This creates a problematic spot since this is in opposition with a CA approach which is being used in this paper. With a CA approach the analyst does not start analyzing according to his/her presuppositions regarding the interlocutors’ identities, but s/he will draw conclusions according to the speakers’ behavior during an actual conversation.
3 Data and Methodology

This section includes a description of the empirical data as well as other types of data used in this study, including an interview with one of the participants. Later in this section, the method used in order to analyze the data and some related terms and definitions will be presented. I will start by describing the different data used here.

3.1 The Data

This study is mainly based on video recordings which were made during two sessions and an interview with the mother which was done at the end of the first session. The interview was done orally and no written data were exchanged. I did this by asking her questions about the background of the family, what they do as free time activities and how involved the children are, what language is mostly spoken at home, what the mother’s preferred language is, if she has one, whether or not the son uses two languages consciously, whether he is able to differentiate and name the two languages, and so on and so forth. There is also a letter of consent which was read and signed by the mother at the end of the second session. An unsigned copy of this letter is attached as an appendix at the end of this paper.

3.1.1 Video Recordings

The first sets of recordings were made during my first visit to the family. My presence there with my camera made the family uncomfortable during the first couple of minutes. That is why I did not use this bit of recording as my data because it did not turn out to be so natural as it is in their everyday life. However, as time passed, my presence and my camera became less obvious. That was when I made the recording which I actually worked on. This is a 15-minute recording, most of which was recorded in their son’s bedroom while he was opening a gift which he got from his mother. The rest was made in the living room when the mother and her son were chatting.

The second set of recordings were made one month later when they had become more familiar with me. Therefore, my camera could capture more natural events happening in the family under investigation, including their game playing, coffee breaks, private chats, and so on. This is 17 minutes of recording which was made in different parts of their house, from their son’s bedroom, the living room, and the hallway. The recording starts in the bedroom where the son of the family is playing computer games with his mother. The son then moves to the hallway to get
his roller skates which he got as a gift the last time I was there. He keeps roller skating there after which he moves to the living room where his parents and his little sister are. The family is having coffee and talking for the rest of the recording.

3.1.2 The Subjects

The family consists of an Iranian mother aged 30, an Iranian father aged 35, their four-year-old son and one-year-old daughter. The main interlocutors in my study are the mother and her son who are present in both sessions and take almost all the turns in the conversation. The mother and the father of the family are originally Iranians who migrated to Sweden ten years ago due to political and social problems. Their two children were born in Sweden and both go to a Swedish kindergarten. As the mother said during the interview, although they have some Iranian relatives here in Sweden, the son is more in contact with Swedish people, as a result of spending most of the day in daycare.

3.2 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) is concerned about the sequential order of talk which means “there are describable ways in which turns are linked together into definite sequences (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 41). The transitions between these turns first of all reveal the speakers’ understanding of the prior turn; and secondly, reveal how participants analyze the ongoing production of talk in order to negotiate their own participation (ibid). Therefore, since I am analyzing actual talk-in-interaction taken from video recordings, CA is the best method to serve my purposes here.

Harvey Sacks, the American sociologist, founded the discipline of Conversation Analysis in the 1960s. Later, Hutchby and Wooffitt defined Conversation Analysis as “the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 12). As this definition proposes, CA is the study of talk as “a highly organized, socially ordered phenomenon” (ibid). In general, CA’s actual object of study is “the interactional organization of social activities” (ibid). But what is the aim of CA? “The objective of CA is to uncover the often tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction” (ibid). In CA, the analyst looks at conversation from an emic perspective, meaning “members’ knowledge-in-use, that is members’ methods or the procedural infrastructure of interaction” (Have, 2007: 34). In other word, the
analyst tries to uncover what participants do and what they try to accomplish in their stream of talk. Thus, utterances are not treated as semantic units by CA, but instead they are studied as products and activities being negotiated, for instance: requests, permissions, clarifications, and repairs.

### 3.2.1 The Foundations of CA

CA’s main concern is about turn-taking in talk-in-interaction, i.e. “how participants systematically organize and orient to the turn-taking resources that constitute the orderliness (or even the apparent disorderliness) of talk-in-interaction” (Musk, 2006: 134). In other words, CA deals with the sequential order of talk (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 41). By the sequential order of turns analysts mean that “there are describable ways in which turns are linked together into definite sequences. One aim of CA therefore is to reveal this sequential order” (ibid). Hutchby and Wooffitt clearly explain this aim and then refer to it as the most basic tool in CA. They believe that throughout a stream of talk, speakers show their understanding of the previous turn in their next turn (ibid).

That understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or it may not; whichever is the case, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn sequence. We describe this as a next-turn proof procedure. (ibid)

Hutchby and Wooffitt believe that the next-turn proof procedure gives the analyst an analytic perspective in order to look at the talk-in-interaction from the participants’ point of view (ibid, 41). In addition to a sequential order, there exists an inferential order in talk-in-interaction i.e. the key resources speakers use in order to understand one another (ibid: 42). Another important dimension of CA is that talk-in-interaction has a temporal order i.e. “talk is produced in time, in a series of turn constructional units out of which turns themselves are constructed” (ibid, 42). Therefore, turns and sequences act as activities such as: requests, invitations, offers, repairs, and etc. Conversational structures, in this sense, are the “crux of this interplay between sequential, inferential, and temporal orders in talk” (ibid). Some of these concepts are going to be discussed in the following sections.
3.2.2 Preference

In adjacency pair sequences (e.g. questions/answers, invitations/acceptances or declinations) the first pair part calls for alternative actions in the second part (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 46). For example, an invitation could be accepted or rejected in the second part, a request could be granted or declined, a question can be answered or ignored, and a repair initiation can be repaired or ignored. These different responses are referred to as preference organization. Agreements or acceptance, for instance, are labeled in terms of a “preferred action turn shape” and disagreement or rejection, for instance, is called a “dispreferred action turn shape” (Pomerantz, 1984a: 64). Preferred next actions usually share common characteristics; they are normally short and direct and are produced immediately. Dispreferred next actions are normally longer and consist of, for example, hesitation, pause, repetition, etc. As Pomerantz says “a substantial number of such disagreements are produced with stated disagreement components delayed or withheld from early positioning within turns and sequences” (ibid, 70). Pomerantz also believes that “conversants orient to agreeing with one another as comfortable, supportive, reinforcing, perhaps as being sociable and as showing they are like-minded” (ibid, 77). Consequently, the opposite is true for disagreeing i.e. disagreeing is considered to be uncomfortable, offensive, or taking a risk.

