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Chapter 1: Introduction

The world is screaming with stories. Every second is filled with words. Individuals, families, sports teams, school books, writers, religious communities, social media sites, political parties, governments and more, are all voicing their versions of what has been, what is, and what could or should be, creating a never-ending global chorus. Some stories speak louder than others, but all recycle the same words, sending them off to be received and re-used. This study sets out to carefully inquire how individuals who grew up as children of immigrants talk about their lives, and particularly about the place of language in their lives. Language, here, becomes both a vehicle and an object of study: when we talk, we endlessly become who we are. What we say about language reflects our view of the world. And in this world, stories of immigration are currently among the loudest of narratives.

In this study, questions of language and identity will be approached through detailed analysis of interview data with twelve individual participants of different backgrounds: Farah, Minh, Imad and Khalid in Turku, Finland; Susanna, Cemile, Danny and Gabriela in Malmö, Sweden; and Ewa, Hülya, Laila and Randeep in Birmingham, UK. The participants and the interview process will be introduced in more detail in Chapter 3. The three cities in which the data was collected are all are major cities in the respective countries, and known as particularly diverse when it comes to nationalities among their populations. The cities will further be described in Chapter 4. This introduction will present the issues which this study starts from, and situate it in previous research on language and identity.

1.2 Migration and linguistic diversity

1.2.1 Stories of migration and belonging

In 2016, approximately 65 millions of people were living as forcibly displaced from their home countries, according to UNHCR estimates. Around 6 %, or one million people, have arrived in Europe, and it is
repeatedly reported that the numbers are at their highest in the post-World War period. The individual stories are silenced and drown, not only in the Mediterranean, but also in headlines and numbers describing what is in many places presented as a threat facing the receiving European countries. Under the name of the ‘refugee crisis’, these journeys fill newspaper front pages, television screens, news feeds and consciences, and are often portrayed as something uncontrollable, threatening and unprecedented.

But the human race has never been standing still. Immigration is much older than the nation-states that govern it. There is nothing inherently threatening, or even unusual, in the movement of people. The ways in which immigration is talked about, however, give a different impression. Blommaert and Verschueren write:

“Vivid images of lethal migration waves are implanted into public consciousness. The formulation of migration policies has become a major concern. By far the most practicable method of containment is to close borders, at least for categories of unwanted individuals, however curious this may be in the face of increased internationalization at the most visible and most widely advertised levels of economic, social and political life” (Blommaert & Verschueren 1998: 12)

The closing of borders and the building of walls are only some of the practices in a larger phenomenon of separation of people into ‘Us’ and ‘Them’, ‘wanted’ and ‘unwanted’. The discourses around belonging are in many ways equally powerful and harmful. Alongside discourses and practices of exclusion of certain people, diversity is simultaneously being celebrated as enriching, and a characteristic feature of present-day Europe. As Blommaert and Verschueren point out, internationalization is presented as encouraged, even necessary, for economic growth as well as for social and political developments. Moreover, the European Union motto, “United in Diversity”, was coined at the start of a new millennium and is seen as marking a step in the creation of a common European identity (see discussion in El-Tayeb 2011). This diversity, however, does not seem to encompass all kinds of diversity, and the policies for an increased movement of people do not encourage all kinds of movements.
The mentioned contradictions shape contemporary discourses on identity and belonging, which have been heightened in the recent years.

A characteristic trait of the debates on migration in most parts of Europe is a stagnation at and insistence on “what if”-scenarios; ‘What happens to Europe if these people stay?’ (El-Tayeb 2011: xii). This immobile stance ignores that people have already stayed, for decades and for centuries. In many European countries, nationalist groups have gained ground in the past decade, creating national stories with which many nationals fail and refuse to identify. In the UK, the discussions around belonging have been particularly heightened and alarming around the time of the referendum in June 2016, in which the majority voted for the country to leave the European Union. Immigration was found to be the most important issue to effect voters during the weeks leading up to the referendum (Asthana 2016). Who determines who may belong, who is recognised as ‘one of us’?

The work on this thesis began in 2012, and during the years that have passed since, immigration has become an increasingly debated topic. In the midst of the stories of nations and immigration, generations of people have grown up as children of immigrants, and as nationals in the countries of destination of their parents’ migration. This study moves beyond the immediate, and currently much-debated, phenomenon of immigration, and looks at what happens in the following generation, especially when it comes to language, identity and belonging. These questions are the object of much debate both at the level of popular discourse, the media and politics, as well as in academic inquiries. Language often figures in these debates, and is presented as a symbol of belonging and non-belonging. The next section will introduce some questions related to linguistic diversity at the time when this study was conducted.

1.2.2 Linguistic diversity

Wherever there are human beings, there is linguistic diversity. Multilingualism, in the sense of several named languages being used, has always been common across the globe, and an ordinary part of life for most of its inhabitants. At the same time, substantial suspicion against multilingualism and multilingual speakers prevails, in many parts of the
Western world in particular. Although the assumptions about the cognitive harms of bilingualism have long ago been proved faulty, and its benefits have been widely advocated and promoted, bilingualism curiously remains associated with a sense of disloyalty and trouble. Piller (2016: 2) remarks: “on the one hand, the fact of linguistic diversity in many societies in the world is well-recognized, frequently enumerated, and even celebrated. However, on the other hand, linguistic diversity is associated with a range of social ills and seen as something that needs to be contained, possibly even something to be fearful of”.

This contradiction was visible in the media and political discourse during the period when the data for this study was collected. Negative portrayals of multilingualism were particularly noticeable in the UK context, where Nigel Farage and UKIP were gaining support. His comments, such as ‘feeling awkward’ when merely hearing ‘foreign languages’ on London trains, seemed to set an example of such views as acceptable. A year after the completion of the data collection, the results of the referendum about Britain’s membership in the European Union unleashed xenophobic violence of both physical and verbal kind, and there have since been several reports of people feeling afraid to speak languages other than English in public. One might therefore ask what findings a study such as this one may yield, if the data collection were to take place today.

In Sweden, too, multilingualism was on the political agenda. In April 2013, when the majority of the interviews in Malmö were recorded, the city council were debating the closing of a school in the area of Rosengård, known as one of the most ethnically diverse neighbourhoods in Sweden. The secondary-school in question was referred to as a symbol of failure, and called a ‘fiasco’: alongside problems of order and discipline, it was pointed out that students were not sufficiently proficient in the Swedish language, and were in no way integrated into Swedish society. In some discussions, the fact that the majority of students spoke Arabic at home was pointed out as a problem for the communication between students and teachers, and for the maintenance of order in classrooms and outside.

It is often presented as a ‘common sense’ truth that monolingualism in the dominant language is the most desired and most
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natural state of affairs in society. Social research has pointed out that as discrimination based on ‘ethnicity’, nationality or ‘colour’ is condemned as unacceptable, language has become a means of keeping people out, either legally, for example in the form of requirements of language skills for citizenship or residence (see e.g. Blackledge 2005), or discursively, by determining what varieties are given prestige or associated with stigma (see e.g. Stroud 2004). This is likely to have a bearing on language maintenance in immigrant families. Previous research on language maintenance reveals that a shift to the dominant language often occurs by the third generation (see e.g. Fishman 1966, Portes & Rumbaut 2001). In general, however, multilingualism, prevails – in constantly changing forms, and in constantly changing environments.

1.3 The ‘immigrant second generation’

The focus in this study is on people who were born in countries to which their parents migrated, i.e. people who are the first generation to grow up and be socialised in the ‘new country’ of that part of the family story. Without ever moving countries, millions of people are classified as ‘aliens’, as ‘second- (or third-, etc.) generation immigrants’ in the places in which their ancestors arrived. In the past decades, the stereotypical picture of ‘second-generation immigrants’ has been coloured by associations with riots in the suburbs of for example Paris and Stockholm, radicalisation and terrorism, and young Muslim men in particular have been represented as the threatening opposite to what it means to be ‘European’. How children of immigrants fare is in many ways believed to serve as evidence of equality, and of integration of migrant communities into the receiving society. Researchers have for a long time taken an interest in the lives and outcomes of children born to parents who migrated; studies have examined their social, economic, educational and occupational paths, as well as their language use and shift and their identity formations. It is not always very clear whom the definition of ‘second-generation immigrants’ refers to. This study focuses on the ‘classical second generation’, i.e. people who were born and socialised in a country that their parents migrated to (see e.g. Levitt & Waters 2002, Rumbaut 2002 for discussion on definitions). Both quantitative and qualitative work has compared the experiences of children of migrants with native minorities, the majority
population, or people who themselves moved. Most of the early studies relate to the United States because of their history as a country of immigration, but there are also a growing number of studies from various European and other contexts. One of the studies most similar to this one is Lotta Weckström’s (2011) study on ‘second generation Finns’ in Sweden. Her design is slightly different, as the definition of ‘second generation’ includes people who migrated in their early childhood (up to the age of three), and people with only one Finnish parent. Weckström also included one key participant neither of whose parent spoke Finnish: a child of a Swedish mother and an Ingrian (descendants of Finnish immigrants in present-day Russia) father, the participant however strongly identified as ‘Finnish’. Including him, Weckström explains, served as a good example of the heterogeneity of identities that are included in the umbrella of ‘Finnishness’. Weckström’s findings will be discussed more fully the chapters of analysis.

Whether findings from different settings can in any straightforward way be immediately related to one another is debatable, and the differences may be substantial also when it comes to different periods of time, their related patterns of migration, social climate, and other relevant aspects. In this introductory chapter, I will next outline some previous research on the ‘second generation’, and, in particular, discuss some problematic starting points and assumptions in popular and academic discourse around it.

1.3.1 ‘The problem of the second generation’

The stories that are told about the ‘second generation’ are often associated with a particular dominant narrative of ‘being caught between two cultures’ (K. Hall 2002: 2). In his description about children of European migrants in America, dating in 1938, Hansen describes “the problem of the second generation”:

‘Life at home was hardly more pleasant. Whereas in the schoolroom they were too foreign, at home they were too American. Even the immigrant father who compromised most willingly in adjusting his outside affairs to the realities that surrounded him insisted that family life, at least, should retain the
pattern he had known as a boy. Language, religion, customs and parental authority were not to be modified simply because the home had been moved four or five thousand miles to the westward. When the son and the daughter refused to conform, their action was considered a rebellion of ungrateful children for whom many advantages had been provided. The gap between the generations was widened and the family spirit was embittered by repeated misunderstandings. How to inhabit two worlds at the same time was the problem of the second generation.”
(Hansen 1938, in Sollors 1996: 204)

This split between the realms of the home and the world outside, the tensions between parents and children, and the different values given to the culture that has been ‘moved’ from its original location, are also reflected in many contemporary depictions. For example, Tosi (1999: 333) asserts that “the second generation, educated in the new country’s school of civic cooperation and urban individualism, finds it difficult to accept that kinship links must govern the freedom, taste and aspiration of each individual”. Levitt and Waters (2002: 15) describe this model as a “‘straight-line’ model of assimilation’, developed with regard to the experiences of children of ‘white’ European migrants to the United States. According to this model, “the second generation learns an immigrant culture at home but encounters the more highly valued American native culture in school, among their peer groups, and from the mass media. They internalize American culture and identity and reject their parents’ culture and identity as foreign”. The outcome of this process is then rebellion, rejection of the immigrant culture, and finally the creation of a culture combining elements from both ‘American and immigrant social systems’, possibly taking a psychological toll, but certainly rewarded with upward social mobility (ibid.).

Portes and Rumbaut, principal investigators in CILS, Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study, argue that the position of being born to migrants “entails the juggling of competing allegiances and attachments (Portes & Rumbaut 2001: 150). As they are “situated between two cultural worlds, they must define themselves in relation to multiple reference groups (...) and to the classifications into which they are placed by their
native peers, schools, the ethnic community and larger society” (ibid). This imaginary of a binary life, with two competing sets of norms or possibilities, has been criticised in later theorisations (e.g. Harris 2006). While the descriptions might be well-recognised by many individuals who are growing up in countries and contexts to which their parents were foreign, the stories are likely to be much more complex and nuanced. One aim of this introduction is to take a step forward from these models, and, with the help of previous research, provide a more detailed account of the larger picture against which the analysis in this thesis is to be viewed.

1.3.2 Assumptions of ‘non-belonging’

An aspect relating to beliefs about migrant integration is the perception that it is important that people of migrant background identify with the ‘national identity’ of the country they reside in. While it is obscure what that identity entails, national identification is considered as “an important indicator of the social cohesion within societies” (Nandi & Platt 2013: 1), and in the case of minorities it is regarded as proof of alignment with, and acceptance of, ‘shared values’ with the majority population. It has repeatedly been pointed out that discourse on national identity tends to overlook the extent to which these labels of identity are important to the majority population, and Nandi and Platt’s systematic study of British identification across ethno-religious groups in the UK revealed that country specific (England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland) identifications were endorsed by half of the majority ‘native’ population, rather than the shared ‘British’ national identity. The researchers therefore concluded that “the “national story” may not be one that, for the population as a whole, is linked to a common sense of Britishness” (ibid. 43). Yet, the belief that people of a migrant background threaten this national story is widespread across several countries in the West. Chapter 8 will look into the discursive construction of ‘national identity’, what it entails, and how it is made relevant within this study.

People who are identified as being members of ‘ethnic minorities’ are often assumed to have conflicting feelings and allegiances towards the nation they live in. Popular discourse in the UK has adopted a fearful belief that there are growing numbers of people, especially Muslims, who live in the UK, but “do not think of themselves as British, have no aspiration to do so and do not want their children to do so either”
(Manning & Roy 2007). This fear of ‘little enclaves’ or ‘ghettos’ of Muslims in particular is also widespread in the rest of Europe. Studies investigating if there are any statistical claims for these assumptions have found no evidence that would make Muslims stand out in any way when it comes to national identity (ibid). Studies have, on the contrary, found that minorities expressed strong British identities, and that this increases over generations (e.g. Nandi & Platt 2013). Respondents were asked the following question: “Most people who live in the UK may think of themselves as being British in some way. On a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means ‘not at all important’ and 10 means ‘extremely important’, how important is being British to you?” (ibid: 11), and it is important to acknowledge that while the responses were skewed towards the higher end of the scale, they were also distributed across the range of possible answers. This may well reflect the difficulty of replying to such a question. How does one ask about belonging? In what terms can ‘national identity’ be studied? The following section will present some previous ways of studying these questions, and discuss the problems they entail.

1.3.3 ‘Where do you feel you belong?’ – Problematic questions and starting points

The complexities and challenges of studying identities have been widely recognised in recent research, for example within the development of sociolinguistics since the mid-twentieth century. Despite these important advances, it is necessary to include in a discussion of previous research some problems that seem to be sufficiently common, and certainly sufficiently important, to require some attention. When it comes to studies of ‘second generation identifications’, the importance of ‘ethnicity’ has been at the heart of many queries. Portes and Rumbaut (2001: 151) argue that “[p]eople whose ethnic, racial or other social markers place them in a minority status in their group or community are more likely to be self-conscious of those characteristics”. Taking into consideration the point that elements such as ‘ethnic’ or ‘racial’ markers are socially constructed, I agree with their assumption. However, a problematic tendency in many studies is to treat ‘ethnicity’ as an a priori category, i.e. taking a particular ‘group’ as their starting point. For example, Sabatier (2008: 191), in studying the role of social context and family for ethnic and national
identity among second-generation immigrants in France, defines the participants in the study as being “from five ethnic groups, Algerians, Antilleans, Moroccans, Portuguese and Vietnamese”. This practice of assuming the borders of ‘ethnic groups’ has been criticised previously (see e.g. Aly 2015: 6), yet appears to remain a comfortable starting point in many studies, which also seem to use concepts such as ‘community’ without sufficient caution.

Secondly, the questions by which identity is approached in academic research need to be critically reviewed. The respondents in the CILS study were asked to respond to the question “How do you identify, that is, what do you call yourself?” (Portes & Rumbaut 2001). Similarly, Haikkola (2010), in a study of the ‘second generation’ in Finland, asked her participants “What nationality do you feel you have?” (my translation from Finnish, “Minkä maalaisiksi te tunnette itsenne?”). While these inquiries are likely to yield interesting responses, they are problematic in the sense that they seem to embed an implicit expectation of identification as singular and definite, and may exaggerate the significance of national identity above other identities, for example regional ones. These questions need to be seen as highly context-dependent, and the responses are likely to vary depending on who is asking, when, and for what purpose. Portes and Rumbaut remark on the changes in responses in their samples from 1992 and 1995/6, but it might be worth asking whether the answers would consistently be the same even during the same day.

Another example of ambiguity in data collection can be found in the statements by which Sabatier (2008: 198) examines alignment with the parents’ backgrounds vis-à-vis the dominant surrounding society. The respondents were asked to mark their opinion on a five-point Likert scale on the statements ‘I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group’, and ‘Being a member of French society is important for me’. What does it mean to have a ‘strong sense of belonging’ to a group, or to be ‘a member of French society’? Who decides what the respondent considers as ‘their own ethnic group’? While there might be a vague consensus of the general understandings of these questions based on ‘common sense’ assumptions of ethnicity, identity and belonging, it is important that research does not reiterate these assumptions uncritically. Moreover, it is somewhat alarming to see research that in itself contributes to essentialising identity, like Sohrabi (1997: 51) in his justification of choosing teenagers as his target group in looking at identity: “at the start of adolescence, the second-
generation immigrants feel the need to acquire a true identity”. While this sentiment might also be expressed in everyday discourse, the idea of a quest for a ‘true identity’ fits poorly in contemporary social research.

These mentioned problems have highlighted some challenges related to the collection of data on questions of identity and identifications. The methodological shortcomings must also be taken into account when reading the findings of such studies. What do their results actually reveal, and how valid are they? This question arises particularly when ‘identity’ and ‘ethnicity’ are studied quantitatively. It seems difficult to move away from the underlying assumptions of ‘one-ness’ of identity and belonging (as well as attachment to language). Even when attempts have been made in social research to overcome simplistic categories, these ‘common sense’ assumptions appear to be so deeply engrained that they are difficult to avoid.

1.4 Individual voices, collective stories

The sections above have described how questions of identity in the ‘second generation’ have been related to particular dilemmas that seem to have formed a kind of dominant narrative (cf. K. Hall 2002: 2) against which many studies have been conducted. These questions of living ‘between two cultures’, as well as an expectation that they should demonstrate a sense of ‘belonging’ (and, on the other hand, the assumption that they do not belong, or are excluded from belonging), are embedded in the starting points of many studies on the topic. To some extent, this is also the case in studies on what happens to language after migration. If a language is viewed and presented as a symbol of ‘heritage’ or ‘identity’ in an a priori sense, the findings will inevitably contain similar problems.

The criticism of the design of and questions asked in some previous research has to do with the understanding of social categories and their application in social research. Categories may be seen as “part of the social landscape as forms of discourse and practice”, which “enter the social field as primary units of social representation and social organization”, however fixed to their spatial and temporal contexts and the power relations that are at play (Anthias 2012: 8). Sealey and Carter (2004: 108) remind researchers in applied linguistics about the importance of theorisation regarding the categories that they employ in research on
language and identity, and point to the problems in trying to find ‘independent’ categories. They make a distinction between ‘social aggregates’ and ‘social collectives’ as a useful approach in thinking about identity categories. Social aggregates are features that can be linked to create a sense of ‘groupness’, for example the poor, the unemployed, or women over the age of fifty. These categories do not imply a shared culture, shared norms or conventions, but are the “only common feature (...) identified as salient by whoever is employing the category” (ibid: 110). This kind of ‘membership’ or connection to a social aggregate is not necessarily voluntary or an expressive of identity, but there might be constraints on people’s agency in identifying otherwise. Social collectives, on the other hand, are groups that imply “awareness of and commitment to conventions that constitute the group” (ibid: 111), for example that of marriage. Being positioned as a wife or a husband entails having complied with a set of norms in order to enter that category. Even if the analytical aspects and dilemmas of categories may not be reflected much in everyday life, they have a bearing on research and in the validity of design, analysis and consequent conclusions, and therefore they need to be given thought in the research process.

What this entails in practice is that researchers need to justify their use of categories throughout the research process. There are several examples of studies that address similar questions as this thesis, in a thoughtful and detailed way. Most of them are based on in-depth fieldwork, observations as well as interviews, and over extended periods of time. These studies have looked at the complex of negotiation of identities in situated practice, among adults of Finnish descent in Sweden (Weckström 2011), adolescents of South Asian descent in London (Harris 2006), Sikh youth in Northern England (K. Hall 2002), and ‘Arabs’ in different London settings (Aly 2015), using theories that focus on the performative character of the everyday display of identities. Through extensive fieldwork or repeated interviews, they have been able to follow individuals through processes of ‘becoming’ and thus looked at performances of different identity categories. They address the histories of migration and the representations of migrants in the receiving countries, thereby contextualizing the everyday actions of people in relation to local and global questions. The studies recognize the creative potential that people have in presenting and performing their selves, but also locate these practices within structures of norms and expectations. What the
studies share are an interest and care for the fine-grained details, and their links to discourses that eventually span over the entire globe. They will be referred to in the chapters of analysis, as studies with partly different designs, for example when it comes to the definitions of ‘second generation’ or the age group in question, but that are nevertheless interesting comparisons. The common denominator in these studies is thus a strong focus on the individual voices, in combination with attention to the larger stories of which they are part.

It may be claimed that we are living in a time in which the individual’s story is highlighted and celebrated – through reality TV, YouTube celebrities, blogs and literary biographies, individual stories attract attention and admiration, and send a message that everyone’s story is important. People strive for uniqueness, but this uniqueness is always constructed from commonality as well as difference. Simultaneously with the discourses of uniqueness, tendencies of interpreting similarity persist, especially when it comes to immigrants, or other groups that are discursively constructed as ‘Them’, as opposed to ‘Us’. Muslims collectively apologising for attacks are examples of how collective identity is assumed even by people who are disadvantaged by it.

Apart from the studies mentioned in the previous sections, the ‘second generation’ has been studied in fields such as transnationalism studies, diaspora studies, youth research, and within theories of cultural hybridity. While these areas certainly are interesting, they fall outside the scope of this study. On the other hand, the work on this thesis was greatly influenced by fictional (and non-fictional) works by authors such as Marjaneh Bakhtiari, Jonas Hassen Khemiri, Athena Farroukhzad and Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. The works of these authors deal with questions of belonging in contexts that involve immigration, and contribute to challenging the dominant, simplistic narratives by offering more nuances and complex ones. Their works informed the preparation of the interview questions, and highlighted problematic everyday instances that may be seen as a result of essentialising identities or simplifying ‘ethnicity’, ‘culture’ and ‘nationhood’. Adrian Perera’s (2017) book is the first of its kind in the Swedish-speaking context in Finland, and addresses similar timely questions.
1.5 This study

1.5.1 My interest in multilingualism, language and belonging

Questions of multilingualism are, as has been shown, much-debated topics that affect the lives of many. At a personal level, the interest that led to the undertaking of this kind of study has its roots in a genuine interest in people and their stories, as well as a fascination with everyday constellations of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ and the borders that are drawn between these. As I grew up as a mainly Finnish-speaking child in an area where the Swedish language was not only the most widely spoken language, but also viewed as the single strongest marker of local identity, my personal experiences and reflections on them have contributed to this interest. Through primary education in a Swedish-medium school, I came to position myself as a very conscious Finland-Swede. In the context of this small, rural and seemingly ‘ethnically homogeneous’ area, the role of language was emphasised as the main marker of difference, even with growing numbers of bilingual families such as mine. Gradually, the Swedish language became the language my sister and I spoke to each other, and the Finnish language slipped to the side. The sense of a community – albeit an ‘imagined community’ – among the Swedish-speaking minority has been a significant social safety net in my life, and the spirit of minority identity an important point of collective belonging. Only as an adult, and especially after spending longer periods of time outside of Finland, has my relation to the Finnish language again approximated that of my childhood, and I have come to position myself as both ‘Finland-Swede’ and ‘Finnish’, depending on context.

Questions to do with linguistic identity have thus for me often been emotionally loaded. My experiences of how language can be employed to signal belonging in powerful, complex and affective ways have instilled in me a great curiosity about and interest in questions regarding multilingualism in other contexts. My emotions have contributed to my interest in researching these questions, however with adequate analytical distance. Many of the initial presumptions and hypotheses that influenced the questions I asked the participants related to my own experiences - rather naively, I started out thinking that I knew what it was like to be a bilingual. During the course of fieldwork, I quickly became aware of the
many intertwined elements that characterise bilingual lives in different contexts. It is my hope that this study will reflect the complexity that the concept inhabits. My own positioning throughout the research process will be discussed in Chapter 3 on methods and materials.

1.5.2 Research questions

As explained earlier in this chapter, the original curiosity in this study was about questions to do with language and identity among people growing up in a country to which their parents migrated. The research questions for any study are likely to change slightly during the process, and this study is no exception. From this general area of interest, the main questions that guided the interview process and the analysis became the following:

- What happens to language in the generation born after migration?
  - How do people whose parents migrated talk about language in their lives?
  - What roles are attributed to languages in their life stories?
- What identity positions are created in interview talk about language and life stories?

1.5.3 Aim and scope

Questions to do with identity and language are by their nature open-ended and complex. This study sets out to examine how these questions are talked about, and what kinds of identity negotiations take place, in interview data with twelve participants. It draws on theoretical frameworks from mainly ethnography and positioning, and foregrounds the role of language in negotiating identities. It recognises that identities are also negotiated and displayed through various other social practices that fall outside the scope of this study.

There is not yet much research on the adult ‘second generation’ in any of the three national contexts in focus in this thesis. There is, however, a large volume of studies of multilingualism among ‘second’ and subsequent generation children and adolescents. The focus in previous research has mainly been on actual language practices, and the existing
literature acted as an inspiration in this study which aims to find out what beliefs speakers associate with ‘their languages’ and the ways in which they use them. Questions of language and identity have been studied with similar premises of looking beyond ‘communities’ of preconceived ‘ethnic groups’, for example within research on multilingual practices (see e.g. Lehtonen 2015, Blackledge & Creese 2010, Rampton 1995 among many others). The contributions in Martikainen & Haikkola (2010) on migration and generations give important insights into different aspects of the lives of immigrants to Finland.

Previous research from other contexts has demonstrated that a language shift towards the dominant language in society generally occurs within three generations after migration. However, issues to do with language use and attitudes, as well as language maintenance or shift, are expected to be highly dependent of their contexts, and no study has looked specifically at views of individuals in the ‘second generation’ in the contexts that this study focuses on. The study takes special interest in how people relate to these ‘migrated’ languages, which will here collectively be referred to as ‘heritage languages’. In the British context, these languages are often referred to as ‘community languages’, and in Sweden and Finland as ‘home languages’, which relate them to certain places in which they are assumed to be used. The use of the term ‘heritage language’ is not intended to suggest that these languages are automatically inherited, but to reflect the link between generations.

The concept of ‘identity’ has been questioned in much social research in the past decades, and has been described as ‘operating under erasure’ (Hall 1996). While the traditional, essentialist views of personal identity are widely recognised as faulty, the concept remains one that yields much interest both in academia and beyond. With the criticism of previous understandings of ‘identity’ in social research, and the seeming failure in popular discourse to move forward from essentialist views, what is the need for the study of the concept of identity? Can studies such as this one do more than highlight already recognised issues of inclusion and exclusion? Can they avoid the risk of distinguishing certain individuals as ‘different’ and of accentuating the very concepts they are critical of, such as the label of ‘second-generation immigrants’?

Identities continue to be claimed, cultivated, protected, fought over, celebrated, made impossible, ascribed and denied, and they continue to be perceived and presented as important by individuals in everyday life. This
is why there is also a continued need to study how they are created, negotiated and played out, and to carefully explore the processes through which belonging is regulated and negotiated. Moreover, with the current number of asylum seekers in Europe, it will soon be increasingly common for European adolescents to have parents who grew up somewhere else, and spoke languages that were not previously associated with Europe. This makes these questions particularly worthwhile to study. It seems as if ‘identity’ is still a concept to which much meaning is attributed, and this meaning needs to be analytically disentangled. This is what this thesis hopes to do.

1.5.4 Organisation of the thesis

This thesis has begun with an overview of some problematic starting points when it comes to the ‘immigrant second generation’. The next chapter will introduce the theoretical and methodological starting points by reviewing the main theoretical views of identity on which this study is based, as well as their methodological implications. Chapter 3 will further describe the particular interview techniques that were used in the data collection, and introduce the twelve participants who are at the centre of this thesis. The discussions of methodology will include reflections on ethical considerations as well as on my role as the researcher. Chapter 4 will discuss the history of immigration to the three contexts in which the interviews were made, and the views of multilingualism and identity presented in the interviews conducted in the respective cities.

The analysis will be divided into five chapters: the first part, Chapter 5, will focus on positioning in the re-told migration stories, i.e. what the participants tell about their parents’ migration journeys. Chapters 6 and 7 will analyse talk about language use, and the roles attributes to language in life stories. Chapter 8 will take a closer look at negotiations of the boundaries of cultural identities, and Chapter 9 at participants’ stories of situations in which they have been ascribed the identity of ‘Other’. The final chapter will draw together the analysis in a concluding discussion that links it to wider phenomena.
Chapter 2: Theoretical and methodological starting points

The overview of previous studies of identity and belonging among children of immigrants underlined the importance of reflecting on the starting points on which such a study is based. This chapter will specify the theoretical assumptions of identity and language that guide the present study, and thus situate it in the larger research field. I will first introduce the view of knowledge and its construction that this thesis is built on, and present how this study will approach the concept of identity. Positioning will be discussed from two main perspectives: firstly, positioning in interaction and stories, and secondly, positioning in relation to multilingualism and language ideologies. Finally, the chapter will discuss as what implications the theoretical stating points have for the choice of methods and materials.

2.1 An ethnographic approach to knowledge

This study sets out to look at individual accounts of a micro-scale of social life, in order to draw attention to larger structures and phenomena. Its aim is to explore in detail some contemporary questions by linking empirical data to theoretical frames. In everyday life, the complexities of the phenomena at hand are often left unquestioned. These kinds of standpoints lie at the heart of ethnographic research (see e.g. Copland & Creese 2015, Blommaert & Jie 2010, Denscombe 2010, Hammersley & Atkinson 1995), which acts as the foundation for the design of this study.

Ethnographic research, widely used today in different areas of social research, has its roots in the field of anthropology. It involves an aim to obtain an emic, ‘inside’ view of locally situated practices, most often through spending a considerable amount of time in a setting, sharing a part of everyday life with those studied, and collecting different kinds of materials such as field notes, recordings, as well as documents and material objects (see e.g. Denscombe 2010). Approaches in linguistic research employing an ethnographic approach have flourished under the name of ‘linguistic anthropology’ in North America, while in the British context developments of a similar kind have come to be known as
‘linguistic ethnography’ (Copland & Creese 2015). Both are fora for research that combines linguistics with perspectives from ethnographic research, and imply an interdisciplinary view of social phenomena. The present study has been carried out largely outside both of these contexts, yet has been influenced by the advances in linguistic ethnography, and embraces its character as a situated and interpretive methodology, with a “democratic approach to participation and interpretation of local perspectives” (Copland & Creese 2015).

An ethnographic approach to research, moreover, consists of more than its methods. It is characterised by a view of knowledge as constructed; a view that relates to theoretical perspectives as much as methods. In line with this view, the process of knowledge construction is seen as the product (Blommaert & Jie 2010: 10). This has implications for the role of the researcher, who is seen as a co-participant in the construction of knowledge (Briggs 1986: 25). This, in turn, means that social research can never be carried out ‘anonymously’, without being affected by the surrounding context and the life and identity of the researcher (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 16). ‘We are part of the social world we study’ (ibid. 21), and our knowledge and beliefs influence how we make sense of what we observe (Denscombe 2010: 86). A democratic approach to participation, mentioned above, also entails seeing the people who take part in the study as participants, rather than informants whose task is to provide the researcher with specific information.

This study begins from an interest in people’s views and in how they make sense of different components of their lives. It is based on in-depth interviews that took place over a more or less extended period of time in the places where the participants were living. Although the interviews are accompanied by field notes and some observations around the interview situation, the study does not follow the method of participant observation characteristic of ethnography. Respecting that interviews alone do not make ethnography, I am nevertheless persuaded by the views on reality and knowledge presented through previous decades of ethnographic research, which has acted as a foundation, as well as guided the process of this research project. Since much of what is considered social behaviour is performed without major reflection and may be difficult to explain in words (Blommaert & Jie 2010), it would be interesting to see how the views expressed in the interviews are manifested in everyday life. But that would be a different study. As the aim, in line with an ethnographic
understanding of knowledge construction, is not to find out an objective ‘truth’, but to observe phenomena that are displayed in a particular instance of social interaction, interviews are taken to be appropriate means for collecting data for this purpose. Furthermore, the study focuses on the narrative accounts and the process within which they took place. It embraces a view of interviews as collaborative activities, and pays close attention to the fine details in order to present a holistic picture that highlights the complexity inherent in studying matters such as identity.

When knowledge is viewed as constructed and as dependent on the context and participants, including the researcher, it does not mean that the findings cannot be seen as representing social phenomena (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 18). By following the empirical data and presenting it in the light of relevant theory, the data become ‘cases of larger categories’ (Blommaert & Jie 2010: 12) and the study a representation of wider social structures. The following section will present the main framework within which I conceptualise identity, and of language in relation to identity.

### 2.2 Positioning in interaction

Identity, who one is in the world, is recognised as a complex compound of factors, including biological, genetic, psychological and social ones. The purpose of studies such as this is not to try to pin it down. In fact, any attempt at doing so would inevitably fall short. However, one way of examining an aspect of identity – arguably a central one – is to focus on positioning in verbal interaction. This section is divided into three main parts in order to present three related aspects of positioning: what it means in the present context, how it relates to narratives and discourse, as well as to studying multilingualism.

#### 2.2.1 Positioning self and others

The understanding of positioning in this study draws on ideas from positioning theory (Davies & Harré 1990, 1999; Harré & van Langenhove 1999), positioning analysis (Bamberg 1997), as well as related research on identities in narratives and in multilingual contexts. Positioning theory
aims at accounting for “the ephemeral conditions that matter so much in social life” (Harré & van Langenhove 1999: 2), i.e. the passing moments in everyday interactions in which identities are seen as emerging. With its origins in discursive psychology, it defines ‘position’ as “a metaphorical concept to which a person’s ‘moral’ and personal attributes as a speaker are compendiously collected” (Davies & Harré 1999: 17). In social interaction, positioning is inevitable, although not always intentional – participants in a conversation always position each other, and simultaneously themselves. It is relational, because for somebody to be positioned as for example powerful, others must be positioned as powerless (Harré & van Langenhove 1999, van Langenhove & Harré 1999). Positions may emerge ‘naturally’ in the course of the interaction, or as imposed consequences to previous positionings (Davies & Harré 1999). Identity is, in other words, not seen as a stable or fixed end product, but as “an open question depending upon the positions made available within one’s own and others’ discursive practices” (Davies & Harré 1990: 4).

Through everyday acts of positioning, human beings appear both as singular, displaying a personal identity, and as ‘instances of types’, associated with social identities (van Langenhove & Harré 1999: 24). The development of a sense of self in terms of social identity includes learning about categories or roles, such as male/female, father/daughter, student/teacher etc. and taking part in discursive practices that give them meaning. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985: 208) remark that terms are not used in identical ways by different people, but that ‘meaning is always to some extent idiosyncratic’. In their work Acts of Identity, they put forward the argument that “[t]he individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or the groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished” (ibid: 181). In other words, individuals imagine themselves and others as belonging to certain categories and not to others, and display this belonging through various linguistic and extra-linguistic acts. The categories are associated with morals and values, and with a sense of having the characteristics to identify with and be identified as belonging to categories and their subclasses (Davies & Harré 1990, 1999). Cultural stereotypes, central in national and ethnic categories of belonging, are likewise rhetorical devices, positionings that people draw on and make use of in everyday discourse. Rather than being pre-existing mental entities, they are
‘generalised expectations’, and their meanings are open to change as the discourses around them change (van Langenhove & Harré 1999b). Individuals can be members of a wide range of social groups, and thus have access to a spectrum of positions to draw on in composing their multiple identities (cf. Wodak et al 2009). Previous studies (see e.g. Block 2007) have examined questions of second language identities in for example migration and study abroad contexts, and pointed out that these identifications are inseparable from other markers of social groups.

While positioning theory emphasises the agency and choices of individuals when it comes to practices of positioning self and others, it also recognises the constitutive power of discourse. Discourse is here understood as “an institutionalized use of language and language-like sign systems” (Davies & Harré 1990: 47), occurring at different levels, from the smallest level of everyday interaction, to the political and cultural. Discourses may also develop around topics, such as gender, class, or ethnicity. Discourses, as well as institutional practices, may restrict what positions are available for people at a given time. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 21) propose a framework that distinguishes between imposed, assumed and negotiable identities. Imposed identities are identities that cannot be contested or resisted at a particular time. Examples mentioned by the authors is the identification of Jews in Nazi Germany, as well as immigrants to the US in the early twentieth century, who were coerced to change their names. Assumed identities, on the other hand, are accepted and often the valued and legitimised ‘common sense’ assumptions in dominant discourse. These are related to perceptions of norms, such as that of monolingual speakers of the dominant language, and are usually accepted without questioning. Negotiable identities are positions that may be, and often are, contested and resisted, such as ethnicity or national identity which are relevant in this thesis. These three categories are dependent on their contexts, and the same identity claims can be imposed, assumed or negotiable for different individuals or groups, or even the same individuals or groups but in a different situation.

Harré (2015) claims that positions are embedded in the story lines in which the speakers are engaged. Therefore, the rights and duties associated with a particular position “are what they are because a certain story is unfolding” (Positioning Theory Symposium, YouTube). This study takes discourses to be recognised story lines, in relation to which individuals position themselves. Positioning theory has always been
linked to narratology, as the jointly constructed story lines were seen as the location in which positioning takes place (Davies & Harré 1990). Its link to narrative analysis was, however, developed by Bamberg (1997), who proposed a model for examining positioning at three levels: at the level of what is reported, in relation to the audience, and in a larger context beyond the local conversation. This model, and its implications for the analysis in this study, will be examined in more detail in Section 3.3 on methodological starting points. Bamberg’s contributions, however, will be discussed next in a section looking at narratives as sites for examination of identity positioning.

2.2.2 Positioning in stories

The past fifty years have seen a rapid increase in studies of narrative to examine social life in ways that positivist methods could not sufficiently capture. This ‘narrative turn’, influenced greatly by the contributions of Labov and Waletzky (1967) on the components of narrative structure, has gained ground within a number of disciplines, including anthropology, history, cultural studies, medicine, law, psychology and sociology (see e.g. Bamberg 2007, Riessman 1993), creating a diverse field of narrative research, with several directions and traditions. The view embraced in this study involves an understanding of narrative, like any form of talk, as a forum for expressing, creating and maintaining certain identity positions in the specific context in which the narrative is told (e.g. Bamberg 1997, Ochs & Capps 1996, De Fina 2003). Narratives should therefore not be interpreted as mirroring factual past events; instead, what is interesting is how characters, events and actions are brought to life at the moment of telling (Bamberg 1997, Riessman 1993, De Fina 2003). In telling a story, speakers can assign themselves and others roles and characteristics, and impose a sense of order and unity on the “natural incoherence and discontinuity of the unruly everyday” (Bamberg, De Fina & Schiffrin 2007: 5).

Narrative studies of identity have largely focused on autobiographical stories, where the speaker can make relevant and evaluate aspects of selves in the past, present and potential future. This is referred to as a “doubling of roles”, as the narrator can play the part of both the teller of the story, and a character within it (Wortham 2001: 13). Several studies (e.g. Boydell et al 2000, Wortham & Gadsden 2006, Castillo Ayometzi 2007,
Simpson 2011) demonstrate how telling a story about one’s life can foreground different aspects of identity, allowing the teller to exercise their agency when it comes to how they would like to be perceived by the hearer. Often, these stories relate to a challenge in the environment, for example what it is like to be homeless (Boydell et al 2000), a young father in a lower-class urban setting (Wortham & Gadsden 2006), a Mexican undocumented migrant in the United States (Castillo Ayometzi 2007), or an immigrant learner in an ESOL context (Simpson 2015). As the tellers of their stories, the speakers can present themselves in a more nuanced way, for example as different and better kinds of homeless people, as responsible and decent fathers despite challenging circumstances, or foreground certain elements of their identification. It is thus in the contrast between the self as a teller and the self as a story character that the doubling of roles, and hence the foregrounded values, becomes apparent. The story thus gives opportunities for the teller to present themselves in what they see as more desirable terms at the moment of telling.

The heavy reliance on elicited stories of lived experience has, however, also been criticised in recent research. While the study of narratives provided means for an examination of identity in an anti-positivist and de-essentialising manner, the frequent applications of Labov and Waletzky’s model and the privileging of narrative data have been claimed to lead to “a tradition of idealization, essentialization and homogenization of narrative” (Georgakopoulou 2007: 3), as well as “presuppositions on what constitutes a story, a good story, a story worth analyzing” (De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008: 380). These reactions and observations on the inadequacies in previous narrative research have brought about the introduction of the concept of ‘small stories’ (see e.g. Georgakopoulou 2007, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008).

‘Small stories’ is intended as an umbrella term for a range of underrepresented stories in narrative research (Georgakopoulou 2007). The term mirrors the general character of these brief tellings, but also reflects their metaphorical character as “fleeting aspects of lived experience” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008: 379). These can be tellings of ongoing or hypothetical events, allusions to previous tellings, postponements of telling, or refusals to tell (ibid. 381). In narrative research focused on life stories – ‘big stories’ – they may be overlooked as poor data, and judged as not fulfilling the narrative criteria (Bamberg 2006). Yet, it is not only in elicited and reflected autobiographical tellings
that identities are negotiated, but, if not more importantly, at least more frequently, in these ephemeral instances of interaction.

The implications of the small story approach go beyond the actual form of the stories, and draw on a number of beliefs about the character of narratives. It sees narrative as a unit embedded in communication, whose structure emerges through joint constructions between participants (Georgakopoulou 2007). It unfolds “moment-by-moment in the here-and-now of interactions” (ibid. 4), and is thus firmly rooted in its local context. This approach, foregrounding the dialogic and relational character of narratives told in interaction, has been referred to as a “post-Labovian stance on narrative analysis” (Baynham 2010: 1).

In this study, although the material consists of elicited data, I share the views put forward in small story research on the relational and embedded character of narratives. These approaches will be employed most explicitly in Chapter 5, which examines how the participants recount their parents’ migration stories. While the data collection process aimed at finding out how the participants talk about their lives, including certain potential ‘landmark events’ (De Fina & Georgakopoulou 2012: 159), perspectives from small story research allow for a more holistic view of the data. This study thus recognises that stories take different shapes, and pays careful attention to the interaction as a whole. In line with De Fina and Perrino (2011), it moreover sees the dichotomy of ‘natural’ versus ‘elicited’ data as flawed. The next section will tie positioning and narrative together with recent research on multilingualism, looking at the story lines in the form of language ideologies in relation to which multilingual positioning practices occur.

### 2.3 Positioning and multilingualism

One of the starting points in this study is that positioning of identities at the level of local, every day interaction does not take place in isolation, but evolves in a co-constructive relation with larger ideologies. There are several definitions of ‘ideology’, and Woolard (1992) provides a useful overview of some main strands. What is most relevant for this study is the view of ideologies as created and maintained at several levels of society, such as the media, education, politics, the economy and the law, in a process through which certain ideas come to be seen as ‘common sense’
These ideas are not neutral, but serve to ‘sustain relations of domination’ (Gal 1989: 359) and the interests of particular groups or positions. Ideologies are thus collective phenomena that are often represented as universally true, and usually come to be viewed as the norm, even by those who are disadvantaged by them (Woolard 1998). Moreover, ideologies are not only produced through conscious and planned activities, but also in ‘unintentional reproduction of ‘determined’ meanings’ (Blommaert 2005: 174) by ordinary people through different kinds of practices in everyday life. When people position themselves and others in relation to discourses or story lines, they are simultaneously affected by ideology and contributing to giving ideologies their meanings and values.