3.2.3 Repairs

According to what was mentioned above, repair initiation and offers of repair could be clustered as an adjacency pair. The preferred action turn shape for repair initiation is a repair in the next turn. On the other hand, ignoring the repair is a dispreferred action turn shape. As Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks point out, from a conversation analytic point of view, repair is not considered as “correction or error” (Schegloff, Jefferson; Sacks, 1977: 363). Instead, “repair involves the temporary suspension of a turn or sequence in progress in order to attend to an emergent trouble of some kind” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 59). The trouble could be, for instance, problems of hearing or understanding. Have says “a repair sequence starts with a repairable, an utterance that can be reconstituted as the trouble source” (Have, 2007: 133). For example, if the trouble is mishearing, the hearer would ask the speaker to repeat the same utterance again, usually by asking questions such as: ‘what did you say?’ or ‘can you say that again?’.
According to the person who takes the initiative in repair, there can be different varieties of repair sequences. If the speaker of the repairable initiates the repair, it is called ‘self-initiated repair’, or if others take the initiative it is referred to as ‘other-initiated repair’. As a result of the repair initiation, the repair, then, can be carried out by the speaker himself, in which case it is called ‘self-repair’ or by others, in which case it is called ‘other-repair’ (Have, 2007: 133; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008: 60). To put it in a neat classification it can be said that repairs can be divided into four varieties: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Different varieties of repairs will be discussed along with the data and analysis later in this study.

3.2.4 Transcription

CA is the study of tape-recorded, naturally occurring interactions. Transcription of the recordings is the initial step which enables the analyst to analyze the data. Doing this, of course, does not turn the transcripts into ‘data’. However, it is just a way to put the audio, or in my case video, on paper to make it more tangible and suitable for CA purposes. Hutchby and Wooffitt state it more clearly:

Conversation analysts […] do not analyze transcripts alone: rather, they aim to analyze the data (the recorded interaction) using the transcripts as a convenient tool of reference. The transcript is seen as a ‘representation’ of the data; while the tape itself is viewed as a ‘reproduction’ of a determinate social event. (2008: 70)

Although even the recording, being audio or video, does not reproduce everything that happened at the time that the interaction occurred, at least what is on the recording has actually happened (Hutchby, 2006: 70; Sacks, 1984: 26). At this point, it is the responsibility of the transcriber to show, as closely as possible, what happened during the actual production of the data using an exact system of transcribing. The system used by conversation analysts is based on the one developed by Gail Jefferson (Jefferson, 2004). The same system, more or less, is used in this study, the key features of which are shown in the following figure.
In order to discuss the examples of these sets of recordings, they come in different excerpts in this paper, which are numbered according to the order they appear. There is an introductory heading for each excerpt which first says: where this excerpt happened; second: what the interlocutors were doing during this excerpt; third: which number recording it is from, first or second?; fourth: which number bit of each recording it is from; and fifth: what time in the recording the excerpt starts from.

| (0.5)          | Pauses in tenths of a second |
| ( . )          | Pauses of less than 0.2 seconds |
| okay=          | Equal sign: latching between utterances |
| =okay          | Square brackets: overlapping talk |
| ¬okay¬        | Dash: cut-off word |
| ʌyes ʌ        | Colon: prolonged previous sound |
| rull-          | Fullstop: falling intonation |
| ru: :          | Comma: continuing intonation |
| ?              | Question mark: rising intonation |
| ¿              | Upside-down question mark: sharply rising intonation |
| ((laughter))  | Double brackets: non-verbal activities |
| “wait”         | Encompassing degree signs: Quieter than surrounding speech |
| what           | underlining: speaker emphasis |
| WHAT           | Capitals: louder than surrounding speech |
| >open it<      | Encompassing more than and less than signs: quicker than surrounding speech |
| sabr kon       | Normal black font: Persian utterances |
| chi-e          | Dash between words: spoken Persian word blending |
| vad            | Words in italics: code-switching (Swedish) |
| let go I       | Words in grey (smaller font): word by word translation |
| let me go      | Words in grey (bigger font): idiomatic translation |
| what?          | Words in grey italics: translation of code-switching |
| teach)me(teach | Reversed brackets: translation of compound Persian verbs with the pronoun in between |
4 Repairs

Before I start to analyze the data which is the purpose of this section, a presentation of various different categories of repairs which I found in my data is required. Earlier I introduced four different categories of repairs: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. Not all of these categories exist in my data. If I want to divide my findings, I can say that there is no self-initiation of any kind in the whole of my data. Instead every time repairs were other-initiated, namely other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair, some of which are language repairs and some not. So, on the whole, there are two examples of other-initiated self-repair when it is not a language repair which are discussed in section 4.1, four examples of other-initiated self-repair as a language repair two of which are discussed in section 5.1, and three examples of other-initiated other-repair two of which are discussed in section 5.2.

4.1 Other-initiated Self-repair

The pattern which is found in some parts in the conversation is that the boy makes a Swedish utterance and the mother immediately initiates a repair by asking “what?” in Persian. As the examples being discussed regarding this pattern show, the boy does not treat this as a language repair and as a result he repeats the same utterance once again in Swedish. In these examples the mother accepts the boy’s utterance by saying “yes” in Persian in her next turn. An example of this pattern is clearly explained in the following paragraph.

The very first utterance that is produced in the recording being discussed is a Swedish utterance made by the child (excerpt 1) where after getting a gift and unwrapping it, he sees a picture of roller skates on the box and utters his first turn with excitement about what he got as a gift. (It should be noted that in the following examples the Swedish utterances are shown in italics and Persian is shown in normal font):

Excerpt 1  (in the room: unwrapping the gift, 1st recording, No.1: 00:00)

1 Child  ‘ru::llskridsko::r’ (.)‘rullskridskor’=({unwrapping the gift})

roller skates  roller skates
Mom =did-i ° (. ) age goft-i chi-e? ((smiling))

saw you if said you what is

Did you see? Can you say what it is?

Child rullskridsko:r

roller skates

Mom chi? ((leaning her head a little forward to the boy))

what

Child rullskrid skor 7 ((touching the skates in the box))

roller skates

Mom La:re: j

yes

As it can be seen in the transcription, when the boy unwraps the gift and finds out what is in the box in line 1 he excitedly says the word for roller skates twice in Swedish. He utters this turn in a quiet voice. In the next turn his mother asks him in Persian if he knows what it is in the box (line 2). In reply the boy says roller skates, with much more stress on the last syllable, but again in Swedish (line 3). Without any pause (in such examples pauses may show dissatisfaction with the interlocutors’ language choice), in the next turn taken by the mother she initiates a repair by asking “what?” in Persian while leaning her head a little toward her son (which is what Persians do when they want to hear something one more time in contrast to Swedish people, who lean their head backward in such a case). In the next turn the boy does not offer a language repair in his utterance which shows that he probably assumed that his mother did not hear what he said rather than assuming that she is not satisfied with his language choice. Accordingly, in line 5 he repeats the same utterance he produced in the previous turns of the same excerpt with the same tone and again in Swedish. His mother’s turn in line 6 overlaps his turn in line 5 where she accepts his response by saying “yes” in Persian although his utterance was not in the language she initiates the repair in. This is where they reach alignment and the conversation goes on to another topic.
The pattern discussed above was as follows: first a Swedish turn taken by the child, second the mother initiating a repair in Persian, third the child repeating the same utterance in Swedish, and finally the mother accepting the turn by saying “yes” in Persian. Here, another example with a similar sequence occurs in the following excerpt, except that after taking the roller skates out of the box the boy is checking them. Here, in this sequence he is talking about trying on the roller skates for the second time. The first time he expressed this idea was in line 27 but he did not get any reply or any response granting his request.