### 2.3.1 Language ideologies

A most important starting point when it comes to language ideology is that ideologies that seem to be about language are rarely, if ever, about language alone (Woolard 1998). Rather, language represents a forum for several kinds of ideological struggles. Studies of language ideology thus bridge elements of linguistics and social theory (Woolard 1992). At any point in space and time, several language ideologies are operating in interconnection with each other. Weber (2009: 134) provides a useful list of some ideologies that are relevant to his study of multilingual Luxembourgish society, and also applicable to many other contexts. These include for example the social hierarchy of languages, the maintenance and privilege of the ‘standard language’, and the purist ideology of ‘good’ or ‘proper’ language. What constitutes a ‘language’ and how it is differentiated from a ‘dialect’ or a ‘variety’ are results of socio-political and ideological processes, as is the superior status of named languages, and of certain named languages in particular. As pointed out by Gal (2006: 14), ‘language’, in the form of nameable, countable, bounded and differing entities, was invented in Europe. While ‘languages’ in these fixed forms never existed, the ideas were circulated through colonialization to most parts of the world, and gained foothold in the processes of nation-building both in Europe and beyond. ‘Standard languages’ came to be constructed and viewed as common points of reference for people who supposedly belonged to the same ‘nation’, and were thus expected to share a common
collective identity. Languages therefore also became an element of justification of the nation’s raison d’être (e.g. Anderson 1981, Ellis 2006).

When it comes to purist ideologies of ‘ideal speech’, these norms are connected to ideas of both personal and collective identity. In other words, how a person speaks is viewed as reflecting what they are like and where they belong (Cameron 1995, Gal 1998, Woolard & Schieffelin 1994). The connotations to the speaker’s intellectual and moral characteristics reflect the different socio-political values associated with different kinds of speech. These values are not only symbolical, but may also have economic implications (e.g. Irvine 1988).

On his list of relevant ideologies, Weber further includes three interrelated ones: the one language-one nation ideology, the mother tongue ideology, and the “monolingualism as natural” ideology (Weber 2009: 134). What these share are a belief in ‘one-ness’ as the most natural and desirable state of things. These ideologies are presented as ancient, despite their fairly recent histories; Piller (2016: 28) notes that “[o]verlooking 3000 years of linguistic diversity is the result of a specific monolingual way of seeing”, dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the political pressure since those times to create unified nation-states out of linguistically and ethnically diverse peoples. Today, monolingualism is taken for granted; it is the ‘unmarked case’ against which bi/multilingualism is seen as the exception (Ellis 2006). Moreover, these ideologies are reflected also in the ways in which linguistic diversity is organised and talked about in modern nation-states: languages are named as national and official, as minority languages, regional languages, foreign languages and immigrant languages (Gal 2006). Especially in English-speaking nations, monolingual discourses also dominate educational and social policy. However, ‘monolingualism’ is in itself a myth – every speaker, as Ellis (2006: 175) points out, “has access to different registers, and thus has experience of social and linguistic variation”. This assumption is an important part of the theoretical basis of this study. The following section will look more closely at current perspectives on multilingualism, and explain how all language is inherently plural.
2.3.2 Theoretical perspectives on multilingualism

In the face of the monolingual ideal, bi/multilingualism has been, and in some circumstances remains, poorly valued, combatted, and denied, in policy and practice. In sociolinguistics, however, it has become almost like a banner of the field, and since the 1960s, researchers have put forward arguments for multilingualism as a positive phenomenon (Blommaert, Leppänen & Spotti 2012: 1). When it comes to multilingualism and identity positioning, the influential work around ‘code-switching’ (for an overview of main directions and works, see Heller 2007: 7-8) was ground-breaking in presenting multilingualism as a set of linguistic assets instead of a deficiency. The concept and its use have since been criticised, not least for the assumed direct relation between ‘code-switching’ and ‘switching’ between identity positions (see e.g. Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004).

In the past decade, a multitude of new terms have been introduced in an attempt to better describe the actual practices of multilingual communication. These terms include ‘polylanguaging’ (Jørgensen et al 2011), ‘translanguaging’ (García 2009), and ‘metrolingualism’ (Otsuji & Pennycook 2010). What these terms share is a view of language as socially constructed, an approach that includes a view of bilingualism as “only one perspective on a more complex set of practices which draw on linguistic resources which have been conventionally thought of as belonging to separate linguistic systems, because of our own dominant ideologies of language, but which may more fruitfully be understood as sets of resources called into play by social actors, under social and historical conditions” (Heller 2007: 15). This view thus disclaims the traditional perception of languages as linguistically determined systems, and underlines their character as socially, politically and historically constructed.

These new directions in multilingualism research are a promising move away from seeing components of bi/multilingual talk as automatically linked to certain identity positionings. Bailey (2007: 258) emphasises that “languages or codes can only be understood as distinct objects to the extent to which they are treated as such by social actors”, and hence, judgements about what is marked must be based on “the way social actors appear to distinguish among forms, rather than analysts’ a priori claims”. In this, he refers to Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of heteroglossia, which captures the inherent dialogicality of all forms of language. Bakhtin (1981:
291) describes language as “heteroglot from top to bottom”, and, through his analysis of dialogue in the novel, calls into question the concept of ‘monolingualism’. Suggesting that languages “do not exclude each other, but rather intersect with each other in many different ways” (ibid.), he refers to how ‘national languages’ co-exist with languages associated with different epochs, generations, occupations and ideologies, which all “encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people” (ibid: 292). Bakhtin’s ideas have been tremendously influential in sociolinguistic research in the past decades. Somewhat ironically, the majority of research drawing on the concept of heteroglossia examines talk in settings that are characterised as ‘multilingual’, and with data encompassing signs associated with different languages.

This study is informed by a view of language as inherently heteroglossic and as socially constructed. It looks at positioning both through the language, and of the languages, in the talk by the participants. The symbiotic relationship between practice and ideology implies a need to look both ways; as much as studies on practices need to keep ideology in mind, studies on ideology need to acknowledge current practices and how they are treated in lay and expert discourse. Blackledge and Creese (2010: 31) assert that researchers “are obliged to take account of what people believe about their languages, listen to how they make use of their available linguistic resources, and consider the effects of their language use – even where we believe these ‘languages’ to be inventions”. Similarly, social categories also appear as ‘real’ entities to many people in everyday life, and ‘ethnic groups’ are often taken to be self-evident and distinct (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 208). Research looking at how language and identity is talked about needs to bear this in mind, yet justify the use of terms at an analytical level (cf. Sealey & Carter 2004).

2.4 Methodological starting points

The previous sections have presented theoretical starting points that draw on previous research of positioning, narratives and multilingualism. While the methods used for this study will be presented in the following chapter, I will here include a discussion of the research interview in the light of the theoretical frameworks embraced in this thesis. In this section, I will outline a view of interviews as co-constructed interactional events,
which are both different from and similar to other kinds of conversations. In line with the theoretical starting points, the section will explain how the interviewer and interviewee both position themselves and each other throughout an interview conversation. The research interview has long been a prioritised method of collecting data in the social sciences. Interview data is, however, also at times regarded as inferior to recordings and observations of spontaneously occurring talk and situations. This paradox relates to a number of assumptions of what an interview is, and what constitutes a successful example. These questions will be discussed next.

The research interview is a particular kind of conversation; although it may look strikingly similar to an ordinary conversation, it is in fact something more than that (Denscombe 2010, Kvale 1997, Hammersley & Atkinson 1995). Interviews conducted for research purposes “involve a set of assumptions and understandings about the situation which are not normally associated with a casual conversation” (Denscombe 2010: 172-173). They are “special occasions” (Gillham 2000: 7), controlled and managed by the interviewer and characterised by a mutual understanding that what is said will be analysed as data in order to interpret and explain certain social phenomena (Denscombe 2010, Kvale 1997). As interviews are also used in, for example, journalism, and for purposes of employment or study, people likewise have certain expectations and assumptions of the character of an interview discussion.

At the same time, the interview is always a conversation between two (or more) persons, and thus involves aspects similar to any social interaction. Mishler (1986: 11) calls for recognition of the interview as a form of discourse; a verbal interaction rather than a verbal interchange. In other words, the interview is not to be seen as a stimulus-response pattern (ibid. 36), but as a “joint product of what interviewers and interviewees talk about together and how they talk to each other” (ibid. vii). Research using this method thus requires awareness of the linguistic and interactive aspects, social construction, and the relation between interviewer and interviewee in the context of the interview (Kvale 1997: 42). While the interview is structured around asking and answering questions, the answers are not ‘already there’ within the interviewee, waiting to be drawn out (Briggs 1986). In answering a question, the interviewee “connect[s] the question with some element(s) of a vast and dynamic range of responses” (ibid. 22). During the conversation, both interviewer
and interviewee are thus “constantly exchanging implicit messages as to how they perceive the speech event and how they want their utterances to be interpreted” (ibid. 108). In addition, while answering research questions is a central part of the situation, the participants simultaneously engage in other kinds of social action (Wortham et al 2011). In the context of this study, these actions may include (depending on the individual participant) for example negotiation of shared values and ideals, ‘teaching’ me as the listener about aspects of religion or cultural history, or convincing me about the positive aspects of a neighbourhood with a bad reputation. Interviews are embedded in other every day talk, and at the same time “afford tellability that may otherwise be restricted” (Modan & Shuman 2011: 14), i.e. give space for the participants to reflect upon matters and topics that may be taken for granted or silenced elsewhere.

The devaluation of the research interview and its comparison with ‘naturally occurring’ talk seems to be a remnant from positivist views on knowledge, and an idea of the interview data as detachable from the context and participants, thus viewed as ‘artificial’ in comparison to spontaneous, observed events (De Fina & Perrino 2011). Perhaps needless to say, the value and relevance of any research methods relate to the questions that are being examined, rather than the methods alone. In interview research, the ‘interviewer effect’, i.e. the ways in which the researcher’s identity shapes the data that is yielded through interviews, is important to account for, although it is not possible to determine exactly to what extent and in what ways the interviewer’s personal characteristics, and how the interviewee relates to them, influence what is said (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 141). Rather than minimising this effect or viewing it as a weakness, it needs to be seen as an integral part of the data. Blommaert & Jie (2010: 50) comment: “Nobody enters an interview situation as a blank page; as soon as you enter, you are someone”. Elements of the interviewer’s identity, such as age, gender, or nationality, and their intersections, carry associations that may work in favour or against the building of trust, and affect the kinds of things that the interviewee will disclose, depending on what the interviewee attaches to these elements as markers of identity (Denscombe 2010: 178). In Chapter 3 on methods of data collection, I will describe, in as much detail as possible, my role in the research process with each participant.

As mentioned, the research interview is here understood as a conversation between two or more people that is both ordinary and
extraordinary in character. Lumley & Brown (2005: 842), who write about interviews in a language testing context, describe interview discourse as “highly asymmetrical with respect to dominance, contingency, and goal orientation”, with “greater reactiveness on the part of the candidates and greater goal orientation on the part of the interviewers”. Chapter 3 will discuss the approach to interviews embraced in this study, and how these elements played a part in it. Certainly, the interview is controlled and managed by the interviewer, but as it is a joint and collaborative activity, its outcomes cannot be predicted. Gillham (2000: 2-3) states that as research is about creating new knowledge, “open-minded researchers cannot always be sure what direction it will take”. As the ‘objects’ that are studied are ‘subjects’ of their own (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 124), as is the researcher carrying out the study, interview research needs much flexibility and requires continuous negotiation of meaning-making in interaction. Even when an interview may be based on what looks like simple questions, there is always room for alternative interpretations by both parties in the interview (Mishler 1986).

Despite its popularity and frequent application in the social sciences, the research interview has for long kept a rather similar form, mainly centering on sets of questions. Other ways to encourage people to talk have, however, recently been proposed, and methods such as photo-elicitation have successfully been used in studies relating for example to social class, community, identity and culture (see e.g. Harper 2002). Yet the interview contains much unrealised potential. This study extends the research interview by using four different approaches, which will be presented in Chapter 3, which will also discuss the data analysis based on the theoretical starting points presented here. These methodological starting points, i.e. looking broadly at what constitutes a narrative, and focusing on the different levels in which the positioning takes place, allow for a detailed and in-depth analysis of the small-scale context of the particular stories, as well as their larger implications. Before moving on to a presentation of the data collection and the process of analysis, as well as to introducing the twelve participants, I will summarise the main ideas that this study is based on.
2.5 Chapter summary

The theoretical and methodological starting points that have been outlined above lend themselves to a study of identity as highly context-bound, dynamic and accomplished in interaction. An ethnographic view implies attending to the complexities of small instances of contextualised actions, which are studied with consideration both of details and their wider implications. In focusing on interactional positioning, it is essential to pay attention to the immediate as well as the extended context, in this case the interview situation with all its contextual elements, including the participants’ awareness that what they say will count as data for an academic study of language and identity. This further implies that I, as the interviewer, am present, even when silent, and that the conversations are joint products between us. Narratives, in whatever shape they take, are embedded in their contexts: by foregrounding actions or characteristics of self and others, comparing and contrasting, speakers negotiate their own identities and how they wish to be perceived. The negotiation takes place in and through language, which is viewed as inherently plural, and its meanings as continuously open to change. The positionings to be analysed in this thesis are firmly anchored in specific processes of data collection, which will be accounted for next.
Chapter 3 Methods and materials

The previous chapter presented the theoretical perspectives related to the research interview as a method for collecting data on identity positioning. In the present chapter, I will first describe and evaluate the methods of data collection, i.e. a four-step interview process. This will be followed by a presentation of the twelve participants, and some reflections on the data collection process with each of them. Next, I will describe the methods of data analysis, which builds on positioning analysis and is influenced by small story research. The chapter aims at detail and transparency in describing the different components of the process. Moreover, it will include an account of the ethical questions that were relevant in conducting the present study, as well as reflections on my role as researcher.

3.1 Methods of data collection: four kinds of interviews

The interview has, as mentioned, for decades been a favoured means of collecting data for social research. In line with an ethnographic approach to knowledge, described in Chapter 2, it is not only the transcribed interviews that are seen as data, but the whole process of interviewing. It is thus important to access information on the context in which the words were uttered and the stories were told, and about the people telling them and the person or people listening to them. In collecting the data for this study, I decided to use four different kinds of interviews. The process of data collection was influenced by conversations with friends (reporters and documentary makers) on innovative ways of eliciting stories. The techniques will be presented below. The data for the study comprises a total of approximately 36 hours of recorded conversations. A list of the length of the recordings with each participant is included as Appendix IV.
3.1.1 The photograph-based interviews

The first step of the data collection was the photograph-based interview, which had two main interconnected purposes: to allow the participants to choose what elements of their lives and identities they wished to make relevant at the beginning of the interview process, and thereby to level the power dynamics between me as the researcher/interviewer and the individuals as research participants. Photo-elicitation is seen as a technique that ‘enlarges the possibilities of conventional empirical research’ (Harper 2002: 13) by making it possible for the interviewee to ‘show rather than ‘tell’ aspects of their identity that might have otherwise remained hidden’ (Croghan et al 2008: 345). Its effects are thus not only additive to a conventional interview, and what counts as data are not the photographs alone. Rather, they become means of expanding the topics by including a visual element that the talk is attached to. Harper (2002:20) suggests that photo-elicitation is useful for ‘bridging the gap between the worlds or the researcher and the researched’, by together discussing the meaning of a photograph. In other words, the method affects both the kinds of data that are elicited, and the process through which the data collection happens.

The task that the participants were given was fairly simple in its format: I asked them to bring approximately ten photographs portraying something that is important to them. A similar approach was used by Croghan et al (2008) in their study on young people’s constructions of self through the relation between identity and consumer goods. The researchers viewed the photograph-based interviews as forms of self-accounting, where the photographs reflected the participants’ preferences and gave them scope to present more complex, ambiguous or contradictory versions of who they are. Similarly, my intention was that the participants would be able to influence how they wished to be introduced to me and to the research project. The practicalities of the process differed slightly between participants. All of them had fairly little time, approximately a week, to gather the photographs they wished to use. While some used a camera or phone to take new photographs, others brought along pictures that had been taken earlier. At the actual interview situation, I asked two introductory questions: ‘Was it difficult to choose the pictures?’, and ‘Did you have a strategy for choosing them?’. The purpose of these questions was to find out about the thinking behind the choices and
to see how participants had understood the task. The participants then had
the opportunity to choose in which order to present the pictures, and how
to present them through talk. Afterwards, I asked them whether they
associated any particular languages with the photographs they had just
shown.

Most participants brought their photographs to the interview, and
either gave me copies of their photographs or sent them to me by email
before or after the interview. Some forgot to send them afterwards, and
two participants (Khalid and Hülya) forgot to bring them to the actual
interviews. In those two cases, I only have their descriptions of what
photographs they had picked. Although this was unfortunate, I did not
see it as compromising the quality of the interview to any great extent, as
the focus was on the talk about the photographs rather than the physical
photographs as such. The photographs will also not be analysed
separately, but are seen as ways into talk and self-representation. Among
the pictures brought by the participants, family was clearly the most
common theme. Friends, hobbies, pets and significant places were also
portrayed in many participants’ pictures.

As mentioned, a part of the purpose of including the photograph-based
interview was to allow the participants to choose what aspects of
themselves they wished to talk about in the first interview. The task was
intentionally vague, but it can be expected that the information that the
participants received about the study beforehand affected how they
perceived it. The photograph-based interview nevertheless acted as a kind
of icebreaker into talking about life and identity. By asking the participants
to ‘show rather than ‘tell’ aspects of their identity’ (Croghan et al 2008:
345), I was able to see their worlds in ways that words alone would not
have allowed. It is important here to note that although my intention was
to give the participants a choice of what to present rather than jumping
straight into rather personal questions, it would be misleading to treat it
entirely as a strategy to ‘grant them choice’ – after all, the task was set by
me. Similarly, although the idea was for participants to be partly ‘in
charge’ of the interview situation by determining in what order the
photographs were presented and how much time should be spent on each
photograph, it would be misleading to claim that this completely levelled
the power relation. I was still the one with the recorder, and the one for
whose purposes the interview was recorded, and I have eventually chosen
what will be included and left out in the final product of the study.
During the interviews, I noticed that many participants automatically oriented towards me to lead the conversation, probably because of the common expectations on an interview situation. An effect of the photograph-based interview was, however, that I needed to respond spontaneously to whatever emerged in the discussion, as I normally did not see the photographs beforehand, and in the cases where I did, the photographs rarely had a meaning before being explained by the participants. In that sense, the participants were clearly the experts in the situation, whereas I needed to adapt to the situation while remaining in charge.

3.1.2 The life story interview

The second interview was described to the participants as a ‘life story interview’ and the list of questions that acted as a guideline for these interviews is included as Appendix II. The ‘life story’ is here understood as “a temporally discontinuous unit told over many occasions and altered to fit the specific occasions of speaking, as well as specific addressees, and to reflect changes in the speakers’ long-term situation, values, understanding, and (consequently) discursive practices” (Linde 1993: 51). In other words, how the participants’ lives were recounted depended on the particular situation: the stories were fixed in place and time, and told to me, a semi-familiar researcher for research purposes. The extracts from the life stories are thus documentations of ‘fleeting aspects’ of lived experience (cf. Harré & Van Langenhove 1998), captured at a particular moment of their lives.

Blommaert & Jie (2010) recommend organising the interview conversation around topics rather than questions, as the semi-structured interview is flexible when it comes to the order of questions and their formulation. Piloting the interview questions on somebody outside the research setting is normally recommended (see e.g. Gillham 2000). However, as it was rather difficult to find participants, especially in Turku where the data collection started, I did not want to lose any participants to piloting. Also, as the questions were targeted at specific experiences, piloting on somebody who did not meet the criteria did not seem purposeful. As every participant was interviewed several times, it was nevertheless possible to add questions during the process, and to leave out
questions that did not seem relevant any longer. In that sense, the set of questions came alive during the interview process.

The set of topics and questions was inspired by readings on multilingualism and language maintenance, as well as my own experiences of growing up in a bilingual family. Both point to childhood as an important time for shaping language practices, which is why many questions were targeted at that period of their lives. Questions about the future, on the other hand, brought to the surface interesting negotiation of values and attitudes. Moreover, the differences in age between the participants naturally affected how much talk there was about adulthood – some were only standing at the brink of it when the data was collected. The life story interview was generally the most fruitful for yielding what came to be seen as the most important and interesting data in the analysis.

3.1.3 The place-based interview

The interviews for this study were recorded in three different cities, but these cities were not seen as fixed entities, and will not be compared with each other as such. The initial idea behind the place-based interview was to get to know the settings (better) by walking in them together with the participants. The instructions that the participants were given was to choose a place that for them represented their Turku, Malmö or Birmingham respectively. This section will discuss the kinds of data that were yielded through the place-based interviews, and what it added to the data collection process as a whole.

Farah chose a walk through the city centre, and apart from a museum, she did not comment much on the space we walked through. Minh’s interview was made by the Aura river, which he described as a vein that links the city together. Imad picked his favourite café, which he said embraces all of his favourite things about Turku. Khalid and I walked through the neighbourhood where he was living, and where he had gone to school for some years. I was not familiar with this area, nor with the other neighbourhoods in which he had lived.

In Malmö, Susanna guided me through a ‘normal day’, from where she gets off the bus to work, where her son goes to school, and finally where she sometimes goes to the gym after work. Cemile showed her favourite places in the centre of Malmö, after which we walked to the part of the city where she lived. During the walk, we encountered many people that she
knew. Danny’s interview took place in the area where he lived, and of which he described himself ‘a kind of spokesperson’. Gabriela chose Folkets Park, a large park at the centre of Malmö, and the area around it. The walk ended at a place where she often met up with her sister.

Ewa’s interview took place at the university campus, where she spent a lot of time. Hülya chose the Botanical Garden of Birmingham, which she described as a peaceful place to come to. Laila, like Ewa, chose the campus, and the interview was recorded by a statue near the train station, which she said she remembered from when she first arrived in Birmingham. Randeep’s interview started at his workplace, and went through some of the historical buildings in Birmingham city centre to the Millennium Park, which had recently been renewed.

In practice, the place-based interviews looked very different depending on the participant and their interpretations, but what the interviews had in common was that they became good opportunities for returning to previously mentioned themes that I wanted to clarify or hear more about. Using probes to delve deeper into the topics and themes, listed as a ‘good practice’ for example by Denscombe (2010), was surprisingly difficult at the beginning of the data collection process, and it was at times agonizing in hindsight to note how I had changed the topic or asked another question instead of immediately following up on interesting things the participant had said. As the place-based interview generally followed soon after the life story interview, it was often possible to return to previous topics and ask follow-up questions, or to clarify topics that were particularly interesting.

Another characteristic of the place-based recordings was that they were in many ways more relaxed than the previous recordings. By this time, we had already established some kind of relation, which in many cases resembled a friendship. Nevertheless, identity positioning is of course a continuous process even between people who know each other, and the place-based interviews offered sometimes unexpected opportunities for positioning oneself as a certain kind of person. The following extract from the interview with Cemile in Malmö is a telling example of this. We were walking past a shop, when a homeless woman approached us and asked for change:
LADY ON THE STREET: excuse me I’m homeless [inaudible] could I have
CEMILE: actually I don’t have any money on me today
but if it were after my payday you could have met me I
hope we see each other another time (. ) thank you
byebye (. ) as you see Linda you can’t stop yourself you
really want to give even if it’s not always credible but
you can’t ignore it either (. ) because it exists

Here, Cemile replies to the woman who is asking for change, and tells her
that on a different day she would have given something. I as the
interviewer and the recorder attached to her jacket collar function as an
additional audience, and the short conversation with the woman thus
becomes a space in which Cemile has an opportunity to perform the values
that are important to her and that she has emphasized previously in the
interviews: meeting every person as an equal and being a good role model
for other people. Her explanation to me, framed by the opening comment
‘as you see, Linda’, adds information about her understanding of the
complexity of the matter (‘even if it’s not always credible’), and
summarises her standpoint (‘you can’t ignore it’). The place-based
interview with Cemile was exceptionally rich in encounters which
triggered practical display of values that Cemile wished to be connected
with, and these expressions felt very genuine to me.

3.1.4 The group interview

The purpose of the group interview was to find out how questions of
language and identity were talked about in the everyday lives of the
participants. I asked the key participants to bring at least one person (and
a maximum of three) whom they knew well enough to be comfortable to
share opinions with. The themes mainly centred on bi/multilingualism on
an individual and social level, and the list of statements is included as
Appendix III. The group interview was planned to resemble a focus group

3 KVINNA PÅ GATAN: ursäkta mej jag e uteliggare [ohört] skulle jag kunna få
CEMILE: jag har faktiskt inte på mej men hade det vart lönehelgdag hade du kunnat träffa
på mej hoppas vi ses en gång då (. ) tack hej (. ) som du ser Linda man kan inte hindra sej
man vill faktiskt också ge även om de inte är trovärdigt hela tiden men man kan väl inte
bara blunda för det heller (. ) för det finns ju
interview in that the participants were active in discussing certain topics, and my own role would be that of a listener. Sometimes, however, the participants invited me to take part by asking me to give my opinion, which I did, but only after they had discussed the statements.

Two participants (Cemile and Laila) were not interviewed as part of a group. They did not feel comfortable with asking their busy friends to participate, so they were asked the same statements/questions individually instead. Participants Danny and Gabriela knew each other and took part in the same group discussion.

In practice, the group interviews differed greatly from one another, and different statements became central in them. Eventually, I came to focus mainly on the statement ‘You can be Finnish/Swedish/British without speaking Finnish/Swedish/English’, as well as comments on present-day and future multilingualism in the three contexts. Extracts from the group interviews will also be included in Chapter 4, which introduces the three cities.

3.1.5 Discussion on the methods of data collection

The previous sections have described the different kinds of interviews, and, in particular, the kinds of data that were elicited through them. Moreover, I have argued that the broader range of methods influenced both the contents in the forms of data, and the power relation in the interview process. Why was it then important to think of the power relation, when, in all honesty, it may have gone unnoticed by the participants? In part, it was with considerations of the view of co-construction of knowledge in mind that I saw it as preferable. Shifting the power towards the participant being in control, especially in the photograph-based and the place-based interviews, aimed at establishing that they were not seen as ‘objects’, but as individuals who were not only co-participants, but also to some extent ‘co-managers’ of the study. Another reason was simply that I anticipated that it would be more enjoyable for the participants. In addition, the different techniques function as attempts at eroding the view of interviews as opposed to naturally occurring conversations, as they were by nature spontaneous and guided by topics raised by us as participants as well as whoever we happened to encounter.

Eventually, the life story interview, based on the most traditional model
of a semi-structured interview, was the one that yielded the majority of data to answer the first set of research questions. Nevertheless, they were all fruitful in capturing identity positioning across a range of contexts, and through topics that might not have been voiced had I merely used questions as prompts. The potential of the research interview naturally goes far beyond the kinds of interviews that were used in this study. Especially when it comes to identity research, it will be interesting to see the development of alternative forms of interviews and what they can contribute.

3.2 Participants

As mentioned, a total of twelve people were interviewed for this study. The criteria for taking part was that the participants should be at least 18 years old, born in Finland/Sweden/UK respectively or have migrated before the age of two, and that both of their parents had migrated to these countries. An additional hope was to find people of different backgrounds both when it comes to language, parents’ country of birth, age, occupation and education. Chapter 1 outlined the reasons for deliberately not restricting the criteria along any lines of ‘ethnicity’ as an a priori category. The aim was therefore to focus on generation as the determined element, and to see if there are similarities in the points of view despite the differing backgrounds. The ‘second generation’ is here defined as including those who were so young at the time of migration that they have no or little memory of life until that point. Three of the participants (Ewa, Imad and Danny) were born before their families migrated, and were six, eight and ten months old respectively at the time of migration. In practice, the participants were recruited through friends, as well as through extensive footwork and by contacting schools, organisations, sports teams, etc.

The presentations of the participants include a brief biographical outline with some comments on the interview process and aspects of the relationships between them as participants and me as the researcher and interviewer. Although it is certainly not my wish to ‘put them in boxes’, the following page will include a table for reference to facilitate the reader to remember who is who. The table includes the participants’ given name in the study, their age and the city they live in, their parents’ country of
origin and main language, as well as a note on the main language of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (alias)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Parents’ country of origin and language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>Iraq (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>Vietnam (Vietnamese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imad</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>Lebanon (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalid</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Turku</td>
<td>Somalia (Somali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Finland (Finnish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemile</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Turkey/Macedonia (Turkish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Iraq/Kurdistan (Kurdish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Chile (Spanish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Poland (Polish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hülya</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Turkey (Turkish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>India (Urdu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randeep</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>India (Punjabi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TURKU PARTICIPANTS

Farah was born in a town in Eastern Finland in 1994, and moved to Turku with her family at the age of four. She has three older brothers and a younger sister, and as her parents migrated from Iraq together with her paternal grandparents and uncles with their families, she has grown up with cousins who are of a similar age. At the time of the interviews, Farah was 18 years old. She was in her final year of school, and was living with her parents and her younger sister. She described herself as an active student: she was a member of the student council, and had tried ‘virtually every hobby at least once’. She dreamed about a career as a doctor, and was preparing for her entrance exams to Medical School. Farah also envisioned moving abroad, perhaps to Britain, which she had a great interest in.

Farah was the first participant to be interviewed for this study. I found her by contacting a local school in Turku, who gave me her contact details. As soon as I called her, she said she is ‘the kind of person who volunteers for this kind of things’. I first interviewed her in November 2012 for an assignment in a course on ethnographic fieldwork. The predetermined theme of the interview was Christmas. That interview acted as a kind of pilot interview, and is not included here. In the photograph-based interview, Farah talked about her home, her family and her interests, including school work (an essay on the meaning of liberty) which she seemed to excel in.

Farah’s role in shaping the process of data collection cannot be underestimated, and I feel extremely grateful for her contribution as the first participant in the study. When I was a new and slightly apprehensive doctoral student, her enthusiasm and helpfulness were invaluable. She booked a study room at her local library, and this is where the life story interview was recorded on two consecutive days in February 2013. The place-based interview was recorded in March 2013. As the data collection progressed, it became relevant to ask some further questions, so I interviewed Farah by phone in August 2013. Something in Farah reminded me of myself at the age of 18, which I also told her. We have stayed in touch and have met several times after the data collection.

***
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Minh was born in Turku in 1989. His parents and two older sisters had been among the first Vietnamese refugees to come to Finland in the late 1980s. At the time of the interviews, Minh was 23 years old and was studying at university and working in customer service jobs on the side. He was living with his mother and his younger sister. Minh described himself as impulsive, and used a metaphor of a bowl made of fragile glass, with a lot of contents that easily spill out all at once when triggered by something. Minh’s hobbies included hip hop dancing and teaching himself to play the piano. He seemed to have high educational aspirations and drive to be successful through commitment and hard work. These were reflected in the photographs he brought, for example an image of the staircase to campus, which he presented as a metaphoric picture of the perseverance that is required in order to develop and learn.

I found Minh through his sister, whose contact details I had been given by a mutual acquaintance. The first recording was made in February 2013 as a combination of the photograph elicitation and the life story interview. Minh’s busy schedule with his studies meant that there was a break until June 2013 before the following recording, a combination of the second half of the life story interview and the place-based interview. The group discussion was recorded in January 2014. Minh commented that his spontaneity and impulsiveness might make it difficult for him to remember commitments such as the scheduled interviews. At times, I worried that he would drop out of the study, but when the interviews took place, he was always fully engaged, open and sociable, and I felt like the things he said were extremely interesting data. I found Minh a very polite and sociable person, with thoughtful and well-communicated opinions.

***

Imad was born in Lebanon in 1990. He was eight months old when his family fled to Finland, and settled in Turku. The family contemplated moving back, but their plans were changed when a war broke out between Israel and Lebanon in 2006. They later bought a house there, but at the time of the interviews, several years had passed since Imad’s last visit. When the recordings were made, Imad was 22 years old and studying at university. He lived with his parents and his two younger brothers. He had recently become involved in politics and was very active in a political
youth organisation, which clearly had great importance in his life at that time.

Imad entered the study as a friend of a friend. The four recordings with him took place during four consecutive weeks in May 2013. Imad’s photographs were scanned from family albums, and thus the themes revolved largely around family and childhood, but also took up other aspects of identity, such as his early fascination with airplanes and technology. For the place-based interview, Imad suggested his favourite café, which also acted as the site for the group interview. Imad and his friends who took part in the group interview were active in a political youth organisation, and both in the individual interviews and the group interview, I sometimes had a feeling that they may have been quite aware of this affiliation when answering some of the questions. As Imad knew that I shared much of the same values, the political affiliation became an element of shared identification in the discussions. I found Imad slightly shy but kind and easy-going, and well-informed about social topics and phenomena.

***

Khalid was born in Turku in 1993. He is the second oldest child in a family with six children. At the time of the interviews, Khalid was 19 years old and was studying at a local vocational school to be a machinist. He lived with his mother and his younger siblings. When Khalid was approximately ten years old, the family moved to Egypt for a year. He has also spent several summers abroad, helping to supervise at his mother’s businesses in for example Ethiopia, Kenya and Egypt. He had spent most of his childhood and adolescence living in different parts of Turku.

I found Khalid through visiting a Somali-owned shop, where the owner knew Khalid’s father. This recruitment procedure made me slightly concerned that he had agreed out of a sense of obligation, but despite possibly being the participant who was least familiar with the concept of a doctoral thesis, he seemed rather open and happy to take part. The first interview took place at Khalid’s school, and was a combination of the photograph-based interview and a life story interview. As Khalid forgot to bring the photographs to the interview, I only have descriptions of what he photographed. Sports were a main theme in the photographs, as well as food and family. Tall and sporty, Khalid mentions not practicing sports as much as before, after an accident when he was thirteen and broke both
legs. My initial impression of Khalid was that he was quite quiet, but I quite soon came to realise that he might not be quiet, he might just not have very much to say on the questions that I had in mind. When the second interview took place, in the form of a walk through the area where Khalid was living, the interview included a lot of talk about Khalid’s area of study, a form of engineering that I knew nothing about. I found it important to talk about this although it was not relevant for the study, as I had a feeling that many of the questions I was asking were about issues that Khalid had not given much thought to previously, and I did not want him to feel inadequate. The group interview with Khalid was recorded in a park in the city centre in July 2013. I found Khalid a very sweet person, even if the conversations with him felt more structured and formal than with some of the other participants, perhaps due to us not sharing many common points of reference.

THE Malmö PARTICIPANTS

Susanna was born near Stockholm in 1962. Her parents and older brother had recently moved to Sweden for work. Susanna mentioned the summers spent in the Finnish countryside, and seeing the poverty but also experiencing carefree times of proximity to family and friends, as significant childhood memories. At the age of thirteen, Susanna got a part-time job as a cleaner at Arlanda airport together with her mother. This experience is portrayed as an important event in her life, as it introduced her to many different kinds of people and developed her social skills. In 1999, Susanna moved to Malmö, and at the time of the interviews, she was 51 years old and was working as an administrator. She had shared custody of her primary-school aged son.

Susanna was the first participant in Malmö, and I found her through a friend of a friend. I met her at her workplace in January 2013 to explain the research project and the data collection. The interviews were then recorded within four weeks in April 2013. The photograph-based interview and the life story interview were recorded at Susanna’s workplace, and she talked for more than an hour on each occasion, without much input from me. Susanna’s photographs mainly were centred on her everyday life with her son. In many of her stories, she came across as a caring and responsible person.
Susanna seemed to enjoy talking, and I found her stories very interesting to listen to. That I was from Finland, the country that her parents migrated from, was treated as a shared element of identification in the conversations, for example in references to perceptions of ‘Finnish traits of character’, such as being stubborn and not giving up, and amused knowledge about the stereotype of ‘Finnish people’ in Sweden ‘drinking too much alcohol and fighting with knives’. In the place-based interview, Susanna showed me around her Malmö through a walk around the places she sees on a typical week-day. The group interview with Susanna was the first group interview of the whole study. It took place in Susanna’s home, and she had invited two of her friends to join. Susanna served everyone sandwiches and tea, and the atmosphere was very welcoming and friendly. I felt that Susanna took a very caring approach towards me throughout my time in Malmö, perhaps because of our age difference and that I was new in the city, as well as perhaps because of my Finnish background. I much appreciated this kindness.

***

Cemile was born in Malmö in 1982. Her parents are both of Turkish-Macedonian background; her father grew up in Turkey, while her mother and paternal grandmother grew up in Macedonia and moved to Turkey at adult age. Cemile has four older half-siblings who lived in the same house as her when she was growing up. Cemile grew up in a diverse and underprivileged area in Malmö, and was very much attached to the place. At the time of the interviews, she was 30 years old and was working there as a youth worker. It was evident that she felt responsibility to be a good role model for the young people, and that this was a role she also took pleasure in. She had plans to study at university, but mentioned having a bit of a phobia for academia.

I found Cemile through her workplace. My intention was to interview one of the youth she was working with, but at the first visit it turned out that Cemile herself filled the criteria and was happy to take part. The photograph-based interview and the life story interview were recorded at her workplace. Cemile showed me photographs from her phone and from Facebook, and most of them were related to family (holidays and times with her nieces and nephews), as well as to the young people she worked with. The place-based interview took place through a walk around the city. As Cemile felt her friends and colleagues were too busy to take part
in the group interview, she was interviewed alone based on the same statements.

During all interviews, I noticed that Cemile was quite used to being interviewed by journalists, and might not have completely understood the difference between my interviews and journalistic interviews; for example, she commented on having been a bit incoherent and told me I can cut the interview later to make it flow better, which I explained was not necessary in this kind of interview. Between the three interviews with Cemile, I spent some time at her workplace, for example helping out in a power walking group that she was starting up. I found her a very considerate and friendly person who puts people at ease, and the times I spent at her workplace were an important part of my time in Malmö.

***

Danny was born in Kurdistan in Iraq in 1983. His parents had made the decision to flee just before he was born, and he arrived in Sweden at the age of ten months. The family moved around in search of job opportunities, before finally settling in the Stockholm area after his sister was born. They grew up in an area that Danny describes as very homogeneous, where he stood out and encountered bullying and racism. After finishing school, he moved to Malmö to study, and later moved to Canada, where he met his wife. They were living in a socio-economically disadvantaged area of Malmö, and Danny described himself as ‘pretty much a spokesperson’ for that area.

At the time of the interviews, Danny was 29 years old and was working as a substitute teacher and an aspiring writer and comedian. The English language and North American culture were central to his private and professional life, and was also reflected in the photographs he showed, for example one of Los Angeles as the place where he dreamed his life would be. Danny had seen my message in a Facebook group for a local youth group, and volunteered as a participant. The first meeting was recorded in his apartment. As his English-speaking wife was present, we decided to conduct the interview in English. I thought about how the wife’s presence would influence the interview, and was aware that it would make the interviews with Danny different from the other data, as he was in a sense addressing two people as well as the recorder. I decided that this would not be a problem, and that asking her not to be present in her home would be much more problematic and something I did not want to do. During the interviews, his wife was mainly listening, but sometimes she reminded
Danny about details he had not mentioned, or reacted to what he was saying. Danny’s wife (and their dog) were also present at the guided walk interview, which was carried out in the area where they lived. The group interview was recorded with Danny, his wife, and participant Gabriela in Folkets Park in June. A small additional recording was made after the group interview to check up on some questions that had arisen since April.

I found Danny to be a very witty and verbally talented person, and he talked at length about various topics, which made me feel like the recordings were very successful. The first interview with Danny lasted for more than two hours, and was a conversation that just seemed to flow. I remember it as one of the interviews that felt the most enjoyable during the data collection process. At the end of the interview, Danny and his wife also commented that they were happy to take part in the study and considered its themes important and worthwhile.

***

Gabriela was born in a small town near Stockholm in 1979. Her family had recently come to Sweden as asylum seekers after fleeing from the military coup in Chile, during which her father and paternal grandparents had been imprisoned and tortured. Gabriela grew up as the middle child of her family, and her parents were very active in the Chilean community and in politics. Her parents divorced when she was an adolescent, after which Gabriela lived with her mother and her siblings. She moved to Malmö in 2006.

Gabriela’s life story is characterised by a traumatic event; when she was thirteen years old, she and her sister visited their parents’ home country Chile for the first time for what they believed to be a vacation, but that turned out to be a part of what she found to be her father’s plan to keep his daughters in Chile as he perceived them to be ‘too Swedish’. Having neither Chilean nor Swedish citizenship, she was stateless, and had to wait for eleven years before she could seek asylum in Sweden. This time was very difficult for Gabriela, and she had since broken all contact with her father and paternal grandparents. The trauma of what had happened was relevant at the time of the interviews, although ten years had passed since her return to Sweden.

Gabriela was recommended to me as a participant by Danny’s wife, who said she had an ‘interesting story’. At the time of the recordings, in
April and June 2013, Gabriela was 33 years old, and had recently graduated from her university studies. She had just started a job with adolescents with psycho-social problems, and was finding the job rather overwhelming. As my month of initial data collection in Malmö was coming to an end, we scheduled the first two interviews to take place on two consecutive days in April 2013. Timing issues also influenced the order in which the interviews were conducted. The first interview took place at a café, and acted as an introductory meeting as well as the beginning to a life story interview. The photographs were discussed briefly at the beginning of the second interview, as the theme had made her sad because it made her think of her two dogs that had passed away some time earlier.

The events in Gabriela’s life, as well as her current circumstances during the time of the interviews, will be discussed in Section 3.4 on ethical considerations in relation to interviews. My relation to Gabriela was affected by the difficult contents of her life story and the challenges she was facing at the time of the interviews. I felt concerned for how participating in the study would affect her, and a greater responsibility towards both her and how best to take care of the stories she had told me. I also liked Gabriela very much as a person, and greatly admired her strength and her determination to make society better.

THE BIRMINGHAM PARTICIPANTS

Ewa was born in Poland in 1994, and moved to England at the age of six months, when her system engineer father got a job there. The move, which Ewa describes as initially intended as temporary, became permanent, and Ewa’s younger brother was later born in England. Ewa grew up in a small town in the south of England, and describes it as similar to ‘a childhood you see in old books’. She went to a Polish school in London every Saturday from the age of seven. Later, when she attended boarding school for her secondary education, she continued via correspondence and thus completed a Polish national curriculum. She moved to Birmingham to study, and was a second-year language student at the time when the interviews were recorded. She was active in several sports societies and in a Polish association.

Ewa was the first participant to be interviewed in Birmingham. I found her through a friend of a friend, who was active in the same Polish association. The first interview was recorded in a university building in
October 2013. Ewa brought photographs that were normally hanging on her wall, of family members and friends as well as her old school. At first, Ewa seemed a bit shy, and I got the impression that she was a bit nervous of the recorder, to which I responded by talking more than I normally did in the interviews. For the second interview in the following month, Ewa suggested meeting at a pub instead. She arrived with dough on her hands after cooking Polish food for her housemates, and the interview was significantly more relaxed than the first one. The place-based interview with Ewa was recorded in a university room, and the group interview at a rather noisy café at campus. By then, it was clear that Ewa was more comfortable with the interview process, and we had come to know each other sufficiently for trust to have been built. I found Ewa a friendly, bright and knowledgeable person.

***

Hülya was born in Birmingham in 1990. Her father had moved to Britain from Turkey for work when he was in his twenties, and some decades later, he married her mother who joined him in England. Hülya is the eldest child in the family, with a seven year difference to her sister and fourteen to her brother. Because of this age gap, Hülya often refers to herself as having grown up as an only child. Her parents owned a kebab shop, where Hülya spent most of her time as a child. She describes her childhood as a difficult time, with the insecurity of the late hours at the shop, and being bullied at school from almost as early as she can remember.

I found Hülya through a friend who knew her family. At the time of the interviews, Hülya was 23 years old and was studying fashion, and briefly moved to Turkey to work for a company there. The first two interviews were recorded in October 2013, in the week prior to her departure. The third and fourth were recorded in February and April 2014 after her return. Even if Hülya had visited Turkey regularly and previously completed a work experience there, this was the longest time she had spent in the country. As all the interviews, apart from the place-based one, were recorded at Hülya’s family’s café, I was slightly concerned that the presence of her parents would influence what she could talk about, or that I would be disturbing when she was ‘on duty’. But Hülya spoke very openly already at the first meeting, even if the themes
were difficult. With the experience of the interviews with Gabriela, I checked with Hülya whether she wanted to talk about them and reminded her that she did not have to. The place-based interview was to a large extent not recorded due to weather circumstances, but it had an important purpose in strengthening the trust, not least because Hülya had been so open about difficulties in her life. Hülya’s friend, who took part in the group interview, was Turkish, and she translated some of the statements for him during the discussion.

Although a lot of time passed between the first interview and the last, I saw Hülya regularly at the café that her family owned, and often exchanged at least a few words. I found Hülya very kind-hearted, sensitive and easy to talk to.

***

Laila was born in a northern English town in 1982. Her father came over from India at the age of eight when he was orphaned, and her mother migrated when they got married. Laila is the youngest daughter of three. She grew up in a community where family friends formed what she refers to as ‘fake family’, or extended family. She describes her school as ‘very white’. At university, Laila studied science subjects, and moved to Birmingham for her doctoral studies, which she completed a few years before the recordings were made. At the time of the interviews, Laila was 31 years old, and was working in an academic job. Heritage in the form of Islam, language and traditions were very important to Laila, not least at the stage of her life that she was in: she had recently got engaged (to a ‘white British’ man) and was planning their wedding which was to take place the following year. The photographs she brought to the first interview included a baan box that had belonged to her grandmother, a picture of her and her fiancé as well as memories from family trips to National Trust sites.

Laila was introduced to me through a friend, and the first two recordings took place in October 2013 at a café. As Laila already had a Doctoral degree, I was a bit more apprehensive than with other participants, but Laila quickly turned out to be very sweet and cheerful, as well as sympathetically positioned towards my research. She often said that she liked talking, and I found there was a sense of ease to the recorded discussions. At the same time, when we talked about the fact that she
would be identifiable in my study by the friend who introduced us, Laila commented that it did not matter as the contents had not been ‘personal’, as she remembered that the themes had mainly centered on childhood. This made me aware of how each participant may perceive the interviews in different ways, and also control what aspects they wish to speak about. Laila’s perception of the interviews as not being ‘personal’ did not make the data collected with her any less valuable, and I still felt there was a depth to the conversations. Between the interviews with Laila, and especially over the spring 2014, we met sometimes at social events, such as dinners and pub quizzes, as members of the same friendship group. I thus got to know her better than some other participants, and she got to know me better than most other participants.

***

Randeep was born in Birmingham in 1973. His grandfather was the first member of his family to arrive in Britain in the 1960s in order to work in a foundry. His father joined in his early teens. His mother arrived as a nineteen-year-old, and the marriage of his parents was arranged in Britain. Randeep was the second child in his family, with an older brother and a younger sister. He is married to a woman whose parents are also from Punjab, and has two children, who at the time of the interviews were of primary school age. At the time of the recordings, Randeep was 40 years old, and was working as a civil servant. He was very active in the Sikh community. He held positions of trust in a committee, led yoga sessions and meditation, and had been involved in setting up Punjabi classes that his children attended. He also described himself as more traditional than his brother and sister, and talked a lot about the significance of Sikhism in his life. He wore a turban and followed a vegetarian diet, and clearly placed great importance on these.

Randeep took part in the data collection for my Master’s thesis in January 2011, and was thus an old acquaintance when I started my data collection in Birmingham. He agreed to take part in further interviews for the present study, and the first recording was made at his workplace in November 2013. Randeep showed me photographs on his camera, and many of them were related to India and Sikhism. Randeep knew that I was studying Punjabi, and invited me along to events organised by a Sikh organisation. He often asked about my progress in Punjabi, and told me
about Sikhism in general. Even though my reasons for learning Punjabi were completely unrelated to Sikhism, it was interesting to learn about this religion that I knew very little about. Sometimes I was concerned that Randeep’s impression of my interest in Sikhism was greater than it was, but I also did not want to seem uninterested.

The recording from the place-based interview with Randeep, a walk around a part of Birmingham, was unfortunately affected by a technical problem approximately twelve minutes into the recording, when the microphone was attached differently. The sound quality after this point is too poor to be properly audible. As the previous recordings included a lot of interesting data, the quality of the overall data with Randeep was not compromised because of the technical problem. I found Randeep very kind and interesting to talk to. Our differences in for example age, gender and life situation were sometimes apparent and relevant, and what was instead treated as common identifications were for example our vegetarianism and interest in languages.

3.3 Methods of data analysis

If the methods used for conducting a study are at times obscured, it is often especially the methods of analysis that are particularly invisible in the final product. Erickson (2004) calls for demystifying the data construction and analysis, and making it visible. This section aims at describing the theoretical views that guided the analysis, as well as the practical process behind it.

3.3.1 Theoretical starting points: Analysing positioning in interview data

To begin with, Chapter 2 outlined that the focus in this study is on positioning in narratives told as part of interview conversations. Anecdotes have been referred to as “the raw diamonds in fieldwork interviews” (Blommaert & Jie 2010: 52). In planning this study, I did not consciously set out to elicit or look primarily at narratives, but in hindsight, it is not difficult to see why many of the interview questions were responded to with anecdotes or stories. Stories were, however, used
for many purposes beyond elicitation: they were shared spontaneously to justify certain views, as explanations, and sometimes at moments that were signaled as unintentional moves away from the predetermined topics. During the course of data collection, stories seemed to stand out as particularly interesting elements, often already at first hearing. Through reading about positioning theory and analysis in combination with narrative analysis and small story research, I became aware of the many layers of positioning in the accounts given by the participants. This section will outline the main methodological starting points in data analysis.

Narrative analysis has been referred to as looking at data through a magnifying glass (De Fina 2003). Perspectives from small story research, discussed in Chapter 2, bring a widened lens to what counts as a narrative, thus making it possible to include and account for those fleeting moments in which identities are seen as emerging. In these small instances of talk, a lot is happening. Bamberg (1997: 337, see also Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) proposes a model for analysing positioning at three levels. The first level examines the story: who are the characters, what are they doing, how are they positioned in relation to each other? The characters may be foregrounded by their agency or helplessness, or by their personal qualities. The plot often moves forward in two ‘landscapes’: a landscape of action and one of consciousness (Ochs & Capps 1996: 26). While the landscape of action presents what the characters in the story do, the landscape of consciousness focuses on what they feel or believe. At the second level, the focus lies on how the speaker positions themselves in relation to the audience. This distinction is also made by Wortham (2001), who urges the analyst to distinguish between the represented contents in the story, and the enacted contents at the moment of its telling. Bamberg’s third level moves beyond the immediate context, and ask how narrators position themselves to themselves, i.e. how they want to be understood by telling the story they are telling, in the way they are doing it. Here, in the case of the interviews for this study, the audience does not only consist of me as the listener and researcher, but the story may be directed towards the recorder as a vehicle to address a larger public, with all potential surrounding discourses of language and identity, in all their forms. Barkhuizen (2009: 285), also drawing on Bamberg’s model, suggests expanding the analysis at the third level to include other data collected for the project, to help contextualise the story further and analyse its meaning in a larger perspective.
Positioning is accomplished through several linguistic elements, as well as communicative and rhetorical strategies (De Fina 2003). The analysis of positioning in this study was much influenced by the works of Wortham (2001), and Wortham and Reyes (2015), who suggest steps for identifying linguistic acts of positioning in stories. These steps include paying attention to the choice of words and metaphors, reported speech, evaluation and modalisation. Based on Bakhtin’s ideas on the dialogicality of all language, the words that people use are never seen as neutral, so by choosing their words, speakers thus participate in the ongoing processes in which the meanings of words are shaped (Bakhtin 1981, Wortham 2001). As each chapter of analysis centres on a specific theme, the methods of analysis were slightly different, and these will be mentioned at the beginning of each chapter of analysis. Bamberg’s model was most explicitly used in Chapter 5, as well as in the individual analyses of all the data collected with each participant, which functioned as a major step in the data analysis.

The insights from small story research greatly influenced the analysis process, and offered a way of mapping what counted as data for the analysis. During the process of analysis, longer extracts – stories – were analysed in detail, and through this process, the themes that constitute the chapters were crystallised. Eventually, these methods will be most clearly employed in chapters 5 and 8, which focuses on stories around particular events in the data. In the other chapters of analysis, what will be foregrounded are the contents that answer in various ways to the research questions.

3.3.2 The process of analysis

The analysis of data started already at the point of the interview discussion. After each interview, I wrote down some notes about the conversation, and included any points that I felt had had an impact on the discussion. The following step in the analysis was to transcribe the recordings. The task of transcription involves some ideological choices, and in transcribing, I aimed at representing the participants’ voices as authentically as possible. In transcribing the three languages, I have opted for a kind of written standard, as the main element in focus is the narrative and its function in context. For this reason, I have not included a separate
transcription key in this thesis. Some stutter and repetition (especially of words such as ‘like’, Finnish ‘niinku’) was, however, omitted. Pauses are marked by (.), and non-verbal communication, such as laughter, is marked within brackets. Any extracts longer than three lines in the text are presented in the form of block quotes to increase readability. The extracts from Finnish and Swedish have also been translated, and I include the original quotes in the footnotes in order to facilitate reading. Certain dialectal and idiolectal features inevitably disappear in the translations.

Erickson (2004) reminds us that patterns and themes in the data do not just emerge, but need to be found. After transcribing the interviews, I wrote an individual analysis in which I described what I found to be the main themes in the data with each participant. At this point, I also chose the names that the participants would be given in the thesis. My aim was to find names that reflected the real names of the participants, so that their associations would be approximately the same. The process of writing the individual analyses, which lasted approximately a year alongside the data collection, also offered the opportunity to try out different models for data analysis and to identify the ones that seemed the most relevant and helpful. The approach was thus a bottom-up process (cf. Erickson 2004), and it was here that small story analysis and the contributions of for example Michael Bamberg and Alexandra Georgakopoulou, as well as the approaches to analysis of narratives as presented by Stanton Wortham, became extremely valuable. The individual analyses included longer extracts from the interviews – at times longer than the analysis itself. I have chosen shorter extracts in the final analysis to illustrate the most important points, but still tried to keep the small stories as intact as possible. Many of the presented examples were told as anecdotes, employed to explain a certain point of view, foreground a particular position, or juxtapose the self with others.

The process of writing the individual analyses largely followed the following steps: after listening to the recordings and transcribing them, I highlighted the passages that seemed the most interesting and relevant in the light of the questions I wanted to find out about. I grouped the extracts according to some larger themes, and in the process of writing the individual analyses, I identified the most common themes to be language use in the family and thoughts related to it, definitions of ‘national identity’, and identity positioning in stories. After this, I wrote a two-page summary of each report of individual analysis (which ranged from
approximately 7,000 to 17,000 words), which I presented to the participants at a feedback meeting. While participant feedback is often mentioned in conjunction with methods of data collection and analysis (see e.g. Denscombe 2010), it is generally presented as a way of increasing the validity of the findings. In relation to this study, I wish to discuss its usefulness also in view of ethical considerations.

The summaries to the participants included a brief note on the analysis in general, and themes that I had identified in the data, illustrated by quotes. They were written in Finnish, Swedish and English respectively, in order to be as accessible as possible for the participants. In practice, the meetings during which the analyses were discussed often resembled catch-ups between old acquaintances. A long time had normally passed since the recordings, and the participants had at least partly forgotten what they had told me. I asked the participants if we could go through the summary and then have a general chat. Most meetings lasted approximately an hour, with the talk about the analysis rarely taking up more than a third of the time and the remainder being devoted to catching up and hearing about what had happened since the recordings. I made the decision not to record the feedback meetings, and to draw a line to end data collection before them. However, they influenced the analysis by reminding or clarifying issues that were in the analysis.

One of the main purposes of the feedback meetings was to check whether the participants were comfortable with seeing their words and stories in print, and whether I still had their consent. A related aim was to present more controversial issues and see whether the participants gave their consent to including them. Nobody objected to any of the themes or interpretations in the analysis, or wished to change anything. However, in some cases, I could sense a slight shock in how much information they had given, detectable for example in Hülya’s exclamation ‘When did I tell you all of this?’. This made me increasingly aware of the possible sensitivity of the material, and the character of the interview to invite talk that may be more open and revealing than other kinds of talk. The positive feedback and support of the participants was moreover a great source of motivation and inspiration for continuing the analysis and the writing.

Discussing the analysis with the participants also gave the opportunity to offer my reflections on the data collection. Earlier sections have mentioned the discussion with Imad about my apprehension that he felt that I wanted him to choose between ‘Finnishness’ and ‘Lebaneseness’,
and my concerns around the psychological toll on Gabriela from talking about past traumas. I found it very important to be able to discuss these issues with the participants, and the discussions in their turn were valuable lessons in conducting research with human beings as participants. Presenting the analysis to the participants and receiving their feedback could be more explicitly discussed as a part of research methodology in general.

As a general note, the data analysis could be described as going through phases of initial impressions and interpretations, which were then widened and deepened with the help of insights from narrative analysis, positioning analysis and small story research, to again be presented in a way that foregrounds the contents that are most relevant to the theme in question in order to be able to include as wide a range as possible of the perspectives that were made relevant in the data. The chapters of analysis will include notes on the methods of analysis in relation to the particular data and questions relevant in that chapter.

3.4 Ethical considerations in the process of data collection and analysis

Research of every kind entails its ethical considerations that relate to all stages of the research project. Social research based on interviewing moreover comes with specific ethical dilemmas to do with its directly relational character. How to conduct research in an ethical way is a topic of continuous deliberation. Guillemin and Gillam (2004) and Kubanyiova (2008) highlight distinctions between the a priori macroethical principles that form codes of ethics, and microethical considerations that arise during the course of situated social research in the shape of particular decisions and their justifications. The macroethical principles are valuable as a set of moral standards, but the complexity of research reality renders necessary a more detailed and contextualized approach based on a view of research as a relational activity (Kubanyiova 2008: 506). It is with these distinctions in mind that this section will discuss some particular aspects of ethical considerations in the context of data collection. This section will discuss a number of ethical considerations that are present in interview-based research in general from the point of view in this study, and take a closer look at a particular situation in the data collection that brought about a
need for specific ethical deliberations. Finally, it will discuss ethical considerations relating to the presentation of data as part of the analysis.

3.4.1 Recruitment, informed consent and research relationships

The sets of moral standards related to social research, termed macroethical principles in the previous paragraph, come with different formal requirements in different national contexts, although the principles are the same. As the data collection for this study took place in different geographical locations, different formal requirements applied. The most explicit was the application for ethical review at the University of Birmingham, where considerations related to the study were approved by an Ethics Team. The data collection in Finland and Sweden, however, applied to the same ethical standards, outlined for example in the document “Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland” (2012). When it comes to recruitment of participants, informed consent was given in writing by all participants. Moreover, recognising that some participants may have had a better understanding of what a doctoral study is and what their stories will be a part of, I saw it as my responsibility to ‘check consent’ at several points during the process. One case required an on-the-spot ethical decision: when Farah and her friends arrived at the group interview, I realised that the two girls were not 18, but 16 and 17 years old. As the topics of the discussion were not sensitive, and since they were already there, I decided to carry on with the interview as planned. Before the interview started, I explained to them that I would ask for consent also from their parents by sending them a letter after the interview. The girls signed and understood the letter of informed consent, and their parents later returned signed letters confirming that they, too, gave their consent.

The literature around ethical considerations in qualitative research comments on the character of the relationship between the researcher and participant, emphasizing the importance of ‘building rapport’ or creating trust in order for the data collection to be successful. Finch (1993), however, states her surprise over the immediate willingness of her female research participants to talk to her about their lives. Expecting to “have to work at something called rapport” (ibid: 167), she found that their shared
identities as women, as well as the time she had to listen and the confidentiality related to the research interview, were sufficient to create an atmosphere in which material was elicited with “extreme ease” (ibid). In a similar way, I found many participants very open already at the first encounter. Moreover, like Finch, I do not believe that their readiness to speak to me was a result of any special qualities or skills that I have as an interviewer.

This openness does not imply that there were fewer ethical dilemmas; rather the contrary, as is also noted in much literature (Kubanyiova 2008, Kvale 1997, Finch 1993). Kvale (1997: 110) advises the interviewer to be aware of the risk that the character of an interview may lead to the participant telling things they may later regret, and warns about the potential resemblance with therapeutic conversations (ibid. 105). These concerns become particularly relevant when talking about sensitive topics or difficult experiences. This will be discussed in the following section, with examples from the interview process with one participant, Gabriela. The relationships between the participants and me could be described as one of friendly acquaintance. While the conversations were friendly, both the participants and I knew that the premises of the situation were that they were helping me and that I was dependent on their contributions to be able to carry out the study. It was their experiences and stories that were in focus, and while I gathered a lot of information about their lives, they often had little insight into mine. In this sense, I do not believe the researcher-participant relationship can ever be fully compared with a friendship, even if a friendship has grown between some of the participants and me after the data collection. Moreover, as is pointed out by Hammersley and Atkinson (1995: 115): “there must always remain some part held back, some social and intellectual “distance”. For it is in the space created by this distance that the work of the ethnographer gets done”.

3.4.2 Asking about difficult experiences

Birch and Miller (2010: 189) ask: “Can the invitation to narrate past and present experiences, together with future hopes, avoid offering potential therapeutic opportunities?” While it is clear that participants choose what they wish to disclose to the researcher and are aware of the purposes of
their participation, there may be situations in which the borders become somewhat blurred, as the interview may offer an opportunity to talk to somebody with time and interest in listening. In asking people about their lives, one can never be sure of what questions may be sensitive. This section will give examples of situations that called for reflexivity on microethical considerations in the sense outlined by Kubanyiova (2008) with participant Gabriela.

Before the data collection with Gabriela, I heard that she had ‘an interesting story’. I did not know what this implied, and it was not discussed during the first interview. As the second interview, i.e. the ‘life story interview’, asked questions about different stages of the participant’s life, Gabriela at some point noted ‘I think we’re going to maybe run away a bit from what you wanted to ask’. She then told the story of how at the age of thirteen, she had visited Chile together with her sister, and how when they were going to fly home, her father ‘dropped the bomb’; they were not going home. At this point of the interview, she burst into tears, and it was clear that the events were still very emotional and difficult for her. As it seemed to me that she was comfortable with telling me the story, I decided not to interrupt, suggest a change of topic or end the interview there. I did not ask her whether it was alright to keep recording, although later I thought that maybe I ought to have asked. When it seemed like the story was finished, I told Gabriela that I would not carry on with the remaining questions, as they would have seemed trivial and strange in comparison. As I was interested in knowing how much of a ‘new’ experience it was for her to tell the story, I asked if it was something she often talks about, to which she replied that it is, but not to the same extent and detail. Later that evening, I sent her a text message to ask if she was alright, and to thank her for sharing her story with me.

There were some circumstances in the interview situation that I perceive to have played a part in making the interview more emotional, and that led to further questions about the responsibility related to research of this kind. When the first recording was made the previous day, Gabriela had just finished a long (more than 24-hour) shift at her work, which she experienced as overwhelming. When I met Gabriela the following time six weeks later, she also admitted that she was exhausted and was thinking of quitting her job. In the autumn, she e-mailed me

4 ”jag tror vi kommer att skena iväg lite från det du tänkte fråga”
saying that she had quit and changed to a less demanding part-time job. During the summer, she also e-mailed me to let me know that her father had unexpectedly passed away.

The circumstances outlined above relate to a number of ethical considerations. First of all, conducting the interviews at a time when Gabriela was clearly more vulnerable made it feel like more of an intrusion into her life, whether she perceived it as such or not. Although she was an adult and had signed the consent form as well as suggested the times of the interviews, and she was aware of the questions related to the study and the possibility of ending the data collection at any point should she wish to, I felt, in some way, a greater responsibility towards Gabriela than the other participants because of this perceived vulnerability. At the same time, I wanted to respect her integrity as a person capable of making her own decisions, and concluded that the best solution was to provide her with as much information as possible about the data collection, and the support that any new friend would be willing and able to offer.

The second point relates to how the data collection process may at times have resembled a therapeutic relationship. While I felt very unqualified for this role, I wanted to support Gabriela because I liked her very much as a person. In addition, I felt honoured that she seemed to trust me enough to talk about these sensitive issues. My approach was thus not to ask about or bring up the events, but should she mention them, I would listen. The third point has to do with how best to take care of Gabriela’s accounts in the analysis and writing up of the dissertation. Recognising that the topics are of sensitive nature, and that she is likely to read the final product, I wanted to make sure to handle them in a respectful and fair way. The news about her father’s death also added a sense of uncertainty about how to use the data. More than a year after the data collection, I met Gabriela to present the analysis to her. On this occasion, I expressed my concern at having taken up her time at a period when it may have been inconvenient, and making her think of difficult experiences and using the accounts around them as data. She told me that she had found it good to have somebody to talk to during that time, as her colleagues at work and other people she saw on a daily basis were not aware of the experiences she had gone through and the feelings related to them. This sense of the researcher being ‘someone to talk to’ is described by Finch (1993) as a part of interview research, and she warns about its exploitative potential. The data collection process with Gabriela thus included numerous ‘on-the-
spot decisions and actions’ (Kubanyioiva 2008: 506) that the macroethical guidelines did not offer any practical guidelines on. I had not prepared for these ‘ethically significant moments’ (ibid. 516), nor could I have. These circumstances called for a deeper level of reflexivity than any other situation in the data collection, although numerous other moments could also be mentioned here as significant. Some of them were touched upon in Section 2 where the participants were presented.

What is important to note here, however, is that despite the fact that this interview and my relation with participant Gabriela were in many ways different, it does not mean that other kinds of data were in any way less valuable. Birch and Miller (2010) express an understanding of a ‘good interview’ as one that includes self-disclosure and very personal stories. They conclude that “the more intimate we, as researchers, felt the interview to be, the more we felt we had gathered ‘real’ meanings” (ibid. 192). By contrast, I view all interviews as ‘good’ interviews, and all meanings as equally ‘real’ meanings. Every interview produces something, and there is no absolute ‘reality’ or ‘truth’ that interviews can succeed or fail to capture. The purpose of the present section has been to highlight the situations in social research in which macroethical guidelines are not sufficiently detailed in order to provide practical solutions. In line with Kubanyiova (2008), I believe that the ‘greater good’ and the responsibility to society can never be a higher priority than the responsibility towards the individual person, and this has guided my spontaneous decisions and actions.

3.4.3 Ethical considerations in the analysis of data

As mentioned, ethical consideration are best conceptualized by distinguishing the general moral standards guiding each research project, and the contextualized, situated deliberations that emerge during the process (Kubanyiova 2008). When it comes to the analysis and presentation of data, anonymisation and confidentiality are some of the basic macroethical guidelines. The names of all participants have been changed for the purposes of this research. The pseudonyms were chosen to reflect the character of the real names, i.e. if the real name could be seen as associated with Arabic, the pseudonym was likewise chosen with this in mind. Complete anonymity, on the other hand, is much more difficult
to guarantee in practice. Many of the participants were found through mutual friends, and these friends would easily be able to identify them. Even when names are changed and when information on profession, field of study or area of residence are left out, there are no guarantees that nobody would be able to trace the information back to the participant, should they make considerable efforts to do so. Most participants did not seem concerned about this; it was common to hear comments such as ‘I’ve got nothing to hide’ or ‘I stand for what I’ve told you’; sometimes even the question ‘Why did you change my name?’. For my own part, however, I was very cautious about the potential risks related to the impossibility of guaranteeing total confidentiality. The political climate in all three countries, with the rise of anti-immigrant political parties and the gradual mainstreaming of such ideologies, increased my apprehension about the risks of the data falling into the hands of somebody who may want to harm these people. For this reason, information that may increase the possibility of identification of the participants is treated in terms as vague as possible. It was also in the nature of this study that some personal information about the participants and their family members was disclosed to me, and that I made the decision not to include it.

Defining the border between what counts as data and what does not emerged as the relationships between the participants and me became more familiar and informal during the course of the interview process. Although participants have at the beginning of their participation signed a paper to confirm they understand that their words will be treated as ‘on the record’, can it be assumed that they remember and think of this at every stage of the process? Kvale (1997: 110) cautions the researcher to be aware of this potential risk. One step in deciding on this was to present the analysis to the participants and hear their feedback on it, as presented earlier in this chapter. This opportunity was seen as a part of the negotiation of consent, and to offer to the participants a chance to see how their words and stories would be used. Despite these steps, I acknowledge the possibility that participants may not agree with my analysis or the ways in which they are presented. It is my sincere hope that the analysis does not cause any harm to or hurt any of the participants or anyone related to them.
3.4 Reflections on my role as a researcher

As the theoretical introduction established, an ethnographic approach to knowledge encompasses taking into account the role of the researcher as a participant in the construction of data. Social research can never be carried out in isolation from the wider society, or independently from the biography of the researcher (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 16). This does not mean that the validity of the findings is restricted to the data elicitation situations (ibid. 18). What it does imply, however, is that there is a need to include an account of the role of the researcher’s self (see e.g. Denscombe 2010), as s/he brings to the situation attributes that cannot – and should not be attempted to be made invisible or changed for the purposes of the research. These attributes, such as gender, age, ‘ethnicity’ etc., are not to be viewed as givens, but receive their significance through what meanings are attached to them by the interviewer and interviewee. ‘Reflexivity’ cannot be defined and sufficiently discussed under one sub-heading, but permeates the dissertation as a whole. This section nevertheless aims at a brief ‘public account’ (Denscombe 2010: 87) of some aspects that I consider important to mention separately. These relate to my relation to the places and the language varieties the interviews were conducted in, and my own belonging to some of the categories that were relevant to the study.

The literature around the role of the researcher points to certain inescapable elements of identity, yet remarks that it is impossible to determine exactly how and to what extent these elements influence the interview conversation (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995). It seems reasonable that rather than being seen in isolation, it is the interplay between different elements that becomes meaningful. For example, I did not feel that gender alone played any great role in the relationships, but that it contributed together with age in the cases where the participant was either considerably younger or older than me, and not of the same sex. The way in which it contributed at the time was, in my experience, that there were fewer common elements of identifications to draw on in the conversations. This does not, however, mean that gender or age should be seen as unsurmountable differences; they are merely elements among many.

When it comes to the places where the data was collected, it is evident that my relation to the cities in some ways affected the conversations that took place in them. Turku was a city that I had lived in for the past seven
years when the recordings started, but I had yet never fully considered it my hometown, and my life there had mainly centred on the university and student life. Malmö, on the other hand, was for me a completely new place, which I instantly felt a strong liking for and attachment to. My warm relationship to Malmö as a place is surely also reflected in the relation to the individual participants as well as the data collected with them, and the time spent in Malmö was of great significance for ‘growing into’ the role of a researcher. I lived in Birmingham for approximately two years, and was often perceived as a local by other international students, but never by British people. I also felt partly like a stranger, but partly as though I belonged.

Linguistically, I was perceived as a bit of an outsider in all contexts. In Finland, the participants knew that I studied at the Swedish-medium university, and that Swedish was my first language. It happened at times that words escaped me in Finnish during the conversations, and although I consider Finnish to be one of my mother tongues, I was not accustomed to using it for academic purposes. In Malmö, on the other hand, my variety of Swedish was instantly noticed as different, and I slightly adapted my way of speaking in order to be understood and not to draw attention to it. Many people I talked to perceived me as a learner of Swedish, and some reacted with amusement to my way of speaking. Although English is the language I am academically most comfortable in, I lacked many of the cultural references and nuances of language. My ‘foreignness’ also positioned the Birmingham participants as ‘natives’ even in the cases in which they positioned themselves as other than English/British, as they had the knowledge and cultural competences acquired through growing up in the UK.

Another issue related to the places was that in Finland, I was part of the dominant majority, although to some extent positioned by both myself and the participants as a member of a linguistic minority. This identity was something I gave much thought to, and that caused some discomfort and fear of labelling the Turku participants as ‘Other’. At the first meeting with Farah, in January 2013, I noted the following comment:

_We talked about mosques and she said that they are often built inside regular blocks of flats. I told her about the plans to build a minaret in Inkoo and she said “mä en kyllä lähtisi rakentamaan sellasia tänne, kun mehän asutaan niinko teidän maassa”_ (Eng. ‘I
wouldn’t start building them here, because we do kind of live in your country’). We and you again; interesting.  
(Research journal, meeting with Farah, 8 January 2013)

This distinction between ‘we’ and ‘you’, and particularly the idea that I belonged to the ‘we’ that somehow has a privileged ‘ownership’ to Finland, was a thought I was very uncomfortable with. In the situation, I explained to Farah that I see Finland as her country as much as mine. Her comment still contributed to the caution I already felt of the positioning that the participants may read into my research. When Minh at his first interview commented that he would not want to describe differences between Vietnamese and Finnish culture as he has grown up in Finland, I told him I hoped he did not think I expected him to do that. To this, he replied that he did not have any expectations apart from what was stated in the information sheet he received before giving his consent, which made me realise my worry might have been exaggerated. Yet, I had similar concerns with Imad, especially when listening to the recordings in which he said ‘as I’ve said several times, I feel more Finnish than Lebanese’. In the summary I sent him before the feedback meeting, I voiced my concerns of him perhaps feeling I was trying to make him decide between elements of identifications, or expected him to be ‘Lebanese’. He told me this was nothing he had even thought about at any point of the interview process. While these fears seemed to be unfounded, they nevertheless affected the data collection and were part of the positioning of both me as the interviewer, the participants, and the whole research project. There were times when I wondered if with my research I was unintentionally contributing to reinforcing a label of ‘second-generation migrant’ upon my participants and others belonging to the post-migration generation.

If one of the aims of a separate section on reflexivity is to offer some illustration of how the researcher’s self affected the research process and product, it is my hope that this discussion has provided some insights. As mentioned, reflexivity will be made visible throughout the dissertation, as the affects cannot be separated from the rest of the contents and analysis.
3.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented the methods of data collection used in this study, and discussed their usefulness and potential. It has aimed at transparency in the account of how the data was collected and analysed, and how my role as interviewer/researcher and relationships with the individual participants have shaped it. The chapter has also introduced the twelve participants, and the following chapter will introduce the three cities that they live in.
Chapter 4: Three urban contexts

While the idea of identities, nations and communities as socially constructed has become widely accepted across social sciences, space is often still described as constant and impersonal. Massey (2005: 9) argues that space is the ‘product of interrelations’ and a sphere of ‘contemporaneous relations’, which is ‘always under construction’. In other words, space is imagined as a “cut through those myriad stories in which we are all living at any one moment” (Massey 2013). Space is hence built of the relations that span the globe, and the power relations that play a part in them. This chapter will outline the spaces in which the interviews were recorded, through accounts of the histories that have shaped them, their present descriptions, and imagines futures.

It is fair to say that migration has consistently been among the most debated topics in the three countries where the data for this study was collected, as well as elsewhere in the world. The fact that migration has been largely overlooked in the histories of all three countries makes it appear as a new phenomenon, and the recent discourse around it seems to further inflate concerns about its significance to the national stories. The chapter will give a brief account of migration to Britain, Sweden and Finland with the aim of providing a context to the stories of the participants. Their family migration stories will here be introduced as a part of these larger stories, which to some extent overlap in the three countries. By including extracts from the group interviews, I hope to illustrate how the participants view multilingualism in their cities now and in the future.

4.1 Britain and Birmingham

4.1.1 Migration to Britain

The character of the population of the British Isles has always been affected by migration. Those who later became known as the English were a mix descended from Celtic and Pictish tribes, Angles, Jutes, Saxons and Vikings, as well as Normans through a conquest that came to set the foundation of language, government and law. It was Britain’s imperial
status that first brought people from further away to the British Isles; slaves from Africa and the Caribbean, Indian servants and merchants, as well as black and Chinese seamen settled in the 1800s (Winder 2004). Present-day debates and discourses of migration, however, tend to view the post-war period in the 1940s as the period when international immigration to Britain began.

Up until 1948, Britain had no formal legislation on citizenship: its subjects included everyone under the rule of the British Empire, and later the British Commonwealth. The British Nationality Act gave Commonwealth citizens the continued right to live in Britain. During the period of the Empire, the direction of movement had generally been from the British Isles to the colonies, but when it turned around, it led to a reconsideration of citizenship and migration, as well as to questions of belonging (Bhambra 2016). The shortage of labour after the Second World War welcomed close to 100,000 workers from Eastern Europe to Britain, and this pattern of migration seemed to spark little debate. It was instead the arrival of the Empire Windrush, bringing approximately 500 people from the West Indies to the British shores that became the emblem of the start of immigration. Bhambra remarks that “from the very day of their arrival a moral panic ensued in the country, which was couched in terms of issues of integration and the potential drain on resources (housing, schools) they would precipitate” (Bhambra 2016). She further argues that the concerns were more likely to be a consequence of these people being darker citizens, rather than economic reasons. During the following decade, almost 250,000 people arrived from the Caribbean, India, Africa and Hong Kong. The numbers escalated particularly in the year before the Commonwealth Immigrants Act in 1962 introduced quotas for migrants without work permits or credible skills and qualifications (Winder 2004: 369).

It was in this period that the parents of Randeep and Laila moved to Britain. Randeep’s parents both first came from India to Britain as teenagers; his father around the age of thirteen and his mother in her late teens. Their families moved to Britain to work in the factories in the 1960s. Laila’s father had been orphaned as a child and had come to live with a brother in England at the age of approximately eight. Her mother migrated from India when she married him. Although not from the Commonwealth, Hülya’s father likewise moved from Turkey to Britain in the 1960s, looking for work in restaurants and hotels and performing with
music. Her mother joined approximately twenty years later when they got married.

In 1971, the Commonwealth Immigration Act was passed, which meant that hundreds of millions of former British citizens were no longer eligible to move freely to the British Isles. Two years later, Britain joined the European Economic Community, thereby opening its borders to 250 million new European citizens (Bhambra 2016). Racial prejudice and anti-migration sentiments were growing in the 1960s, and the Act in 1971 was in practice intended to restrict entry to only those who could prove their British ancestry, thereby keeping other than white migrants out (Winder 2004: 379-80). The infamous ‘rivers of blood’ speech given by Enoch Powell in 1968 functioned as an example that made xenophobic discourse seem justifiable and politically acceptable, and although he was excluded from the shadow cabinet, he received the support of thousands (BBC online). In the 1970s, African Asians with British passports expelled from Uganda and Kenya accounted for the most noticeable migrations, but the numbers of people arriving from India and Pakistan on the grounds of family reunification were both larger and steadier (Winder 2004: 385).

The last decade of the twentieth century marked the beginning of a new scale of migration worldwide. Conflicts and crises on almost every continent pushed people to move and seek asylum abroad. From 1993 to 2003, the number of foreign-born people in Britain more than doubled, from 3.8 million to approximately 7.8 million or 12.5 % of the population (Rienzo & Vargas-Silva 2014). The latest census in 2011 showed 80.5 % of the population in England and Wales identifying as White British. Indian and Pakistani remained the most reported ethnicities other than White, while Poland had rocketed in the list of countries of birth (ONS online). Ewa’s family moved from Poland already in 1994, six months after Ewa was born. Her father got a temporary work contract with a telecommunications company, which meant that they came on a working visa. The restrictions on migration from the EU A8 countries, including Poland, were abolished in 2004, and when it comes to languages, the latest census shows that Polish has in fact recently risen to be the most widely reported language apart from English. It is moreover spoken in 95 % of the electoral wards, reflecting a spread over the whole country. Punjabi, Urdu, Bengali and Gujarati nevertheless remain widely spoken (JRF report 2013).

In the 2011 census, the questions on ethnic group in terms of cultural background, introduced in the 1991 census, were accompanied by more
specific ones on for example month and year of arrival in the UK, length of intended stay, national identity and passports held. This may be seen as reflecting the increased focus on control when it comes to immigration. The questions are, however, problematic; while they may give definite answers, what they mean for the individuals varies tremendously. This ‘tick-box’ identity politics has long been criticized (see e.g. Fanshawe & Sriskandarajah 2010). The categories fail to capture the multiple ties and belongings that exist, and assume linear and uniform identifications. The question ‘What is your main language’ supposes monolingual lives and minds, and ignores the practices that have long been ordinary in Britain as well as elsewhere.

When it comes to the responses to migration, the picture is paradoxical. Despite the long history of migration and the high levels of identification with Britain among people of other background, polls and surveys such as the British Social Attitudes survey show that large majorities of the population have believed that there are too many immigrants in Britain since at least the 1960s (Blinder & Allen 2016). Migration has topped the list of ‘most important issues facing Britain today’ since 2007 (Ipsos MORI online), and reports show three out of four people in Britain wishing for reduced immigration (Blinder 2014). Earlier polls, however, reveal immense misconceptions regarding the percentage of the UK population made up by migrants, as well as how many of the world’s refugees the country accepts (Winder 2004: 440). The anti-immigration discourse in politics and media has without a doubt contributed to these misconceptions. Enoch Powell’s infamous speech, as well as Margaret Thatcher’s comment that people ‘have felt swamped by immigrants’ (Winder 2004), are much-quoted early examples of this, with recent equivalents in David Cameron’s reference to ‘swarms of people’ entering Britain through Calais in France, as well as Nigel Farage’s comment that Britain is ‘at breaking point’ because of immigration. In the year leading to the 2015 General Election, support for Farage and his party UKIP, with its strong anti-migration approach, was increasing. Concerns regarding migration were not only directed to former colonies and war-torn countries, but also to migration from within the EU, mainly Romania and Bulgaria. Immigration was identified as one of the most important issues also in the referendum about Britain’s membership in the European Union, where the majority voted to leave.
The public attitudes have gone hand in hand with legislation ever since the 1960s, and there has never again been a return to the kind of unrestricted policy that existed before that. Seven major pieces of legislation on immigration were introduced between 1999 and 2009 (Spencer 2011: 13), among them the introduction of a test on ‘life in the UK’, as well as the requirement to demonstrate skills in the English language for obtaining British citizenship (National Archives online). These requirements have been identified as being linked with a chain of discourse in the aftermath of clashes between mainly young men in some towns in northern England in the summer of 2001. Speaking languages other than English at home became seen as a cause of poor educational success, and therefore also poorer employment, stigmatization and unrest (Blackledge 2005). The ‘Cantle Report’, also written in the aftermath of the 2001 events, found people leading ‘parallel lives’, and thus made recommendations mainly on the level of local government to ensure stronger communities (Community Cohesion Review Team Report, 2001). This is seen as a significant part in a shift from a policy based on ‘multiculturalism’ towards ‘community cohesion’ as a priority.

Events all over Europe and the world in the early 2000s, as well as their reports in the media, led to a ‘backlash against multiculturalism’ (Vertovec & Wessendorf 2009), which was pronounced ‘dead’ or a ‘failure’ in Britain as well as many other Western European countries. These stances viewed multiculturalism as a single and unitary ideology that was seen as harmful to society by stifling debates, denying problems, fostering separateness, refusing common values and even providing a haven for terrorists. Even if the backlash discourse developed in different national political contexts, the responses were largely similar. Vertovec and Wessendorf point out that even though the attacks on multiculturalism have not led to radical changes in the basis of policy, “they have certainly fomented a negative atmosphere surrounding immigrants, ethnic minorities and particularly Muslims” (ibid. 27).

Meanwhile, multiculturalism or cultural diversity have become commonplace in many parts of the country (Wessendorf 2014). The results of the 2011 Census show that 91% of the population in England and Wales identifies with at least one UK national identity (ONS online). Furthermore, elements that have previously been associated with other parts of the world have become a commonplace part of British life, for example when it comes to food, celebrations of holidays, as well as
popular culture. When it comes to multilingualism, the 2011 Census reported over 600 unique answers to the question “what is your main language”. Welsh, Gaelic and Irish are recognised as minority languages protected under the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages (The Statistics Portal). The English language has no official status in law, but is in practice viewed as the national language.

### 4.1.2 Birmingham

With a population of approximately 1.1 million people, Birmingham competes with Manchester over the status as Britain’s second city. Moreover, as 42% of its people identify as other than white, Birmingham counts as one of the most diverse cities based on ethnic background together with its Midlands neighbour Leicester. The 2011 census reported that out of the city’s foreign-born population of 238,313 around 45% had arrived during the past ten years, which reflects Birmingham’s character as a growing city. With 45.7% of its residents being under the age of 30, it is also the youngest city in Europe (2011 Census: Birmingham Population and Migration Topic Report, Visit Birmingham website).

Migration has shaped Birmingham for centuries, with urbanisation and industrialisation increasing the scale and speed of migration from the eighteenth century onwards (Dick 2013). The patterns have followed those of migration to Britain in general, with larger scale migration coming mainly from the Caribbean as well as India and Pakistan. The most reported main languages in the 2011 census still include mainly South Asian languages, such as Urdu, Punjabi, Bengali and Pakistani Pahari, followed by Polish, Somali, Chinese/Cantonese and Arabic. Indian and Pakistani remained the largest reported ethnic groups. Areas such as Ladywood, Nechells and Soho had the highest concentration of recently arrived migrants, while more established migrants were more likely to live in Lozells, Handsworth and Sparkbrook (2011 Census: Birmingham Population and Migration Topic Report).

The character of migration to Britain and Birmingham reflected in the mentioned statistics has lately also received a lot of academic attention. The concept of ‘superdiversity’ (Vertovec 2006), originally coined to describe the character of the population of London, now has its own research institute in Birmingham (the Institute for Research into
Superdiversity, IRiS). ‘Superdiversity’ contrasts the kind of diversity that has existed in Britain since the 1990s with earlier migration which came mainly from Commonwealth countries. It aims to shift focus from ethnicity and country of origin to the interplay of various elements that may be relevant, such as age, sex, socio-economic background, reason for migration and migrant status in Britain. The concept is very advantageous in understanding the demographic character of all three contexts in this study, and a useful analytical lens when studying migration.

While statistics speak of multilingualism and diversity, residents’ experiences of it may vary. The group interviews for this study included a question on multilingualism in the present-day and future in the views of the participants. This section will illustrate some of the views expressed in Birmingham. Firstly, ‘multilingualism’ was conceptualised in different ways. While Laila remarked that she definitely finds Birmingham multilingual as multiple languages are visible in the city landscape, Ewa’s two friends, both of them students of foreign languages, saw everyday interaction as complex, and yet dominated by English:

EWA’S FRIEND A: I’m from an area [of London] where anyone who knows a language apart from English doesn’t use it because most other people don’t know it but then the borough right next to me a lot of people migrated from Asia and they all speak among themselves in their languages but then they switch to English when they speak with us so there’s no sharing of it at all (...) it’s almost like pulling a bit of string when you see the right person you switch to their language

EWA’S FRIEND B: it’s kinda similar in Birmingham as well you get areas where people speak their own language but then when they go into the city centre they’ll speak English to the rest because that’s the main language but I think Birmingham classes itself as a multicultural city yet it’s not as multilingual as it’s seen as cause most people speak English so it classes itself as one thing yet it’s not transferred to other aspects of multiculturalism
The image given in the account by Friend A may be interpreted as a reflection of a ‘superdiverse’ neighbourhood, with small numbers of speakers of several different languages and more established Asian communities in the neighbouring borough. ‘Pulling a bit of string’ moreover reflects the flexible language practices reported in several studies on multilingualism (cf. Blackledge & Creese 2010). Friend B appears to be critical to the portrayal of Birmingham as multilingual, and sees the dominance of the English language as an obstacle to a more flourishing multilingualism as part of the city’s multicultural character.

Hülya says that she knows ‘many people from other countries that have kids that are born here and they can’t even speak their own language’, and reflects that ‘they’re actually fading out of their own culture and actually slowly getting more English than their own background’. The connections between language and identity will further be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, but Hülya’s comment here illustrates that she sees language shift as a process of identity shift. Laila expresses a wish for a favourable climate around multilingualism, and relates her view on the future to her own plans to raise her children bilingually:

LAILA: I see a good future for it [multilingualism] that’s kind of what I want because hopefully I can have kids one day and if I did I hope they can speak at least two languages speak English but understand my language understand Urdu and that’s only gonna happen if multilingualism’s seen as a positive thing and embraced and so I want there to be a positive atmosphere around it

In other words, Laila attaches her personal hopes to larger ideologies that value bilingualism on an individual level, and portrays a supportive climate as a necessity for language maintenance.