Excerpt 2  (in the room: checking the roller skates, 1st recording, No.2: 00:26)

39  Child  *får ja prova dom nu* ¿  ((checking the skates))

  may I try them now

  *Can I try them on now?*

40  Mom  (0.3) *mm?*  ((looking at the boy))

  mm?

41  Child  *får ja prova dom.*

  may I try them

  *Can I try them on?*

42  Mom  (0.5) are,

  yes

In line 39 the boy is checking the roller skates and asking for his mother’s permission whether he can try them on or not. In Swedish he asks “can I try them on now?” (with rising intonation). In the next turn (line 40) the mother offers a repair when she says “mm?” with a rising intonation which means the same thing as “what?” that the mother uttered in excerpt 1, but still it is not clear whether it is a language repair initiation or not. Here, again the boy does not make any repair in his language and instead repeats almost the same utterance with the same tone of voice in line 41, but this time with different intonation (falling intonation), as if he is just repeating the words in order for his mother to get the message, because he said it with rising intonation (question intonation) when he uttered it the first time. After a 0.5 second pause, when
she is busy checking the roller skate, the mother shows her acceptance of his request (and apparently his choice of language) by saying “yes” in Persian (line 42).

Thus, in these two excerpts (1 and 2) the repair initiated by the mother is not treated as a language repair by the boy. That is why when the boy repeats the same utterance in the same language in response to his mother’s question “what?” she replies to his question by saying “yes”. Yet the trouble source is ambiguous; whether it is the boy’s language choice or that the other person could not hear him?

5 Language Repairs

Although the trouble source is ambiguous in the above examples, what is clear is that they are not treated as language repairs. In this section some examples of language repair will be discussed. The repair initiations in all of these examples are treated as language repairs, some of which are repaired by the boy himself and some are repaired by his mother.

5.1 Other-initiated Self-repair

There are other examples where the above pattern is not followed, that is, after the boy utters something in Swedish and the mother initiates a repair by saying “what did you say?” in Persian, the boy offers a self-repair in his language by switching to Persian or at least he utters some part of the next turn in Persian. In some examples the mother responds to the boy’s question in the next turn but on some other occasions she just ignores him. Figuring out what these occasions are is what is going to be discussed in the following paragraph.

The following excerpt is one of the examples where the boy offers a language repair to his utterance after his mother initiates a repair by saying “what did you say?” in Persian. This excerpt occurs in the room after they have taken the roller skates out of the box and the boy puts one of the roller skates on. He then touches the wheels on the roller skate and expresses his interest in the number of the wheels at the same time.

Excerpt 3  (in the room: putting on the roller skates, 1st recording, No.3: 00:09)

1 Child  va många hjula de eːɪ (touching the wheels)

What many wheel it is

What a lot of wheels there are!
In Swedish, the boy says “what a lot of wheels there are!” (line 1) and as it is shown in the transcription he puts the most emphasis on the word “wheels”. Being busy unfastening the other roller skate she has in her hand, after a 0.5 second pause in line 3, the mother initiates a repair to the boy’s previous turn by saying “what did you say?” in Persian. There is a 0.8 second pause, after which the boy offers a self-repair (line 5) where he changes language but only for the first two words at the beginning of his utterance, after which he switches back to Swedish. Thus, the boy tries to achieve initial interactional alignment by shifting language to the one that his mother initiates the repair in, but his mother does not totally accept this partial repair to his utterance. Here, she expected the boy to repair the utterance completely and utters it in Persian and not just the first two words and the proof is that (as it is shown in lines 6 to 8) this repair by the boy is followed by his mother’s silence and sniffing while she is busy preparing the roller skates for the boy to put them on. Then the topic changes which occurs as a result of her renewing the context when the scene is changed and the mother starts to help the child put on the roller skates by telling him, in Persian, to put his foot forward (line 9).

Another repair initiation by the mother with the same pattern can be seen in excerpt 4 when the mother is helping the boy to take off his roller skates and he is exploring different parts
of them, at which point he finds a part which he does not know what it is. He asks his mother about this:

Excerpt 4  (in the room: taking off the roller skates, 1st recording, No.3: 04:19)

82  Child  mamma:: i va ä dom hâ::ra ti::ll ::
  mom  what  are  there  for
  Mom what are these for?
  va dom hâ::ra till mamma:::
  what  these  for  mom
  What are these for mom?

83  Pause  (0.6)

84  Mom  chi  mig-i: ?
  what  say  you
  What are you saying?

85  Pause  (.)

86  Child  ina  baraye  chi-e:: :
  these  for  what  is
  What are these for?

87  Pause  (2.3)

88  Mom  nemidoon-am’  maman,  shayad  (1.2)  skydd-e  nemidoon-am  (…)
  don’t  know  I  mom  maybe  protection  is  don’t  know  I
  I don’t know son, maybe it’s protection. I don’t know

In line 82, pointing at the bottom of the roller skates, the child addresses his mother and asks in Swedish “what are these for?”. Although he asks the question twice, after 0.6 seconds of pause while she is fixing one of the roller skates she has just taken off the boy’s foot, the mother asks “what are you saying?” in Persian (similar to the example in excerpt 3 above) which is another repair initiated by her. There is a minor pause in line 85 after which the boy switches into Persian and utters the next turn, which is the same question as in his previous turn, but this time completely in Persian (line 86). The mother tries to answer his question but since she is
checking the roller skate to give him the correct answer, there is a 2.3 second pause before she utters anything. Finally, in line 88 she says in Persian that she does not know but she says maybe it is for protection. Before saying the word protection, the mother pauses for 1.2 seconds after which she uses the Swedish word for it: “skydd”. Finally, they achieve complete interactional alignment because the boy offers a self-repair to his language after his mother’s repair initiation and the mother responds to his question and the conversation goes on.

To conclude, it cannot firmly be said that whether the nature of the trouble in the second pattern (excerpts 3 and 4) was the boy’s language choice or that the mother wanted him to repeat in order for her to hear clearly what he said. But, according to next-turn proof procedure, in both excerpts (3 and 4) after the boy offers a repair in his language (partial or complete), there is a long pause before the mother utters her next turn which could be due to the fact that she is busy preparing the roller skates for the boy or helping him putting them on, or that she is not satisfied with his repair. But the clear fact is that although she is busy in both excerpts, she does not try to answer him in excerpt 3 where he made a partial repair, whereas she tries to respond to him in excerpt 4, after he offers a language repair and utters his next turn completely in Persian. This can be proved using the video recording to see that before she starts taking her turn in line 87 she checks the roller skates and looks for the best answer regarding the part of the roller skates that the boy asked about. They then reach alignment for this part of the conversation and then they move on to other topics, as usual.