When thinking about the future of multilingualism and diversity in Birmingham, Randeep and his friend discuss, in the most elaborate discussion among the group interviews in Birmingham, the concerns and risks related to the segregation they see in schools and neighbourhoods. Both in their forties, Randeep and his friend, who is of partial Caribbean heritage, compare today’s Birmingham to the one that they grew up in. Randeep comments ‘When I was growing up we had a lot of social mixing whereas I think now from what I’ve observed so I can only speak about my limited
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experience I think there’s a lot less social mixing and I also feel that we have to go out of our way to make it happen’, and is supported by his friend:

RANDEEP’S FRIEND: you’re right about the young people not mixing because I have mine come out of their teenage years now one of the things they said to me is mum your cultural range of friends is really wide and I was thinking I hadn’t really thought about it but yes they were right because you know Hindus Sikhs Muslims English Welsh you know it is quite wide and I take that for granted but for other generations they don’t have those relationships across different linguistic and cultural bases so I think the social divisiveness and the need for mix is a real crucial issue now (.) if that continues into the future then what we’ll have are isolated groups which doesn’t bode well for our society

These generational shifts are portrayed as alarming, yet not beyond repair. Randeepl’s suggested solution, which he describes as ‘a bit controversial’, is to find a way to stop the ‘white flight’, i.e. to stop white people from moving out from Birmingham in order to have a balanced mix:

RANDEEP: so my hope for the future would be that we can find a way where white people in particular don’t want to move out of Birmingham that actually they want to stay and they feel valued and also we have more white people moving in and that’s a very controversial statement to make [laughs] but that’s what we need

RANDEEP’S FRIEND: yeah I think it’s interesting partly because if you think of some of the migrants who are white in colour but migrants from other countries how they integrate into a community and a lot of people then don’t realise that sometimes you’re Polish or whatever they assume you’re British by virtue of looking at you they never assume we’re British automatically do they
laughs] so I think for those communities that have come from Eastern Europe and places like that and they also bring with them their heritage and their languages it’s how that then gets integrated into the community or whether they will also become isolated or choose to become isolated because I think sometimes there’s an element of choice as well

These comments around the ‘white’ population foreground one of the topical issues in Britain around the time of data collection, i.e. the different kinds of ‘white’ that have become relevant through immigration from other European countries, and especially from Eastern Europe. These events have underlined the problematic character of concepts like ‘white’ and ‘non-white’, up until now often used rather unreflectingly in talk about ethnic diversity. The integration or segregation of the white but non-British population thus brings another layer to the discourses on belonging and cohesion. Randeep’s friend’s comment ‘they never assume we’re British automatically do they’ is further interesting, as both of them are children of some of the early migrants to Birmingham. Their belonging as natives still seems to be questioned, or is at least perceived to be questioned, by a collective ‘they’, perhaps referring to the general attitude. Randeep and his friend conclude that the social division they are sensing now is worrying both on an economic and social level, as well as dangerous on an individual level ‘because that’s when you start to get all the extreme stuff milling around’. Religious extremism was topical in Birmingham in the years when the interviews took place, in particular in the aftermath of what came to be known as the ‘Trojan horse plot’, a supposed plan by conservative Muslims to take over Birmingham schools in the spring of 2014. However, this was not directly brought up in any of the interviews.
4.2 Sweden and Malmö

4.2.1 Migration to Sweden

The history of migration to Sweden is often presented as a shift from a country of emigration to one of immigration in the first half of the twentieth century (Svanberg & Runblom 1989). This in turn plays a part in the story of the Swedish population as originally ethnically homogeneous, one of the cornerstones of ‘Swedish national identity’ (Rojas 1993). In the 1800s, the heyday of nation-building and creation of national identities, this relative ethnic homogeneity was given more importance. However, through strong trade links to continental Europe, all levels of Swedish society had been influenced by migration mainly from continental Europe and the Nordic countries in the 1600s. German and Dutch were used alongside Swedish in the seventeenth century House of the Nobility, and Scots, Walloons and Dutchmen joined a population already including Finns and Balts as imperial subjects (Svanberg & Runblom 1989). The nineteenth century was characterised by large emigration mainly to North America; 1.2 million Swedes left between 1821 and 1930. In the 1930s, the question of refugees became topical in Europe, including Sweden. Legislation to protect political refugees was introduced, however preferring immigration of people perceived as culturally similar and restrictive especially towards Jews (Byström & Frohnert 2013).

As Sweden remained neutral and uninvaded in the World Wars, it had a great economic advantage over many countries in the post-war years. The period from 1950 to the mid-1970s is seen as a golden age in industrialism, with strong economic growth and high living standards. A shortage of labour led to almost unrestricted immigration, and in two decades approximately 370,000 people migrated, mainly from the Nordic countries and Northern Europe (Byström & Frohnert 2013). Finns were by far the largest group. The demand for workers in Sweden, economic problems in Finland, as well as related differences in income between the two countries were factors that brought approximately 250,000 Finns to Sweden (Svanberg & Runblom 1989). Susanna’s parents were part of this migration, and arrived in 1958 to work in factories in Dalarna.

Up until the 1960s, there was no official policy and not much public debate on how migrants should be treated. Through the Swedish model
of the welfare state, the ‘People’s Home’, migrants were granted the same rights as Swedish citizens. The *de facto* policy was also one of assimilation to the Swedish language and culture (Byström & Frohnert 2013). Wickström (2013) highlights the contribution of ethnic activists, particularly Finns, in the change in discourse that led to the beginning of integration policies and ideologies of what would today be referred to as multiculturalism. In accord with a general discourse climate emphasising equality and solidarity (Byström & Frohnert 2013), policies were built on a desire to incorporate non-Swedish groups into society, and simultaneously support and accept their distinctiveness (see e.g. Wickström 2013). Language came to be a central aspect in this new approach. Concerns of ‘semilingualism’ among migrant children who would lack sufficient skills both in the language spoken at home and in Swedish were raised in academic as well as public debates. This perceived loss of the mother tongue was deemed to be dangerous not only on the level of the family, but also for society at large; in a similar way as in the discourse in the aftermath of the riots in England some decades later, this linguistic scenario was seen as potentially turning the children into troubled and marginalised youngsters who would threaten social cohesion (Wickström 2015). While requirements for English language proficiency for migrants became part of the solution in the British context (Blackledge 2005), in late 1970s Sweden the suggested resolution had instead been the introduction of state-sponsored home language tuition. Finnish migrants in Sweden, as well as political cooperation between the two countries, again played an important role in this reform (Wickström 2015). In 1986/87 there were 83,500 students with a home language other than Swedish, and approximately 66% received tuition in those languages (Wande 1989); in 2006/7, approximately 60% of the 150,000 school children with a home language other than Swedish were receiving tuition (Sveriges Radio).

When Sweden was hit by an economic recession from the mid-1970s, migration also changed in character. Labour migration decreased, and was replaced by refugee migration and family reunification (Svanberg & Runblom 1989). Sweden was one of the strongest critics of the military coup in Chile in 1973, and received more Chilean quota refugees than any other country in the following years (Horna 1989). Gabriela’s parents and grandparents were among the political refugees who escaped torture and imprisonment in the mid-1970s. At the time, Chilean refugees were
warmly welcomed in Sweden, and solidarity groups and committees were formed to support the political cause. The migration was assumed by both sides to be temporary, and many made great efforts to return (Horna 1989). The 1980s also saw migration from conflict zones such as Iran, Lebanon and Turkey, and the fall of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s increased migration to Sweden (Svanberg & Runblom 1989). Cemile’s parents and older siblings migrated from Turkey, where her mother had previously moved from Macedonia. Danny’s parents fled from the Iraqi part of Kurdistan as soon as he was born in 1984, and arrived in Sweden when he was ten months old.

The past decades have seen a rapid rise in the numbers of migrants in Sweden as well as elsewhere. In 2014, 16% of the Swedish population was born abroad. Among 167 reported nationalities, Finland, Iraq and Poland topped the list. The migration from Syria was however the single largest element; one in five migrants came from Syria, and the numbers rose from 5,000 in 2012 to 26,000 in 2014. This contributed to 2014 seeing the largest increase in population ever between two subsequent years (Statistics Sweden), and made Sweden one of the main hosts of Syrian refugees in Europe (Eurostat). When large numbers of asylum seekers arrived in Europe in 2015, Sweden became one of the main hosts, with nearly 163,000 people seeking asylum, among them some 35,000 unaccompanied minors (Migrationsverket.se). However, border controls were introduced between Denmark and Sweden (effectively between Copenhagen and Malmö) in November 2015, which led to a halt in the numbers of arrivals.

Sweden has generally held a reputation as a liberal and tolerant society that defends human rights and offers sanctuary to refugees from conflict areas. While contemporary policies are still based on the idea of integration, assimilation has started to make its way into discourse around immigration. The populist, anti-migration political party the Sweden Democrats, who gained 12.9% of the votes in the 2014 parliamentary elections and thereby became the third largest party, desire a return to an assimilation policy that actually never officially existed (Wickström 2013). The perceived ethnic homogeneity, seen as a distinctive characteristic of Sweden (Rojas 1993), has also not existed for more than a hundred years. When it comes to languages, however, the Swedish language is seen as a self-evident part of life in Sweden. Wickström (2015: 284) remarks on the “discrepancy between official rhetoric on minority rights and multiculturalism and de facto resistance to making Sweden a multilingual
country”. Sweden’s language law, which determines Swedish as the main language of Sweden, dates from as late as 2009. It further names Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli, Romani and Sami as national minority languages, to be protected and promoted (Riksdagen.se).

4.2.2 Malmö

The city of Malmö, with approximately 320,000 inhabitants in 2015, is Sweden’s third city after Stockholm and Gothenburg, as well as one of the fastest growing cities in Europe (Statistics Sweden, Stigendal & Östergren 2013). In half a decade, Malmö has transformed demographically into a younger and more ethnically diverse city than before (Salonen 2012). 31.7% of the 2014 population was born abroad; the numbers had more than doubled since 1995. If children with one or two foreign-born parents are included, the percentage was slightly more than half of the population: 51.4%. The most common countries of birth in 2014 were Iraq, Denmark and former Yugoslavia (Statistics Sweden).

This dynamic demographical character contributes to the image of Malmö as more cosmopolitan and continental than other Swedish cities. The Öresund Bridge uniting Malmö with Denmark in 2000, as well as Malmö University, have played a part in this development. These positive discourses are, however, accompanied by persistent negative ones. Malmö has been portrayed as ‘Sweden’s Chicago’ with riots, shootings, gang crime and segregation (Salonen 2012: 8). Some parts of the city, mainly the area of Rosengård, have repeatedly been used as examples of ‘failed multiculturalism’ in right-wing populist discourse in Sweden as well as internationally. The blocks of houses that make up Rosengård were built as part of the ‘Million Program’ – a venture to build a million apartments in the space of ten years. This decision dates to 1965, when industry was flourishing and the economy exceptionally strong. The new areas, in Malmö located mainly in Rosengård, Lindängen, Kroksbäck and Holma, were initially seen as attractive, but only a few years after their construction they were deemed a failure and people started moving out (Ristilammi 1994). The coincidence of the undertaking of the Million Program and the economic recession of the 1970s left a mark on Malmö. Segregation along both socio-economic and ethnic lines has long been problematised, and recent reports show differences in health, education, employment as well as average length of life between the different areas.
of the city (Stigendal & Östergren 2013). Moreover, the majority of the population live in areas with low resources (Salonen 2012).

All participants interviewed in Malmö referred to these discourses in some ways. The generational aspects were further foregrounded in all group discussions, and this brief summary will in part juxtapose the comments around the older generation of migrants, the younger post-migration generation, and the unborn future generation. The question regarding the future of multilingualism made Susanna think of older generations of her family:

SUSANNA: I think the multilingualism will go on
I’m thinking of [home town] where my parents are and the desire to move back to your home country that’s been there but when it finally becomes possible for different reasons the difference is far too big (.) so maybe you try but then you come back but then you preserve your mother tongue and that’s why I think so you stay in a way 5

Susanna’s reference to the plan to return among older migrants, and the reality that they encountered when the plans became possible, was supported by her friend, herself a migrant from Latin America. They both pointed to this as an important factor in language maintenance, as according to their experiences migrants with an intention of returning to the home country sometimes had a hostile attitude towards the Swedish language and did not want their children to learn. This will be further discussed in an example by Gabriela in the final section of this chapter.

Generations were topical also in Cemile’s comments. In her work with young people, she saw a language shift already taking place:

CEMILE: the younger ones have an accent in their home language because they speak Swedish with their friends right and maybe Arabic at the same

5 “jag tror att flerspråkigheten kommer ju att fortsätta finnas jag tänker på [hemort] där mina föräldrar o att längtan att flytta tillbaka har ju funnits liksom till sitt hemland men sen när det väl kanske blir möjligt o göra det för olika saker då är skillnaden alldeles för stor (.) då kanske man provar men sen kommer man tillbaka men sen bibehåller man ändå sitt modersmål o därför tror jag så att man stannar kvar på nät vis”
time but eventually when they go to a different school Swedish is the only language they’ll know properly so I think it might break I think they know the home language but not to the same level as their parents.

As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, concerns about the language skills of young people, and especially the lack of Swedish, was mentioned as a reason for closing a school in the Rosengård neighbourhood. Cemile’s comment that the children will only hear Swedish when they go to a different school points to a similar pattern. The observation of young people having ‘an accent in their home language’ as a result of being surrounded by Swedish outside the home is linked by Cemile to the eventual shift to speaking mainly Swedish and lacking a ‘proper’ knowledge of Arabic/the home language. At the same time, she underlines the positive contribution of multilingualism to Malmö, such as its position in commerce and its international atmosphere, and says it is very important to her.

Danny, in his group interview, presented a similar opinion of multilingualism as natural on one hand, yet challenging on the other:

DANNY: Malmö has nothing to worry about really like really just take anyone from the street and tell them do you know what a shawarma is they’re gonna be like yes you know what I mean it’s like it’s natural like Gabriela said it’s supposed to it’s created with migration (...) Malmö’s case nothing to worry about the world on the other hand (..) I think yeah we are gonna see less and less languages smaller communities that just speak a certain language are gonna die

As Danny presents it, Malmö has ‘nothing to worry about’ – he thereby portrays multilingualism as a positive phenomenon worth keeping. It is
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further described as something that everyone is involved in. The mentioning of Arabic and the dish ‘shawarma’ in Cemile’s and Danny’s examples is no coincidence; Arabic is widely spoken in the areas they live in, and expressions have made their way into the language. Danny’s comment further embraces at least three kinds of multilingualism: the level of diverse and cosmopolitan cities like Malmö, that of the globalised world, and his own future family. These contrasting scenarios reflect the complexity of the concept and the many levels it is associated with.

What emerged as a central theme in the group discussion including Danny and Gabriela was the comment by Danny’s Canadian-born wife that Sweden does not have a culture. The conversation included some interesting positioning of the meaning of ‘culture’:

DANNY’S WIFE: I don’t find that there’s so much a culture here there is like an ideal but there’s not really a culture (...) it’s like a lifestyle as opposed to being you know like from Chile for example (...) if you think of like Chilean like lifestylewise you could be really really poor but you’re still Chilean in your blood there’s still a culture there’s music there’s right (...) whereas like even North America’s kinda like that Canada doesn’t really have a culture other than maple syrup but we have a lifestyle (...) you can go there and still retain your culture which is why we have you know Chinatown and we have Greektown and we have Little India and we have all these different you can go and you can be in your culture and still have a Canadian lifestyle

GABRIELA: yeah that’s a good point yeah I’ve never seen it like that but yeah that’s true like you don’t have a Swedish culture you have a Swedish (.) lifestyle

[later in the conversation]

DANNY: I was just blown away by what you thought I’ve never thought about it that way (...) like certain places don’t have a culture in the same sense it’s more of a lifestyle cause a lot of people when they think about Sweden they’re like oh it’s so equal
clean organized it’s the lifestyle they want when they come here you know what I mean it’s not necessarily the culture cause you’re allowed to have your own language and your ethnicity and sexual orientation etcetera it promotes you for you it gives you the same rights and privileges that you’re supposed to have in a society like healthcare and education and you know so I never thought about it like that and I think it’s the same thing with Canada.

Gabriela and Danny are both clearly initially surprised by the comment, yet seem to be rather persuaded by it. Danny’s wife begins by contrasting ‘culture’ and ‘lifestyle’ by exemplifying with Chilean, which is of course Gabriela’s background but also possibly associated as ‘exotic’ in contrast with Western cultures. The clarification ‘you could be really really poor but you’re still Chilean in your blood there’s still a culture there’s music’ functions to emphasise the difference between lifestyle and culture as presented here; while the former is related to income and socio-economic status, the latter is seen as located in ancestry and music and possibly other art forms. Danny’s wife further makes a comparison with Canada/North America, in her view also lacking a particular culture, which in turn has created diasporic centres such as Chinatown, Greektown and Little India. When Danny later returns to the topic, he confirms the idea through describing Sweden as ‘promoting you for you’ and offering equal rights and privileges as well as other services relating to a welfare state, such as education and health care. The discussion between the three participants is to some extent controversial, yet links can be made to the discourse around the policy of ‘multiculturalism’ mentioned in the background section. This is how the Swedish model of multiculturalism was regarded at the time of its emergence at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s; integration meant that migrant groups would be incorporated into society, yet their particularity when it comes to language and ‘culture’ would be supported (cf. Wickström 2013). What is interesting to see is how the policy may have affected what is seen as ‘Swedish culture’. Rojas (1993) mentions a rise in studies around ‘Swedish identity’ as coinciding with research on migration in the Swedish context.

Finally, the key role of politicians in assuring continued multilingualism and multiculturalism is mentioned in the group discussions in Malmö as well as in Birmingham. Susanna comments ‘I hope
migration will continue and I hope we’ll have a new government who are more accepting to that and then I hope that the unemployment will somehow be solved because it’s not just in Sweden it’s a threat but in many places”, thus relating language to other large issues in society. The attitudes reflected in the interviews in most cases differed greatly from those prominent in political and popular discourse during the time of data collection.

4.3 Finland and Turku

4.3.1 Migration to Finland

Compared to Britain and Sweden, the history of migration differs on several points that still have significance today. One of the most visible consequences is the exceptionally small percentage of foreign-born people for a Western European country – approximately 6 % in 2015 (Statistics Finland). This section will examine key stages of migration to Finland.

Finland was long a country of emigration; there are today approximately 600,000 ancestors of Finnish emigrants who moved to the United States at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, as well as 400,000 emigrants and their ancestors in Sweden (Alitorppa-Niitamo et al 2005). While a shortage of labour brought migrants to the UK and Sweden after the Second World War, Finland needed to replace internal migrants from areas that were lost to the Soviet Union and did not experience the same demand for workers (Salmio 2000). Work was thus never a main reason for migration to Finland in the mid-1900s, nor did Finland have colonial ties. While some refugees had fled to the newly independent Finland around the time of the Russian revolution, migration for humanitarian reasons first came in small numbers from Chile and Vietnam in the 1970s (ibid). Nevertheless, at the end of the 1980s, more than half of foreign nationals in Finland came from other Western European countries (Jaakkola 2000), and a considerable number of immigrants well into the 1990s were returnees with Finnish ancestry who
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had special arrangements for residence permits between 1990 and 2011 (Alitorppa-Niitamo et al 2005). These people, generally labelled Ingrian returnees, were assumed to have a ‘Finnish identity’ and to have maintained the Finnish language as well as Finnish traditions, yet many spoke Russian or Estonian and had weak ties to Finland (Salonsaari 2012).

In the early 1990s, the beginning of a larger scale of international migration mainly for humanitarian reasons and family reunification coincided with an economic recession and mass unemployment in Finland. This affected attitudes towards migration, as well as migrants’ integration, socio-economic status and well-being (Alitorppa-Niitamo et al 2005, Jaakkola 2000). Refugees came mainly from Somalia and former Yugoslavia, and later particularly from Kosovo as well as Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan (Statistics Finland). Finland joined the European Union in 1995, which marked the start of a more unified policy when it came to immigration (Salmio 2000). Legislation around immigration therefore dates from around the turn of the century. Although the numbers of foreign nationals tripled in the 1990s, the numbers remained comparatively low; at the turn of the millennium there were only 136,200 foreign-born people in Finland, representing 2.6 % of the population (Statistics Finland).

The families of all participants interviewed in Turku arrived as refugees. Minh’s parents and older sisters first arrived from Vietnam in the late 1980s, as some of the first Vietnamese migrants in Turku and the first quota refugees to Finland (Minh’s own report, Kokko 2002). Imad was eight months old when he arrived with his family from Lebanon in 1990. Khalid’s and Farah’s families were refugees from Somalia and Iraq respectively in the early 1990s, shortly before they were born. They are all thus among the first adults from the generation who was born to migrants that did not come from the immediate geographical vicinity.

Not until the twenty-first century has Finland truly become a country of immigration. Out of a population of almost 5.5 million people in 2015, approximately 5 % were born abroad. The numbers of speakers of languages other than Finnish and Swedish likewise correspond to roughly 5 % of the population (Statistics Finland). This measure has been seen as more useful than country of birth or nationality due to the large numbers of returnees who speak Finnish, yet is not completely unproblematic as it is based on individual choice where each person can only choose one language. The largest reported languages are Russian, Estonian, Somali,
English and Arabic (Statistics Finland). Finland is officially bilingual, with Finnish and Swedish as its national languages. The varieties of Sami language are indigenous languages of Finland, and the rights of their speakers are protected through the Language Act. Finnish Romani, Finnish and Swedish sign languages are further recognised as minority languages, and likewise have legal status (Institute for the Languages of Finland).

Despite the notable increase in the numbers of speakers of other languages – from less than 25,000 in 1990 to almost 267,000 in 2012, Finland still has one of the lowest percentages of migrants in Europe (Väestöliitto). Helsinki has the highest proportion of migrants, 8.4%, and the migrant population as well as the overall population is generally concentrated to the south of the country (Väestöliitto, Salminen 2012). Most migrants come from other EU countries, or move because of work or family. Humanitarian reasons only accounted for 8% of all migration to Finland in 2013 (Väestöliitto). It has long been noted that asylum processes are extremely strict (Salmio 2000), and the numbers of accepted asylum claims are the lowest in the Nordic countries (Finnish Immigration Service). In 2015, Finland received an unprecedented number of asylum seekers, when approximately 32,000 people, mainly from Iraq, Somalia and Afghanistan, sought asylum in the country.

Despite the small scale of migration and its late start, anti-immigration discourse has gained ground in Finland, and the populist party The Finns entered the government in 2015 after becoming the third largest party in the parliamentary elections. Immigration became a much larger topic of debate in 2015, after the data collection for this study had been completed. If the interviews were recorded today, recent discourse would certainly influence the participants’ identity positioning.

4.3.2 Turku

On a national scale, Turku has been much affected by international migration. With a population of approximately 180,000, it is among the largest cities in Finland (Statistics Finland). Its harbor has long employed workers from overseas, and its universities hosted international students and staff. Moreover, Turku has received the highest number of refugees after the Helsinki area; between 1993 and 2010 the numbers were however merely around 2,200 (Salminen 2012). Many refugees who were initially
placed in other more rural parts of the country have also moved to Turku due to for example social network connections to its existing ethnic communities, its vicinity to Stockholm and the continent, as well as perceived better services and opportunities for study and employment (Kokko 2002).

In 2011, 5.3 % of the Turku population were foreign nationals, half of whom were nationals of other European countries. Speakers of languages other than Finnish or Swedish accounted for 8 % of the population, and represented 100 different reported languages. Russian remains the largest language; 20 % of those speaking other languages in the greater Finland Proper area reported Russian as their language. What characterizes migration to Turku is the concentration of migrants in a few suburbs, mainly Varissuo, Lauste and Halinen. Varissuo has been called the most multicultural suburb in Finland, as 38 % speak languages other than Finnish or Swedish (Salminen 2012). While this parallel between language and culture is simplified, the segregation along ethnic lines seems to be a fact. Access to rental apartments, social support systems, and services such as shops catering especially to people from particular countries have been pull factors in attracting new migrants, and the already established communities have grown larger while ‘ethnic Finns’ have moved away from the area (Salminen 2012). The difference between the city centre and the suburbs was mentioned in some form in all group interviews in Turku.

When it comes to the participants’ perception of multilingualism today and in the future, the opinions varied slightly in the different group interviews. Khalid and his friends did not see Turku as particularly multilingual:

LINDA: finally I was going to ask what you think about the future of multilingualism here in Turku
KHALID’S FRIEND B: well it looks pretty quiet I’d say
[laughter]
KHALID’S FRIEND A: you never know maybe in ten fifteen years twenty years
LINDA: okay (.) is Turku multilingual now in your opinion
This perception of multilingualism as something possibly existing in the relatively distant future is however juxtaposed with a comment by Friend A about multilingualism in their own group of friends: ‘some people in our group of friends too can say at least one word in these languages (. ) they know at least one word (. ) and usually it’s a swear word’. They then list the languages they know at least a few words in: Somali, Kosovo (Albanian), Kurdish, Arabic, Bosnian, Russian, Swedish, Spanish, French, Italian as well as English. Friend B moreover compares Finland with Sweden and concludes that Finland has very few migrants but that perhaps there will be more in the future, making the city more multilingual.

Imad’s friends likewise discuss the definition of multilingualism. Their conversation was a more policy-oriented as they were all active in local politics when the interview took place. One of his friends comments:

It kind of depends on the starting point so whether you see Turku as a multilingual city or multicultural city meaning that you employ more officials to translate stuff or does it mean that people who speak other languages than Finnish or Swedish or English translate themselves maybe on a voluntary basis or organise events and so on (. ) we’d have such huge resources for it but then all people talk about is how there are too many migrants in Varissuo and how something needs to be done about that.

---

8 LINDA: viimesenä mä ajattelin kysyä et mitä te luulette monikielisyyden tulevaisuuudesta täällä Turussa
KHALIDIN YSTÄVÄ B: aika hiljaselt näyttää mun mielest [naurua]
KHALIDIN YSTÄVÄ A: ei sitä koskaan tiedä kymmenen viistoist vuotta parikyt vuotta
LINDA: okei (. ) onks Turku nyt teidän mielestä monikielinen
KAIKKI: e:i

9 KHALIDIN YSTÄVÄ A: mun piti just sanoo jotai et jos ajattelee nii jotkut meidänki kaveripurukasta osaa ainakin yhen sanon tosi monest kielest yleensä se on haukkumasana

10 IMADIN YSTÄVÄ B: se tavallaa riippuu myös siitä että mistä lähdökohdasta lähetää siitä et niinku Turku monikielisenä kaupunkina tai monikulttuurisena kaupunkina
She adds that these are issues that politicians should have considered when migration to the city started, and that the instead of reacting by limiting migration they could have thought of how to benefit from it. The different sides of multilingualism, on one hand contrasting individual and societal multilingualism and on the other hand multilingualism in different parts of the city, are reflected upon also by Farah and her friends, who on a personal level see multilingualism as something that ‘makes life much better’:

**FARAH:** it’s nice to notice here that in schools and work places and all the other services you still speak Finnish and English and Swedish but then when you come to the suburbs and this kind of places then you hear more languages (.) for example over there there’s a Somali shop an Arab shop and a Kurdish shop so when you come to the suburbs it’s multilingual but when you go to central Turku it’s still trilingual it hasn’t changed at all

The contrast between the suburbs, particularly Varissuo where the interview was recorded, and the city centre reflects the demographic patterns described earlier in this section, and the concentration of people of migrant background in very few areas. The less multilingual city centre is nevertheless presented as trilingual. It is slightly unclear whether Farah’s evaluative comment ‘it’s nice to notice’ refers to the continuous trilingualism of the institutional and service-related contexts, or to the...

---

11 **FARAH:** tääl on hieno huomata että kouluissa ja työpaikalla ja kaikissa muissakip palveluissa vieläkip puhutaan suomea ja sit englantia ja ruotsia mut sit kot tulee tällei niinko lähtiin ja tällaisi paikkoinhin nii sit aletaan puhuu enemmän kieli (.) esimerkiksi tuolla on toi somalikauppa arabikauppa ja kurdikauppa ja sillai ja sit kut tulee lähiöön nii sit se monikielisyys mut sit sit kun menee niinkut Turun keskustaan niin kyl se on kolmikielin vieläki et ei se oo mihinkää siit muuttunu
multilingualism of the suburbs, or perhaps both. The contrast is nevertheless clear, and the differences between the city centre and the suburbs were mentioned in all group discussions in Turku. Whether this kind of segregation is a positive or negative phenomenon was discussed at length particularly by Minh and his friend:

MINH: the papers have written a lot about these suburbs that foreigners refugees and immigrants are concentrated in it really has two sides when it comes to its effects because from the point of view of multiculturalism it’s a good thing because that kind of cluster of foreigners is a really positive thing for language maintenance and cultural maintenance because you can befriend people from your own culture and your own country (...) but then as a regrettable side when you cluster they’ll be isolated from what’s going on in the rest of the country

MINH’S FRIEND: it automatically alienates you from the rest of the country and that’s when these unfortunate conflicts and disagreements happen

MINH: but then again for multiculturalism and cultural maintenance it’s a good thing to be alienated like that and to have your own reserve [laughs] where they are I believe that although I said that within a few generations so if immigrants will continue to be concentrated to a slum area with lots of immigrants then the language might not disappear as quickly (...) so it depends on how the politicians will deal with it I don’t know which one I prefer I wouldn’t want to have these clusters because having a small population isolate themselves from the rest of the world is not a good thing but then again if the culture disappears that’s not a good thing either so finding a balance is difficult (.) you need to have these bumpkins [laughs] who don’t want to be with anyone else than
people from their own country in order for the language and culture to be preserved.12

The positive value given to language maintenance and the maintenance of culture on one hand, and being part of the larger society on the other, is presented by the two friends as a challenge that remains to be solved. Interestingly, when Minh describes the people living in Varissuo he uses the third person plural ‘they’ and thereby excludes himself from the described group despite having lived there almost all his life. He also sets himself slightly apart from the view that the newspapers present, as he sees it from two different sides. He further exemplifies with the United States, and the clusters that for example Little Italy, Little Saigon and Chinatown represent. ‘People who live there and people who don’t become a bit different’, he says, comparing people of a migrant background who do not speak the associated languages with people living in the clusters who do:

MINH: if you could succeed in the same way as they do in the States that you have these areas that aren’t discriminated against really but they want to live in that kind of areas and there’s nothing wrong with it

12 MINH: just lehdishän on ollu paljon juttuu että tulee näit lähiöitä mihin ulkomaalaiset pakolaiset maahanmuuttajat keskittyvät sil on tosikakspiippunen vaikutus se on monikulttuurisuuden kannalta hyvä juttu koska semmonen keskittymä ulkomaalaisia on tosi positiivinen asia niinku kieli ja kulttuurin säilymisen kannalta koska sähän pystyt kaveeraamaan omast kulttuurinomast maasta tulleiden ihmisten kanssa (.) mut ikävänä puolena siinä on että kun keskittyy niin nehän tulee eristäytymään muun maan menosta

MINHIN YSTÄVÄ: väkisinki se etäännyttää siit maan muusta jollon sit syntyy näit ikävii konfliktiei sananharkkaa

MINH: mut sit taas monikulttuurisuuden kannalt ja kulttuurin säilymisen kannalt se on taas hyvä juttu että etääntyy tolee et on se oma paikka on se oma reservi [nauraa] missä ne on et mä oon sitä mieltä et vaik mä sanoin et parin sukupolven päästä nii jos maahanmuuttajat tulee jakossa myöski keskittymään johonki slummillauseeseen mis on paljo ulkomaisiin nii sit se kieli ei välttämät katoa niin nopeasti (...) et se riippuu siit miten nää politiikot tulee hoitamaan mä en tiedä kumpaa mä suosin mä en haluais näit keskittymii koska se että tämänen pieni kansa eristäytyy muusta maailmasta nii se ei oo hyvä asia mut toisaalta se kulttuurin katoaminenkaan ei oo hyvä asia et balanssin löytäminen on vaikeaa tällaisen suhteen (.) vaatii sellaisii junteja [nauraa] sellasis jotka ei halua ollak kuin omien maalaisten kanssa että se kieli ja kulttuuri tulee säilymään
and others can visit if they like then it works but for example Varissuo is the kind of place that nobody even sets their foot there because it’s such a scary place and the rumours compete with each other it’s not really welcomed by the majority Finnish population this kind of slum and they think why do they want to live amongst themselves they are in Finland they should learn Finnish and start working and studying and become Finnish’¹³

The negative discourse around Varissuo, defined here by Minh as a ‘slum’, has persisted for a long time. In a feature for the Turku University student newspaper, Haapamäki (2011) describes its historical development from a socio-economically poor neighbourhood with a rise in crime rates during the 1990s, to a rather peaceful and diverse place with good access to services. The changing attitudes are commented on in the group interviews with Imad and Minh. Farah and Khalid never mention the negative connotations in the first place, although they do talk about the suburbs and have spent their whole lives there.

The relative novelty of cultural and linguistic diversity in Turku/Finland sets it apart from the other contexts in which the interviews for this study were made. Yet elements in the individual interviews as well as the group discussions point to it becoming more established and part of what is seen as the norm. Imad’s friend shared an anecdote about how her assumptions were proven wrong in a chance encounter in the city:

IMAD’S FRIEND B: nowadays it’s so much more common to see different kinds of people and hear different languages when you walk in the city I caught myself in the nest of prejudice one day when

¹³ mut jos pystyy onnistumaan samal taval miten Jenkeis onnistutaan et on tällasia alueita oo ei syrjitä oikeesta vaan niitä ei haluaa asua tollasis alueissa ja siin ei oon mitään väärää ja muut voi tulla vierailleen jos ne haluun niin sillon se vois toimii mut ku et esimerkiksi Varissuo on sellainen alueen et kukaan ei tulla asua tollais alueissa ja niin pelottavaa aina vaan pahempi toisistaan niin ei oott kauheen terveellisyyteen Suomen kanottavaksi korvissa ja mielessä tämmöen keskittymää tämmöen slummi ajanajallaan et miks ne haluais asua tollien keskenään ku nehan on tällä Suomessa niitenhän kannattaa osatas suomeeseen ja päästä työelämään ja opiskella ja rupee suomalaisiks
I saw two black men who were walking towards me and I was like yay now I’ll hear some fascinating language and then it turned out they spoke Finnish with each other and I was like boo [laughs] there wasn’t anything and then you kind of notice that you expect that we’re so far from each other. 

In telling this humorous story about the ‘nest of prejudice’ and her quoted thought ‘yay now I’ll hear some fascinating language’, Imad’s friend seems aware of the positive prejudice of migrants as ‘exotic’ and supposedly different that still prevails in Finland. It points to a change that has taken place in the demography, but not yet in the attitudes even among people who have positive attitudes towards immigration.

**4.4 Chapter summary**

The overview of the history of migration to Britain, Sweden and Finland presented in this chapter makes it clear that while the national contexts are unique, they have all been affected by some larger supranational developments. It would of course be misleading to suggest that the three countries are following a certain line, with Britain ‘ahead’ and Finland ‘behind’, as Wahlbeck (1997: 120) also argues. In line with Massey’s theorisation around space, its constructedness also implies that the future is open, to be shaped by the stories and people who cross it.

In sum, the postwar period saw industrial development that created a demand for workforce, and thus Britain invited imperial subjects and workers from Europe, Sweden recruited in the other Nordic countries and northern Europe, while Finland had to replace people internally after losing some parts of the country to the Soviet Union. The economic growth particularly in Britain and Sweden came to a halt in the 1970s which led to changes in the kinds of migration, with family reunification and later
humanitarian reasons to a large extent replacing labour migration. This was also when the first refugees started arriving in all three countries. Conflicts were sparking off around the world, and the 1990s may be seen as the starting point of a new era of migration for humanitarian reasons which is still ongoing and has escalated in the recent years. While the majority of the world’s refugees are not in Europe, migration and asylum are among the most debated issues in all three countries as well as elsewhere in Europe and the world. The overview also shows how attitudes to migrants who come from geographically nearby countries, and are seen as similar in appearance and customs, have always been more positive than to those who are perceived as ‘different’.

The outlined migration patterns have moreover affected the three cities in which the data collection for this study took place. Birmingham is today known as ‘superdiverse’, with large and long-established Asian and Caribbean communities alongside smaller numbers of people from almost every country in the world. Malmö is dynamic and swiftly growing, and its image is divided between continental cosmopolitanism and looming danger. Turku, where the proportion of inhabitants with migrant backgrounds is comparatively low, is nevertheless a diverse city that attracts migrants from elsewhere in Finland because of its established communities and contacts to the rest of Europe. Segregation along socio-economic and ethnic lines is noted in all three cities, which was reflected in the group interviews. The expressed views and opinions also reflected the complexity of multilingualism at different levels – from personal experiences and hopes to larger ideologies of what society should be like. Although it is not the aim to specifically compare the three settings, a phenomenon that stood out was that the link between language and identity seemed to be stronger in the Malmö discussions than in those recorded in Birmingham and Turku.

The group discussions further established that questions of language and identity raise opinions, and that every person has some expertise in discussing these questions. The three cities are not fixed entities, and the participants’ experiences and attitudes contribute to shaping how they are viewed. While many participants drew parallels between the topics and their own lives, the statements that functioned as the basis for the group interviews were deliberately designed to be objective and focused on people and society in general. How do the opinions expressed as responses to the group interview statements then compare with the way
in which the participants talk about their own lives? What roles are attributed to languages in their own accounts of being ‘Sikh’, ‘Iraqi’ or ‘Polish’? These questions will be explored in the chapters to come. First, however, the focus will turn towards re-told stories of migration.
Chapter 5 Re-told stories of journeys of migration

The constructed concept of ‘second-generation migrants’ assumes that the event of migration is relevant to identification beyond the generation of those who actually migrated. Whether people born to migrants identify with the national or ethnic background of their parents, the dominant society, both, or any other, they are likely to at least sometimes encounter this assumption. This chapter focuses on stories in between those generations. It examines the participants’ representations of events of family history by analysing their responses to the interview question ‘What do you know about how your parents came here?’. While acknowledging that their answers are specific to the interview context, the analysis will take up their different stances to the events that brought about the migration. The specific research question to be explored in this chapter is what these accounts can tell about the participants’ identity positioning. In this, it will first distinguish between different kinds of responses to the interview question. The accounts will further be analysed with the support of approaches from narrative analysis with a specific focus on how the parents are portrayed, how the participants’ selves emerge in the interaction, and how the story itself is presented in relation to the participants’ own lives.

5.1 Life narratives

The theoretical introduction in Chapter 2 laid out the framework that underpins the analysis of identity positioning in narratives in interview talk. This chapter will employ a combination of methods relating to the analysis of life stories. Narrative studies have been profoundly influenced by the ideas put forward in Labov and Waletzky’s (henceforward L&W) 1967 paper on the character and structure of oral narrative. While it has received substantial criticism (see e.g. contributions in Bamberg 1997), it may still be viewed as the foundation of studies of oral narrative. L&W defined narrative as consisting of at least two clauses linked by temporal juncture, which correspond to a sequence of experienced events. They outlined an overall structure including the following elements: an orientation that introduces the setting and characters, a complication
which is the main body of the narrative, an evaluation that foregrounds the point of the narrative, a resolution that presents what the action resulted in, as well as a coda to close the story. The abstract, summarising what the story is about, was later added to the beginning of this suggested structure. L&W moreover depicted the narrative as having two main functions: referential and evaluative. Since this seminal paper, other important strands of narrative analysis have developed within several areas (for an overview, see De Fina & Georgakopoulou 2012). As mentioned, stories have later also been suggested to be related to a variety of interpersonal purposes such as putting forward arguments or challenging the views of others, as well as attuning one’s own stories to others around one (De Fina & Georgakopoulou 2008). An important function of narratives is thereby to claim and negotiate membership in social groups (Linde 1993, cf. Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). In this way, stories are not only about individual experiences, but also reflect collective social representations and ideologies (De Fina 2003: 7).

When it comes to the organisation of spontaneous stories, they do not always follow the orderly line of organisation presented by L&W, but rather emerge and develop in the course of verbal interaction (De Fina 2003, Georgakopoulou 2007). One kind of story that differs from the narrative in its traditional view in particular ways is referred to as a chronicle (Linde 1993). Consisting of a series of episodes that evolve around temporally ordered events, chronicles need not have one single evaluative point but rather have as their main function the telling of how “a certain state of affairs was brought about” (De Fina 2003: 98). In this way, chronicles act as a kind of table of contents of potential narratives (Linde 1993: 88). These sub-narratives, or episodes, are defined by changes in time, setting, and/or characters involved, and may have specific evaluative points. De Fina (2003) illustrates how stories of border crossing from Mexico to the United States in her data are recounted in the form of chronicles. The accounts presented here were also elicited and aimed at finding out about a particular event that involves both temporal and spatial juncture, from the country of origin to the country of residence, and the answers resemble chronicles in a similar way to De Fina’s. In line with the stories of border crossing, the data presented here differs from Linde’s original characterisation of chronicles as lacking abstracts, orientations and codas and consisting only of narration of events. They do, however, vary vastly in their degree of elaboration and detail. The term ‘small
stories’ (e.g. Georgakopoulou 2007, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008), is useful here, as an umbrella for the stories that do not fit with the structure proposed by L&W, nor with the concept of chronicles.

The analysis here focuses mainly on what the participants accomplish by telling the narratives in the ways that they do, or by refraining from telling a story. What are principally considered are, in other words, the representative, performative and interactional functions of the narrative. The most relevant theoretical and analytical approaches used here are attuned to the view of identity as positioning through aligning oneself with and distancing oneself from certain categories, which may be known or emerging at the moment of speech. Narrativisation is thus understood as “painting selves in the world” (Ochs & Capps 1996: 28).

The analysis will make use of Bamberg’s (1997) distinction between three levels in which positioning takes place. The characters are firstly positioned in relation to other characters in the narrated events, and thus juxtaposed or presented as similar to these others. The speaker additionally positions him- or herself in relation to the listener and other possible audiences. The third level corresponds to a kind of self-positioning that Bamberg (1997: 337) describes through the question ‘How do I want to be understood by you, the audience?’, which expands the view from the local context to a larger social one. These levels correspond to Wortham’s (2001) distinction between the represented and enacted contents as levels of positioning. He describes identities as emerging through the characteristics, actions and values attributed to speakers as characters within the story, as well as those that are interactionally accomplished at the moment of its telling. The factuality of the reported events is therefore not important; what matters is that the speaker presents them as having happened, and the ways in which the events are reported. Needless to say, although the participants were speaking to a usually mostly silent interviewer, the mere presence of another person and how they are perceived by the speaker influence the way in which the story is told. In this case, participants were also aware of speaking to a recorder and indirectly to readers of a research project on a particular topic related to migration and identity.

What, then, constitutes a story worth telling? Georgakopoulou (2008: 33) argues that “however problematized, the context of an elicited story in an interview situation still tends to divide participants into a teller with strong floor-holding rights and a recipient”. As the data here consists of
elicited stories as part of research interviews, it may be argued that the question of tellability is indisputable. However, as the analysis will show, the participants might not agree with this assumption. In the context of a research interview, the participants can also refrain from telling a story, and position themselves by doing so. Linked to the aspect of tellability is that of tellership, and the question of who can tell a certain story. Linde (1993: 283) suggests that apart from a speaker, their family and friends as well as other people who participate in their lives have ‘story telling rights’ to events in their life story. The family may, moreover, be seen as both a community and a frame of communication in which generations overlap: experiences, explanations and destinies are constructed beyond the borders of generations (Assmann 2006: 22). While life story interviewing normally starts by questions on time and place of birth of the speaker, they do usually include inquiries about the previous generation(s). The majority of narrative studies of identity however clearly favour stories of personal, lived experience. This chapter will illustrate that the re-told migration stories or their absence have a function in how the participants are positioned, even if the recounted events took place before they were born, or when they were too young to remember. The aim here is to examine that positioning, with the help of linguistic approaches in previous research.

The analysis in this chapter takes as a starting point the distinction between the different levels at which positioning takes place (Bamberg 1997, Wortham 2001). Bamberg’s suggested levels are here seen as corresponding to three distinct research questions, i.e. how are the parents positioned (‘How are characters in the story positioned in relation to each other within the story?’), how are the participants themselves positioned (‘How do speakers position themselves in relation to the audience?’), and how is the reported story positioned (‘What can be said about positioning beyond the local context?’). The analysis in this chapter is based on a close reading of the participants’ replies to questions about what they know about how their parents came to their respective countries of residence. The analysis section is split into three sub-sections, each with a particular kind of data, and the emphasis will fall on slightly different aspects depending on the data in question.
5.2 ‘What do you know about how your parents came here?’

The routes that brought the parents of the participants to Finland, Sweden and the UK respectively were influenced by different factors in the countries they migrated from as well as the countries they migrated to. These factors were briefly mentioned in the overviews in the previous chapter. The parents of Randeep, Hülya, Susanna, Ewa, and Cemile moved mainly for employment, while Laila’s father had come to the UK as a child to stay with his brother who had migrated there for work. The parents of Farah, Minh, Imad, Khalid, Gabriela and Danny fled from war or conflict. This chapter is divided into sub-sections that are based roughly on these differences. The first section will look at the stories of Randeep, Hülya, Susanna, Ewa, Cemile and Laila. While the reasons for migration were largely similar, the stories do not resemble each other particularly, but foreground and evaluate different aspects of the migration experience. The second section focuses on the stories of Danny, Farah, Gabriela and Minh, whose parents came as refugees. The third section presents the answers mainly of Khalid and Imad as examples where the story is largely unknown or untold.

5.2.1 Work-related migration stories

This section examines the replies of the participants whose parents moved for reasons related to employment in their new countries of residence. In most cases, it was the fathers who were employed, and were often the first ones to arrive in the new country. The section will look at elements of the participants’ accounts in order to closely examine the three levels of positioning. Extracts of the stories will first be presented individually, after which the themes will be drawn together in a discussion. Starting from how the parents are positioned, the stories vary in the degree of characterisation as well as what aspects of context are foregrounded.

Susanna’s mother lived in Sweden twice during her childhood, as a so-called ‘war child’ who was sent there during times of war in Finland. Susanna presents the mother’s positive experiences of Sweden as the reason the parents later migrated there permanently: “she thought it was fantastic (...) so when things got hard in Finland she wasn’t afraid to take the step
she would probably have wanted to stay here because here they had food and everything”\(^\text{15}\). Her mother also received healthcare in Sweden as a child, which Susanna presents as unlikely to have been available in Finland. Susanna moreover presents her father as representing the industrious character of Finnish migrants who were appreciated in Sweden at the time: “Finns are hard-working right they were welcomed (...) you went to work even if you were ill and it was physically hard work no real education”\(^\text{16}\). Both of her parents worked in physical jobs, her mother as a cleaner and her father in construction and lathes. Randeep’s story is also based on knowledge about the character of migration from South Asia to Britain in the 1960s. He describes his grandfather as being one of many children, which meant that he needed to find work in a city as his share of land would not be sufficiently sustainable for him to survive on. His decision to depart for Britain is presented as an ordinary and logical thing to do: “they were asking people from Commonwealth countries to come to Britain to work he obviously applied for that and other people from our village had gone as well already so he had those kinship contacts”. His father was a teenager at the time, and his marriage with Randeep’s mother, who had come to Britain through a similar story, was later arranged there.

In Cemile’s account, her father’s story is characterised as ‘a bit more interesting’, and her mother’s story remains untold. Her account of her father’s journey involves more details both about what preceded his migration and how that influenced him later. He had grown up in Macedonia in a large family that after his father’s death moved to Turkey, and Cemile characterises his early life as a struggle with poverty, where helping his mother was the main priority. The account includes evaluation on how these experiences influenced him later in life:

CEMILE: that’s why he’s very independent (...) oh yeah and another thing still today he’s very very economical he always says sure you can blow your money away but that needs to be on food and so on when it comes to entertainment he doesn’t really understand except from when you’re on holiday he’s kind

\(^{15}\) “hon tyckte de va fantastiskt (...) så då när de blev knapert i Finland då va inte hon rädd för att ta klivet hon hade nog helst velat stanna här för här fanns det mat o allting”

\(^{16}\) “sen är ju finnar arbetsamma dom va ju välkomna (...) då gick man till jobbet även om man var sjuk liksom o hårt kroppsarbete ingen riktig skola bakom sej”
of like restricted himself (.) because of what he’s experienced before\textsuperscript{17}

Her father first found a job as a tailor in Sweden, and later started working on the ships between Malmö and Germany. Hülya, in her story, foregrounds the age difference between her parents, and describes her father coming to Britain on a working visa in his early twenties to work in restaurants and perform with his music:

HÜLYA: he worked basically in a lot of places he went to Glasgow and all this and then he settled here after and then he used to sing and play guitar (.) he used to do a lot of jobs basically he did the work in the restaurants he did his own thing and then around forty-four he went he did go back and forth to Turkey obviously but then when he was forty-four he was like I’m gonna get married

Hülya’s mother then enters the story as a ‘pretty, blonde girl’ whom his sister introduces to him; “then they said yes and then everything kinda happened”. Laila’s story is related to labour migration but differs on the point that her father arrived already as a child as he was orphaned and sent to live with a brother in England. Her account does not describe the parents \textit{per se}, but evaluates their reactions to the migration. She characterises her father’s experience as easier: “I guess it was strange for him to be in a you know a different country but when you’re that young you just sort of get used to it don’t you”, while her mother’s experience is presented as a larger challenge:

LAILA: I think it was harder for her because she didn’t know anybody at least with my dad it was still family he was coming to and she’d sort of had lived this life up to the age of nineteen you know an adult and then came to a different country to live with strangers and so yeah it was quite different for her I think (.) she didn’t love it [laughs] certainly not to begin with [laughs] a lot to get used to

\textsuperscript{17} “de e därför han e jättesjälvständig (...) ja o annan grej än i dag han e väldigt väldigt ekonomisk han säger alltid visst man ska slösa men de får vara till liksom äta o så o när de e nöje så förstår han inte riktigt förutom under semesterperioden han har lite liksom han har begränsat sej själv (.) på grund av de han har upplevt tidigare”
These stories may be viewed as chronicles and thus as lacking an overall point; their primary purpose is telling about certain events from a generation in the families. The descriptions of the parents may be seen as representations of collective history, as the participants are the sons and daughters of the people they describe and their lifelines are thus inevitably affected by the events that the previous generation experienced. Few accounts include explicit descriptions that disclose what the parents as individuals are like, or what they were like before migrating. An interesting aspect is however what these short accounts place focus on. What piece of information was seen as relevant in the context where they were told? Susanna and Randee in particular make use of presupposed knowledge about the context of labour migration from Finland to Sweden and India to Britain respectively, and their parents (in Randee’s case grandparents) are linked to figures of personhood and thus presented as examples of larger social personae. Randee’s parents in particular are not described or characterised as exceptional, but the account rather describes elements in a phase in the history of migration. Susanna evokes the presupposed understanding with the verb in present tense (‘Finns are hard-working right they were welcomed’) which may be seen as including the present interlocutors under the positive stereotypical image of Finns. The element of being welcomed in the countries the parents migrated to is present in both accounts, portraying the parents as appreciated workforce, although attitudes towards labour migrants were not as positive as the portraits here may convey. There are tentative links between how Randee and Susanna position their parents, and how they position themselves elsewhere in their interview talk. For example, Randee’s characterisation of his parents’ journey as ordinary is similar to his positioning of himself as ‘nobody special’: at another instance he comments ‘my life’s quite mundane and I’ve never thought of my life as interesting material’. Susanna’s foregrounding of her mother’s preference for Sweden is likewise in line with her own early decision to ‘choose Sweden’: ‘I think I decided from the start that I support Sweden’.

Several of the accounts mention the hardships that the parents faced before migrating. Poverty is mentioned by Susanna, Cemile, Randee and Laila as a reason for migration. Cemile’s account is one of the most

---

18 “jag tror att jag bestämde mig redan från början att jag håller på Sverige”
descriptive out of the examples here, and evolves largely around her evaluation of who her father is because of growing up in scarce circumstances. She links his traits of character – being ‘very very economical’, not understanding spending money on entertainment, and restricting himself – to these experiences, thus creating coherence in his life story as it is reported here. Hülya’s father, on the other hand, is characterised more through his age and actions; in contrast to the sort of jobs that the parents of Susanna, Randeeep and Cemile migrated to, he is presented as ‘doing his own thing’ and being a musical entertainer alongside the work in restaurants. In contrast with Randeeep, Hülya’s story thus involves a sense of uniqueness in the presentation of her father. Some of the participants present the events from the point of view of the parents and include their landscape of consciousness, i.e. their feelings and beliefs, in their accounts. Laila’s foregrounding of her parents’ feelings and reactions is perhaps simultaneously an account of migration as it is about arranged marriage: her mother is presented as ‘having to live with strangers’ after a life in India up until adulthood, which evokes a sense of distance from this custom, or at least a recognition of it not being the norm in the British social context. Susanna’s description of her mother’s experiences includes similar reflections of the inner world of the mother from a distant past. In this case the evaluation concerns her mother preferring Sweden over Finland (‘she would probably have wanted to stay here’) ever since living there as a child. This positive view (‘she thought it was fantastic’) is thus presented as a partial reason for the migration. These points of views from inside the parents’ minds relate to the ‘storytelling rights’ and the access that the participants have to these stories. As the events took place years before the participants were born, these representations are to some extent imagined and built upon representations by others.

Apart from the presented evaluations, the participants position themselves through interactive enactment in telling the accounts. In Bamberg’s terms, this represents the second level of positioning. Cemile and Hülya are most present in their accounts, either as characters in their stories or as active commentators on the represented events. Cemile includes her childhood memories of missing her father when he was working on the ships to Germany: ‘then you’d miss dad he was away because he worked on the ships as a server so he was gone and you’d long for when he came cause you knew there’d be sweets and so on [laughs] (...) and even if he couldn’t
buy any that week it wouldn’t make a difference but that you knew that he was home". The positioning of Cemile as a child in the account is likely to reflect how she wishes to be understood at the moment in which the story is told: as an understanding and considerate person, who may be viewed as family-oriented. The link between the experiences of her father and of Cemile herself create a sense of continuity between their life stories, even if Cemile concludes that the tales of her father are ‘pure history’ to her and represent a different world from the Sweden she grew up in. Hülya is present in her account through explicit reflections that are woven into the ongoing storyline. In describing her father’s early experiences, she comments: ‘he worked in Glasgow at this hotel place like this really fancy place and he met Charlie Chaplin there I know can you imagine it’s like when he says that I’m like oh my god dad you’re so old’. The mentioning of Charlie Chaplin as a historical referent prompts her comment to me as the interlocutor, through the quote of herself reacting with amusement or astonishment to her father’s age. She makes a similar comment in describing his steps towards marriage in ‘when he was forty-four he was like I’m gonna get married very late marriage’, where her comment ‘very late marriage’ takes a humorous stance on what age is the ‘proper’ age for marriage, and the ‘proper age’ for becoming a father. These comments also position Hülya herself as a young person, and are also perhaps ways of aligning with me as another young person. The examples demonstrate how telling the story makes it possible for the participants to convey their norms and to confirm their belonging to certain social groups and their understanding of the norms and values related to these groups.

The participants are also positioned in how they present the story itself, here representing a third level of positioning (Bamberg 1997). The structure of the accounts, and especially their openings and closings – in Labov and Waletzky’s terms the abstracts and the codas – seem to be a location in which the participants convey this. Randeep opens his story by saying: “well my grandfather came because he (.) for economic reasons you know”. After initial hesitation he opts for the phrase ‘for economic reasons you know’, which is directed at assumed knowledge that will make the story recognisable as representing a certain social phenomenon. Hülya

---

19 “о så brukade man längta till pappa var ju borta i o med att han jobba på båten som servitör så var han ju borta o så längta man till att han skulle komma för då visste man ju att han skulle köra med dehär med godis o såhära [skrattar] (...) o även om han inte kunde köpa den veckan så spela de ingen roll men att man visste att han va hemma”
similarly surrounds her story with the abstract “basically what happened was my dad came here with a working visa when he was about twenty-two or something” and the coda “that’s how they came here basically”. The word ‘basically’ here signals a simplification but also the core of the complication, in structural terms. In Ewa’s case, the entire story consists of an abstract and a coda, bridged by a humorous evaluation: “my dad had a six-month contract at [name of company] in Britain and it’s been quite a long six months [laughs] yeah that’s pretty much it”. Cemile similarly summarises her parents’ journey as ‘life’: “well (...) what can I say life [laughs] they just came here”\(^{20}\). These openings and closings position the stories as having relatively low tellability, and as unexceptional and to some extent perhaps uninteresting. The event of migration is moreover not presented as a rupture in a course of events; in the cases of Ewa and Hülya, the migration is rather presented as where the story begins. The information about the events that the stories revolve around has clearly been passed down from a previous generation, and it is possible that the participants have been asked the question previously. The context of the specific event however always influences how a narrative unfolds and is presented, and the context of the research interview acts as a ‘third participant’ in the interaction.

The next section will examine, with the help of a similar distinction between three levels of positioning, four lengthier stories about forced migration. The stories of Danny, Farah, Gabriela and Minh give the impression that these kinds of migration stories have high tellability, and also seem to have a place in the lives of the participants.

5.2.2 Stories of forced migration

Among the responses to the question of what the participants knew about their parents’ migrations, three accounts stood out as particularly elaborate and extensive. They include several distinct evaluative points and are particularly rich in description of different episodes along the journey. These stories by Farah, Gabriela and Danny relate to forced migration, and may be seen as different kinds of chronicles from those presented in the previous section. The common aspects in these stories lie particularly in how the parents are portrayed as certain kinds of people,

\(^{20}\) “ja (...) va ska man säga livet liksom [skrättar] de ba kom hit”
and how these positionings reflect the participants as speakers, as well as in what meaning is attributed to the story itself. Minh’s story differs from the other three, but will also be included here because of the similar value he attaches to it. This section will examine positioning in the same way as the previous, i.e. by distinguishing between how the parents are portrayed, how the participants enact their own identities through the interaction, as well as how the story itself is positioned vis-à-vis the participants’ lives.

As three of the stories are very long, I have chosen here to present passages from them that are particularly interesting when it comes to the participants’ identity positionings. Presenting the full story would certainly have its advantages, and it is only for reasons of space and balance that this decision has been made. Another option would have been to choose only one participant’s story, but that would have implied making a judgement on ‘representability’, which is not in line with the theoretical or epistemological approach here. Therefore, some passages will be re-narrated by me between the extracts and their analysis.

To start with, Danny frames his story as ‘a hell journey’. In Labov and Waletzky’s terms, this would be the abstract that summarises what is to come. After that, he begins to narrate the events:

LINDA: what do you know about how they came to Sweden this is actually kind of a later question but

DANNY: yeah oh they had a hell they had a hell journey first ehm Iraq was in during that time in war with Iran so whoever fled from Iraq were granted asylum in Iran and other way around all you had to do was say I’m against Saddam Hussein and that during that time it was Ayatollah so he was like cool come in (.) the enemy of my enemy [laughs] so they came they fled over like you see here [points at map on computer screen] it’s not all that far from Iran this is Iran they fled over here and there they just pretty much told me they haven’t got into that much detail but they’ve told me it was a hellish type of journey ehm from the border to Iran they had to walk in like (.) this waist-deep snow (.) ehm they had no food my mum the only thing they had onion and bread and they ate that with snow
and they pretty much gave as much as possible to me because I was an infant and they didn’t really know where they were going.

After the floor has been opened to Danny’s story despite the fact that in the interview scheme it was part of a later theme, his initial abstract is followed by the word ‘first’, which marks the beginning of the story events. Danny introduces the spatial and temporal setting and humorously, through creative constructed dialogue that mirrors the political atmosphere (‘I’m against Saddam Hussein’ / ‘cool come in, the enemy of my enemy’), and rationalises the first direction of the journey. With support of the map on the computer screen, he then outlines the first episode of events. His parents are represented as being lost and caught in a frightening and chaotic situation, reflected for example in the verb tenses and verb phrases (‘they had to walk’, ‘they didn’t know where they were going’). Despite the circumstances, they are also presented as making sacrifices for their son. Danny himself is included as an infant, yet the use of the third person plural pronoun excludes him from the main characters and puts focus on the parents. The reoccurring words in this extract place the events in an extreme context described as ‘full war’ and ‘just chaos’, with the word ‘hell’ or ‘hellish’ repeated a number of times. This choice of words and their repetition create the frame within which the events are intended to be understood.

Danny then continues by describing the perilous journey by car in the mountains, and finally arriving in Tehran, where they stayed at a refugee camp. His father went ‘every day to every embassy’ to ask for asylum, but without luck. From Tehran, they managed to take a flight and land at Damascus airport:

DANNY: they were stuck kinda stuck at the airport in Damascus and it was obviously multiple conflicts going on in that region at the same time so they it wasn’t unusual that you just lived in the airport for a month or two until you could

[WIFE snickers]

DANNY: it wasn’t
WIFE: can you imagine

LINDA: [no]

DANNY: [yeah can] you imagine [laughs] and every time they tried to smuggle themself cause my dad wanted to go to Australia that was his thing he was like Australia nice warm I know that the warmth thing is ehm it’s a common thing among us we like it warm [laughs] so he wanted to live in Australia have a big vineyard and sheep that was his dream (.) so obviously at the embassy in Iran they told him no and in Syria they were like hell no so he was like what do we do and my mum was like Switzerland I’ve always wanted to go to Switzerland that sounds like a great country the Geneve convention and the UN and all that they were like cool so every time they tried to smuggle themself on board of a of a plane they would have to approach the lady or the man behind the counter who would scan the tickets and be like we don’t have any passports but we’ll buy a ticket et cetera and they would always be like cool don’t worry and they took some money but I think what happened four five times they tried that every time before the plane took off they came in and did an extra: and it was obviously the person they paid off it was obviously them who took the money and at the same time made a call

In this passage, Danny’s wife interjects a snicker to mark her disbelief, and through her comment, she also engages me as the other and perhaps primary listener to confirm the incredibility of what Danny has said. After echoing her comment, Danny returns to the course of events he was describing. The episode presents a new complication and solution: as his parents lacked passports, they had to resort to ‘smuggling themselves’ onto planes. This storyline is interrupted by further characterisation of the father, whose dream about having a vineyard and sheep in Australia may be seen as an emblem for a particular kind of peaceful, rural lifestyle that he desires. Danny here links himself to his father in the comment ‘it’s a common thing among us, we like it warm’. Among the pictures that Danny
had brought to the first interview was one of Los Angeles, which he said he dreamed about because of its warm climate. This characterisation of his father thus emphasises the link of similarity between them and brings himself into the story. The mother is also given voice, as she contributes an alternative plan that is here presented as leading to the parents’ decision, i.e. going to Switzerland. In contrast with the father’s plan, hers is presented as more knowledgeable, with reference to the UN and the conventions on human rights. The other instances of indirect reported speech may again be claimed to add to Danny’s position as a storyteller: the dialogue at the end of the extract (‘in Iran they told him ‘no’ and in Syria they were like ‘hell no’ so he was like ‘what do we do’”) are characteristic of Danny’s own voice in presenting the events in a vivid and dramatic way and of making the story his own.

The different passages in Danny’s narrative are marked by the inflection of the word ‘so’, and in the following extract, the deictic ‘eventually’ marks it as the part of the story where the resolution will be presented (cf. L&W 1967):

DANNY: so eventually (.) my dad saw one person working there he had some kind of a rash my dad studied medicine in in Iraq so he was like I think I know what that is he told the man cause he was kinda talking to him and the man was scratching at the same time and my dad was like I think I know what that is (.) and he wrote down what medicine or substance and he said try this (.) and it worked (.) and from there they built a relationship and he that man who worked at the airport spoke with another lady (.) there was kinda feeling for us cause I was a child and they got to know each other they were there for a month or two they eventually they recognize you so they knew my name and they were like how’s the little one doing and blablabla and they were just waiting for money cause every time they went on board and got rejected they wasted their money you’re a refugee where do you get money from (.) so they had to get money wired from their parents so eventually this man who had the rash and the woman said we’ll help you don’t worry about it the man he will scan the tickets I’m
gonna be onboard and I’m gonna make sure we have a quick departure so you don’t you know so you’re not gonna suffer anything like that or be kicked off so eventually we took off

This episode thus marks a turning point in the chronicle. The actions are to a large extent carried forward through the use of reported speech between Danny’s father and the man working at the airport, and their exchange is presented as the key to them finally being able to leave the conflict area. In this important episode, the reported speech is initiated by Danny’s father, who moreover gives a recommendation to the man. This is significant because initiation, as well as what kind of speech act is ascribed to a speaking character in a story, are cues to power constellations constructed inside the story world (cf. De Fina 2003). Danny’s father’s agency is thus highlighted here as the reason for the solution. In addition, the added information and explanation of the circumstances (‘you’re a refugee where do you get your money from’), also juxtaposes the father’s agency with the restrictions of the situation. The airport staff, through the reported speech attached to them, are furthermore characterised as amicable and helpful in contrast to earlier instances attributed to non-named people at embassies and offices. Danny also makes a switch in his use of pronouns, as he himself is here included in the first person plural ‘we’ who finally take off from Damascus.

Danny then describes how his family arrives in Sweden, after first going to Switzerland and Denmark in vain. He voices an unknown person saying “try Sweden they’re more a bit more humane when it comes to refugees”, recounts the arrival in Stockholm, and shows the first picture of him that was ever taken: a black and white picture of himself with his father. The story ends with a telling coda: ‘so that was my mum and dad’s journey and that’s the short version [laughs]’. By describing it as his parents’ journey, he once again excludes himself from the events. His comment ‘that’s the short version’ signals the magnitude of experiences that make up the story, of which he previously mentioned he has not heard the details.

This analysis of Danny’s story has illustrated how his parents, and particularly his father, are positioned in different episodes describing the journey. The father’s resourcefulness and persistence as well as his educational background and knowledge are foregrounded as central to the development of the events. At the same time, he is positioned as a
vulnerable person, a political refugee, and as caught in a situation described as ‘hellish’. Danny himself is positioned both in the descriptions and foregrounding, as well as through the orchestrating of the reported speech or constructed dialogue that moves the story forward. The positioning of the story itself will be discussed later in this section, together with the stories of the three other participants.

The focus will now shift over to Farah’s story, likewise from the country of Iraq. Her parents fled from Saddam Hussein’s regime in the early 1990s, before Farah was born. Her story begins with a characterisation of the situation her parents were living in before the rupture that their migration presented:

LINDA: I was going to ask what you know about your parents’ move to Finland (.) like in general

FARAH: ehm well I know that for example my dad why they had to leave Iraq was that because they were basically because Saddam had this thing right (.) like (.) how do I explain he was really the kind of person that he didn’t like a certain kind of people that represented a particular like part of the religion and then when my parents did represent like these Shia muslims and then like they had some political messages there so if you for example had said that he causes mischief to Shia muslims then it would have been death instantly so then if you even slightly said your opinion it was death instantly and then I rememember that my parents ehm my dad especially and his family they always spoke their opinion and they didn’t want to be the kind of people who go under a tyrant’s power and they wanted to really say something because they wanted to change things and then I think they had somehow like been labelled as communists even though they didn’t have anything to do with communists they were really religious people

21 LINDA: mun piti kysyä et mitä sä tiedät sun vanhempien muutosta Suomeen (.) sillei ylipäänsä
FARAH: aam no mä tiedän se et esimerkiks mun isäni nii miks he joutu tuleen sielt Irakista oli se et koska he oli periaatties ko Saddamillahan oli sellanen (.) niinko (.) miten mä
The main components to be drawn from Farah’s account are the way in which her parents (particularly her father) is portrayed, how the course of events is depicted, and how Farah herself is present in the account through commentary that builds the story and highlights the parts that she seems to see as the most central or interesting. Farah represents her as a virtuous, ‘good’ person in several ways. He is an outspoken and courageous person resisting a tyrant and fighting for change, he is a devout Muslim, and he is a well-known and successful businessman importing his goods from Europe. Saddam Hussein, on the other hand, is represented as ‘Saddam’, a rather infatuous character who disliked certain kinds of people without having a good reason for it, but also as a powerful one whose misrepresentations of people could lead to ‘instant death’. Farah’s own position can be understood as that of a young person, who is careful with her description of the situation, and who seems to value highly the characteristics of her father that she foregrounds. The story continues with the complication:

FARAH: it was funny really to hear that that was how like Saddam got rid of people was that he labelled them as communists and then came death and then when their names were this was funny their names came into the day’s paper and ehm then like dad was just at a café reading the paper looked up the names that was it (. ) you had to escape immediately because they would have come there instantly it was quite funny to hear how they reacted to it when it really happened so sometimes when mum says it it’s as if it were from a movie or something it was so strange that as soon as the

selittäisin et hän oli tosi sellanen ihminen että hän ei pitäny tietynlaista ihmisistä jotka edusti jotain tiettyä niinku osaa uskonnosta ja sillon ko mun vanhemmat just edusti niinku näitä shiiamuslimeita ja sit taas niinko heillä oli jotain poliittisen sanomien tässä näin jos oli vaikka sanonu että että hän aiheuttaa pahaa shiiamuslimeil nii sit se ois ollu heti kuolema et nii sit ko puhu vähänki sano mielipiteensä nii sit se oli heti kuolema ja sit mä muistan et mun vanhemmat mun isä varsinko ja hänen perhe ni ne aina sano mielipiteen et he ei halunnu olla sellasii mitkä niinku menee tyrannin vallan alla ni he halus oikeesti sanoo jotai koska he halus muuttaa asioita ja sit mun mielestä he oli ollu jotenki sillai et et vaan he oli leimattu kommunisteiks vaikka ei ollu mitään tekemist kommunistien kanssa et he oli ihan uskonnollisia ihmisii
names were in the day’s paper like on the killing list
then it was probably a scene like [laughs] we have
to get away\textsuperscript{22}

Farah uses the phrase ‘it was funny’ at many instances in her recounted
story, and it seems clear that this phrase functions more as a marker of
new or especially interesting information that will follow, or as an
evaluation of something which seems incredible and foreign to her, rather
than actually funny. The complication in the story is described through
actions in the story world, which Farah then juxtaposes to her own reality,
and evaluates it by commenting ‘it’s as if it were from a movie or something’.
In line with this cinematic comparison, she voices ‘the scene’ by using a
high pitch in the constructed comment ‘we have to get away’. After this, she
moves to recount life before the complication happened:

FARAH: it was funny because my dad and (.)
granddad had a really big company and then there
in Iraq so that was probably why we were quite
well-known because we were our town was quite
small like maybe the size of Savonlinna the town
and it was the kind of town where industry was
flourishing so they had like a (.) metal works and
they actually bought all their stuff from Europe and
like it came through Bagdad from Europe and
around the world so(.) then when they were well-
known at this metalworks a:nd then dad said when
they had a really big lorry then everyone went
inside it like (.) they escaped like in the lorry so you
didn’t take basically you left all your stuff you just
took the most important you took a bit of clothes
you took some money to exchange and that’s how
they went to Saudi-Arabia and it was really in my

\textsuperscript{22} FARAHH: se oli hassu oikeesti kuulla et et se oli miten niinko Saddam pääsi eroon
ihmisistä oli et hän leimas heidät kommunistiks ja sit tuli niinku se kuolema ni sit ku
heidän nimet oli niinko siinä tota noin ni päivän lehdessä se oli hassu heidän nimet tuli
päivän lehteen ää sitte totonoinn išä oli vaan kahvilassa luki päivän lehden katso nimen
se oli siinä (.) piti lähtee karkuun heti koska he olis tullu sinne samantien se oli se oli aika
hassu kuulla että miten he reagoi siihen sit kun ihan oikeesti se tapahtu et välillä ku äiti
sanoo sen ni on ihan ku ois joku elokuva tai jotai tällasta se oli nii ihmeellistä et heti ku
päivän lehdessä se luki nimi että nämä ovat niinko tappolistalla ni sit se oli sellanen
varmaan kohtaus että [nauraa] pitää päästä pois
opinion the greatest thing to hear that really Saudi-Arabia accepted them because I’ve heard that for example in Iran they didn’t always accept so there it was stricter and it was hard so especially when a big lorry is driving in the middle of the motorway what’s in here like quite strange it was really quite quite a rescue because luck was on their side when they got away from there.

The main characters are still Farah’s father and his family, were the owners of a metal works in their small town. Here, Farah’s use of the first person plural is very interesting: through her comment ‘we were quite well-known there’, she includes herself in the collective identity of her family, in events that took place before her birth in a space in which she has never lived, but that nevertheless seems tightly linked to her story. At a later point in the conversation, she said that as her family is so close-knit, it feels as if the events that her parents went through actually have happened to her. At the same time, there is a sense of surrealism of the cinema in how the incidents of Farah’s father spotting his name in the day’s paper and in how the family escapes in the big lorry on the motorway: here, too, Farah changes her pitch to mark the reported speech (‘what’s in here?’) to serve as a comment to highlight the strangeness and potential danger of the events. Farah’s story ends with an evaluation (‘luck was on their side when they got away from there’), in which she also foregrounds the positive aspects of being welcomed in Saudi-Arabia, which led to the escape being successful.

23 FARAH: se oli hauska kun mun isän isällä ja isoisällä oli tosi iso yritys ja sit siel Irakissa ni varmaan sen takii me oltii aika tunnettui ku me oltii meidän kaupunki on tosi pieni sellane varmaan pienempi ku se on ehkä Savonlinnan kokonen se kaupunki ja se oli sellanen kaupunki enemmän jossa niinku teollisuus kukosti nii heil oli siel tollanen metallipaja ja he itse asias osti kaikki tavaransa niinku Euroopasta ja tällei ja tuli niinku aina Bagdadin kautta Euroopasta ja eri puolelt maailmaa ni (.) sit ko he oli tunnetut tällä metallipajalla ja: sit isä sano että ko heil oli sellane tosi iso kuorma-auto niin siihen kaikki sitte meni niinko (.) he pakeni niinko sillä et ei otettu kaikki tavarat periaattees jätettiin et otettiin vaan tärkeimmät otettiin pari otettiin vaihtorahaa mukaa otetti pari parit vaatteet ja sit se oli niinko sillä he meni Saudiarabiaan ja se oli oikeesti mun mielestä kaikista hienointa kuulla et oikeesti saudi arabia niinku oti heidät vastaan koska just on kuullu esimerkiksi et iranissa ei aina otettu vastaa et siel oli vähä tarkennat ja (. ) se oli se oikeeta et varsinki ku iso kuorma-auto menee keskellä moottoritietä niin mitä tässä on (. ) sillai aika ihmeellist (. ) se oli kyl aika (. ) aika pelastus koska onni oli heidän mukanaan ko he sielt päasi pois.
The third account of forced migration is told by Gabriela, whose parents fled from Chile to Sweden in the 1970s.

GABRIELA: what I know is what my grandmother and my mum have told me (.) my dad has always been a bit mute about it (.) mum was twenty when it broke out and she was a student then and my mum’s story is she’s a bit like the black sheep she’s from a very right-wing and middle class family very Catholic very wealthy [...] so she had a teenage revolt and her family is very Catholic they’re eight siblings and she grew up in a very shall we say patriarchal society where men would study right and women would learn to conduct themselves as a lady and maybe study to be a nursery teacher to have the title in the drawer but then in reality make the husband proud that’s what she’s been indoctrined into (.) mum did her revolt because she’s the only one among her sisters who wasn’t a virgin when she got married she’s the only one who had boyfriends and who drank it was the seventies when she was young she hung out with the hippie movement and smoked weed and wanted to change the world (.) and her family took away her allowance and so on they wouldn’t pay for her studies as a way of punishing her (.) my mum knew that the only way to get out was a scholarship because she was a really good student a model student so she was studying to be a nurse when the military coup broke out24

24 GABRIELA: det jag vet är ju vad mamma och farmor har berättat (.) pappa var alltid lite stum om det (.) mamma var tjugo år när det bröt ut och hon var student då och min mammas historia hon är lite såhär svarta fåret hon kommer från en väldigt höger och borgerlig familj väldigt katolsk väldigt rik [...] och hon gjorde tonårsrebell och hennes familj är väldigt katolsk dom är åtta syskon och hon är uppväxt på en väldigt ska vi säga patriarkalsamhälle där män skulle ju studera och plugga kvinnorna skulle lära sig och föras sig som en dam och kanske läsa till dagisfröken för att ha titeln i lådan och som egentligen göra mannen stolt det är det hon blivit indoctrinerad till (.) mamma gjorde sin revolt för hon är den enda bland sina systrar som inte var oskuld när hon gifte sig hon är den enda som hade pojkvänner som drack det var sjuttonda när hon liksom var ung hon hängde med den här hippirörelsen och rökte gräs och skulle förändra världen (.) och hennes familj
Gabriela straight away frames the story as something she has heard through her female relatives, her mother and her paternal grandmother. The main character in the first part of the story is Gabriela’s mother, then a twenty-year-old student. Gabriela portrays her mother as the ‘black sheep’, a concept that in itself indexes deviation from family norms. She then juxtaposes her mother’s character and actions with the surrounding norms in what may be seen as four adjacent storylines patched together. Firstly, her mother’s family is described as ‘very right-wing’, ‘middle class’, ‘very Catholic’ and ‘very wealthy’, indexicals that point to a specific kind of characteristic with particular connotations. In addition, the context in which her mother grew up is defined as a ‘patriarchal society’. Although this concept alone would probably be sufficient to describe the circumstances, Gabriela foregrounds the context by the story-within-the-story on the gender roles that her mother was ‘indoctrined’ into, marking the power of the ideological constraints on women’s role in this kind of society. Gabriela’s use of the marker ‘ju’/’right’ (‘män skulle ju studera’ /men would study, right’) signals an expectation of mutual knowledge about the topic between her as speaker and me as listener at the moment of telling.

Next, Gabriela positions her mother as breaking the norms not only of society but also within her family, as she is presented as ‘the only one among her sisters’ to break the conventions. Having boyfriends, drinking, hanging out with hippies and smoking weed are presented as undesirable behaviour for a woman in the represented contents, yet in the telling of the story, they have the opposite effect: the ‘revolt’ of Gabriela’s mother foregrounds characteristics that Gabriela as a feminist seems to look up to. Moreover, her mother’s escape from the punishment from her family through being a ‘model student’ further positions her as intellectually virtuous and thus reflects Gabriela’s stance as a person who values education. In other words, through the juxtaposition of recognizable characteristics, Gabriela foregrounds her mother as a particular kind of person, i.e. an independent and intelligent rebel. As the story continues,

drog in hennes veckopeng och så vidare skulle inte betala studier som ett sätt att straffa henne (.) min mamma visste att det enda sättet att komma ut därifrån va stipendium för hon är jätteduktig elev münsterelev så hon studerade till sjuksköterska när militärkuppen bröt ut
Gabriela also includes her paternal grandmother and her father in the events:

GABRIELA: grandmother has a lot of burn marks from cigarettes on her body so when I was little I didn’t connect it I thought it was a little road for my smurfs to walk on because she had them all the time so I was like grandmother (. ) my smurfs can walk here right she was like no problem (. ) and then when I became more aware I asked her why do you have so many marks over your chest and here and then it was like (. ) because grandmother doesn’t have any problem with talking about these things (. ) it’s as if she distanced herself from her own feelings and told whereas dad (. ) was blocked (. ) when I would ask my dad like how long were you captured for I didn’t get any answer it was like (. ) we don’t talk about that chapter (. ) so it was through mum and grandmother I would find out about everything and grandfather was also free to talk (. ) no problem but not my dad.

Here, Gabriela herself also enters the story, first as a child whose innocence and lack of awareness is contrasted with the physical reminders of the torture that her family went through before fleeing, for example through the voicing of her child-self asking ‘my smurfs can walk here right?’.
Her grandmother is presented as stable and calm, in contrast with the reaction of her father, who is described as being ‘blocked’. Gabriela

---

25 GABRIELA: famor har mycket brännmärken av cigaretter på kroppen så när jag var liten jag förknippsade inte det jag tyckte det var en liten väg för mina smurfar att gå för hon hade det för hela tiden så jag tyckte famor jag (. ) mina smurfar får gå här hon ba inga problem (. ) och sen då när jag började bli mer medveten och jag frågade varför har du så mycket prickar över allt bröstet liksom överallt var det sådär (. ) för att famor hade inga problem med att berätta sånthär (. ) det som om hon tog avstånd från sina egna känslor och berättade medans pappa (. ) blockerades (. ) när jag kunde fråga pappa såhär hur länge var du: fångslad fick jag inget svar från honom det är som (. ) det där kapitlet pratar vi inte om (. ) så det var genom mamma och famor som jag fick reda på allting farfar var också helt fri för att berätta (. ) inga problem men inte min pappa
mentions a process of becoming more aware, and the following passage evaluates her father’s traumas and his ways of dealing with them:

GABRIELA: and he would always get depressed in December (.) my dad is really big he’s one ninety and robust he’s big as a bear (.) as a Chilean it’s a bit unusual to be that tall but he was (.) for me he was always big and strong (.) and his birthday was December sixth and it used to be a few days after that around Lucia [celebration on 13 December] it always went downward for him (.) then he’d stay in bed and you would see him crying uncontrollably but he never wanted any help for this (.) because they had at the time (.) after the second world war they created centres for victims of torture victims of war and you could get psychiatric and psychological help and so on they sent many people from Sweden there (.) because in the seventies a lot of people from Latin America from different military interve- and many from Iran who were refugees so they sent people there but dad was like (.) no (.) he was a man and would get by on his own

The descriptions of her father as ‘big as a bear’, ‘big and strong’ again mark a contrast: this same big and strong person was also suffering from the traumas of his torture at a young age. Gabriela’s teller voice is knowledgeable: she understands that his problems were due to the trauma, recognises that there would have been help, and presents his masculine pride as the reason for his continued poor mental health. At a

26 GABRIELA: och han hamnade alltid i depressioner i december (.) min pappa är jättestor han är en och nittio och kraftig så han är stor som en björn (.) för att va chilenare lite ovanligt att va så lång men han (.) för mig var han alltid stor och stark (.) och fyllde är den sjätte december men det var alltid sådär två: senare efter ungefär vid lucia som det alltid svackade för honom (.) då kunde han va i säng och då kunde man se honom gråta sådär hejdlöst men han ville aldrig ha hjälp för det här för det fanns (.) på den tiden (.) efter andra världskriget så skapade dom ju ett center för tortyrskadade krigskadade där man kunde få psykiatrisk psykologisk hjälp och så vidare dom skickade väldigt många härifrån Sverige dit (.) för just under sjuttiatea kom det jättemånga från Latinamerika från olika militärinterventio- det kom väldigt många från Iran som flydde så det skickades dit men pappa var sådär (.) nej (.) han var man och skulle klara det här själv
later point in the story, she makes an evaluation: “he has all the theory in his head but his actions were the opposite to what he fought for so that’s why we started to have a crisis when I realised that he wasn’t as big and strong as he thought”\textsuperscript{27}. This evaluation of when the point of crisis started is related to how Gabriela tells the story of her parents’ migration. It is difficult to determine where the story of the journey ends – as the traumas follow far into Gabriela’s childhood and adolescence, the journey, too, seems to stretch over many years. The story also includes Gabriela’s own development from her childhood innocence and seeing her father as big and strong, to adulthood and realization of his vulnerability.

In sum, the foregrounding and positioning of the main characters in Gabriela’s story are interesting: the female characters are presented as strong and capable while her father, despite his strong appearance, is discussed mainly as a victim. All characters are presented as quite complex, which reflects Gabriela’s analytical stance towards the events she is recounting. The place of the stories will be discussed after a brief analysis of Minh’s story, which is significantly shorter, yet clearly of value to him.

When I ask Minh about how his parents came to Finland, his reply is brief:

LINDA: do you know how your parents came to Finland
MINH: they fled from the Vietnam war right and through horrible adversities they ended up in a refugee camp in Malaysia and from there they could seek asylum in Finland and it was a process that took many years but I think it was eightyseven that they arrived in Finland\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} “han hade all teori här i huvudet men hans handlingar gjorde tvärtemot vad han kämpade för så att där började vi hamna i kris när jag började inse att han var inte så stor och stark som han tänkte”

\textsuperscript{28} LINDA: tiedäksä miten vanhemmat tuli suomeen
MINH: nehan pakeni Vietnamin sotaa jaa totaa kauheen vastoinkäymisten kautta nii he päätyivät totaa Malesiaan pakolaisleirille jaa sieltä he totaa pystyivät anomaan tota Suomen turvapaikkaa ja kyl se oli monen vuoden prosessi et he pääsi tänne mutta oliks se vuonna kaheksanaseitttemän kun he saapuvat Suomeen
The opening comment ‘they fled from the Vietnam war right’ positions the story in a particular setting, from which there are many known stories. Minh does not mention his parents, but rather summarises the events. The summaries ‘through terrible adversities’ and ‘it was a process that took many years’ may be seen as titles of possible episodes of a narrative, as ‘raw material of a story’ as suggested by Linde (1993: 88) as a characteristic of chronicles. However, for whatever reason, they are not elaborated in the narrative told as part of the interview.

Up until now, the analysis has focused on the first levels of how the characters are positioned in relation to one other in the story, and how the participants as tellers are positioned in how they tell the story. The last section here will examine how the story itself is positioned by these four participants, i.e. Danny, Farah, Gabriela and Minh. It may be claimed that all four give the story a special meaning and give it both intrinsic and instrumental value in their lives.

When Danny has finished his story about the migration journey, I ask him if he can believe that he was there, and that he, too, made that journey. He replies, saying ‘no I just yeah it’s crazy’, and continues:

DANNY: we were kinda discussing it today I was just like we’re having problems I’m pretty sure as you too and everyone else ehm like we’re trying to go through everything we’ve been through in our life and my mum and dad have just the things they’ve gone through and they had you can tell they’re kinda traumatized still they talk about it in another way so

Danny thus bridges the story with his own daily life, by mentioning that he and his wife were discussing the challenges they face, and contrasts that to the story of their parents. Farah expresses gratitude for the fact that her parents have told her the story, as she says that many people in Arab countries prefer to forget the past. She also comments that the story has strengthened her, and that as her family is very tight-knit, she feels as though she has experienced the events herself. Farah also comments on her parents’ reason for passing the story on to their children, saying that in twenty years’ time they might not be there any more and the children need to know where they came from. She also portrays them as saying: “you need to know what happened to us so that you really understand what the
The story is thus presented as valuable beyond its effects on the life story of the family. Gabriela’s account of the story of her parents is similar: she presents her parents as saying that they fled in order to give their children a better future with more possibilities, and therefore encouraging them to be independent and not to be indoctrinated into a particular ideology. On this, Gabriela comments: “I’ve taken it to heart very much I feel a responsibility somehow like oh they did this long journey my grandfather and grandmother too (.) so I need to be a bit critically thinking be a reflective person like a driving force.” Gabriela here voices herself telling herself to act according to the importance she gives to the story, and at the time of the interviews she was doing voluntary work with victims of violence and speaking up for the rights of women and girls. The story thus seems to function as motivation for her actions in her daily life.