In the first pattern (excerpts 1 and 2), on the other hand, the repair initiation is not treated as a language repair by the boy, but instead it is treated as a repetition request. That is when he repeats his turn in the same language as in his previous turn. According to the next-turn proof procedure, in excerpts 1 and 2 after she heard the boy’s repeated utterance she responded to the boy, at which point they reached alignment. However, it cannot be said that the alignment they reached during the second pattern is greater than the first one because in each pattern what was required by the means of repair initiation was met at the end of the excerpt, that is, in the first two excerpts presumably the trouble source is that the mother does not hear what the boy said, so she needs to hear it again. That is where she initiates a repair in his utterance. At the same time, how the boy treats his mother’s repair initiation is to repeat his utterance one more time in order
to let her hear it. Therefore, since this is what the mother requires, i.e. to hear what he is talking about, she replies to his question and then they move forward in the conversation to other topics.

5.2 Other-initiated Other-repair

There are some examples which follow a different pattern from the previous ones mentioned in the two subcategories above. In these patterns after the boy takes his turn, whether in Swedish or Persian or a mixture of both, the mother initiates a repair by uttering the same utterance but in a different language. If the trouble source is the language choice, she repairs him right away. And if the trouble source is not the choice of the language and is a syntactic problem, for example, she gives the boy the opportunity to correct it himself by repeating the same utterance. If the boy still does not respond to the trouble, she utters the correct form herself. There is one example for each of these occasions which will be discussed below.

One of the occasions in which the above pattern occurs is in the following excerpt which is taken from the second set of recordings. Here, the boy is sitting on a video game car playing video games. His mother accompanies him by sitting and watching. She then asks the boy if she can play too. The boy starts teaching his mother how the car works and what she needs to do. The conversation is as follows:

Excerpt 5  (in the room: playing video game, 2nd recording, No.1: 00:16)

1  Child  ba in- in e:- e svänga mikon-am, ((turning the wheel))
with this this em em turn do I
I- I em em turn with this,

2  ba in-am >köra mikon-am<  ((pointing to the gas pedal))
with this too drive do I
And I drive with this,

3  ba in-am mm ((pointing to the gas pedal by mistake))
with this too mm
And with this em
To teach his mother how to use the game car, he starts with a Persian utterance and takes in a Swedish verb which, here, carries the central meaning of the utterance. He does the same
thing in all the first five lines of this excerpt. In line 1, he turns the wheel and says “I turn with this”, he uses the Swedish word for turn which carries the most important meaning in this utterance. Before he utters the Swedish word for turn he mumbles as if he is searching for the word and finally he finds the Swedish word. In line 2, he does almost the same thing as regards word insertion. Putting his foot on the gas pedal and pointing to it at the same time he says in Persian “And I drive with this” to say the word “drive” he uses the Swedish word and utters it rather faster than the rest of the same line. In line 3, he tries to show his mother the other pedal’s function. By mistake he points to the same pedal as before, but soon he notices and points to the right one. That is why he utters the first part of the utterance twice before he finally points to the right pedal (line 4). Again, he inserts a Swedish verb for “stop” in the Persian utterance saying “And I stop with this”.

Line 5 is a repetition of line 2. He says the same thing as he said in line 2. He puts his foot on the gas pedal again and in Persian says “And I drive with this” But this time he utters the Swedish verb for drive in a quiet voice. He probably notices half way that he has said this before. In line 6, he continues explaining when he points to a button on the wheel showing that it has the same function as the gas pedal by saying: “And I drive with this” in Persian using one inserted Swedish word for “drive”. As in line 5, he utters the word for “drive” in a quiet voice which could show his uncertainty about what he is talking about and even his choice of language for this single word.

His mother starts her first repair initiation turn before the boy finishes his turn which is actually not easy to hear. She replaces the Swedish verb “köra” with the Persian equivalent and pointing to the gas pedal she says completely in Persian “I accelerate with this” (line 7). She utters this turn with a question intonation which could be both a question in order to know the real answer to it or a repetition of what the boy said in another code in order for the boy to remember the Persian verb he could not find. The boy does not treat this as a language repair and does not offer any repair in his utterance. He takes a 0.3 second pause before he accepts his mother’s alternative repair in line 9 by saying “mm” which is used as an approval. His mother continues the repair in the same format i.e. repeating the boy’s turn in line 3 with a replaced verb with a question intonation. That is when in line 10 she says “I brake with this” with a rising intonation. The boy, accordingly, shows his approval again (line 11) by saying “mm” like he did.
in his previous turn (no repair offered). His mother shows her acceptance of his approval by saying “okay” in line 12. So, this is how the mother initiates a repair and she also makes the repair herself.

Another example of this category, as it was mentioned above, is when the trouble source is a syntactic problem in the boy’s utterance, that is, when one of the words he uses in order to construct a Persian compound verb is wrong. His mother initiates a repair by repeating his wrong sentence with a question intonation. The boy approves his mother’s utterance. Then, the mother offers the repair herself in her next turn.

The following excerpt begins when the mother is helping the boy putting on the roller skates in the hallway. They are talking about the last time the boy roller skated. Then, the mother asks him about the person who was supposed to teach him how to roller skate:

Excerpt 6  (In the hall: putting on the roller skates, 2nd recording, No.2: 00:27)

1  Mom  gharar bood ki yad-et bed-e? ((fastening the buckle))
    supposed was who teach you
    Who was supposed to teach you?

2  Pause  (0.9)  ((trying to help his mother fasten the buckle))

3  Child  x yad-am yad-am kard-e.
    x taught me taught me did he
    x taught me.

4  Pause  (0.3)  ((pushing the buckle))

5  Mom  yad-et kard-e x?=
    taught you taught he x
    x taught you?

6  Child  =mm¿
    mm.

7  Mom  oke:j (.) yad-et dad-e manzoor-et-e.
    okay taught you taught he meaning your is
    Okay. He taught you, you mean.
In line 1 the mother is fastening the buckle on the roller skates when she asks the boy in Persian “who was supposed to teach you?”, by which she means teach him to roller skate. In line 2 there is a 0.9 second pause when the boy tries to help finish fastening the buckle. In reply to his mother in line 3 he names the person and says that he “teached” him. It should be mentioned that the verb ‘to teach’ is a compound verb in Persian. He utters the first part of the verb twice and uses a wrong word for the second part of the verb. This makes the verb totally wrong but, still, one can understand its meaning from the context. There is a 0.3 second pause in line 4 when the mother pushes the buckle in order to fasten it. After that, in line 5, she initiates a repair by repeating the boy’s syntactically wrong utterance with question intonation. She brings the trouble spot to the beginning of the utterance making it more emphatic. The boy immediately confirms it by saying “mm” in line 6. In the next turn his mother first accepts the way he treats the repair by saying “okay” in line 7, but then she takes a minor pause and offers a repair by uttering the correct form of the verb. She finishes her repair turn by telling the boy that is what he means in Persian. In response to his mother, the boy says “yes” in Persian confirming her repair, but he never utters the correct form himself.