Minh calls his parents’ story a story of survival: a unique, strong, inspiring, yet sad story. While his depiction of the journey was short, he talks elaborately about its meaning:

LINDA: have you asked them or have they told you about how they came here

MINH: yeah I’ve asked and they’ve also told me I think those kinds of stories are really really interesting and really great because it’s after all such a story of survival that you will that I’ll probably never experience in my whole life if I lived a hundred years I wouldn’t in a hundred years experience the same kind of (.) horror and the numbers of death and losing people close to you and the need to flee from your home country (.) and the whole story of survival I’ll never experience that (.) so I think it’s really: (.) it’s unique it’s really strong it’s a really inspiring story but at the same time it’s really sad (.) many sad things are beautiful in their own way if it’s a story where (.) where those who survive have

29 “teidän täytyy tietää et mitä meille tapahtu et te ymmärrätte oikeasti et mist maailmassa on kyse”
30 “det har jag tagit till mig väldigt mycket jag känner lite som ett ansvar på nåt sätt såhär oo dom gjorde hela den här långa resan även farfar och farmor (.) då måste jag ändå va lite kritiskt tänkande va såhär tänkande person liksom en drivande motor”
shown a kind of courage and strength and it’s inspiring (.) then you think of what kind of problems you have here in Finland in your everyday life someone comes up to you and calls you a gook so hey my parents went through they were in the war their brothers died or their sisters died they had to flee they had to be at sea for seven days without any food so that you say stuff like that (.) peanuts (.) then you can compare you know what kind of things people can survive

Minh portrays the journey it as something he can never fully understand, yet as a story that he can learn from and that can help him in his life. He marks it as extraordinary by saying ‘if I lived a hundred years I wouldn’t in a hundred years experience the same kind of horror’, thus distancing it from anything even potentially possible in his life. He then gives the evaluation that ‘many sad things are beautiful in their own way’, and link to his parents and other Vietnamese refugees the attributes of courage and strength. Like Danny, he juxtaposes these experiences to problems in his own life, such as receiving insulting remarks. One of the most interesting instances of positioning is when he voices himself as replying to being called a ‘gook’ (“hey my parents went through they were in the war their brothers died or their sisters died they had to flee they had to be at sea for seven days without

31 LINDA: ooksää kysynä heiltä vai onks he kertonu siitä miten he tuli niinkun tänne
MINH: siis mä oon kysynä mä oon kysynä ja ovat he itekki kertonu mun mielest tolliset tarinat on tosi tosi mielekuin tokia ja tosi hienoja koska: se on kuitenki niin semmenen selvyyystarina mitä sää mitä on en tuu todennäköstesi ikinä kokemaan en koko elämäni aikana jos mä eläisin sata vuotta yhteensä ni mä en tulis sadan vuoden aikana kokemaan sitä samanlaista (.) kauhua ja samanlaist kauhuja Mää on tosin selviytymistarina mitä: sitä tarvetta paeta kotimaastaan (.) ja se on se koko selvyyystarina mää en tuu kokemaan sitä (.) nii mun mielest se on tösı (.) se on ainutlaatuista se on todella vahvaa se on todella inspiroiva tarina mut samalla se on todella surullista (.) monet surulliset asiat ovat omalla tavalla kauniita jos se on sellaten tarina missä (.) missä: ne jotka selviytty siitä nii ne on ne on osoittanu omanlaista rohkeutta ja taidokkuutta ja vahvuutta ja se on inspiroivaa (.) sit ajattelee et millaisia ongelmia suul on tääl Suomessa on jokapäiväisessä elämäss joku tyyppi tulee ja haukku suu vinosilmäksi nii hei mun vanhemmat kävi läpi ne oli sodassa niitten veljet kuoli tai sisaret kuoli vanhemmat kuoli ne joutu paeta ne joutu olla seittemän päivää merellä ilman ruokaa ni se et sää sanot tollasii nii (.) pikkujuttu (.) sit voi vertailla vähän tietsä mistä miten niinku millasist asioist ihmiset pysty selvyytymään
any food so that you say stuff like that (.) peanuts”). This instance of imagined or inner dialogue is presented as a recourse to give perspective and help him cope with the racism that he faces. He shakes off the insult by the reported ‘peanuts’ (Fi. ‘pikkujuttu’, literally meaning ‘tiny thing’), and thus puts the experiences in perspective.

In the talk about the migration journeys, the stories are in other words presented as points of reference that give perspective to daily issues and problems faced by the participants. They are moreover portrayed as motivational and inspiring, such as in Gabriela’s example of actively making a contribution in society, or Minh’s example of finding a way to cope with insults. The stories may also act as emblems or artefacts of heritage, such as in Farah’s reflections. It is thus apparent that the participants attach a variety of special meanings to these stories of family history. This, in turn, positions the participants as people who have access to a particular kind of story. In her reply to a question of what she would include in a book about her life, Farah determines that her parents’ journey would be the prologue. As the events in the stories happened to close relatives of the tellers, I suggest that they may be seen as semi-autobiographical, as the participants align themselves as sons or daughters of the characters and thus as belonging to the same collective identity. In the stories of forced migration, the actual event of migration is presented as more of a rupture to the course of events, which is likely to be explained by the nature of the different reasons for migration. The next section will however look at two accounts that are strikingly different from those discussed thus far.

### 5.2.3 Refraining from telling

This final section of analysis will look at accounts by participants who might be expected to have stories similar to those examined in the previous section. Imad was an infant when his family fled the civil war in Lebanon in 1990, and Khalid’s parents and older brother fled the war in Somalia a few years before he was born. The accounts that Imad and Khalid give in response to the question are, however, different from the extensive and detailed stories to which Farah, Danny, Gabriela and Minh attach great importance. This section will analyse them as the kind of small
stories that are often neglected in narrative studies, but which are nevertheless significant with respect to positioning.

Imad’s account begins with the reason for migration: the then ongoing civil war. After some time in Russia, the family arrived in Finland. Imad says that his parents have told him a little bit about the journey when he has seen old photographs from the time. Noticing that the story may be untold or largely unknown, I ask him whether the knowledge interests him, to which he replies:

IMAD: well maybe I am somewhat interested but I haven’t really tried to find out about it that much anyway (.) like well we are here (.) it doesn’t really matter that much why or in what way and so on I’ve not necessarily found that to be important information

Imad’s reply thereby defines the story as irrelevant and thus as not having any intrinsic or instrumental value. This account is however significant for positioning. The comment ‘well we are here, it doesn’t really matter that much why or in what way’ is presented in the form of a report of Imad’s own speech or thought, establishing his point of view. This, together with his presentation of the information as somewhat interesting yet not necessarily important, may be seen as a stand against an unvoiced expectation for the story to be relevant, linked to the contraction of the category of ‘second-generation immigrants’. Imad’s positioning when it comes to ‘national identity’, which will be discussed in Chapter 8, is in a clear relation to this comment.

The second example is from Khalid, who expresses uncertainty of when and how his family arrived from Somalia. He knows that his father’s journey went through Russia, whereas his mother and brother had arrived some time earlier, ‘probably through some country or something’. When asked whether he has heard about the migration journey, Khalid replies:

LINDA: do they talk about it (.) or have you asked

---

32 IMAD: no kyl mua ehkä jonku verran kiinnostaa mut emmä sillai oo ottanu selvää niin paljo kuitenkaa (.) et sillai no täällä ollaan (.) ei sillä oo sinänsä hirveesti merkitystä miks ja millä tavalla ja näin en oo kokenu sitä sillä tavalla tärkeenä informaationa välttämättä
KHALID: I’ve never asked but he’s just mentioned it in passing or something. I’ve never ever even heard that story of how he came or. I dunno maybe I haven’t been curious enough to ask.

In the same way as Imad, Khalid positions the story as irrelevant, and also as unknown. His emphasis in “I’ve never ever even heard that story” establishes that he is unable to answer the question, and his comment about not have been ‘curious enough’ perhaps implies a sense of perceived obligation to have done so. He nevertheless makes reference to a ‘story’ and recognises its existence beyond his knowledge. Similarly, Randeep, initially answers: “I’ve never really asked them you know. I probably should [laughs] I’ve never really asked them about the physical journey. Never it’s never occurred to me [laughs]”. The use of the verb ‘should’, as well as the signs of slight discomfort marked by laughter and repetition of the word ‘never’, are perhaps responses to a perceived expectation in a similar way to Imad’s comments. These responses by Khalid and Randeep may be reactions to ‘failing’ to answer a research question (assumptions about what constitutes an interview and how to be a ‘good participant’ were commented on in Chapter 3). However, they may also be directed at implicit discourses and assumptions related to larger social categorisations and how they are understood and negotiated in the interaction taking place in the interviews.

5.3 Discussion and chapter summary

This chapter has presented identity in the form of positioning in narratives about the migration journeys of the parents of the twelve parents. The analysis has built on different levels of positioning, related to representation, enactment and the larger social implications of telling the story in a particular way. It has presented the stories as mainly different, with certain common aspects such as the similar value attached to stories of forced migration from conflict areas. The aim of the chapter was thus to examine how the participants position themselves in telling these stories.

---

33 LINDA: kertooks he niinku siitä. tai ooksä kyselley
KHALID: emmä oo koskaa kyselley se o vaam maininnu vaa joskus ohimennen vaa tai jottai. emmä oo koskaa ikäntä kuullu ees tota tarinaa et miten se on tullut tai. emmä täi emmä oo ollu ehkökä tarpeeks utelias et oon kyselley
or refraining from telling them. Another objective was to connect the life stories of the participants and their parents, who were the ones who migrated and thus the agents of an event that carries significance in some form for the people born afterwards.

If narratives are understood as windows into potential positionings, there needs to be openness from the first step, i.e. from the point of determining what constitutes a narrative. As mentioned, theories of narrative and identity have prioritised a particular kind of narrative; the lengthy, often elicited stories of lived experience. By including small stories that would perhaps be neglected, the perspective of narrative and identity is enlarged and given more detail. Moreover, including stories of events that took place before the speakers were born has drawn attention to the fact that life stories do not begin abruptly at the time of birth, but span generations and build a collective story and a frame of reference. Stories always include collective and social aspects, but when the recounted events and experiences relate to a phase of family history, this aspect is particularly highlighted. In the extracts of stories presented here, it has manifested itself for example in how the speakers have access to the landscapes of consciousness of the narrated characters, and how they are thus able to make evaluations from their points of view. The stories thus become ‘semi-autobiographical’ in the sense that the speakers can make them their own if they wish to do so, as the characters can be presented as belonging to the shared collective identity of a family.

What, then, do the participants accomplish by telling the stories in the ways that they do, and what larger implications do these accounts have? One important element lies in the choices of what to foreground, i.e. what the participants present as the most central or relevant information in the story. The analysis in this chapter is similar to that in other studies of the same kind, for example by Boydell et al (2000), Wortham & Gadsden (2006), Castillo Ayometzi (2007), and Simpson (2011). All of these point out how telling a story can make it possible for speakers to ‘claim agency in a discursive space’ (Simpson 2011: 21). In other words, the story makes ‘acts of identity’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) possible, as the tellers may position themselves as certain kinds of people, for example by the use of reported speech/constructed dialogue. This agency may be related to how the characteristics of the parents are represented, and how they influence the recounted events, such as particularly in the cases of Farah, Gabriela and Danny. It might also relate to positioning of the story itself.
as unspectacular (for example Randeep, Ewa, Cemile and Susanna) or as irrelevant or unknown (Imad and Khalid). It is important to remember that the accounts were directed to answer a specific question about the migration journey in a large sense, and that other stories from the past generation may well be considered more important than the migration itself. Far from all stories here present the migration itself as a particularly interesting or tellable event. Some stories do not include any information from a time prior to that in the participants’ current home countries. The ones who do, however, partly relate to the kind of migration in question: life prior to work-related migration is portrayed as characterised by poverty and struggle (Susanna, Cemile, Randeep, Laila) while the stories of forced migration emphasise the parents as educated and of a stable economic and social position (Farah, Gabriela, Danny).

The analysis has thus shown that narratives can function as fora in which participants have agency in determining what they find relevant, interesting or important, or taking a stance against assumed or real expectations. In Chapters 7 and 8 I will present how the participants’ own choices of categorizations along ‘national’ or ‘ethnic’ lines are created, as well as how others ascribe them certain identities. But first, the following two chapters of analysis will examine the first research question: what happens to language in the generation born after migration.
Chapter 6: Stories about language use

6.1 Language in the ‘second generation’

What happens to language in families where the children grow up in a country to which their parents migrated needs to be understood within a larger framework, in which practice and ideology affect each other in numerous ways. When we talk about language, we always talk about more than language (Woolard 1998); language ideologies incorporate ideas of concepts such as nationhood, personhood, social cohesion and success. Questions of language maintenance thus need to take into account a set of intertwined discourses that may be relevant in different ways for different individuals and families. As was mentioned in the Chapter 1, previous studies suggest that language shift to the dominant language in society may be expected by the third generation. This makes the language use and attitudes of those in the first generation to grow up in the new country interesting and relevant to study.

This chapter will combine talk about proficiency and use, and examine aspects of the linguistic self-portraits painted through the interview talk. First, I will discuss findings on language maintenance in previous studies. I will then map, as thoroughly as the interview data permits, the participants’ thoughts about their own linguistic practices: how do they describe their use of different languages? How do they position themselves in relation to the languages their parents spoke in their countries of origin? As the family seems central both in previous studies and in the data for this study, a separate section will focus on schemes of language maintenance in the family, including the participants’ thoughts on language in the future generation.

6.1.1 Studies of language maintenance in contexts of migration

One of the immediate questions when studying language after immigration was whether people speak the language(s) their parents spoke. However, the mere volume of literature on language testing and
evaluation suggests that there is no simple way to measure what is called ‘proficiency’. The concept has also been problematised in much sociolinguistic research. For this reason, the interviews instead contained questions about language practices and use, with the assumption that for a language to be used, some degree of proficiency must exist. Most participants, however, also commented on ‘how well’ they speak these languages, thus referring at least to folk definitions of proficiency. The term ‘proficiency’ will here thus be used to refer to a topic of conversation.

Early studies of language maintenance, mainly from the context of European migration to the United States, found a rapid shift towards English already in the generation born after migration. Fishman (1966: 395) relates this to a lack of language awareness: language was rarely seen as an important component of ‘daily, traditional ethnicity’, which led to a less stable maintenance of language. While fragments of ‘culture’ were retained and maintained, they were usually not sufficient for continued language use. Later studies have to a large extent confirmed this pattern of language shift towards the dominant language, through bilingualism in the ‘second generation’ to English monolingualism by the following one (e.g. Alba et al 2002). The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal study (CILS), with approximately 5,000 young participants from seventy-seven different nationalities in San Diego and Miami, is likely to remain the largest study of its type to date, and investigates the adaptation of ‘second-generation migrants’ (including children who migrated before the age of six, i.e. what the authors refer to as the ‘1.5 generation’) growing up in the 1990s. The first survey was conducted in 1992, and follow-up surveys in 1995/1996 and 2001-2003. The project included questions that aimed to find out for example what languages were spoken in the homes, and how the young people related to these languages. The findings point to a decrease in speaking languages other than English. In the earliest sample, 95 % of the respondents reported that another language was spoken in their home, but ten years later, 17 % reported not knowing any language other than English. The reported language preferences also shifted more and more towards English; while in 1992, 69 % preferred using English, the percentages grew to 85 % in 1995/1996 and 97 % in 2001 (Portes & Rumbaut 2001).

While it is important to keep in mind a slight reservation regarding survey questions (in this case, for example, how do people determine what language they prefer using, and what does it mean to ‘know’ a language?),
it appears that knowledge and preference of English over other languages was close to universal, and fluency in the parents’ language uncommon. There were, however, significant differences among the different groups studied; reported skills in Spanish among Mexican-origin respondents, for example, actually increased over the period of the survey. Alba et al (2002) in a study of census data in the 1990s likewise found that while among descendants of Asian migrants, language shift towards the English language seemed to take place at the same rate as that of Europeans arriving in the early twentieth century, the process was slower process among speakers of Spanish. In all the examined groups, however, the majority of ‘third-generation’ children reportedly spoke only English at home, and in the cases in which bilingualism was reported, the data did not include any reports of proficiency.

The tendency among children of migrants to speak the dominant language of society with their siblings has been identified in several studies from different contexts (see e.g. Namei 2012, Latomaa & Suni 2010, Rynkänen & Pöyhönen 2010, Mills 2001, Sohrabi 1997). This pattern of language choice seems to be influenced by several factors. Spolsky (2009: 18), writing on language management in the family, observes that “as a child starts to come under the social and linguistic pressure of school and peers, he or she commonly brings the new language into the home, speaking it sometimes to the parents and regularly to siblings”. The external domains of school and peer groups are thus expected to have an immensely powerful impact on determining what languages are used. Sohrabi (1997: 65) comments that very few of the parents he studied made a conscious choice not to speak Persian to their children, but that the shift seemed to happen due to less conscious changes. Rynkänen and Pöyhönen also find that Finnish was related to educational success, and that many parents in their study admitted that the Russian language was confined to the home. However, there were some difference when ‘generation’ was broken down into smaller units: for ‘generation 1.75’, i.e. those who were below schooling age when they moved, the patterns of language maintenance seemed closer to the ‘second generation’ than for example in ‘generation 1.25’, who moved as teenagers. Hence, even ‘first generation’ entails various potential ways of linking with language.

Studies of language maintenance have long seen the family domain as central, with intergenerational transmission as the most natural way of managing a language (Spolsky 2009). In line with this, parental beliefs are
still seen as one of the main factors influencing language patterns in the family (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). The parental beliefs are often manifested by ‘organised management’ in the form of expectations or instructions from older family members to younger (Spolsky 2009). The participants in Weckström’s (2011) study also reported ‘forbidding’ the dominant language in society (in this case, Swedish) from being used in the home, thereby trying to ensure space for the language seen as under threat of disappearing. Recent research however recognises the family as a dynamic system, and the agency of its every member (King & Fogle 2013). Portes and Hao (1998) analyse the early CILS samples to explore what factors contribute to language maintenance. Their conclusion is that it depends on a combination of factors, including having friends of the same national origin and a strong coethnic presence in the school, as well as factors relating to social class, with bilingualism being more common among the middle classes.

6.1.2 Why do people care about language maintenance?

Heritage languages are not only managed within the family, but in many countries, tuition in the ‘mother tongue’ or ‘home language’ is provided for children of migrant backgrounds. In Britain, so called complementary schools, set up to teach the children and grandchildren of immigrants about the language and ‘culture’ associated with former homelands, are attracting thousands of children to study in the evenings and at weekends. Why are people ready to make such commitments?

Teaching ‘cultural heritage’ has been observed to be among the main motivations for complementary schools in Britain (see e.g. Blackledge & Creese 2010). Other ethnographic studies confirm the value attached to language as part of heritage and ‘identity’. In a study on the young ‘third generation’ of grandchildren of Pakistani migrants to Britain, Mills (2001: 399) remarks that the children “operated within a familial situation where there were constant injunctions and reminders about their duties and obligations as regards their languages and the ways these affiliate them to particular groups and accentuate family ties”. Their parents, who were born into the ‘second generation’, thus seem to want to emphasise these links between language and the values of family, heritage and community, in bringing up their children. Mills also found that despite their lack of
proficiency, the children linked language to their sense of attachment to a ‘culture’ and ‘identity’.

Previous studies have also seen that where a certain language is linked to religious practice, such as Arabic for Islam or Punjabi for Sikhism, the efforts to maintain them may be stronger. Perera (2014) in his study on Sinhalese and Tamil Sri Lankans in Australia found that religious beliefs as well as nationalistic and political affiliations contributed to language maintenance. While there was no definite relationship between these, Perera found that most of those who maintained the languages were devout Buddhists or Hindus, and that language was seen as a marker of nationalism and an emblem of ethnic identity. Moreover, he noted that religion was seen as a way of “bringing the second generation into contact with other Sri Lankans as part of maintaining some standards and values in a new country” (Perera 2014: 12). On the other hand, there seems to be an expectation of language assimilation for symbolic reasons as the dominant, official language is usually a symbol of the core of ‘national identity’.

6.2 Stories of language practices

These findings from previous studies were taken into consideration when designing the interview questions about language in the lives of the participants. The following sections will present their thoughts on questions to do with language use. Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 will present examples by all participants, with a synthesis in 6.2.3 to discuss what kinds of identity positions are accomplished in these extracts of talk. This allows for a mapping both of the reported language use and of values and ideas that the participants associate with language in practice.

6.2.1 Proficiency and use

The term ‘proficiency’ does not easily fit into the kinds of sociolinguistic discussions and views on language advocated by this study, in which speakers are seen as drawing from a repertoire of linguistic elements related to named languages, of which nobody has total knowledge. Lehtonen’s 2015 thesis on indexicality in multilingual Helsinki includes valuable discussion on what speaking ‘good Finnish’ means in the local
context of an elementary school where many pupils languages other than Finnish in their homes. While there is no objective way of measuring or determining what counts as ‘good Finnish’, her data includes a clear perception among the participants that such a notion exists. The same can be said about the talk of many of the participants here. Talk about proficiency emerged in relation to many themes in the interview discussions. In the presentation of data, I will include as much contextual information as the space permits, in order to illustrate what links the participants seemed to make between proficiency and other themes.

The first examples are from Hülya, as she talked about proficiency at greater length than most other participants, and her talk thus serves as a good starting point. Hülya’s characterisation of her Turkish illustrates that reports of proficiency were related to time and space, as well as topic. In an interview recorded before her work period in Turkey, she mentioned ‘when I meet someone in Turkey now they don’t know that I’m from here they can’t tell from my accent so I get really happy about myself when I say it they’re like how did you learn Turkish so good like you know you’ve never lived here’. Afterwards she likewise confirmed that people she worked with did not realise based on her speech that she grew up outside Turkey. These comments that represent Hülya’s Turkish as indistinguishable from that of ‘native speakers’ in the perception of people in Turkey are thus presented as a source of happiness and as a confirmation of her proficiency. On the other hand, in the group interview, and in the presence of her newly acquainted Turkish friend for whom she was often translating the questions and clarifying concepts, Hülya commented that she would not say she ‘knew Turkish properly’: ‘I dunno I don’t ever think that I can learn Turkish properly to the full because I haven’t lived there I know English so much better because I’ve been here’. This comment was a part of a discussion of bilingualism and language proficiency, and reveals an idea(l) of total language proficiency, but also reflects the influence of the dominant language. ‘My English dictionary in my brain is bigger’, Hülya explains, and links it to having been more exposed to English.

As Hülya was for a long time the only child in her family, she grew up speaking mostly Turkish at home with her parents. She later also attended classes to learn Turkish. Yet, she describes her feelings regarding speaking Turkish when she was younger: ‘I used to be scared when I go to Turkey because I couldn’t speak it before (. ) five six years ago my Turkish wasn’t good at all and I used to literally be scared to speak to someone because I was scared of
what to say I didn’t know if I could understand them’. She explains that her proficiency improved significantly when she lived in a shared house with only Turkish girls during her time at university. The stories that Hülya tells about her proficiency are characterised by emotions: she describes the transition from being ‘literally scared to speak to someone’, to now being ‘really happy’ about herself for her improved skills. She also presents it as inevitable that she knows English better than Turkish, as she has grown up in England.

When I ask Hülya what language she speaks with her younger brother and sister, she replies: ‘I speak mixed with them (.) because I guess because they’re like me (.) even though I’ve learnt Turkish and everything you know it’s not the same as when you grow up there cause I’m more familiar with the language here so we kind of joke in English and stuff you know sometimes in Turkish but yeah it’s more English with them I guess’. Here, her characterisation of her siblings (‘they’re like me’) creates a form of collective – children who grew up surrounded by the dominant language – even if their proficiencies may differ greatly from each other’s.

Not all participants talk about proficiencies to the same extent and in the same detail as Hülya, and it needs to be remembered that all accounts are only partial glimpses into the particular contexts in which they were told. In presenting these accounts, the starting point will be threads or themes which link the examples together and set them apart. Firstly, Minh mentions that he speaks Vietnamese with his parents and older relatives, and that he can speak it ‘fluently’. With his sisters he usually mixes Vietnamese and Finnish. He describes these mixes as ‘automatic’ in speech between bilingual people. Some participants, mainly Ewa and Cemile, do not define their proficiencies, in their cases in Polish and Turkish respectively. This seems to be related to a sense of it being self-evident that they speak the languages. Both speak these languages with their parents, and have spent extensive periods of time in the countries their parents moved from. Ewa describes not having realised that Polish and English were separate languages when she was a child: ‘I once brought a Polish book to my English teacher during story time cause we could bring in books and gave it to her and I was like can you read this and she was like no so why not cause my mum would always translate English books into Polish for me at story time so and I couldn’t understand that this teacher couldn’t do the same thing in reverse’. Bi/multilingualism was hence her norm, with no clear borders between different languages.
Cemile’s accounts of her childhood reflect the multilingualism of the area where she grew up. The migration patterns to Sweden during her lifetime were always visible and audible in her neighbourhood: first mainly people from the Balkans and Greece, later Arabic-speakers from various Middle-Eastern countries. Cemile describes always having learned a few phrases in the languages the other families spoke: ‘you mainly learn from friends at school classmates (.) the neighbourhood (.) cause back then you always played outside right (.) it was related to belonging as well cause many didn’t know Swedish but they started to learn a bit from each other’. This multitude of languages still characterises her daily life, and she names her ‘basic languages’, apart from Swedish and Turkish, as English, German, Danish, and some Arabic and Albanian. ‘I have a passion for languages (.) I love getting to know other cultures even if I haven’t travelled that much but (.) I like it (.) that’s why I like Malmö too’, Cemile explains. The presence of several languages thus makes Malmö an ‘international’ environment, which Cemile enjoys. As Cemile describes mainly learning by listening, she mentions being affected by the language use of the adolescents she works with: ‘when you’re with the adolescents you’re influenced by them as well (.) so sometimes I can use a phrase and like whoops no that’s not then you try to stop yourself [laughs] yeah that’s a bit difficult I must admit’. When I ask her for examples, she mentions ‘jalla’ (Arabic for ‘come on’ or let’s go’). Cemile seems to want to avoid using these words or phrases, thus striving towards a monolingual norm in a very multilingual environment – in which ‘jalla’ is very much part of ‘everyday Swedish’. She also mentions having had negative feedback and lower grades on her written Swedish when she was at school. ‘I was like noo I was born here I grew up here why do I have that’, she says, and explains that the teachers told her that she ‘writes like she speaks’. In other words, Cemile seems to view problems with literacy as something only experienced by people who are not native
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34 “det kommer först o främst via vänner skolan klasskamrater (.) gården (.) för då lekte man ju ute man va ju alltid ute på gården (...) det var också nån tillhörighet för det var ju många som inte kunde svenska men dom börja ju lära sej lite av varandra”

35 “jag brinner för språk (.) som sagt jag älskar kulturer och liksom gå o se (.) ja fastän inte jag rest så mycket men (.) jag gillar det (.) det är därför jag gillar Malmö också”

36 “när man är med ungdomar o så så brukar man lyssna av dom också (.) så ibland så kan jag använda nåt uttryck ba ops näj dedär är inte så försöker du bryta dig själv [skrattar] aa dedär e lite svårt faktiskt ja måste erkänna”

37 “Jag ba tänkte näj jag är ju född här uppvuxen här så varför har jag det”
to the country, while those born in Sweden are expected to automatically be good at writing Swedish.

Concerns about competence – ‘full competence’ – characterise Gabriela’s talk about proficiency. The many years she spent in Chile means that she has been exposed to Spanish more than any other participant to their heritage language. Spanish is the language that is used when the family comes together, but Gabriela describes Swedish as her sister’s and her language. Her younger brother, on the other hand, is described as being very much against bringing in Swedish among family, and being uncomfortable if Gabriela speaks it to him. When it comes to the Swedish language, Gabriela differentiates between her Swedish and that of many other Latin Americans in Malmö:

GABRIELA: many Chileans that I’ve met here through my boyfriend (.) they were born in Sweden and have always lived in Malmö and they have an accent they’re semilingual in my opinion (.) such a strong accent (.) and I don’t mind accents my mum has a bit of an accent too but I think it’s strange when you’re second or third or fourth generation and you were born here and you don’t have a good basis in the language (.) I still find it shocking (.) I can’t understand how they get by later on with studies and everything.  

In this narrative, Gabriela positions herself as different from these ‘semilingual’ speakers, whom she characterises as people who should be more proficient, since they, too, were born in Sweden. The youth she works with are also described as lacking a ‘good basis in their mother tongue and in Swedish’, which Gabriela defines as semilingualism. The responsibility for providing a good basis in the language lies with the parents, Gabriela says, and relates it to how children are raised, as well as

38 GABRIELA: många chilenare som jag har träffat här genom min sambo (.) som är födda i Sverige och har bara bott i Malmö och dom bryter dom är halvspråkiga vad jag anser (.) dom bryter otroligt mycket (.) och jag har inga problem igen med brytning för min mamma har också en liten brytning det är inte det men jag tycker det är konstigt när man är andra när man är tredje när man är fjärde generationen och du är född här och du har ingen bra grund i språket (.) jag tycker det är fortfarande chockerande (.) jag kan inte förstå hur dom har klara sig längre fram med studier o allting
their own motivation. Her way of speaking, which she presents as different from other people of Chilean background living in Malmö, thus also becomes a sign of what kind of person she was successfully raised to be.

When it comes to correctness, Imad has similar concerns as Gabriela. He reports speaking Arabic ‘practically perfectly’, and using it both with his parents and siblings. He worries about the language proficiencies of his younger brothers:

IMAD: my younger brothers have had both languages at school and you can see that well their Finnish is not nearly as strong as mine was at the time and there are so many small things that they don’t know and then at the same time well they can’t speak Arabic perfectly either’

Imad reports remarking on his younger brother’s speech, and seems to take responsibility for improving their language. He is puzzled by why his brothers, who were both born in Finland, have been placed in a classroom for people who learn Finnish as a second language. When he started school, nobody remarked on his language skills, as he says they matched those of his classmates. His brothers, on the other hand, hear mostly ‘non-native’ Finnish in the classroom, which he believes has a negative impact on their language. For Imad, having a ‘perfect’ command of spoken language is presented as important. He is the only member of his family who does not read or write Arabic. He mentions that learning has been in his plans for a long time, but up until now he has not studied it at all.

On the other hand, a participant for whom studying the heritage language seems very important is Randeep. He reports having learnt Punjabi in his childhood, as his grandparents lived in the same house and took care of him and his brother and sister while the parents were at work.

‘we had to speak to them in Punjabi we had to because they didn’t understand English so my grandfather knew a little bit of English but he wouldn’t out of
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39 “mun pikkuvuusliku on nyt ku on ollu sitä molempaa kielitä molempia kieltä on ollu koulussa ja näin niin huomaa sen että no suomenkielisäi ei oo sillais lähiskään niin vahva kun mitä mulla oli nihin aikoihin et on siis tosi paljo sellasii pieni juttuja mitä ne ei osaa ja sitte on sit taas se et no arabiankieltäkään ne ei kuitenkaan sillais tähdellisesti osaa puhuu”
principle he would not speak to us in English’. These ‘principles’ seemed to relate to both languages: Randeep’s father, who was still at school age when he migrated, was reportedly ‘very concerned’ that his children spoke ‘very good English’ in order to improve their economic and professional paths, and therefore spoke to them in English. Randeep later studied English at university level, and describes having ‘better English than some of the so-called indigenous people’. As an adult, he also took up his studies in Punjabi. ‘I did speak Punjabi as a child but I never learned how to read and write (.) that was my issue (.) which is why as an adult I’ve done the GCSE then I went to the Brasshouse [Language Centre]’, he says, and mentions that he hopes to take a gap year and study Punjabi at a higher level in India. Randeep comments:

RANDEEP: if I could afford to I’d take a year and go and study it and actually give myself that time but time isn’t on my side and I need to do an immersion really immerse myself in it but I can’t do it until my kids are older so yeah so I won’t be free for another ten years to do it

This commitment to improving his language skills is something he seems to categorise as self-improvement, but he also aspires at developing materials to improve the quality of tuition of Punjabi for children in Britain. His ambitions to reach the highest possible level of proficiency in all areas of language are thus presented as something that would enable him to help others at the same time. As the Sikh holy scripts are written in Punjabi, Randeep also sees being able to read the language as a key to a deeper understanding of the nuances of the texts.

In a similar way as Randeep’s parents, Laila’s parents also emphasised the importance of learning good English, and she thus grew up speaking both English and Urdu in the home. When I ask her what language she spoke with her family when she was a child, Laila explains that ‘there was quite a lot of overlap so we always had two but were more skilled in one’, and says that when she started school, her skills in English became stronger than those in Urdu. When Laila was a teenager, her parents became concerned of the children forgetting their skills in Urdu, and thus started speaking to them more in Urdu instead of English. Today, she reports understanding Urdu ‘completely’, but only speaking it occasionally, ‘out
of respect’ to friends of her parents and to older relatives. ‘When we went to India and we spoke Urdu there we just got laughed at they laughed at us because of the English accent to it’, she says, including her sisters in the collective ‘we’. Laila does not read or write in Urdu, but says that her boyfriend is now studying it. For Laila, having a strong proficiency seems of secondary importance: being able to understand, and the mere presence of the language in her life, is, however, assigned great value.

Danny, for whom English is a central part of everyday life as it is the language he speaks with his wife, and also one he uses professionally, does not talk much about his proficiency in Kurdish. Like Laila, he mentions receiving amused remarks from other people on his Kurdish ‘sounding funny’, and he likewise does not read or write it. I ask Danny whether it is important for him to know some Kurdish, and he replies with a slightly regretful explanation of why he did not learn literacy:

DANNY: I’m not gonna say feel ashamed but I kinda feel bad that I don’t know how to read and write it cause it’s a whole different language (. ) my dad really tried my sister can read it but slowly (. ) my dad really tried he had like home lessons but my dad is not now maybe but back then he didn’t really have the patience he’s not the best teacher that’s also the reason why I don’t have a driver’s license today I just argued with my dad every time we were driving

Apart from referring to his father’s lack of patience as a cause of not learning, Danny refers to himself as having been ‘kinda like a lot of other kids’: ‘I was like what am I gonna do with that language I’m not gonna go back I’m not gonna move back do I regret it today of course to a certain extent’. His attitude at a younger age, evaluated through the comment ‘when you’re young you’re stupid’, thus involves the sense of ‘feeling bad’ that Danny initially reports, as well as a change in the way he relates to the language. Whereas Danny as a teenager seemed to only see the instrumental reasons he would learn Kurdish, he now seems to attribute other importance to it as well. However, he takes a positive stance: ‘I know because of my language gene I pick up language so quick if I went there for let’s say a vacation I will come back and be very I don’t think like anybody would tell that I grew up here’. A ‘native-like’ proficiency is thus presented as fairly easily attainable,
because of what Danny defines as his ‘language gene’. Like Cemile, he reports having learned phrases from many languages spoken in the area of Malmö he lives in. Words and phrases associated with languages spoken in former Yugoslavia, Spanish, Portuguese, German and Arabic are part of his repertoire, and as his wife confirms, ‘you really like speaking different languages’. As was mentioned in Chapter 4 about multilingualism in Malmö, Danny moreover sees knowing and using words in several languages without being proficient in them as an integral part of living in Malmö.

Farah, too, speaks about her ability to learn new languages, and mentions the place of English as important in her life:

FARAH: nowadays when there’s Facebook and Twitter and all these things we’ve come to use the English language (.) so we speak it really well actually (.) it’s become for me at least like a second language so somehow I speak English a lot and it’s funny cause before I used to think about everything in Finnish now I think about everything in English and then I wonder when will I think in Arabic [laughs]40

In this story, she seems to assign some competition between the different languages as to which one is used the most for ‘thinking’, i.e. internal speech. Farah speaks Arabic with her parents and older relatives, and Finnish with her siblings and cousins. She reports having learned Finnish before she learnt Arabic, as her families were among the only non-Finnish-speaking people in the town where she was born. Farah also comments that her mother did not correct the children’s speech, as she found their ways of speaking Arabic very endearing. Farah was nine years old when she visited Iraq for the first time, and remembers that people questioned whether she was ‘really Iraqi’:

40 “nykypäivänä kun on tää kaikki feisbuuk ja twitter ja kaikki tälliset nii sit ollaa päästy siihe englanninkieleen (.) et sitä me puhutaa tosi hyvin itse asias (...) siit on nykyään tullu mulle ainakin tällanen toinen kieli et jotenki mä puhun englantii todella paljo sit se on aina kummallista ko esimerkiks ennen mä ajattelin kaikki suomeks nyt mä ajattelen kaikki englanniks sit vaa miettii et koska mä ajattelen sit arabiaks” [nauraa]
FARAH: I spoke a different kind of Arabic than the others and then they said like are you from Lebanon or something when you speak weird Arabic like that and then I was like no: and then they thought a bit and well are you from Egypt or something when you speak strangely like that and I was like no I’m really Iraqi. Here, like in the accounts of Danny and Laila, Farah’s Arabic is identified as ‘different’, and interpreted by the others as a different dialect of Arabic. Farah tells the anecdote in a jokingly manner, accompanying her insulted comment on being ‘really Iraqi’ with laughter. Correctness and proficiency are highlighted as important in Farah’s accounts, not only when it comes to Arabic, but also to the Finnish language. When I ask Farah if she ever receives compliments on how well she speaks Finnish, and explain that the phenomenon was introduced during the data collection, Farah describes another phenomenon which she links to the compliments:

FARAH: we foreigners have this technique that we can tell if a person is good at certain things like in education or even as a person by how well they speak Finnish (.) if they speak Finnish well they are probably quite well-mannered they know a lot about society and have a real education (.) if they don’t speak Finnish well or for example have the wrong word order or speak in the past or the future tense we know that okay that person is not very good

41 “mä puhuin niinko erilaista arabiaa ku muut ja sit ne sano et ooksä jostai Lebanonist kus sä puhut tollee outoo arabiaa ja sit sillai en ja sit ne vähä mietti no ooksä nyt Egyptist kus sä puhut tollee oudosti mä vaan sillai ei mä oon iha irakilainen”
42 “meil ulkomaalaisilla on tällanen tekniikka että me pystytään päätellä ihmisestä että kuin hyvä hän on tietyis asioissa esimerkiks koulutukses tai edes ihmisenä on just että kuin hyvin hän puhuu suomenkieltä (.) jos hän puhuu hyvin suomenkieltä hän on todennäköisesti aika hyvääkäytöksinen ihminen tietää paljon yhteiskunnasta ja on kouluuttautunut oikeasti (.) jos hän ei puhu hyvin suomenkieltä tai sillai et esimerkiks sananjärjestyksii on väärin tai puhuu mennees tai niinko tulevas aikamuodossa nii sit me heti tiedetään et aha toi ei oo kyl ihan niin hyvä”
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Speaking Finnish ‘properly’, using the right word order and verb tense, becomes a sign for decency and character, and thus bears immense significance.

Correctness and perfection are also marked as important in Susanna’s talk about language. She comments that she did not really think of what language was spoken in her home when she was a child, but that friends would comment and laugh at their use of Finnish. Susanna also remembers starting school and becoming aware of how the Swedish she heard at home was ‘incorrect’:

SUSANNA: I felt that I made so many mistakes and that even the teacher reacted not in a mean way but that she corrected me and that I thought that’s something I don’t want to be exposed to. I have to listen to what the teacher says because how she pronounces is correct at home it isn’t correct right it’s here that I have to keep my ears open

This discomfort with being corrected, as well as the fear of being laughed at that Susanna also describes, led to what she refers to as a decision she made very early in life: ‘I decided that I will be so perfect nobody can ever laugh and this decision I made when I was very young and I did it [laughs] I’ve done well’. Reaching the ‘highest possible proficiency’ in other words became a target that Susanna set for herself, and reportedly reached – she mentions her good level of Swedish language as the channel to worklife when she was a teenager, and says she still receives compliments for how well she expresses herself. Curious about how Susanna refers to the Finnish language, I ask her what she calls it, and Susanna mentions viewing it as ‘a language I haven’t fully learned’, and ‘my father’s language’. When the interviews were recorded, Susanna’s mother had passed away a few years earlier, and her elderly father was forgetting his Swedish, which meant that she was trying to use Finnish with him. ‘I guess

43 “jag kände att jag sa så mycket fel och att även fröken reagerade inte på elakt men att hon rättade mig och det där tänkte jag att jag vill nog inte bli utsatt för jag måste lyssna vad fröken säger för vad fröken det hon uttalar är rätt hemma är det inte korrekt va utan det är här som jag liksom får hålla öronen öppna”
44 “jag bestämde mig för att jag ska va så perfekt ingen ska nånsin få skratta och det beslutet tog jag när jag var väldigt liten och jag fixade det [skrattar] det har jag gjort bra”
"I'm a bit sad I haven't learned Finnish better"\textsuperscript{45}, Susanna says, and remembers having worried about forgetting her Finnish between the summers spent in Finland, which were the times when she used it the most. As an adult, she has tried taking beginner’s classes, but has found that her northern dialect of Finnish has been very different from the one taught. Susanna mentions that her son does not speak any Finnish, but reports sometimes telling him a few words and their meanings.

Like Susanna, Khalid reports not being very proficient in his heritage language. He replies to my question about what language he speaks with his brothers and sister with a characterisation: ‘among us kids nobody’s very good at speaking Somali (.) like it depends it’s actually quite bad (.) we don’t even have full sentences so we have to combine words our parents do understand but\textsuperscript{46}’. Khalid mentions speaking mainly Finnish with his mother, as well as with his siblings and cousins. When he was ten years old, the family spent a year living in Egypt. He reports having spoken Finnish with his brothers there as well. During that year, Khalid asked his mother to find him a tutor for learning Arabic, as it was used in the school he went to. He can read Arabic, and has been reading the Quran since he was young. Khalid’s talk about Somali is often characterised by expectations from his father. For example, he comments that he is expected to use Somali with his cousins when his father and uncles are present: ‘when we’re all in the same place we do always spe- we have to speak Somali\textsuperscript{47}’. The slight hesitation, and the added verb to signal external influence on the language choice, indicate that the language choice is connected to the expectations of the figures of authority, the older male relatives. On the other hand, Khalid talks about two friends who live nearby, and who like to joke in Somali. Khalid listens to their banter, and tries to speak with them. ‘With them I’ve liked speaking Somali\textsuperscript{48}, he says. These examples show complexity in how Khalid relates to a language of which he does not identify as a proficient speaker. When I ask Khalid if he finds it important to know some Somali, he replies: ‘well it’s good to know some but you don’t need to know it completely’\textsuperscript{49}. Being able to

\textsuperscript{45} “Lite sorg har jag väl för att jag inte lärde mig finska bättre”
\textsuperscript{46} “meist lapsist ei ketää oo hirvee hyvä puhumaa somaliaa (.) niinku miten sen nyt ottaa itse asian aika hyvän (.) ei ees oo täysinäissä lauseit niinku et pitää niinku yhdistellä sanoja kyl meiän vanhemmat nyt ymmärtää mut”
\textsuperscript{47} “kun me ollaa kaikki samas paikas nii kyl me siel niinku aina pu- joudutaan puhuu somaliaa”
\textsuperscript{48} “Nitten kaa mä oon tykänny puhuu somaliaa”
\textsuperscript{49} “kyl se nyt on iha hyvää osata jonku verran mut ei sitä nyt iha täydellisesti tarvi osata”
‘combine words’ and use bits of Somali in some social settings seems to suffice for Khalid, rather than trying to reach ‘complete’ proficiency.

Before discussing what the participants accomplish by telling these stories about language proficiency in the ways that they do, and what identity positions emerge through this, I will briefly present some accounts on how language was managed – in many cases actively – by the parents raising their children in a new country. Some aspects have already been mentioned in the previous sections, as a distinction between use and attitudes is bound to be fairly arbitrary. As has been underlined, talk about language is never only about language, and both the parents’ schemes and the thoughts of the participants about language in future generations embed values and judgements beyond skills in communication.

6.2.2 Language management in the family

When British politicians suggest that immigrants should speak English as at home as a way of combatting social unrest, there is clearly an embedded expectation that children of immigrants need help and support in order to learn English. Tabloid newspaper headlines about schools where all pupils have a first language other than English likewise contribute to spreading an image of the breakdown of communication, and thus of social cohesion, because of other languages being spoken at home. Similar stories have made headlines in Sweden and Finland as well. This assumption is overturned in the data in this study, as well as in much previous research. On the contrary, it seems as if it is the heritage languages that need more conscious efforts in order to be spoken. This section looks at accounts in relation to family schemes for language maintenance, starting from the participants’ childhoods, and finally looking at their thoughts about the future of language in their families.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, intergenerational transmission has long been seen as the most natural way of maintaining a language. Spolsky (2009) also points to ‘organised management’ through explicit or implicit expectations on what language should be spoken. Recent research however recognises the family as a dynamic system, and the agency of its every member (King & Fogle 2013), and children do not always readily accept the suggested schemes (see e.g. Blackledge & Creese 2010). Many participants (Farah, Minh, Cemile and Ewa) present the
language use in the family as a fairly self-evident system, in which the heritage language is used with parents, and the dominant language with siblings. However, Ewa, for example, mentions using Polish with her brother if their parents are present. In accounts that reveal more explicit schemes for language management, many participants present the father as the main authority and ‘language police’. Danny, Imad, Khalid and Hülya all mention their father’s rules to encourage the use of the heritage language in the home. ‘My dad had a rule he said when we’re out we speak Swedish (. ) speak Swedish when we’re out (. ) and when we’re home speak Kurdish’, Danny says, thus outlining a language scheme which is directed at ensuring a form of bilingualism where both languages have their place. Imad’s account has very similar traits: ‘when I was younger my father had strict rules that when we are at home we speak Arabic in order to learn it well (. ) if me and my sister spoke Finnish sometimes my father didn’t like it at all’. Hülya similarly mentions her father’s authority and preference: ‘my dad wouldn’t let me you know he wouldn’t like it when I spoke English’. Gabriela, too, mentions the expectations on language use from both of her parents: ‘my parents were very strict with having us speak Spanish at home and then at school and in other places we’d speak Swedish but not at home’. These accounts describe a pattern in which the heritage language is reserved for the home, while the dominant languages (and other languages) are assigned their place outside. It seems that all four, to some extent, and whether consciously or not, challenged these systems and spoke the dominant language more than their parents wished. The rules for language use were not always accepted by the children, and as Danny comments, ‘it obviously became the exact opposite’. Their agency is thus also highlighted in stories of language management. The participants further describe the schemes as being accompanied by comments to remind them to use the ‘correct language’, thus also revealing that in practice, the schemes were met with resistance, whether conscious or not. Khalid, for

50 “sillon nuorempana mun isällä oli tarkat säännöt että kotona ku ollaan niin puhutaan arabiaa sen takia et sitten opitaan se kieli hyvin (. ) mun siskon kans jos puhu joskus silleen suomee niin mun isä ei yhtään tykänny”

51 “mina föräldrar var välldigt noga med att hemma pratade vi spanska och i skolan och så vidare skulle vi prata svenska men inte hemma”
example, quotes his father as saying ‘come on at least try a bit’\textsuperscript{52}, and Imad likewise cites his father’s invitation/command: ‘speak Arabic’\textsuperscript{53}.

The language management schemes reported by Randeep and Laila differ from the others in that they also explicitly describe their parents’ efforts to ensure that the children have a good command of the dominant language, in both of their cases English. This implies that the language scheme also included the English language as part of the communication in the home. Randeep mentions his father speaking English to the children, while Laila reports that her parents used English with the children and Urdu with each other. This scheme changed when Laila and her sisters became teenagers:

LAILA: then they suddenly thought oh no (.) we don’t want them to be too English you know we want them to still be in touch with the culture and our language so then they went the other way and spoke to us a lot in Urdu to make sure we still have those skills’

Here, language seems directly related to identity in a cultural or national sense, and the parents adjust their scheme to ensure a balance between ‘Englishness’ and ‘Indian culture’. The roles assigned to languages will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Formal tuition in the heritage languages has been available for some time in all three countries, but was perhaps not provided in the areas when the participants were growing up. Susanna remembers that Finnish was offered, but as she did not have any friends who attended the Finnish class, she did not want to take part. Danny, on the other hand, mentions that his father ‘did not want his tax money to be spent on Kurdish lessons’, and preferred teaching his children in the home. Farah, Minh, Cemile and Hülya attended classes in their heritage languages when they were younger, but relate them more with play than with learning. Ewa is the participant with the most extensive formal education in the heritage language. She attended a Polish Saturday school in London, and completed her schooling in the Polish education system in parallel with the British, as the family was long planning to move back to Poland. ‘I

\textsuperscript{52} ‘yritä nyt ees väähä’
\textsuperscript{53} ‘puhukaa arabiaa’
hated my parents for it at the time’, she jokingly says, referring to her Polish classes always coinciding with birthday parties of friends. Other participants remember being taught more or less formally at home, learning vocabulary through having to look up words in a dictionary (Gabriela), filling in written tasks (Khalid), or receiving instruction in literacy in other alphabets (Farah). The efforts described up until this point have mainly related to the parents’ expectations and wishes. Language maintenance seems to have been, in most cases, explicitly noted as part of the upbringing of the first generation born in the new country. How do the participants themselves relate to language maintenance? What are their thoughts on language in the next generation?

At the time of data collection, Susanna and Randeep already had children, and in the cases of all the others, the talk about the next generation revolved around a hypothetical future generation of children. All the participants who did not yet have children report that they would like their children to learn their heritage languages, and present this wish as fairly self-evident. A few of them, however, note that understanding the language would be sufficient. Not many of the participants speak of any elaborate plans for how this language maintenance would function in practice, perhaps because it was not relevant at the time when the recordings took place. Danny, who expresses a wish for ‘at least one’ of his children to learn Kurdish, explains that if his future family lives in an English-speaking country, it would be more important for the children to learn Kurdish than Swedish. Perhaps attributing the same ‘language gene’ he describes in himself to them, he estimates that ‘they can just go for a summer and I’m pretty sure they’re gonna come back and know some Swedish’. In his case, it is thus not only a question of maintaining one language, but two languages that in an English-speaking context would be minority languages, relying to a large extent on active maintenance in the home. Gabriela worries that as she speaks Swedish with her partner, should they have children, it would be difficult to maintain Spanish in the family. She is also concerned about how growing up in Malmö would affect their language: ‘I really don’t want them to grow up here in Malmö I don’t want them to have this accent I don’t want them to be semilingual and mix Spanish and
Swedish", she says. These concerns about semilingualism were discussed earlier, and Gabriela seems to relate it to Malmö as a place. Her own childhood in a rural town with many fewer immigrants is often compared to Malmö in her accounts, and she relates her ‘good Swedish’ to the local dialect of the greater Stockholm area.

When it comes to Susanna and Randeep, the participants who were already parents, their reported language strategies differ substantially from one another. Susanna states that her son ‘does not speak a word of Finnish’. When it comes to heritage languages, she comments: ‘I do think it’s good to know your home language in some way because it belongs to you somehow (.) but there can also be a sense of shame involved in it’\textsuperscript{55}. This sense of shame, which Susanna exemplifies by talking about to her godfather, whose alcoholism and failure to learn Swedish made her angry and ashamed, is related to a more general representation of Finnish immigrants as ‘second-class citizens’ in Sweden. For Susanna, and, through her, also for her son, ‘choosing’ Swedish – and becoming ‘monolingual’ – thus seems like a way of taking a step upwards in social mobility. When I ask Susanna ‘I was also wondering can you be Finnish without speaking Finnish do you think’\textsuperscript{56}, she replies by saying ‘now I had a completely different thought (.) how can you be in Sweden and not speak Swedish’\textsuperscript{57}. Referring to this counter-thought as her ‘defense mechanism’, perhaps signifying that this is an ideology she is aware of and believes I agree with, she thus attributes greater value to speaking the dominant language in society and presents it as more important than, and perhaps as opposed to, the value of maintaining a heritage language.

Randeep, likewise, emphasises the role of a high proficiency in the dominant language. However, he relates it mainly to education, and portrays the relation between ‘good English’ and educational success as a fact. I ask him ‘with the children do you speak English or’, to which he replies: ‘we have to speak English with them because if we don’t then they’ll struggle at school’. For his children to also learn Punjabi is nevertheless presented as

\textsuperscript{54} "då vill jag absolut inte att dom ska bo bli uppväxta här i Malmö jag vill inte att dom ska ha den här brytningen jag vill inte att dom ska va halvspråkiga blanda spanska svenska"

\textsuperscript{55} "jag tycker nog att det är bra att man kan sitt hemspråk på nåt vis jag tycker nog det för det tillhör en på nåt vis (.) men att det kan också va en skam inbegripet med det"

\textsuperscript{56} "jag hade fundera också på det att kan man vara finsk utan att tala finska tycker du"

\textsuperscript{57} "nu tänkte jag nån helt annan tanke (.) hur kan du va i Sverige och inte tala svenska"
extremely important to him. The children attend a Saturday school, and are also taught at home. In Randeep’s account, there is still a sense of regret for the limited space of Punjabi in the everyday life of his children:

RANDEEP: I actually feel that people in my situation in my generation because we tend to speak more English in the house than we speak Punjabi unfortunately it’s just the way it is and then we have the TV on which is in English we have the radio on in English so they get very little exposure to listening (. ) I mean we try to do what we can and then you come home at six o’clock then you’ve got homework to do homework’s in English so it’s almost all the time it’s squeezing Punjabi or Hindi or whatever out’

Factors from daily life, in which the dominant language occupies a lot of space through education and the media, are thus presented as ‘squeezing’ other languages out, and causing a language shift in later generations. Participants in Weckström’s (2011: 65) study similarly point to lack of time as a reason for the weakening of language skills between generations. Randeep further says that a lot of people have ‘given up’ and thought that their children can learn later in life, he says, but adds that he will ‘keep pushing them and keep persisting’. He points out that maintaining bilingualism in the generation of his children is a much greater challenge than in his own:

RANDEEP: their grandparents speak English and can understand English and often reply back in English and I keep saying to them don’t reply to them in English you must reply back to them in Punjabi because they know now that the grandparents can speak English they become a bit lazy and they speak in English’

In other words, he is trying to create a similar scheme that he grew up in, where his own grandfather ‘out of principle’ only used Punjabi. This is presented as a prerequisite for maintaining bilingualism: ‘it’s very difficult to be bilingual (.) unless you’ve got somebody who lives in the house who speaks
another language and who does not understand English or is very stubborn and refuses to speak English then you can do it’.

These examples illustrate the schemes and plans that guide(d) language use in the participants’ families. While there are many similarities in how the schemes are employed in practice, they seem to relate to discourses or judgements that are in some ways different from each other, and may even be seen as competing discourses. For example, the emphasis on the dominant language demonstrated in the accounts by Laila about her parents, and Susanna about herself as a parent, reflect discourses around the necessity of a high command of the dominant language for being successful and accepted. While Laila’s parents are described as later perceiving a need to support the heritage language for reasons of identity and culture, Susanna’s reference to the stigma associated with the Finnish language seems decisive in her language choices. It is clear that all language choices relate to some associated values or ideals. These, and the positions accomplished or performed through talk about language use and proficiency, will be discussed next.

6.2.3 Identity positioning through talk about language practices

The previous sections have provided an insight into talk about language through small stories from the interviews, specifically small stories related to reported proficiencies and uses. There are a number of things that call for further discussion. To start with language use, all participants seem to use their heritage language in at least some situations, albeit to very different extents. Most participants, however not all, report using the heritage language with their parents, and the dominant language in society with their siblings and peers. But this, too, would be an oversimplification, considering that several participants report speaking ‘mixed’ with their siblings and sometimes with their parents, and taking into account Imad, who reports that he speaks only Arabic at home. While it should not be seen as self-evident that the participants were ‘bilingual’ from birth, or that both languages were always a part of their repertoires and lives, it seems to have been the case, at least in the self-reported memories in adulthood. Most participants also report arrangements put in place by the parents, in which certain languages were expected to be used in certain places or with certain people.
From the accounts by the participants of this study, it is moreover not possible to distinguish clear lines around when a language is used and when it is not, and boundaries between different domains seem to be blurred. However, in many accounts, the heritage language seems to be associated mainly with home and family in the schemes that were decided on by the parents. The striving towards complying with two simultaneous discourses – that of speaking the dominant language as signs of integration and ‘good behaviour’, and that of maintaining the heritage language, is apparent for example in the rules enforced by the parents of Danny and Gabriela: Swedish outside the home, Kurdish and Spanish respectively in the home setting.

In the accounts about language use, the participants seem to view ‘mixing’ as something that happens automatically and naturally, yet also as something that should be avoided. Lantto (2016: 149) finds that her informants in the Basque country regard it as “somewhat self-evident that speaking two languages at the same time was undesirable language use”, and consider it a threat to the minority language. The understanding of mixing as undesirable and ‘bad’ language is apparent also in this study, for reasons related to concerns about negative associations of those speakers who mix languages. The participants recognise, and perhaps to some extent agree, that languages need to be ‘kept apart’, even if mixing is perceived as the natural state of affairs in the areas or contexts the participants speak about and live in. The participants in Malmö, with the exception of Danny, demonstrate the strongest ‘purist’ views: Susanna and Gabriela emphasise the importance of ‘full, proper competence’ in the Swedish language, and Cemile too seems to see this as the desired state towards which one should aim.

According to Gal (2006: 17), standardisation of language is “not primarily a matter of speaking but rather of exhibiting loyalty towards a denotational code whose high status and norms of correctness are created and supported by powerful institutions such as universal education, language academies, press capitalism, linguistic science, and linguistic markets that instill in speakers a respect for the norm”. This loyalty and respect for what is considered as the norm – as ‘proper’ speech – is very clear in many of the participants’ accounts. For all participants, such a thing as ‘full competence’ seems to exist as an ideal, and many define this as a level at which their competence in the heritage language would not be identified as ‘foreign’, or different from that of ‘native speakers’, born
and brought up in the countries in which the languages are spoken. This sense of evaluation from others – ‘natives’ – is linked to spoken proficiency and fluency. When it comes to written proficiency, most participants seem to view it as less important than being able to converse, which in itself reveals that the languages are perhaps first and foremost valued for their use in certain face-to-face encounters. These questions are of course most relevant for those participants whose heritage languages use a different script than the Latin alphabet. Randeep is the only one who places great significance on literacy, and he seems to connect it mainly with personal reasons, such as self-development and spiritual life.

What, then, is presented as the opposite of the idealised ‘full competence’? Gabriela talks most explicitly about her concerns of ‘semilingualism’, and relates it to the character of the speaker and to what kind of upbringing they had. Linguists Hansegård (1968) and Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) warned about the hazards of semilingualism among children of immigrants, linking a weak proficiency in the ‘mother tongue’ with poor educational and professional outcomes, and with a sense of ‘intellectual and emotional poverty’ (Stroud 2004: 207). Although the concept has been criticised for being based on false assumptions of language proficiency (see e.g. Martin-Jones & Romaine 1986), its message seems to prevail in both public opinion and in policy, as demonstrated by Stroud (2004) in his paper on ‘Rinkeby Swedish’. Like its southern cousin ‘Rosengård Swedish’ in Malmö, Rinkeby Swedish may be defined as a ‘potential, imagined, pan-immigrant contact variety of Swedish’ (ibid: 196). Associated mainly with young people and employed as a marker of collective identity, its varieties have been studied in several other settings (see e.g. Lehtonen 2015, Svendsen & Røyneland 2008, Rampton 1995). Stroud argues that the reluctance to label Rinkeby Swedish as a variety of Swedish is a sign of the politics around language definition and how judgements on what counts as a language depend on ideologies of social structure. Rinkeby Swedish is viewed as spoken by and characterising immigrants, ‘non-natives’, and its representation in media, policy and public opinion contribute to the exclusion of people who speak it from the linguistic market.

The concerns about semilingualism, and the definitions of varieties such as Rinkeby Swedish, thus play a part in the ‘reconceptualizing of Swedish identity’ (Stroud 2004: 208), where language becomes a ground for defining borders. In other words, the preoccupation with these notions
“allows speakers to use them productively as proxy for statements on migration, race and ethnicity in a range of discourses of a direct sociopolitical nature”, and represents a larger picture about “the maintenance and reinforcement of privilege through reproduction of the speech community and its borders” (ibid). Moreover, apart from the connotations of ‘national’ identity and belonging, the associations of semilingualism make it an ‘unrivalled contender for a moral panic’ (ibid. 209).

While semilingualism is not explicitly mentioned by participants other than Gabriela, many comments point to concerns that are clearly related to ideological assumptions of what language proficiency can say about a person’s moral and intellectual characteristics. Farah’s account of how language skills are a way of finding out about a person’s manners, education, and whether they are ‘good as a person’ is an alarming example. A bright young woman, who would describe herself as open-minded and tolerant, she quite casually reproduces a discourse that justifies discrimination by placing the blame on the non-proficient speaker. The acknowledgement by several participants of ‘perfect proficiency’ as attainable, and the striving towards it, also needs to be seen in relation to what ideas they are associated with. When the participants speak about their proficiency in the dominant language (e.g. Susanna about her decision to have ‘perfect’ Swedish, Randep about having ‘better English than some of the indigenous’, or Cemile worrying about why she as a native struggles with writing), they are simultaneously presenting themselves in relation to upbringing, to educational aspirations and achievements, to intellectual properties, and ‘qualifying’ as people who can make claims about belonging in the speech community, and thus in the wider community. Lehtonen (2015) also found that notions such as ‘bad Finnish’, ‘good Finnish’ and ‘perfect Finnish’ were used in her data from adolescents in Helsinki, and were attributed meaning and used in the identity positionings of the young people.

These same values are reflected in the arrangements in the family that aim at leading to a good level of proficiency in the language in question. Proficiency in the heritage languages is thus similarly always attached to values, and by presenting themselves as speakers of these languages, the participants position themselves as respectful, as well-mannered, as ambitious and achieving, and as ‘good daughters/sons’, and as embracing other positive characteristics. Talk about proficiency may thus be seen as
talk about identity, and this is also reflected in the comments on limits to proficiency, such as Hülya’s fear of not being able to communicate, Danny’s regret for not learning Kurdish literacy, and Susanna’s sorrow of not having learned Finnish better.

A final point in this discussion on accounts of proficiency has to do with reported ideals and practicalities. The expressions by the participants of how they ‘wish’ or ‘should’ master the heritage language are contrasted with practical constraints in daily life in a context in which the power of the dominant language is immense. Their accounts are hence affected by ‘normative expectations’ (Hall, K. 2002: 2) from both dominant national discourses and from ‘ethnic communities’, to the extent that these exist and are relevant for the participants. Previous research for example on complementary schools (e.g. Blackledge & Creese 2010) establishes the perceived importance of learning the heritage language as part of ‘being Bengali, Punjabi’ etc. On the other hand, language seems attached to place in the sense that the participants as speakers of heritage languages compare themselves with speakers in the countries the participants migrated from, portraying them as ‘ideal speakers’, as ‘natives’, whose proficiency is generally seen as the model. Hülya’s characterisation of her siblings as being ‘like her’, with the remark that although they speak Turkish, ‘it’s not the same as when you grow up there’, reflects the difficulties in maintaining a language in a context of displacement. This point is also elaborated on in Randeep’s account on language management in his family, to which he comments that ‘being bilingual is very very difficult’ unless the language is spoken without prompt in the home. It cannot be estimated whether the other participants will succeed in transmitting the language to the next generation, but findings from previous studies point to language shift as immensely common. Why do the participants in this study wish to maintain their heritage languages? What roles are these and other languages ascribed in their life stories? These questions are the starting point of the following chapter.
Chapter 7: Roles attributed to languages in life stories

Chapter 6 discussed the participants’ accounts of language use, and looked at what kinds of ideologies are reflected in talk about proficiency. It seems that in many cases, even if the participants report the dominant language as the one they use the most, the heritage language has a place in their everyday lives. Moreover, most of the participants wish for these languages to have a place also in the lives of the following generation. This chapter will review previous research on the roles attributed to language, and to heritage languages in particular. It will then present in more detail what roles are attributed to languages by the participants. The concept of ‘mother tongue’ has been debated in recent sociolinguistic studies, and the analysis here will examine the participants’ definitions and negotiations regarding the term. Moreover, it will present extracts from the group discussions on the theme ‘You can be X without speaking Xish’, and thereby analyse the connections the participants make between particular languages and identities. Finally, it will discuss the ways in which the participants present bi/multilingualism in itself as an advantage, and how this relates to their wish to maintain language in their families.

7.1 Language in practice and value: perspectives from previous research

7.1.1 The value of language

The investigators in the CILS study found that the reported proficiencies in the parents’ languages were clearly decreasing, and that the overwhelming majority reported that they preferred using English. However, two thirds of their respondents reported that they wished for their children to be raised as bilinguals, with equal proficiency in both languages (Rumbaut 2002). Harris (2006: 117), in his study of youth of South Asian background in London, similarly remarks on the “apparent paradox between their proprietary claims and their simultaneous
disavowal of a high level of expertise in the use of these languages”. Numerous ethnographic studies illustrate a similar discrepancy between practice and value; even when language proficiency is reportedly weak, it does not necessarily mean that the languages - or bilingualism in general - are seen as unimportant.

Language choices in migrant families can, as shown, also be expected to be affected by the perceived value of the language for faring well in life educationally, professionally, and economically. This was exemplified in the previous chapter for example in Randeep’s and Laila’s comments about the necessity of speaking English in the home in order to ensure the educational success of the children. While heritage languages are usually spoken to some extent in the home and to elder relatives, they are often perceived as lacking prestige and instrumental value beyond the family context. Namei (2012: 16) comments that Iranians in Sweden “seem to be very aware of the fact that knowledge of the mother tongue does not pay off in the linguistic market of the host country, while knowledge of the majority language brings them social and economic enhancement”.

The ‘linguistic market’ is not an equal zone: Gal (1989: 353) points out that “[t]he value of a linguistic variety (...) depends on its ability to give access to desired positions in the labour market, which ability derives, in turn, largely from its legitimation by formal institutions such as a school system supported by the state”. The value associated with a particular language depends for example on its communicative reach, and in a global sense, this boosts the value of the English language (e.g. Piller 2016). Powerful, English-speaking nations are vested producers and beneficiaries in making English the ‘global language’, and in maintaining its superior status (Ellis 2006: 189). The monolingual ideal is moreover maintained as these nations tend to see themselves and their speakers as monolinguals. In linguistic diversity, there is furthermore a hierarchy between different languages and varieties, as well as among different kinds of speakers – Piller (2016) points out that while skills in Arabic are highly valued in the employment market for university students with no previous knowledge of the language, the skills among hundreds of thousands of speakers of Arabic as a first or heritage language go largely unnoticed as an asset. If local language systems are conceptualised as pyramids, heritage languages are placed at its bottom (ibid.). However, symbolic value is often attributed to these languages, as will be described in the following section.
7.1.2 Language and ‘identity’

Alongside dominant discourses at national and international levels, local language ideologies also influence the value associated with particular languages or varieties. Status and solidarity do not always correspond, and as Gal (1989: 354) points out, there may be pressure from local social networks to “symbolically demonstrate local solidarity by maintaining the local linguistic variants”. In this, she refers to Bourdieu’s influential theory of language and linguistic practices as forms of capital, which correspond to economic and social capital. Even if the value of certain languages over others is legitimised by educational, legal and administrative institutions, groups may actively promote the less valued languages based on claims to loyalty and solidarity. Moreover, as heritage implies a sense of collective remembering, value can be attributed depending on lenses of nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, and personal history (Graham & Howard 2012).

The symbolic role attributed to language is also evident in much discourse around ‘ethnic’ and ‘national identity’. As was mentioned in Chapter 2, the very notion of languages as they are understood today was strengthened through the idea of the nation (see e.g. Billig 1995, Gal 2006). The narratives that nation-states are built upon usually include a perception of a language and a culture as naturally linked, although such a link was merely created as part of nationalist thinking (Anderson 1983/2006). No nations were originally – or ever – monolingual, and the linguistic unity that exists often relates to state intervention (Barth 1969, Wodak et al 2009). Those languages or varieties that were chosen as the dominant ones pushed others to the margins, as language policy functioned as a central element in creating ‘the nation’. Blommaert et al. (2012) point out that the ‘ethnolinguistic assumption’ is today mobilised by minorities, such as indigenous peoples, and has thus recently been strengthened in power and scope in the struggles by minority groups. The theoretical introduction to the previous chapter saw this idea being adopted by migrant groups, for example in the teaching and learning of heritage languages. Despite criticism (see e.g. Hymes 1968), its ideological impact remains a part of ‘common sense’ thinking about identity and nationality.
“If bilingualism is not maintained, it means that somewhere along the line, someone will lose their linguistic identity” (Mills 2001: 387-388). This assumption seems common in some thinking around language maintenance, and given the findings of how people relate language to identity, and to ‘ethnic’ or ‘national’ identity in particular, statements such as this are to some extent understandable. However, according to the theoretical assumptions on which this study is based, identities can never be ‘lost’ – they are emergent through actions such as speech in interaction, they depend on their local contexts, and they are in constant motion. Linguistic identities, like any identities, are negotiated in an environment characterised both by the creative possibilities and normative expectations that surround them (cf. K. Hall 2002: 2). Moreover, previous research has also illustrated how ‘ethnic’ identifications live on regardless of language maintenance. Just as Fishman found that traditions and ‘ethnic’ identities lived on long after a switch to English among European immigrants to the USA, Weckström also comments that for many of her participants of Finnish descent in Sweden, ‘Finnishness’ was about much more than language, and was a part of ordinary life and ways of doing things.

7.2 What roles are attributed to languages in the interview data?

The following sections will explore the roles that languages were given in the talk about life as part of the interview discussions. The analysis will first present talk which connects language with a sense of ‘heritage’, and discuss the different definitions and uses of the concept of ‘mother tongue’, as well as its links with identity positioning. As the links between a particular language and an ‘ethnic’ or ‘national’ identity are found to be so common in previous studies, the group discussions involved questions of this linkage in a general sense. Finally, attention will turn to multilingualism in a broader sense, and how the participants present it in their life story interviews.
7.2.1 Heritage and ‘mother tongues’

Previous research on language has found that viewing language as an element of cultural heritage appears to be a widespread reason for language maintenance (see e.g. Harris 2006, Mills 2001). In popular terms, languages are often perceived as keys that give access to particular cultures. Blackledge and Creese (2010), who observe that teaching language as ‘cultural heritage’ is one of the rationales of the complementary schools in Britain, however note that the link between language and heritage is negotiated by the children in the context they grow up in, rather than uncritically reproduced. This section will outline talk that places importance on language as part of heritage and identity in relation to family ancestry. Although ‘mother tongue’ does not in all the participants’ accounts relate to heritage or family, the concepts of heritage and mother tongue will be discussed under this same heading. Perhaps needless to point out, language(s) were never given only one role, and this section will later analyse other ways in which languages were positioned in the interview talk.

As was described in the previous section, Randeep harbours a strong wish for his children to learn Punjabi to a high level. He supports his strong commitment for their language learning by saying: ‘I want that one of my gifts to them like my legacy to them is that I give them the gift of Punjabi (.) as one of the most precious things that they get from me is that (.) and what that would do for them in their lives in terms of really really enriching them’, characterising knowledge of the Punjabi language as leading to ‘another world opening up to you with all that knowledge and resources experience (.) culture’. Danny, who was earlier described as saying he would ‘feel bad’ if his children did not learn Kurdish, specifies by saying ‘I would feel that they would lose a part of their heritage’. This would, in his words, imply a loss, as ‘there’s just certain things you can’t really translate (.) you can translate it but it takes the edge out of it’, thus restricting the understanding of some concepts and terms. Laila, too, describes the Urdu language by saying ‘that’s my heritage we’re the first generation in my family to be brought up in another country and really be fluent in English’, thereby portraying the language as running through the family line up until her generation. The terms of ‘heritage’ or ‘legacy’ were not only mentioned in the conversations carried out in English. When I ask Minh if it is important to him to know Vietnamese, he confirms that it is, and states ‘after all it’s a legacy (…) it would
be such a waste to just let go of a legacy that you can have and that you were born with. He also mentions that the ‘inherited language’ might not be a useful part of your daily life, but describes it as enriching. Minh thus places Vietnamese in the periphery when it comes to immediate instrumental value, but nevertheless attributes great significance to it for other reasons. In a similar way to Randeep, he refers to it as ‘enriching’, giving it value that may be conceptualised with the help Bourdieu’s ideas of language as symbolic capital. The language is thus associated with an intrinsic value in and of itself, regardless of its usability in everyday life.

Laila’s comment on language as heritage is preceded by a question about her ‘mother tongue’. I had noticed that she referred to Urdu as her mother tongue earlier in the conversation, and when she talks about proficiency and use, characterising them as fairly limited at present, and in order to elicit Laila’s own definition of the concept, I ask her if it is something she has thought about. To this, Laila responds:

LAILA: my earliest memories would be in the Urdu-speaking community so yeah that’s why I refer to it as my mother tongue I haven’t really thought about it too much but I think it would be quite yeah I think it would be quite sad if my children wouldn’t describe Urdu as their mother tongue

In other words, Laila defines ‘mother tongue’ as the ‘first language’ that she learned early in life, and relates it to emotional attachment as she describes herself as being ‘quite sad’ should her children not share this link. The concept of ‘mother tongue’ has been widely criticised in recent sociolinguistic discussions, and it has been suggested that it should be dropped from the sociolinguistic toolkit along with related concepts such as ‘native speaker’ and ‘ethnolinguistic group’, and instead be treated only as an objects of analysis with enduring ideological power (Blommaert & Rampton 2011).

The criticism of these concepts is directed at the assumption that each person should be either a ‘native’ or a ‘non-native’ speaker of a language, with ‘nativeness’ generally associated with learning a language in early

58 “se on kuitenkin perintö (...) olis kauhee hukka vaa niinku luopuu perinnöstä mitä sä voit saada ja mitä sä voit pitää ja millä sä oot syntyny”
childhood, ‘at mother’s knee’ (Piller 2001). This constellation, taken to occur naturally, is regarded as leading to the highest possible proficiency, a ‘comprehensive grasp’ of the language (Rampton 1990: 97). It is further assumed that this position brings with it supremacy and authority over non-native use of the language in question, as well as a privileged sense of belonging to the community that the particular language is associated with. This, in turn, relates to the ethnolinguistic assumption of an inextricable link between ethnic identity and one specific language. When these beliefs are examined in practice, a number of elements are hazy: for example, there are no guarantees that a person who has learned a language in childhood will outshine others in all areas of linguistic competence, or even feel comfortable communicating in that language later in life (Piller 2001). The assumption of each person having only one mother tongue to which s/he feels attached beyond any other language throughout life is likewise not likely to correspond to actual practices. Nevertheless, some countries, including Finland, require their citizens to register one language as the mother tongue, albeit leaving it possible to change this during the course of life. There are, however, no studies to examine the relation between reported mother tongue and competence in it (Latomaa & Suni 2010).

Considering, once again, that the majority of the world’s population is multilingual, it is clear that these beliefs are far from straightforward. The definitions of the concept of mother tongue nevertheless reveal some interesting positioning in the participants’ accounts. The understanding of ‘mother tongue’ as signifying the language that was learned first is mentioned by Ewa and Randeep, who present it as fairly self-evident that Polish and Punjabi respectively should be their mother tongues. Hülya displays more hesitation: ‘see (. ) if (. ) for something to be your mother tongue do you have to know it fluently like as in do you have to know everything about it’, she asks, and juxtaposes the elements of chronological order or learning on one hand, and proficiency on the other. She concludes that Turkish would probably be her mother tongue, although she knows English better.

If the Birmingham participants mainly seemed to perceive ‘mother tongue’ as the first language that was learned, the four Malmö participants appear to relate it more to identity and nationality. ‘It’s quite funny I’ve always said I’m Swedish (. ) I’m Swedish and Swedish is my mother tongue’59.

59 “Det är ganska lustigt jag har alltid sagt jag är svensk (. ) jag är svensk liksom svenskans är mitt modersmål”
Susanna says when I ask her how she refers to the Finnish language. Gabriela likewise relates the Swedish language to identity, albeit not explicitly calling it mother tongue. She explains that as a child, she rebelled against her parents’ rule to only speak Spanish at home, as she found it embarrassing not to speak Swedish as she wanted to be ‘as Swedish as possible’.

In an interview with Cemile, I tell her ‘I was thinking that for us who are bilingual mother tongue often becomes a tricky concept somehow’\(^60\), and she replies by agreeing and says that even at home and during holidays in Turkey, she uses both languages. This prompts her to tell a small story about what she often says to the young people she works with:

CEMILE: listen this is how it is when you travel abroad to where your family comes from what language do you use there well Swedish mm what do they tell you when you are there like what ethnicity do they see you as Arabs do they see you as Lebanese or as Swedes Swedes you say so yeah well then you have [laughs] a double identity’\(^61\)

This story, in which she voices herself and the adolescents, is told as a pedagogical account in which Cemile presents the phenomenon of having a ‘double identity’ as natural and uncomplicated, and also as very closely tied to language use. Her association of this story with the comment about mother tongue suggests that she, too, links that concept with identity.

The participants’ definitions of their mother tongues are noticeably influenced by the dominant or most widely circulated definitions in the contexts in which they live. While in Britain, ‘mother tongue’ has come to signify ‘languages other than English’, in Sweden, speaking Swedish and displaying attachment to it is seen as a self-evident necessity (cf. Wickström 2015). The term itself is perhaps most actively talked about in Finland, with the obligation on every person to register one mother tongue for official purposes. The Turku participants also have the most detailed

\(^{60}\) ”jag tänkte på det att vi liksom som är tvåspråkiga så modersmål blir ju ofta ett liksom kepigt begrepp på nåt sätt”

\(^{61}\) ”lyssna såhär är det när ni reser utomlands och ska hälsa på (.) där familjen kommer ifran och såhär vilket språk är det ni använder där aa det blir svenska mm vad säger dom till er när ni är där vilken alltså etnicitet ser dom er som araber ser dom er som libanes liksom eller som svenskar svenskar säger ni så ja asså har ni [skrattar] dubbelidentitet”
accounts of negotiation regarding their mother tongue. Farah, who remembers learning Finnish before she learned Arabic, asks herself whether the concept signifies the first language you learned, or the language spoken by your parents, and comments: ‘it’s strange how these concepts have been formed because sometimes there are different cases so what do you say about them (. ) it’s difficult’⁶².

When I ask Minh what language he calls his mother tongue, he is initially silent, and then says:

MINH: mother tongue (. ) this is a tough one (. ) I really don’t know I was going to say Vietnamese but maybe Finnish is eventually more my mother tongue because it comes much more naturally it’s easier for me to communicate in Finnish and if I was to describe myself or make a song it would more probably be in Finnish than in Vietnamese so it’s a language in which I can express myself the best so I’d say it’s my mother tongue⁶³

As a comment to Minh’s hesitation, I add that it does not have to be only one, and he laughingly asks if you could say they are both his mother tongues in different ways. Minh’s examples illustrate a spontaneous negotiation of different elements of linguistic identity, and he involves both proficiency and preference in his reasoning.

Imad, likewise, says that he finds that both Finnish and Arabic are his mother tongues. He explains:

IMAD: that’s sort of the kind of thing that for example in job applications I usually say that my mother tongue is Finnish (. ) and it’s very hard for me to say that Arabic is my mother tongue because

⁶² “se on ihmeellistä et miten nää käsitteet on muodustunut koska joskus on erilaisii tapauksia niin mitä sitte heidän kohdalla sanotaa (. ) se on vaikeeta”
⁶³ “äidinkieli (. ) tää on kyl paha (. ) emmä kyl osaa sanoo mä meinasin vastata vietnaminkielis mut kyl suomi on ehkä enemmän äidinkieli loppujen lopuksi koska mulle se tulee paljo luonnollisemmin mun on helpompi kommunikoida suomenkiellel ja jos mä kuvailisin itteeni tai tekisin laulun nii se olis todennäköisesti suomenkiellellä kuin vietnaminkielellä et se on ehkä kieli millä pystyn ilmasta itteeni parhaiten et mää sanoisin ehkä et se olis äidinkieli”
I don’t read or write it (.) so I don’t know if I have the right to call it my mother tongue (.) so now I often say that Finnish is my mother tongue’

Imad’s account contains several interesting ideological points: first, by listing Finnish as his mother tongue in job applications, he emphasises his proficiency and improves his employment opportunities. His uncertainty about whether he ‘has the right to’ claim Arabic as his mother tongue because of his illiteracy in it relates not only to proficiency, but to perceived ‘ownership’ over a language. Who can claim a language as theirs, and who can judge this claim? Gal (2006: 15) points out that languages are supposedly “the property of all citizens; hence no one’s in particular”. Nevertheless, languages and their varieties are associated with ideas about ‘legitimate users’, and who can claim ownership of a language or variety is a part of discourses with larger social meanings and implications. In Imad’s case, Arabic is his official mother tongue, but the short account suggests that both languages fill different elements of the perceived requirements.

Khalid is also uncertain of his views of what constitutes his mother tongue. I ask him whether he calls Somali his mother tongue, to which he replies ‘basically yeah’, and when I add ‘what about Finnish’, he replies:

**KHALID:** well I never get asked that question but like I don’t see myself as Finnish I do understand that I was born in Finland and have lived in Finland but still my parents are Somali so it doesn’t change me so I do see myself as Somali so (.) yeah (.) the Somali language is basically like (.) my (.) mother tongue

---

64 ”Toi on vähä semmonen juttu et mä on siis esimerkiksi työhakemuksis mä pistän yleensä äidinkieleks suomen (.) ja mun on tosi hankala sanoo sille et arabia on esimerkiksi mun äidinkielikoska mä en kuitenkaa kirjota enkä lue sitä (.) nii emmä tiedä onk mul oikeutta sanoo et se on mun äidinkielki (.) niin nyt mä usein sanon että suomi on mun äidinkieliki”

65 ”periaattees joo”

66 ”entäs sit suomenkieli”

67 ”no ei mul tuu koskaan kysyttyy tota kysymyst mut niinku sil taval et en mä itteeni pidä niinku suomalaisena vaan kyl mä sen ymmärrän et mä oon syntyny Suomes ja asunu Suomes mut silti mun vanhemmat on niinko somalilaisii nii ei se mua mikskää muuta et kyl mä itteeni ihan pidän somalilaisena et (.) nii (.) kyl somalinkieli on periaattees niinko (.) mun (.) äidinkieliki”
Here, Khalid presents an understanding of identity and the ethnolinguistic assumption almost as a non-negotiable fact that remains, regardless of proficiency, place of birth or any other aspect than parental ancestry. ‘Mother tongue’ thus appears to be a category which does not call for particular thought or negotiation, and as a question he is not usually asked to give any particular amount of thought to.

The participants’ definitions of mother tongue reflect the local meanings given to the concept, and they present it as the language learned ‘at mother’s knee’ in early childhood, the one they use most frequently or are most confident in using, or a symbol of belonging and identity. Some take a firm stance, relating their understanding of what mother tongue means to other aspects of identity positioning. Overall, however, the data presented above illustrates that the concept, in its traditional connotations and understanding, fits poorly with the linguistic lives described by the participants. A few participants contest the concept itself, and some seem instead to question their own abilities or rights. Weckström (2011: 63-65) finds similar ideas among her participants. In talking about a sense of ‘naturalness’ and ‘artificiality’, her participants attempt to put into words the complex relations that they have to the languages at their reach. ‘Mother tongue’ is therefore not necessarily the one they learned first, but a flexible and at times problematic concept.

The sociolinguistic debates around the concept of mother tongue have long pointed to the inequality that such terms, and the division into ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers, implies, in creating borders when it comes to who can claim belonging, expertise and ownership of a language. As has been shown here, these issues are reflected in some of the talk by the participants. On the other hand, ‘mother tongue’ may be related to identity and a sense of continuum in the family line, such as in Laila’s example. When a language is related to heritage, it may also be used as a symbol of ‘ethnic’ or national identity. But can somebody be Finnish, Swedish or British, without speaking Finnish, Swedish or English respectively? The following section will focus on the thoughts of the participants and their friends taking part in the group interviews.

7.2.2 Can you be X without speaking Xish?
When Farah talks about her language use and attitudes to the Arabic language, I ask her whether she believes her brothers and sister would answer similarly if they were asked the same questions. She strongly believes they would, and specifies: ‘at the end of the day the language is (...) us it’s not just the Arabic language but it reflects your personality too somehow’.

This comment about how the Arabic language reflects their personalities may at first sight be interpreted as a sign of linking a language with a particular ‘ethnic’ identity. The introductory sections of this chapter mentioned the ethnolinguistic assumption and its ideological strength. This may contribute to the interpretation of comments such as Farah’s along those familiar lines, also in academic studies. It is therefore important to remain open to several other possible interpretations, and the aim of this chapter is to shed light on these. This section sets out to examine the explicit reasoning around questions of identity and language. The statement ‘You can be Finnish/Swedish/British without speaking Finnish/Swedish/English’ was presented as part of the group interviews, whose purpose was to find out how questions of language and identity are talked about among people that the participants spend time with in their lives.

The accounts from the discussions can roughly be divided into three groups: those who agree with the statement, those who disagree, and those who are unsure. As will be shown, these interestingly seem to correlate with the three cities as settings. Starting from the comments in agreement with the statement, Susanna is certain of her view: ‘I say no my immediate huge reaction is no I don’t think so because I think if you come to a country you have to learn the language of where you’re going to live right’.

She adds that how well you speak is a different issue, but in order not to be ‘handicapped’ in society, you need to speak the dominant language. Her two friends agree, and mention that not knowing the language has led to isolation and helplessness especially among immigrant women who have lived in Sweden for a long time. One of Susanna’s friends has moved to Sweden from Chile, and says: ‘I agree that if you live here in Sweden you have

---

68 “se on loppujel lopuks (.) me nii se kieli et se ei oo vaan niinku arabiankieli et se on jotenki kuvastaa jotenki persoonaaki sillai”

69 “jag säger nej alltså min första jättereaktion det är nej jag tycker inte det för jag tycker det om man kommer till ett land så ska man lära sej det språket där man ska bo va”
to learn Swedish to be Swedish otherwise you’re in a pickle in every way.” While all of them seem to talk about the importance of language proficiency in order to get by in society that is characterised as functioning solely in Swedish, they also portray ‘becoming Swedish’ as necessary, and the Swedish language as an obvious component.

The second group in Malmö consisted of Gabriela, Danny and Danny’s wife. All three are initially confused by the statement altogether, and wonder how it would be possible not to speak the dominant language. During the course of the rather long conversation, the three participants mention several exemplifying scenarios. Danny relates the statement to North Americans of other origin, and takes a sceptical stance to their claims of ‘otherness’. When his wife mentions Italian Canadians, he exclaims:

DANNY: that is the perfect example cause I knew a lot of Italian Canadians in Canada they’re like oh I’m Italian I’m like okay do you speak Italian no I’m where were you born they’re like Woodbridge [laughs] and you know what I mean their mom and dad don’t even really speak Italian that well but their grandparents but they still identify themselves as Italian (.) then again are they Italian I think it’s up to I dunno I wouldn’t consider them cause I know more Italian than they do’

Lacking proficiency in the language associated with ‘Italianness’ thus makes the claim less credible to Danny. When I introduce the example of immigrants who have moved to Sweden, Danny says:

DANNY: I dunno they live here they might not be living a Swedish life in here so I don’t know how Swedish that would make them (.) I think it all lands on the culture (.) that’s what makes you into a certain nationality I think how much you identify with your culture and celebrate it if somebody lives here and they don’t embrace any Swedish on any type of level nah I don’t think they could be

70 “jag tycker också att om man bor här i Sverige man ska lära sig svenska för att man ska vara svensk annars det är kört på alla sätt”
Danny thus associates not speaking Swedish with being out of touch with any aspect of ‘Swedish life’, even if the person has citizenship (is ‘Swedish on paper’). Gabriela agrees, and refers to her own grandparents: ‘they were first generation and they never said they were Swedish they were only here killing time because it was fucked up in their country and they always said we are not Swedish’. Self-identification and choice thus also become arguments in national identification, and Danny adds that it depends on the individual: ‘you have the flipside those who’ve just lived here for two years and speak perfect Swedish and they’re all like oh I wanna get into the system’. Language is thus again presented as the core to integration in the form of ‘getting into the system’, and ‘belonging’ becomes a result of personal choice and efforts.

Cemile, who was interviewed alone, hesitates slightly in her answer:

CEMILE: obviously if you call yourself Swedish you need to be able to speak the language (.) or you don’t need to but (.) there are still people that I’ve met they have a different background and they don’t know the language (.) so it’s a bit of both that was a difficult question actually [laughs] difficult to answer (.) the main thing is how you feel’

In her hesitation, it seems as if what Cemile sees as an ‘obvious’ requirement clashes with her own observations of people whose Swedish is limited and whom she would describe as being Swedish, or at least offer the possibility to do so, should they wish to. Finally, she attributes more significance to her own interpretation, and ranks self-identification as the decisive factor.

In the Birmingham context, the statement had yet another level of complexity, as the terms for national identification could be both ‘English’ and ‘British’. The conversations mostly centred on ‘Britishness’ as a general category and label. Ewa and Hülya both commented that the

71 “självklart kallar man sej för svensk så ska man också kunna tala språket (.) eller man behöver inte men (.) det är fortfarande personer jag har träffat dom kan ha en annan bakgrund men dom kan inte språket (.) så att det är både och det var en svår fråga faktiskt [skrattar] svår o svara på (.) huvudsaken är hur man känner sej”
statement would be easier to discuss in the case of a different national identity than British. ‘I think that’s a lot easier to apply to a different country because so many people speak English that it’s actually very difficult to not speak English at all’, Ewa says, but her friend gives an example of people in the area of London where she grew up: ‘they will only know enough words to you know go to the shop and buy some bread they need a translator for the doctor’s and things like that and yet they’re British they live here with their families’. Being settled in England thus seems sufficient for her to classify somebody as being British. Ewa, however, adds a note on self-identification in response to her friends comment: ‘yeah you can get by (. ) although I think it’s quite rare for someone to think themselves as British if they don’t know the language’. When Ewa is asked about ‘Polishness’ without proficiency in Polish, she bases her view on self-identification: ‘I think it’s how you see yourself more than anything so I don’t think it’s (. ) is it possible to see yourself as Polish if you don’t speak it (. ) yeah there’s plenty of people who do’.