To conclude, both excerpts in this subcategory are obvious examples of other-initiated other-repair. In excerpt 5 the repair initiation is not treated as a language repair by the boy, but instead he treats this as a question of confirmation. That is why in reply to both repair initiation turns he just says “mm” confirming that his mother has got the point and she is ready to use the car in order to play the game.

According to next-turn proof procedure the repair initiation in excerpt 6 is not treated as a language repair either. That is why when his mother utters the wrong verb format he approves it by saying “mm” like he did twice in excerpt 5. Here, his mother offers the correct form in her next turn but he still does not offer a repair. At the end of the excerpt he just confirms his mother’s turn by saying “yes” in Persian.
6  No Repair (Language Acceptance)

In contrast to the patterns discussed earlier regarding excerpts 3 and 4, there are some counter examples where there is no language repair initiation at all, that is, the mother accepts the boy’s choice of language. Although he takes the turn completely in Swedish, his mother sticks to Persian and replies to him. Thus, in such examples, the conversation goes on even with two different codes in play but with no repair initiation.

The first time such a pattern is seen in the conversation is in the following excerpt which occurs at the beginning of the video recording. After the boy gets the present and unwraps the box and is excited about it, he tries to open the box. That is where he asks for his mother’s permission to do so. He utters his turn in Swedish and the mother replies to his request in Persian.

Excerpt 7  (in the room: trying to open the box, 1st recording, No.1: 00:14)

7    Child    kan  kan  ja  få  öppna  den?  =  ((trying to tear the box))
    can  can  I  get  open  it
  Can can I open it?

8    Mom    =areː,  
     yes

In line 7, bending over the box, the boy tries to take the roller skates out by tearing the box. At the same time he asks in Swedish “can can I open it?” The mother does not initiate any repair and instead immediately after that (without a pause) she takes her turn in Persian and says “yes”. Therefore, interactional alignment is reached although they do not use the same language to utter their turns.

The above pattern (the boy uttering a Swedish turn and the mother initiating no repair) is seen in the following excerpt as well. This excerpt actually occurs after excerpt 2 which was discussed earlier. Here, after they take the roller skates out and he checks them, the boy starts putting them on. He asks his mother, in Swedish, which foot should be in the roller skate he has in his hand. The mother replies in Persian and no repair initiation is seen.
Excerpt 8  (in the room: putting the roller skates on, 1st recording, No.2: 00:33)

44 Child  vilken fot ska den här vara på? (.)  deːN ?=(wearing the 
skate on his left foot))

Which foot should this be on? This one?

45 Mom  are:,

   yes

In this excerpt the mother is busy checking one of the roller skates and getting it ready for the boy to put it on. At the same time the boy is checking the other roller skate and as it was shown in excerpt 2, which actually occurred right before excerpt 8, he asks for his mother’s permission to try them on. While he lifts the left roller skate and moves it towards his left foot, he asks his mother in Swedish “which foot should this be on? This one?” (line 44). The next turn taken by the mother occurs with no pause and that is when she says “yes” in Persian (line 45), as in all the other examples discussed earlier.

Another example with the same pattern in the same set of recordings occurs when the interlocutors have taken out the roller skates from the box and the mother is helping the boy put them on. While she is fastening the buckles on the roller skates she tells him about his aunt who is going to teach him how to roller skate in the summer, after which the boy renews the context when he makes a Swedish utterance about another topic. The mother does not initiate any language repair and like the previous examples (excerpts 7-8) in reply to the boy she takes her turn in Persian. However, this time she recycles a Swedish word from the boy’s turn and inserts it in her Persian utterance. Accordingly, the boy switches to Persian too and uses the same Swedish word which his mother recycled from him, in his Persian utterance. This actually makes the conversation more coherent. As a whole, what happens in this part of the conversation is shown in the following excerpt:
Excerpt 9  (in the room: the mother fastening the roller skates, 1st recording, No.3: 01:14)

30  Child  mamma ja trodde att de var leksaker i paketet,
Mom          I          thought          that          it       was          toys          in          box          the

Mom I thought there were toys in the box

31  Mom  mm?=

32  Child  =men de var inte de va rullskridsko::r.

But there weren’t, there were roller skates

33  Pause  (0.3)

34  Mom  khob in am ye no l-leksak-e ( 1.0 ) mage na?
well          this          also          a          type          toy          is          whether          not

Well, this is also a kind of toy, isn’t it?

35  Pause  (0.8)

36  Child  Are leksak ye
Yes          toy          is

Yes, it is a toy.

As it is seen in the recording, while the mother is fastening the buckles on the roller skates the boy is sitting watching as well as listening to what she says. After she stops talking there is a 0.8 second pause after which the boy makes a Swedish utterance when he says “mom, I thought there were toys in the box” in line 30. The mother shows her affirmation in the middle of his statement in line 31 by saying “mm”, which cannot be said whether it is a Persian way of affirming or Swedish. Then the boy continues talking in line 32 where he says “but there weren’t, there were roller skates.” As it is shown in the transcription, there is a 0.3 second pause after which, without initiating a repair, the mother utters her turn in Persian and says “well, this is also a kind of toy, isn’t it?” (line 34). To say the word toy she uses the Swedish word for it which the boy used in his previous turn. She may have done so because the word has already been used, and thus she does not need to search for the equivalent in Persian. The tag question “isn’t it?” makes the boy think and find an answer, at which point there is a 0.8 second pause
after which the boy starts his turn in Persian, inserting the same Swedish word as his mother has used in her previous turn, and finishes with a Persian verb saying “Yes, it is a toy.” (line 36). As it was mentioned earlier, when the interlocutors recycle the same word from each other’s utterances, the stream of talk becomes more coherent.

To sum up, the point about this excerpt is that, although the mother accepts the boy’s language choice and does not initiate a repair to his language, the boy switches to Persian after he is exposed to it more by means of the mother’s Persian utterances and questions. Thus, in spite of the fact that the interlocutors use two different languages to communicate and even at some points they insert words from one language to the other, they achieve a joint understanding by the end of the excerpt.

The pattern discussed above also exists in some other parts of the conversation, where it starts with the boy’s Swedish utterance followed by the mother’s Persian response which does not include a repair of any kind, and finally the boy’s Swedish or Persian utterance, which varies from case to case. Another example of the same pattern, which is found throughout the conversation, is analyzed in the following excerpt, which occurs right at the end of the same conversation.

After the boy tries on the roller skates and walks with them in the room, the mother takes them off his feet and tells him that he has to clean up the mess they have made by unwrapping the box and the contents. Not caring about what she has said, the boy makes a Swedish utterance and renews the context. The mother, accordingly, does not follow what she had said in her previous turn and replies to the boy’s Swedish utterance in Persian. What was said is shown in the excerpt below:

**Excerpt 10** (in the room: taking off the roller skates, 1st recording, No.3: 05:08)

91 Child  *ja måste säga till min pappa att ja fick-*

\[I \text{ must say to my dad that I got }\]

\*[em blixten e: :-sk-e: :]

\*[blixten]

\*[I have to tell my dad that I got em blixten em sk-]
After the mother takes the roller skates off his feet and tells him, in Persian, that he has to clean up the mess, in line 91 the boy takes a turn in Swedish saying “I have to tell my dad that I got blixten roller skates.” Before he utters the word for roller skates he mumbles and hesitates, but finally he finds the word and utters it in Swedish which is clearly shown in the transcription above. His mother’s turn in line 92, affirming his utterance by saying yes in Persian, overlaps his turn in line 91. As he starts uttering the rest of his turn, the boy, suddenly gets up and while running out of the room he utters this part in Swedish: “now I’ll go and tell him.” Being busy preparing to pack the roller skates back in the box, after a 1.5 second pause the mother makes a Persian utterance saying “do you want to show him?” The boy, who is now outside the room, comes back to his mother after a 0.5 second pause which is shown in line 95 in order to take the roller skates and do what his mother suggests. Since his mother does not initiate a repair, the boy sticks to the same language which he has used in his previous turns and makes a Swedish utterance as he is rushing back to the room and says “yes, I do” meaning he does want to take the roller skates and show his dad (line 96).

As it can be seen in the transcriptions and as it was discussed above, there is no trouble over the language choice by either of the interlocutors in these examples. They both stick to the
They achieve a joint understanding of what they are talking about.

7 Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to analyze the patterns of code-switching and more specifically repairs in Swedish-Persian bilinguals’ talk. This would take a huge sample, considering the large number of Persians living in Sweden who are actually bilingual. Therefore, I have chosen to narrow the sample to make a manageable study. The study is based on a qualitative analysis of code-switching and repair patterns of an originally Persian family living in Sweden and whose children were born in Sweden.

As regards code-switching, as we can see in the transcriptions attached to an appendix at the end of this paper, the boy does not code-switch until line 60, when 1:20 minutes of the conversation have passed. What is clear is that he switches from Swedish to Persian when he is exposed to it a lot by his mother. Thus, it can be said that his mother’s direct questions in Persian affect his choice of language and cause him to code-switch.

Another conclusion we can make here is that the mother accepts the boy’s language choice more than she repairs it. During the whole conversation there are nine repair initiations two of which are not language repairs. Therefore, seven repairs out of hundreds of turns prove that her purpose is not to correct the boy’s language all the time or teach him how to use Persian, but she is focused on communication and interaction instead.

Since the mother takes most of her turns in Persian and also from the direction of the repairs she initiates, it is obvious that her preferred language is Persian; except for one occasion (excerpt 6), she never repairs the boy’s Persian turns. Whenever she initiates a repair, she does it to his Swedish utterances. Furthermore, since the boy sticks to Swedish unless he is repaired or exposed to Persian a lot, we can draw the conclusion that his preferred language is Swedish. The reason could be the fact that he spends most of his day in the Swedish kindergarten, being exposed to Swedish almost the whole day. He cannot turn that off right away when he comes home in the evening.
In contrast to his mother, the boy never initiates any repairs, either to his mother’s language or to his own. This shows that the mother repairs and accepts his language choice whenever she wants to. The boy follows his mother’s lead most of the time.

As regards the form of the repairs, one can find different linguistic formats in the mother’s repair initiation utterances. On some occasions after the boy’s Swedish turn, she initiates a repair by saying “mm?” or “what?”, both of which are ambiguous. It cannot easily be said what the trouble source is, whether it is the boy’s language choice or whether she has not heard what he said. On some other occasions she initiates a repair by asking “what did you say?” or “what are you saying?”. The previous ambiguity applies here, too. It could be a language repair as well as a repetition request. Another repair format she uses is that she repeats the boy’s utterance with question intonation, which is ambiguous for the same reasons as the other two formats. However, in contrast to these ambiguous repair initiations, there is one example were she initiates a direct, clear repair saying that she does not like the way the boy is talking in that specific turn. She says this when the boy is speaking in childish language. The mother, consequently, shows her dissatisfaction clearly by saying “I don’t want you to talk like that”. This example is not discussed in the existing categories, however it can be found in line 55 of the transcripts in appendix 1.

**Suggestions For Future Studies**

There are other interesting points about this data which are not discussed here due to the fact that they are not closely related to the aim of this study, namely repair analysis. However, these points are worth mentioning for the purpose of further studies. One of them is about insertional code-mixing\(^1\), that is, when the participants insert a Swedish word into the Persian utterance, but not vice versa. One outstanding feature of the mother’s code-mixing is that she inserts a Swedish word for all the features related to her son’s toys, meaning that every time she wants to name a feature on a toy, for example, she inserts the Swedish word for it into the Persian framework, including: “helmet”, “training wheels”, “protection”, and “scissors”. It could be due to the fact that the Persian equivalents are not readily available to her, obviously not to the son either, because she has always used the Swedish words with her son.

---

\(^1\) Insertional code-mixing is the insertion of elements from one language into the grammatical and syntactical framework of another (the base language) (Musk, 2006: 49).
Another interesting point is that the mother code-switches whenever she uses interjections in her turns. She uses the Swedish equivalents of phrases like: oops, wow, oh God, etc. This is what bilinguals often do. They tend to switch languages when they are expressing strong feelings. However, this is not a straightforward issue which can be figured out here. It requires further analyses.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Transcripts: 1st recording, No. 1 & 2

1. Child: *(rullskridskor)* (unwrapping the gift)
   
   *roller skates

2. Mom: =did-i ¿ (.) age goft-i chi-e?  
   
   saw you if said you what is
   
   Did you see? Can you say what it is?

3. Child: *rullskridskor*
   
   *roller skates

4. Mom: chi?  
   
   what

5. Child: *rullskrid-skor*  
   
   *(touching the skates in the box)*
   
   *roller skates

6. Mom: *la:re:*  
   
   yes

7. Child: *kan kan ja få öppna den*  
   
   *(trying to tear the box)*
   
   can can I get open it
   
   *Can can I open it?*

8. Mom: =are:,
Child: *dom hära kartongen ska ja öppna* ((trying to open the box))

>these carton the will I open

*I will open this carton*

Pause (0.7)

Child: *kan ja få öppna den här kartong mamma,*

>can I get open this carton mom

*Can I open this box mom?*

Pause (0.6)

Child: *kan du hjälpa mej mamma,*

>can you help me mom

*Can you help me mom?*

Pause (0.5)

Child: *kan du hjälpa mej m- mamma,*

>can you help me mom

*Can you help me mom?*

Pause (0.5)

Mom: *bezar ber-am ye doone (.sax biar-am khob?*(getting up )

>let go I one scissors bring I ok

Let me go and bring a pair of scissors ok?

Child: *(). oke::j*

*okay*

Pause (11.) ((trying to take out the skate from the box on his own))

38
Child: *kan ja öppna den dära?* ((taking the scissors from his mother’s hand))

*can I open that*

*can I open that?*

Mom: =are:

*yes*

Pause (1.5) ((trying to cut the box))

Mom: *fek kon-am az inja am besh-e (.) baz-esh kard*

*think do I from here also become it open it did*

I think we can open it from here also.

Pause (11.) ((opening the box and taking out the roller skates))

Mom: *did-i:,*

*saw you*

Did you see?

Pause (0.7)

Child: *ja ville prova dom.*

*I wanted try them*

*I want to try them.*

Pause (3.0)

Mom: *khoshgel-an ?*

*beautiful are*

Are they beautiful?

Pause (1.0) ((looking at the boy))
31 Mom are?
   yes?

32 Pause (0.3) ((the child looking at the roller skates))

33 Child ja::=
   yes

34 Mom =chi roo-sh-e?
   what on it is
   what is on it?

35 Pause (0.5) ((turning his face to the other roller skate his mom is holding))

36 Child blixten=
   lightening

37 Mom = blixten:
   lightening

38 Pause (0.5)

39 Child får ja prova dom nu? ((checking the skates))
   may I try them now
   Can I try them on now?

40 Mom (0.3) mm? ((looking at the boy))
   mm?

41 Child får ja prova dom.
   may I try them
   Can I try them on?

42 Mom (0.5) are,
yes

43 Pause (2.0) ((trying to wear the roller skate))

44 Child vilken fot ska den här vara på? (.) de:J ?= ((wearing the skate on his left foot))

Which foot should this be on? This one?

45 Mom are:, yes

46 Pause (3.0) ((helping him putting on the roller skate))

47 Mom ‘sabr kon’
wait do
wait!

48 Pause (1.8)

49 Mom ojdå (2.0) hur gick där? ((pushing his foot in the skate))
ops how went there

Ops! How did it go?

50 Pause (1.5)

51 Mom ‘vais-a ye zare shol-tar-esh kon-am’
Stand you a bit looser it do I
Wait so that I make it looser.

52 Pause (6.8)

53 Child ja vill åka rullskridskor här inne ((in a childish language))
I want go roller skates here inside
I want to roller skate here, inside.
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54 Pause (0.4)

55 Mom 'ja vill inte att du ska prata så där'  
I want not that you will speak so that
I don’t want you to talk like that.

56 Pause (0.7)

57 Child OKe::j då gör ja inte: ((in a childish language))
ok then do I not
Ok then I won’t do it.

58 Pause (11.7) ((fixing the skate in his foot))

59 Mom midoon-i in be dard-e kei mikhor-e??
know you this to be good )when( for it
Do you know when is it good for?

60 Child na::=
no

61 Mom =age goft-i,
if said you
Can you answer?

62 Pause (1.0) ((looking at the other skate where there is something wrong))

63 Child mama(n) ni:ga
mom look
Look at this mom!

64 Pause (1.2) ((the mother looking at the other skate))
Yes, I can fix that.

Can you fix it for me?

Yes, I can fix that.

Yes son, wait.

First, I fix this one so that it becomes fixed.

Oh god, how stuck it is!

It is very very hard!
Appendix 2

Transcripts: 1st recording, No. 3

1 Child  va mänga hjula de eːː (touching the wheels)

What many wheel it is

What a lot of wheels there are!

2 Pause  (0.5)

3 Mom  chi goft-i į

what said you

What did you say?

4 Pause  (0.8)

5 Child  che ghad mänga hjuːːlha e hāːːrː (0.8) jätinemånga hjuːːl.

how many many wheels are here loads of wheels

What a lot of wheels there are! Loads of wheels.

6 Pause  (0.4)

7 Mom  ((sniff))

8 Pause  (1.0)

9 Mom  pa-t-o biar.  ((lifting the skate))

foot your obj bring

Give me your foot

10 Child  AAːːhh ( . ) ((trying to fasten the other skate to line 11))

11 Mom  pa-t-o bokon too inja.  ((holding the skate in front of his foot))

foot your obj enter in here

Put your foot in here

12 Pause  (0.3)

13 Child  Uhh (0.3) Ehh

14 Pause  (0.3)
Mom: pa-t-o bokon (1.4) vali ina male too khoone nista:, foot your obj enter but these for in house are n’t

Put your foot in. But these are not for inside the house

Midoon-i ke¿
know you that

You know that?

Child: ‘eh’

Pause (2.0)

Mom: >are?<
Yes?

Pause (0.6)

Child: are midoon-ra :: m.-
Yes know I
Yes, I know

Mom
L ‘are’ J
Yes

Pause (0.4)

Child: ja ska prova dom här i-i mitt ru:m
I will try on these here in in my room

I will try these on in-in my room

Pause (0.7) ((watching the skates in his feet))

Mom: hmm (7.0) midoon-i ki mikhad yad-et bede¿
know you who wants teach)you( teach
hmm Do you know who wants to teach you?

Child: na: ¿
No

Pause (0.5)
Aunt X: She’s gonna be our neighbor in the summer.

Mom: I thought there were toys in the box.

Child: It was roller skates.

Mom: Well, this is also a kind of toy, isn’t it?

Child: Yes, it is a toy.

Mom: One can play with this, too.
Child =mama maloom-e kheili ren-e :: ((touching the skate in his left foot))

= mom obvious is very clean is

Mom, it seems so clean.

Mom are::h¿ no-e chonke no-e no-e

= yes new is because new int new is

Yes, because it is new, completely new

Pause (0.7)

Child nu ska ja prova dem här inne

= now will I try these inside

Now, I will try these on inside.

Pause (0.5) ((standing up))

Mom komak-et kon-am¿ ((holding his hand))

= help you do I

Let me help you

Child A::hh

Mom bayad yad begir-i-h

= must learn you

You have to learn

Pause (0.3)

Child (...)nu ska ja prova dom på solve:t ((going from the carpet to the bare floor))

= now will I try them on the floor

Now I will try them on the floor.

Mom o:kh=

Child =A:h hi:h hih hih hih hih hih ((moving with the skates slowly and fearfully))
Pause (0.3)

Mom khoob-e::?

good is

Is it good?

Child A::h=

Mom =are::?

yes?

Child are ((Puffing)) ( . ) ((Laughter)) ((Sitting on the bed))

yes

Pause (0.12) ((bumping the skates to the bed and getting up from the bed))

Child ((Laughter)) ((Sitting on the bed))

Pause (0.6) ((getting up again holding to the bed))

Mom Y am dare ha:: ¿ ((the child sitting on the bed again))

Y also has int

Y has, too.

Child ((Nodding))

Mom midoon-i: ¿

know you

Do you know?

Child ((Nodding))

Mom did-i: ¿

saw you

Have you seen?

Child ((Nodding))

Mom ( . ) che rangi-e male X

what color is for x

What color is X’s?
65  Child  svart o ro:sa=
    black  and  pink
    Black and pink

66  Mom  A:ha::n.
    aha

67  Child  do te-do ta dare,
    two    two    has
    She has two.

68  Mom  do ta dare:: ¿ chera do ta dare::?
    two    has    why    two    has
    She has two? Why does she have two?

69  Child  "chonke >mm< ye doone baraye khale X ye ( . )doone baraye Y,
    because  one    for    aunt  x  one    for    Y
    Because,mm, one for aunt X, one for Y
    >un svarta baraye khale X < hh och un rosa-e baraye ( . ) Y
    that    black    for    aunt  x    and    that    pink    the    for    Y
    The black one for aunt X and the pink for Y

70  Mom  vali khale X goft nadare mikhad bekhare vase khodesh
    but    aunt    X    said    does    not    have    wants    buys    for    herself
    But aunt X said she doesn’t have, she wants to buy for herself

71  Pause  (0.5) {(the sudden look of the child at the mom and looking
    away again)}

72  Child  ni::: {(Laughter)} eh eh eh eh {(getting up from the bed )}

73  Pause  (0.4)

74  Child  ja kommer få mer o mer o me::: r, bu:h (0.8) U:hh
    I     come     take     more     &     more
    I come closer more and more and more
Pause (0.5) ((holding to the wall and proceeding))

Mom khoo::b-e i bahal-e::i (0.3) are.vali male bi:roon-e ina,
good is fun is yes but for outside is these.

Is it good? Is it fun? Yes. But these are for outside

biroon kheili rah too:lan-i-e::i,
outside very way long is
outside the road is long

( . ) bayad betoon-i hjälm-et-o bezar-ɹ iː ɣ, eː m
must can you helmet your obj put you

So that you can wear your helmet and also wear your protection

Child Leh eh J

Mom skydd-et-am bezar-ɹ ɹ̠̬ɪ̯̬̩̓ b̠̬ɛ̃ r̠̬ɪ̯̬̩̓ dast-et-o bede man=
protection your also put you then go you outside hand your obj give me
and then go out, give me your hand

Child L e he he:: J

Child =ha:ha:ha:: ((Laughter)) (0.5) ((Jumping))

Mom ‘nakon maman’. dare-shoon biar-iːm ɹ iː ɹ̠̬ɪ̯̬̩̓ are: ɹ̠̬ɪ̯̬̩̓
don’t do mom take )them( off we yes

Don’t do this son. Should we take them off?

Child mamma:: ɹ ɹ̠̬ɪ̯̬̩̓ va ä dom hāːra tiːl l ɹ iː
mom what are there for

Mom what are these for?

va dom hāːra till mamma:: ɹ iː
what these for mom

What are these for mom?

Pause (0.6)
Mom: What are you saying?

Child: Ina baraye chi-e:: ¿

Mom: What are these for?

Child: Ja måste pro:va dom nu: :,

Mom: I don't know son, maybe it's protection. I don't know.

Child: Ja måste säga till min pappa att ja fick-e

Mom: I have to tell my dad that I got em blixten em sk-

Child: Nu ska ja gå o säga de<

Mom: Yes.

Pause: (1.5) (the boy running out of the room)
Do you want to take them and show him?

Yes, I do
Appendix 3

Transcripts: 1st recording, No. 4

1 Mom ...na-bayad ba-shoon rah ber-i.bayad yad begir-i::=  
    not should with them walk you should learn you  
    You shouldn’t walk with them, you have to learn,

2 Child Ja vill aldrig "skridskor"  
    I want never roller skate  
    I never want to roller skate.

3 Mom (.chera ¿  
    why

4 Pause (0.8)

5 Child rullskridskor mikha-m ber-am vali skridskor-i ke  
    roller skate want I go I but roller skate the that  
    I want to roller skate, but I don’t want to go with those that people go on ice with them.

6 Mom chera ¿  
    Why?

7 Child "chon doos na-dar-a:m"  
    because like not I  
    Because I don’t like it.

8 Pause (1.8)
Mom: midoon-I chera ¿

Do you know why?

Child: na:

no

Mom: chonke sai ne-mikon-i yad begir-i (1.5) midoon-i ¿(1.4)

Because you don’t try to learn, you know?

X did-i ye kam mir-e ¿ (1.3) chon bayad sor bokhor-i

Have you seen that X can do it a little? Because you have to slide.

Pause (1.8)

Child: men ja e ba -bara bra på ri -på rullskridsko:r

But I am just good on roller skate.

Mom: to az koja midoon-i, to asan hich vaght na-raft-i.

How do you know it? You have never tried it.

Pause (1.4)

Child: ja vet faktisk >för att ja har sätt att X åkte<

Actually I know because I have seen that X

rullskridskor såhā:r

roller skate like this
roller skated like this.

17  Pause  (1.0)
18  Mom   ... 
19  Pause  (0.9)
20  Child  så lika han
21  Mom   chonke X khoob-e to am khoob-i ć
          because X good is you also good are
          Because X is good you are good too?
22  Child (.) are.
          yes
23  Pause  (1.0)
24  Child  la -ma -m X har lärde mig kard alla
          la ma m X have taught me did all
          X has taught me everything.
25  Pause  (1.5)
26  Mom   to oon rooz be man goft-ić ke to mitoon-i ć ba
          you that day to me said you that you can you by
          That day you told me that you can
          docharkh-atć bedoon-e  (0.5) stödhjul ber-i (0.6) chonke
          bicycle your without training wheels go you because
          ride your bike without the training wheels, because
          to goft-i too dagis yad gereft-i vali Y gof to
          you said you in kindergarten learned you but Y said you
          you said you learned it in the kindergarten, but Y said that you
ne-mitoonest-i ber-i,

not could you go you

couldn’t go.

Appendix 4
The consent letter signed by the mother in the video recordings

To whom it may concern,

I (name of the mother), do hereby give my consent to Mina Kheirkhah to use the video files she recorded of me and my family for the purpose of her master thesis only. I give my consent about the video files to be used in any seminars she presents her thesis.

This Letter of Consent is being issued on 8th of August at my house where she made the video recordings.

__________________
NAME OF MOTHER

AND SIGNATURE