Hülya, perhaps slightly frustrated with the open definitions of national labels of identity, exclaims ‘oh for god’s sake [laughs] what does British mean’, and later asks if she can check the difference between being British and English by doing a Google search in order to be able to ‘properly answer’. Her friend who has recently moved from Turkey relates the statement to ‘Turkishness’, and explains that there are people from minority groups who are Turkish by citizenship but identify more as Kurdish, Albanian, Macedonian or other labels. In the case of Britain, he says:

HÜLYA’S FRIEND: it is actually more political question for example you can be British or English citizen but if you don’t know English how you can live in this country (. ) actually (. ) it seems you are just (. ) immigrant you know you are not British or English because of this language

For him, as a recent immigrant, language is thus a criterion in order to ‘live in this country’, as a ‘British’ or ‘English’ person rather than ‘just an immigrant’. Hülya, having looked up the definitions she found online (‘it says here that being British is about its people or language’), concludes that ‘I guess it has to do with language [laughs] so I guess if you speak it you’re British’. When I ask whether somebody could be English without speaking English, and whether that is a different question, she is more certain: ‘no I
do think that being English is if you’ve actually got the English it’s like being Turkish you know if you’re bo- if you’ve got the parents and stuff”, thus relating it to ancestry and viewing ‘Englishness’ as an non-negotiable identity that cannot be obtained in other ways than being born as ‘English’.

Randee and his friend share the experience of having at least one foreign-born parent, and relate the statement to their own observations and reflections. When his friend ponders upon the extent to which British identity can be developed without having access to ‘the culture’ through the English language, Randee says:

RANDEEP: I was thinking about my grandparents cause their English was very limited and I was thinking about my mother-in-law as well her English is limited and would she consider herself to be British I guess from a nationality point of view she would yeah and she has got a British passport and she would consider England to be her home and in fact even though she’s got a property in India she says that after the second week she’s bored out of her brain cause she wants to come back so my answer to that would be yes I think actually you can be British without speaking English yeah definitely you can’

His friend agrees, and makes her own stance clear:

RANDEEP’S FRIEND: the ones that originally came here without any English most of the people that I knew who spoke very little English from those communities saw themselves as British which is an interesting thing but they still retained their cultural identity their home cultural identity so there was no issue about being British and being from somewhere else I don’t see that as an issue do you’

What both of them have observed, and present as unproblematic, is a sense of identifying both with ‘Britishness’ and another national identity, regardless of how proficient these people are in the English language.

The place of language for national identification appeared to be perceived as rather peripheral in the group interviews recorded in Turku.
Instead, other aspects were named as important, or even decisive. In Farah’s group, the three girls were in agreement ‘I don’t think it depends on language what national identity you have’\textsuperscript{72}, Farah’s friend says, and her opinion is supported by the others. Knowing the ‘culture’ is presented as more important than citizenship, ancestry or language, and the girls refer to national minorities such as the Swedish speaking Finns and the Sami. Khalid’s friends do not see how language would determine national or ethnic belonging: his friend begins by saying ‘it’s not about what you speak’, and his phrase is finished by Khalid, who says ‘but where you are from originally’\textsuperscript{73}. Another friend comments ‘I’ve always considered it to be based on roots’\textsuperscript{74}, and adds ‘I don’t draw a line based on language’\textsuperscript{75}. They thus perceive ‘ethnic’ or ‘national’ belonging to be a rather fixed category: the only way of being ‘Finnish’ is to have ‘Finnish’ parents.

The importance of ancestry and genetics is foregrounded also in Minh’s discussion with his friend. Minh says:

MINH: If you think of a person with Finnish genes who was born for example in the States the father and the mother would be Finnish but the child wouldn’t speak Finnish I would still call them Finnish and probably they would call themselves Finnish too at least partly if you asked them where are you from it would probably be Finland and what nationality are you they might say Finnish American\textsuperscript{76}

His friend argues for identification beyond ancestry, and adds that language is a vehicle for these, but not what determines national identity:

MINH’S FRIEND: well in my opinion you can be Finnish without being a native speaker and this

\textsuperscript{72}“mun mielest se kieli ei niinku ei se määrrä et minkä maalainen sä oot”
\textsuperscript{73}“siis eihän se mitä sä puhut eihän se sitä tee’ (...) ‘vaan se et mist sä oot alkuperäsin”
\textsuperscript{74}“kyl mä oon aina kattonu et juurien perusteelela”
\textsuperscript{75}“emmä kielien perusteelela vedä rajaa”
\textsuperscript{76}“Jos mietitään suomalaisgeeninen ihminen ois syntyny esimerkiks Jenkeissä isä ja äiti on suomalaisii mut lapsi ei puhu suomee ni mä silti kutsuisin häntä suomalaiseeks ja varmaan hän ittek kutsuis itteensä suomalaiseks sillee ainaki osittain jos kysyy et mistä oot kotoisin niin Suomesta varmaan ja minkä maalainen sä oot ehkä suomalais-amerikkalainen sanois varmaan”
goes for any language or nationality it depends on different factors not linguistic factors (.) so how you think and what your values are that’s where it starts77

Imad and his friends are initially unsure. One of his friends questions the statement: ‘that experience does go hand in hand with having (.) like with language and a national identity’78. But another friend challenges this by asking ‘what if you’re deaf and mute or like don’t have language at all in the same way (...) or if you can’t communicate in sign language either is it like no you’re not Finnish because you don’t have the Finnish language that would be a bit strange’79. The others laugh at this example, but also agree on how in this case it would be bizarre to exclude people who for some reason do not have the ability to speak from identifying as ‘Finnish’. The group also mentions national minorities and refer to other bilingual countries, in order to exemplify that the link between one official language and national belonging is not always clear.

There are interesting differences between the ways in which participants in the three cities respond to the statement. While the data is small in quantity, there are clearly some shared phenomena between the different discussions, which differ greatly between Finland and Sweden in particular. While the Malmö participants seem to view the Swedish language as a self-evident and obligatory element of ‘Swedishness’ and for getting by and having a ‘Swedish life’, the participants in Turku rapidly list other elements and factors that they see as having more weight. Here, ancestry and family background is highlighted as central, along with self-identification. In the Birmingham discussions, considering Britain as ‘home’ is presented as a sufficient argument in at least two conversations, and identifications embracing different ‘ethnic’ or ‘national’ components are presented as unproblematic.

77 “no mun mielest siis sä voit kyl olla siis suomalainen vaik sä et olis natiivi kielenpuhuja tai siis ihan päätee mihin tahansa kieleen tai kansallisuteen siiihen vaikuttaa sit kaikki eri tekijät ei ne niinkun kielitieteelliset tekijät (...) eli ihan se ajatusmaailma arvomaailma se lähtee sieltä”
78 “kylhän se kokemus kulkee kuinteiki aika paljon käsi kädes sen kanssa et on (...) niinku kielen ja semmosen kansallisidentiteeti”
79 “entä jos on kuromykkä tai joku sillai muutenki ei ylipäältä oo sitä kielä samal tavalla (...) tai sit jos ei pysty kommunikoimaan viittomakielelläkään nii onk sit et ei nyt sä et o suomalainen koska sult puuttuu suomenkieli ni se olis vähä sillee hassuu”
Whether there was a perceived link between a language and a category of identification or not, all participants viewed knowledge of several languages as positive and enriching. The final section of this chapter will look at the value assigned to bi/multilingualism, and ask what roles languages are given in this.

7.2.3 Bi/multilingualism as an asset

Throughout the process of data collection, it was clear that all participants saw multilingualism as beneficial, both at a personal level and in general. Those who did not put great emphasis on learning the heritage language – mainly Susanna and Khalid – nevertheless described learning other languages as being of value. This section will look at how the participants talk about bi/multilingualism in general, and what they connect with it. These points of view are in most cases in line with the participants’ views about learning their heritage language, but these do not necessarily go hand in hand. The following sections will look at this in more detail.

Starting from a practical level, many presented knowledge of several languages as a flexible asset in everyday settings. Danny, Ewa and Farah mention the possibility of using a language as a ‘secret code’ for communication among siblings or relatives, and thus describe employing elements from their linguistic repertoires for in-group communication that intentionally creates a border with the others present. Speaking the heritage languages is also presented as valuable when it comes to communication within the family. Farah and Gabriela for example mention the necessity of their possible future children speaking Arabic and Spanish respectively so that they can speak with their grandparents and take part in discussions at family reunions. Hülya, Cemile, Farah, Ewa and Randeep also emphasise the added value of speaking several languages when it comes to employment prospects, and portray their bi/multilingualism as traits that bring more opportunities for them.

As was mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, language ideologies entail hierarchical relationships between different languages, both globally and in particular contexts. Reflections of these hierarchies can be seen for example in Susanna’s mentioning of the connotations between the Finnish language and social stigma. Not many participants explicitly say that their heritage language lacks value in the local society,
although this was the case in my Master’s thesis study among speakers of South Asian languages in Britain (Bäckman 2011). Imad, however, underlines that whether his skills in Arabic are valued or not, depends much on person and context:

IMAD: for example among friends it’s quite a big thing a significant thing that I know Arabic so they ask a lot for example if I speak on the phone they’re really curious to listen to the Arabic language and so on (.) but for example if you apply for jobs etc I don’t feel it’s particularly useful’

He adds that although his friends have a positive attitude towards his Arabic skills, he has also received negative comments. When I ask him whether he feels that other languages spoken in the home are valued in general in Turku, he replies:

IMAD: it depends so much on the place where it’s talked about and it depends on the language so what language you speak at home for example well depends on the person but if I say I speak Arabic at home and basically Arabic is my mother tongue some people might be like (.) ugh (.) Arabic but there’s not that much of that anyway (.) but then these same people if I’d tell them I speak French for example they might immediately be like oh nice it’s good that you speak French’

80 "esimerkiks kaveripiireissä ja näin niin kyl se on aika semmonen iso juttu merkittävä juttu et mä osaan arabiaa et ne hirveesti kyselee kaikkeee et ku esimerkiks ku mä puhun puhelimes nii ne hirveestä kyselee sitä arabiankieltä ja näin (.) mut et esimerkiks jos sä oot tehny jotai työhemaksii ja näin nii en mä oo kokenu et siit tulis mitään erityistä hyötyy”

81 “se riippuu tosi palio sit taas siittä paikasta missä puhutaan asiasta ja se riippuu siit kielestää et mitää puhutaan kotona et esimerkiks no riippuu henkilöstää jos sanoo et mä puhun arabiaa kotona mun periaatteessa äidinkieli on arabia nii jollain saattaa tulla vähän sillai et (.) hyi (.) arabia mut aika vähä on sellasta kuitenkaa (.) ku sit taas nää samat ihmiset jos niille vaik sanoo et mä puhun ranskaa sielt tulee sit heti semmonen et aijaa kivaa hyvä että puhut ranskaa”
The different value attached to the Arabic language is also mentioned by Farah, who points out that while Arabic might not be greatly valued in Finland, its status internationally is much greater.

Different forms of bilingualism are thus differently esteemed, with combinations of those languages that are associated with prestige seen as more valuable. In the light of the discussion on multilingualism in the introduction to this chapter, these comments are fairly unsurprising. What becomes more significant, then, is the absence of more similar comments from the participants. In general, the participants present their heritage languages as something that adds to their lives. Not only is the heritage language described as enriching in the participants’ own lives, but also as a legacy to pass on to future generations. Many participants relate their wish to a general appreciation of bi/multilingualism. Minh, for example, says ‘there’s never any harm in learning a language I think there’s always an advantage in it’\(^82\). Ewa, likewise, says that if she had children, she would want them to learn Polish:

```
EWA: not just to keep in touch with the cu- not just to keep in touch with it more kind of because it is (. ) knowing two languages from the start it just makes the rest of them so much easier and I’ve seen loads of things about studies where bilingual children find maths easier or something (. ) culture and everything would be (. ) a part of it but the benefits from knowing two languages from an early age is (. ) why wouldn’t you’.
```

This view of bi/multilingualism as self-evidently advantageous, and associated with cognitive benefits, is reflected also by Imad in his comment ‘you should know as many languages as possible’\(^83\), as well as in Laila’s comment that if she were not of Indian background, she ‘wouldn’t be able to speak this other language which means I wouldn’t be this good or have this interest in learning other languages’. Hülya’s refers to a saying she has learned from her father: ‘my dad used to say like (. ) each language is like another person so yeah he knows about seven so he’s like seven people basically [laughs],

\(^82\) “kielen oppimisest ei oo ikinä haittaa must siit on aina hyötyy”

\(^83\) “kielii pitäis osata mahdollisimman monta”
and describes Turkish as a heritage language she has received ‘naturally’, and that thus adds to who she is.

When Gabriela mentions being concerned that her hypothetical future children might not learn Spanish, I ask her what would happen if her future children only knew Swedish. She replies:

GABRIELA: I would feel like a failure (.) really [laughs] because I think there are so many concepts that don’t exist in Swedish that do exist in English or Spanish of French that give the children a different understanding of the world and they can see things in a different way’

Passing on a language to the next generation is thereby presented by Gabriela as a kind of moral obligation. Randeep expresses similar thoughts in connection with why he would like to give his children ‘the gift of Punjabi’:

RANDEEP: yeah I think it is important for them to learn Punjabi because they’re missing out (.) they’re missing something (.) you know their life will be less for it if they don’t (.) if they can speak Punjabi then it will open up a new world (.) like learning any language (.) you know I mean you speak several languages so and each of those languages have different words different meanings different contexts that you didn’t even know existed you know so I believe the more languages you can learn the better so I really push my daughter on learning Spanish and learning French really push it and she keeps saying why do you take that so seriously and I’ve said because I think I just think it’s so important the more you can open your mind to new languages and different languages different concepts the better’

84 ”då skulle jag nog känna mej som misslyckad (.) verkligen [skrattar] för jag tror att det är så mycke begrepp som inte finns på svenska som finns på engelska på spanska eller franska som gör att barnen har en annan förståelse av världen o kan se saker o ting på ett annat sätt”
All of these accounts share a starting point in questions about heritage languages, and an expansion to language in general: it is not only the heritage language that the participants want to pass on, but a larger set of values of what being bilingual entails. These accounts, alongside creating and maintaining positive discourses around bilingualism, may perhaps be interpreted as narrative ways of overcoming potential disadvantage of the language in question in the local linguistic market. If, for example, the value attached to Vietnamese, Arabic, Turkish, Polish or Punjabi is weak in the dominant discourses in the contexts in which the participants live their lives, they might nevertheless be able to draw on larger discourses of the benefits of bi/multilingualism, and turn the access to several languages to their advantage. Considering the conflicting ways in which bi/multilingualism is presented and discussed, not least in the UK, turning linguistic competences in general to their favour in a larger sense may at least be viewed as a discursive and narrative strategy available to the participants. The introductory chapter presented the conflicting ways in which linguistic diversity is treated in contemporary discourse: on the one hand as something to celebrate and encourage, on the other hand as threatening and problematic. By ascribing the languages – no matter what language is in question – the role of opening up new worlds and enriching the mind, the participants align themselves with celebratory discourses, while their accounts on ‘proficiency’, presented in the previous chapter, reflect ideologies of purity.

7.3 Discussion and chapter summary

Many ideological assumptions and constructions have been in play in the accounts discussed in this chapter. The conflicting discourses can be seen for example in the participants’ definitions of their own ‘mother tongues’: whether the answers are certain or hesitant, they employ some ‘common sense’ understandings of what counts as a mother tongue, and what this entails. It is also evident that the traditional definitions do not fit well with the linguistic practices and the reflections upon these practices described by the participants. The ‘mother tongue’ can, however, be closely connected with a sense of heritage and identity, which the participants wish to maintain.
The ideological power of the ethnolinguistic assumption is clearly noticeable in some of the accounts, both when it comes to personal relations to language, and to general views of language and identity. It is particularly strongly adopted in the group discussions with the participants in Malmö on the topic of ‘being Swedish’ without speaking Swedish. Here, the Swedish language seems like an unquestioned core element of ‘Swedishness’, while the interviews in Birmingham and Turku apply more flexibility to this aspect of ‘national identity’. On the other hand, many of the Turku participants emphasise ancestry and ‘ethnic origin’, which are, at least in some cases, presented as less negotiable. In this sense, ‘Finnishness’ may be more difficult (or even impossible) to obtain, if the criterion of ancestry is viewed as the key issue. Several studies from different contexts in Finland have suggested this (see e.g. Haikkola 2012, Honkasalo 2003). If, on the other hand, ‘Swedishness’ can be acquired by learning the Swedish language, it offers more space for negotiation. In the interviews with the Birmingham participants, ‘Britishness’ in particular was perceived as a fairly open category of identity – identifying Britain as one’s home and self-identifying as ‘British’ was seen as sufficient by several participants.

If the previous chapter mainly focused identity positioning in talk about language use, this chapter set out to look at value judgements through the roles ascribed to language. These may, of course, be expressed in talk about any topic, but it can be assumed that talk about future generations will highlight what values are given particular weight. When the participants say that they would like their children to know the heritage language, and to be bi/multilingual, they mark these as attributes worth keeping. As has been shown in these two chapters, the reasons for this are complex and varied; there is no single answer to why a language should be maintained, but rather a collection of entangled reasons, relating to discourses that give language(s) symbolic value, but also to socio-economic realities that place a value upon language skills, albeit in unequal ways. The participants all view bi/multilingualism as a related to qualities they are proud of and aspire to, whether the heritage language is a central or peripheral part of their linguistic repertoires. In a similar way as in the talk about proficiency, the participants here position their multilingualism as giving them positive traits: they have access to more concepts than ‘monolingual’ people, they have an advantage when it comes to employment, and their lives are ‘enriched’ by influences from
several linguistic worlds. The languages themselves may also be attributed special value, as has been shown for example in accounts by Farah, Laila and Randeeck.

The group interview discussions of language and ‘national identity’ provide an interesting forum for the participants also to position themselves in relation to their definitions of who can count as ‘Finnish’, ‘Swedish’ or ‘British’. As the ‘experts’ in the situation, they were free to draw the lines around ‘national identity’ as either a closed or open category, and the majority saw it as open when it comes to the place of language. The influence of surrounding discourses was evident in the talk, and by adhering to dominant storylines, the participants also contribute to their maintenance and reinforcement. In the group interviews, the participants talked about these topics in a fairly general sense; however, the topic of ‘cultural identities’ also emerged as a much discussed theme in the interview data at large. How are the lines drawn when it comes to the participants themselves? How are boundaries created when it comes to collective identities based on ‘ethnicity’ and ‘nationality’? The following chapter will discuss these concepts in the light of theory, and analyse the negotiation of identities through interview talk.
Chapter 8: Negotiating the boundaries of cultural identities

In politics and much popular discourse, bi/multilingualism is still today linked with questions of allegiance to the ‘national identity’, and many assume a one-to-one relation between language and identity. Speaking the dominant language is generally considered evidence of integration of migrant communities (cf. Ager & Strang 2004), and retaining the heritage language raises concerns about the opposite. The previous chapter illustrated the participants’ own views of the relation between the dominant language and ‘national identity’. This chapter will discuss the creation and maintenance of ‘national identities’, and discuss the negotiation apparent in the interviews relating to the theme of ‘national’ and ‘ethnic’ identities. These will here be referred to as ‘cultural identities’ because of their character as culturally produced and constructed. Both the ‘ethnic’ and the ‘national’ are discursively constructed, as will be discussed in the theoretical overview that opens this chapter. The analysis will focus on specific themes that were common across the data when it comes to definitions and negotiations of cultural identities. Firstly, it will present the participants’ self-definitions in terms of available categories of identification. It will further analyse some elements in relation to cultural identification and belonging, namely through personal names and visits to the country of origin of their parents. Moreover, it will examine the participants’ juxtaposition of themselves and siblings in terms of being ‘more’ or ‘less X’, as well as positioning as ‘different kinds of X’.

8.1 On the construction of cultural identities

Categorisations along the lines of what might be referred to as ‘cultural identity’ seem hard to avoid: despite my conscious choice not to ask the participants to define themselves in any ethnic or national terms, they appeared to easily gravitate towards precisely this kind of categorisation of themselves and others. Ideologies like those that shape cultural identities are largely invisible in their everyday representations. As with ideologies of language, discussed in the previous chapter, ideologies of cultural identity appear as ‘natural’ and timeless, and are rarely
questioned. Billig (1995: 37) remarks that “people forget that their world has been historically constructed”. Everyone is expected to ‘have’ a national and ethnic identity, and these are taken to have certain implications for who they are (ibid). Difference is constructed through the creation of boundaries, which are seen as elements that ‘canalize social life’ (Barth 1969: 15) and form a complex of lines that regulate belonging. These boundaries are shaped through speech and other forms of social practice. Moreover, nations, as well as individuals, depend on and create narratives of identity: powerful stories of nations have been constructed and distributed in different media, such as the national printed press (Anderson 1983/2006), and are reproduced in many spheres of social life. As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, Sealey and Carter (2004) outline a thorough case for reminding researchers in sociolinguistics to include some ‘epistemic authority’ for the categories they apply, i.e. to justify their use from a theoretical perspective rather than presenting them as ‘natural’. Like Billig, they conclude that “the social categories that we use in our everyday interactions are often matters of unexamined convention and tacit agreements” (ibid. 124). The following sections will give a brief overview of the foundation of currently accepted concepts of ‘national identity’, and discuss the complexity inherent in any categorisation along ‘ethnic’ lines.

8.1.1 The historical roots of ‘national identity’

The concept of national identity, usually presented and conceived of as ancient, stems from a fairly recent way of viewing the organisation of the world. There is no general consensus on the meaning of ‘nation’, and neither can one say exactly from what time one can speak of nations (Wodak et al 2009: 18). It is, however, clear that the rise of the nation-state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries transformed the ways in which people conceived of themselves and of community (Billig 1995: 61). In Western societies, a gradual shift directed allegiances and identifications that previously had been given to the tribe, region or religion, towards what came to be represented as ‘the national culture’ (Hall 1996).

In his influential book about ‘national identity’, Anderson (1983) refers to nations as ‘imagined communities’, and links the eighteenth century rise of nation-states with a change in conceiving of the world brought about in the Enlightenment period. French and German Romanticism, and
Herder’s idea of the ‘Volk’ as a unified group of people, was spread through what Anderson refers to as ‘print capitalism’, the growing production and consumption of newspapers and novels, to masses of people. With no dated origins, languages were conveniently appropriated as bases for unity of the nation, which was imagined and presented as an ‘awakening’ from sleep; for example, many artefacts and rituals which were invented during the culmination of nationalist thinking were later viewed as ancient traditions. This sense of nations as awakening contributed to the seemingly eternal story of the nation, casting a sense of mysticism and destiny upon the personal yet shared bond to a ‘homeland’ (Anderson 1983, Billig 1995).

Language ideologies have a central role within ideologies of the nation, and they build on similar perceptions as ‘natural’ and self-evident. Gal (2006: 15) explains that “social groups, by virtue of their supposed linguistic homogeneity and distinctness are thought to deserve a state, a territory, some kind of political autonomy”. Speakers of varieties that are viewed as versions of the same language are therefore seen as belonging to the same territory. Gal further reminds us that ‘language’, i.e. the notion of languages as internally homogeneous entities with clear boundaries between one language and another, was created in Europe. It is thus in Europe that ideologies connecting language and national identity are particularly strong. Nations are, however, to their character imagined; no matter how small the nation, it is impossible for all members to know each other, yet in their minds they are connected to each other and feel attachment to an identity to which particular meanings are attributed (Anderson 1983/2006: 6). These imaginary constructs are produced and reproduced through overt symbols and institutions, as well as through a variety of daily actions and representations that largely pass by unnoticed.

### 8.1.2 Maintenance of identity boundaries

The discourses that nations and national identities build upon depend partly on physical items that serve to reflect boundaries that make a difference. Through national flags, anthems, coins, monuments and ceremonies, members – ‘nationals’ – are reminded of their common heritage and their cultural kinship (Smith 1991). The reminders, however, expand far beyond these explicit institutions. Billig (1995:6) draws attention to the complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations
and practices that are produced ‘in a banally mundane way’, and that enable the continuous reproduction of established nations particularly in the West. A crucial element in this complex is the very assumption that peoples should have their states, i.e. the idea of a division into nation-states as the self-evident world system, and that these nation-states have their adjacent languages and ethnic groups. This organisation is manifested for example in political discourse, cultural products and the structuring of newspapers (Billig 1995: 8), as well as through educational policies, legal practices, sports, and everyday practices. In these ways, discourses of national identities create a common past, present and future, as well as a common culture associated with a shared territory (Wodak et al 2009: 187).

Perceptions of national identity moreover include beliefs about ‘behavioural dispositions’ (Wodak et al 2009: 29), and common traits to characterise the ‘homo nationalis’. These kinds of conceptions of the ‘national character’ are real only in the form of representations in the minds of people: “we only know what it is to be “English” because of the way “Englishness” has come to be represented, as a set of meanings, by English national culture” (Hall 1996: 612). These cultural representations depend on juxtaposition and interaction with what is perceived and represented as ‘foreign’, and by maintaining the boundaries that categorise people as ‘same’ or ‘strange’ (Barth 1969, Wodak et al 2009). The category of the stranger, who is presented as not belonging, is often ascribed more stereotypic traits, while the perceived ‘we’ are viewed as the standard, unmarked norm (Billig 1995: 81). Membership in particular groups is attested for example via use of pronouns and other linguistic markers, as well as by self-categorisation. But to what extent is self-categorisation a matter of unlimited choice?

In the light of the view of identity embraced in this thesis, cultural identity options and possibilities to claim them are likewise seen as limited and differently valued depending on sociohistorical contexts. The analysis to come in this chapter, however, also illuminates the participants’ agency as described by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 27): “individuals are agentive beings who are constantly in search of new social and linguistic resources which allow them to resist identities that position them in undesirable ways, produce new identities, and assign alternative meanings to the links between identities and linguistic varieties”. It is, however, important to keep in mind also the distinction suggested by
Pavlenko and Blackledge about identities as imposed, assumed or negotiable, as described in Chapter 2. The following sections of analysis will examine different kinds of negotiation of cultural identities in the data for this study.

8.2 Negotiation of cultural identities in the interview data

In studies on children of migrants, it appears tempting for many to find out about the allegiances that they feel to, generally, two ‘national cultures’ that they are seen as positioned between. When it comes to the present study, the participants may have interpreted the general topic of the research, and/or some of the interview questions, as aiming at this kind of categorisation, even though they were not explicitly asked about self-identification in national or ethnic terms. In addition, as identities are formed and negotiated in interaction, my own membership in some cultural identities, and, perhaps more importantly, the participants’ interpretations of them, were also likely to influence their negotiations (see Chapter 3 on reflexivity in the data collection process). This section will offer an overview of the range of identifications that were made relevant in the course of the interview conversations. It will present the categories as they were introduced and defined by the participants themselves, and focus particularly on what terms and they employed in this negotiation.

8.2.1 Naming the self

As could be expected, most participants used various identity terms to describe themselves, and what is more surprising are the cases in which participants consistently used one particular identity category. Starting from these cases, Ewa and Khalid were the only ones to always define themselves and refer to themselves as Polish and Somali respectively. Ewa refers to herself as somebody who ‘was six months when she first came over’ to Britain, and detaches herself from both the categories of ‘British’ and ‘English’, despite her friend’s surprised comment ‘that’s weird I would say you’re English just because in my head you are’. Being taken care of by Polish family members, and going to Polish Saturday school where ‘you
were made very aware that you were Polish’ are reasons that support her identity claim. But Ewa’s negotiation of identity and her determination on ‘Polishness’ are also likely to be related to the desirability of different identifications. Ewa mentions having observed a ‘kind of desperation not to be English’: ‘British people are obsessed with finding a different nationality to have; the amount of people who I’ve spoken to who will insist that they’re a quarter Welsh or a quarter Scottish’, and interprets it as an attempt to ‘be seen as sort of more interesting’. Having recourse to other elements to identify with, which Ewa has, thus becomes an advantage and an asset to make use of. Khalid explains his identification as Somali in rather different terms: stating that he has never thought of himself as Finnish, he supports his claim by saying ‘it just doesn’t work like that’, specifying ‘if my parents are both Somali then of course I automatically know that I’m Somali and not Finnish even if I was born here’. His definition is thus based on ancestry, with no room for negotiation of other terms. Identity categories might thus work differently depending on context, and Khalid’s comments raise the question of whether dark skin imposes or assumes an identity as ‘non-Finnish’. These questions will be returned to later in the discussion.

Choice and space for negotiation were in various ways foregrounded by several participants. As was mentioned in the previous chapter in relation to the definitions of mother tongue, Susanna mentions always having described herself as Swedish, and links it to what she calls a choice she made at a very young age. ‘Sweden was better I thought’, she says, and remembers watching winter sports with her father and older brother who supported Finland, while she cheered for Sweden. However, she comments that when she recently saw a play about Finnish migrants in Sweden, it made her realise that she had similar experiences as the people the play was about: ‘I do have that (.) in some way that is not the same for my Swedish friends’. Elements described as being to ‘Finnishness’ were also present in her descriptions of her son, and will be discussed in the second section of this analysis.

Gabriela similarly talks about a certain desire to be perceived as Swedish, and her ‘identity crisis’ in her early adolescence, which coincided

---

85 “ei se vaa niinko mee nii”, “jos mun vanhemmat on kummatki somalilaisii nii kyl mä niinko tietenki automaattisesti tiedän et mä oon somalilaine enkä suomalaine vaik mä oon tääl syntyny”
86 “Sverige var bättre tyckte jag”
87 “jag har ju det (.) på nåt vis som inte är lika kanske som mina svenska kompisar”
with what she remembers as a hardening climate towards people of migrant background in Sweden in the early 1990s. She recalls seeing herself as Swedish, but having her membership questioned by others. Her worries about how to categorise herself made her contact the school nurse, who according to Gabriela confirmed that she was Swedish, and that that was what was important. Gabriela explains:

GABRIELA: it was very difficult for me at thirteen to understand because when I said Swedish no you’re not and I have identified as Swedish but it really felt like am I Chilean or Swedish nothing else (.) I’ve realised over the years that it’s not about being one or the other but also a mix of something new’

At the time of the interviews, Gabriela was working with young people with similar questions, and emphasised that she tries to support them in their process of identification. After her traumatic experiences in Chile, Gabriela received Swedish citizenship, and contacted the Chilean embassy in order to give up her Chilean citizenship. This process had been set aside when the interview was recorded, but Gabriela expressed a strong dislike of being perceived as Chilean. ‘I don’t identify as Chilean at all and when people foist that on me I notice I get really hostile (...) I can say I’m Latin American I can relate to that but absolutely not with Chile it becomes like ooh no’, she says, and adds that in Malmö it is very common for people to ask about origins and ancestry, which makes her very uncomfortable because of her experiences. Beside her personal reasons, his detachment may also be related to stigma; some of the stereotypes that Gabriela mentions that people in Malmö relate with Chilean people is to smoke marijuana and to swear a lot, as well as to ‘speak poorly’, as was described in Chapter 6. Gabriela further mentions that people of other background than Swedish in Malmö are negative towards what are perceived as ‘Swedish
traditions’, such as raising the Midsummer pole, and laughingly says that if people perceive her as more Swedish than Chilean for liking these traditions, it makes her very happy.

In Laila’s case, the country of origin of her parents, India, is peripheral in her identification. While identifying strongly with religion, language and some forms of cultural heritage, she says she feels ‘forced’ to disclose her ethnicity for example when filling out forms. ‘I’d have to tick those two boxes [nationality and ethnicity] but I always feel a lot stronger about the British one I sort of feel like (. . I almost feel like I have to tick the Indian’, she says, adding that for most tick-box purposes, ethnicity is irrelevant; ‘I don’t see how it would be different to an English British person’. Sealey and Carter (2004: 110) raise questions about the validity of ethnic categories on forms: do they enclose ascribed or self-chosen membership? Identity politics that include specifying ‘ethnicity’ along certain determined lines has been criticised for some time (e.g. Fanshawe & Sriskandarajah 2010), yet seems to persist in a range of institutional settings in Britain. Laila comments ‘I’m not allowed to say I’m English on a form’, which suggests that she sees the forms as documents that embody a certain structural ascription which is not negotiable on her part. In a similar way as Gabriela remarks on her identity as ‘a mix of something new’, Laila further comments on certain elements she finds unique to people who grew up as ‘children like her’:

LAILA: it’s funny cause it’s there are some things that you only get if you’re you know (. . in the generation like I am where you’ve got parents who are from like home from India or Pakistan and then you’ve got the rest of the world (. . you know England, and when you’re a child like me there are some things that are so funny and strange and you can’t really explain it to (. . you know I can’t explain the silly things my mum and dad say to my English friends and then the jokes of my English friends my parents just don’t get (. . so it’s quite funny’

This comment, positioning children of migrants at a kind of threshold point in terms of family history, also positions them as being able to see and understand two contexts – that of the home, and that of ‘the rest of the world’. This position is not ‘between two cultures’, it is partly in both at the same time, and seems to represent a position of its own.
Randeep says that he would never refer to himself as English, but would call himself both British and Indian. ‘We’re British and we’re assimilated into English life’, he says, referring to Sikh people living in Britain. He concludes:

RANDEEP: a lot of the things in how the English society works is completely in alignment with the Sikh religion (.) but not with the Indian traditions and the Indian mindset but with the Sikh religion (.) which is why I think it’s very easy to be Sikh and live in this country

Randeep thereby categorises himself as ‘Sikh’ rather than ‘Indian’, thereby choosing between two identity options within his reach. He moreover comments that the process of integration has gone a step too far, and that Sikh people have become ‘too assimilated’ – thoughts that will be discussed in the next section of analysis.

Imad, Minh and Danny self-identify in similar ways. In his introduction at the first recording, Imad complexly defines himself by saying ‘I’m basically almost completely Finnish after all’\(^90\). Despite this self-categorisation, Imad remarks that he is often perceived as a foreigner both in Finland and in Lebanon, where he is mainly seen as ‘European’. He also finds that in Finland, people do not generally distinguish between somebody who has grown up in Finland or a recent migrant: both are conceived of as ‘migrants’. In talking about his brothers, Imad seems to make a distinction between himself and the two brothers who were born in Finland. Even if he was only eight months when he arrived in Finland, the definitions of his brothers as born in Finland seems to be attributed meaning, making them ‘less immigrant’.

Like Imad, Minh also sees himself as ‘more Finnish’:

MINH: I’m only Vietnamese by ancestry but when it comes to culture I’ve adopted the Finnish culture more than the Vietnamese (.) so maybe what makes
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it is that I was after all born from Vietnamese blood
and to a Vietnamese family\textsuperscript{91}

This comment is sparked by the question about what he would include in
a book about his life, to which he replies that he would not be the right
person to talk about cultural differences or to represent Vietnamese culture,
unsolicited comments that possibly relate to what he perceives as an
expectation as a ‘second-generation Vietnamese person living in Finland’.
Vietnamese blood and family are presented as factors that are fixed, but the
adaptation of Finnish culture is given greater significance. What Minh says
he would write about in his book is racism, as he believes that telling about
his experiences of racism in Finland could serve as a revelation for Finnish
people. In connection to talk about racism, Minh concludes that Finnish
society has lately become more open: ‘the Finnish system has adapted a bit to
our kind of people (.) so we have a place now, we’ve been given a place’\textsuperscript{92}.
‘We have been given a place’ reflects the perceived power relations, in which the
‘sistem’, in the form of the majority population, has created a place for the
minority. It also positions Minh in that minority by his use of the first
person plural pronoun. This comment may be interpreted as a
development that stretches the boundaries of belonging, and re-imagines
the ‘nation’.

Danny, who describes his identification in similar terms to Imad and
Minh, defines himself as ‘Swedish with immigrant background’, specifying
that ‘as much as I’d like to believe that I’m African or Kurdish or whatever I got
in me or whatever (...) this is where I grew up, this is where my memories started’.
In his comment, socialisation has an inevitable effect on identity.
Meanwhile, the comment ‘as much as I’d like to believe’ presents ‘foreign’
identification in positive terms, and as a desirable and perhaps more
exciting option. In general, Danny’s recordings have few references to
cultural identities, which in itself may be telling of his stance towards them
– instead, there is a lot of talk about other aspects of identity, based on
preferences and traits of character.

\textsuperscript{91} “mä oon ainoastaan syntyperältäni vietnamilaine mut kulttuuri- mä omaksun enemmän
suomalaisen kulttuurin ku vietnamilaise (. ) et se ehkä tekee sen et mä oon syntyny kuitenki
vietnamilaisest verestä ja vietnamilaises perheessä”

\textsuperscript{92} “Suomen järjestelmä on hieman sopeutunu enemmän niinku meidänlaisiin ihmisiin (. )
et meil on nykyään paikka, meille on annettu paikka”
The participant who uses the largest number of different categorisations along national or ethnic lines is Farah, whose main explicit self-identification in the interviews was ‘Iraqi’, which she explained in the feedback meeting as being a result of the conversations taking place in Finland, where she identifies as Iraqi. Farah’s use of pronouns is also interesting: she refers to herself as part of ‘we who haven’t lived in our own country’ and ‘we who come from other countries’93. On the other hand, during the place-based interview on a cold winter’s day, she also jokingly voiced herself as saying to a tourist ‘you can think of us Finns as eskimos if you want to’94, thereby including herself in the collective pronoun referring to ‘Finns’ (and would-be ‘eskimos’). Farah also defined herself as ‘Arab’, for example when she tells an anecdote about how her hand gestures make her friends comment on her ‘Arabness’, which she amusedly embraces. On another occasion, she also laughingly comments ‘see there’s the problem that we’re foreigners everywhere’95, presenting this phenomenon and the category of ‘ulkomaalainen/foreigner’ in mainly positive terms. Uniqueness seems to be a desired identification for Farah, who comments that she enjoys going to Arab countries because she is seen as ‘special’ there: ‘everyone comes and asks stuff about you and it’s fun I like being the centre of attention so it’s quite nice but here I’m similar to almost everyone’96. This comment on ‘being similar to almost everyone’ suggests that in the area of Turku that she has grown up in, and in Farah’s social networks, diversity is commonplace.

Hülya’s self-identification was affected by her four-month work period in Turkey between the interviews. She describes herself as being brought up ‘so Turkish’, and being bullied for being the ‘only foreign’ in her school. Her relatives in Turkey were presented as important in her daily life:

HÜLYA: I always interacted with my cousins over there in Turkey I never related to people here like the English people in my school because I used to get bullied so I used to have a few friends but even

93 “me jotka ei olla asuttu omas maassa”, “me muista maista tulleet”
94 “kyl sä voit meitä suomalaisii ajaatella eskimoina jos sä haluat”
95 “katokku on se ongelma et me olalaan ulkomaalaisi jokapuolelalla”
96 “kaikki tykkää niinku tulla kyselemään susta et se ole niinku kiva mä tykkääan olla kaiken huomion keskipiste niin sit se on ihan kivaa mut täällä mä oon samanlainen melkein kaikkien kanssa”
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then it wasn’t the same as having like a person who’s from the same place

In the recording following the work period, however, Hülya commented that ‘the people [in Turkey] aren’t like people here’, and said that people in Turkey started to see her as more English when they got to know her better. ‘Everyone here says that I’m a British Turk so yeah I guess’, she later concluded, using a similar compound category to Cemile, who mentions ‘I can proudly say I’m a Swedish Turk’97. At the time of the interviews, Cemile was actively engaging in the organisation of a Turkish cultural evening in Malmö. She explains the basis for her identification through an anecdote she tells to the adolescents she works with (see p. 115): when they visit the countries their parents migrated from, they speak Swedish with each other and are perceived as Swedish, which leads to having what Cemile calls ‘double identity’.

8.2.2 The negotiability of categories of cultural identity

While the kind of self-identification presented above only gives partial insights into the complex practices of self-identifications, they seem, however, one place to start when approaching identifications particularly in interview data. Some points from the overview require more attention. Firstly, as was mentioned, most participants exhibit a sense of agency and choice in selecting how to define themselves. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 21) distinguish between three types of identities: imposed identities, assumed identities and negotiable identities, all related to particular sociohistorical circumstances. Imposed identities are mainly legally defined, such as Gabriela’s lack of recourse to ‘Swedishness’ in a legal sense before she gained citizenship and asylum. She was, however, perceived as Swedish at the Catholic school she attended in Chile, and defined herself as Swedish despite her legal status. The requirement of ticking a box for ethnicity for various administrative purposes in Britain also coerces people with other ancestry than ‘White British’ to make relevant an aspect of identity that they in this setting cannot change, reflected in Laila’s comment about feeling forced to disclose her ‘Indianness’ in situations where she finds it irrelevant. Assumed identities

97 “jag kan stolt säga jag är svensk-turk”
are described as identifications that many accept and do not see a need to contest. Often these identities are the ‘unmarked norm’ in dominant discourses, for example the ‘national identity’ or ethnic belonging of somebody who fulfills the perceived criteria for belonging to the majority population. Khalid’s consistency in his identification as Somali, and his comment about not identifying as Finnish because ‘it just doesn’t work that way’ may be related to this type, perhaps partly explaining why the link between Somali language and Somali identification is not necessarily salient: his belonging is assumed and not negotiated. The majority of the examples presented in this section are, however, examples of negotiable identities: identities which “can be – and are – contested and resisted by particular individuals and groups” (ibid).

Similar distinctions are made by Choi (2010), who builds on autoethnographic observations in her commentary on ‘living on the hyphen’. Choi distinguishes between pre-positionings, which refer to assumptions that people make based on cues such as visual characteristics and national stereotypes, located positionings that are expressed for example in the use of pronouns, positionings based on choice, such as when individuals may ‘pass’ as members of a category that is seen as more desirable, as well as positioning as negotiation. The data for this study includes examples from all of these, as will be discussed in this section. The wide range of potential possibilities reflects the character of ‘ethnic’ categories: as was outlined by Sealey and Carter (2004), when it comes to ‘ethnicity’, categorisation is always complex and to some extent problematic. Whether ‘ethnicity’ is seen as a social aggregate or social collective, certain dilemmas arise. If the basis of categorisation is skin colour (in itself problematic to measure or distinguish) or parents’ place of birth, ‘ethnicity’ would count as a social aggregate, implying that there are no necessary connections to social norms relating to for example language, dress, custom or habit. If, on the other hand, ‘ethnicity’ is related to an aspect of identity or culture, questions of membership and how it is defined, which norms and conventions apply to whom and why, would arise (Sealey & Carter 2004: 116). Questions such as these are entangled in the talk about national identity discussed here.

What kinds of issues or phenomena then play a part in regulating choice of identification among these participants? The options that are perceived as available certainly play a part. Most participants (all except for Khalid) perceive the labels for ethnic identification of their parents,
those related to dominant majority identity, as well as certain ‘umbrella terms’ (Latin American, Arab, etc.) as negotiable and available. Perceived cultural similarity seems to be the main basis of self-identification with the dominant national identity, as described by Danny, Minh, Imad, Laila and Randeep. Some, particularly Cemile, appropriate ‘compound identities’ such as ‘Swedish Turk’. Despite their prevalence in much popular discourse, these kinds of identifications are not foregrounded in the data of this study. More interesting, on the other hand, are the negotiations that are related to the desirability of certain identifications. Susanna’s self-identification as Swedish can be linked to her thoughts on language presented in the previous chapter, and to how elements of ‘Finnishness’ were connected to a social stigma particularly during her early life. Eidheim’s 1969 study in a coastal Lappish area of Norway (in Barth 1969) was an early study into how members of the stigmatised Lappish population were seeking to qualify as full participants in Norwegian society for example by distancing themselves from what were seen as vices of the Lappish population. Similarly, Susanna seems to have been able to ‘qualify’ as Swedish, i.e. she had at her disposal the elements that would make her ‘count’ as Swedish. Gabriela, on the other hand, refers to ‘her colours’ that differentiated her from the stereotype of the ‘national character’. She also comments on her joy when having ‘Swedishness’ attributed to her, even when it lacks value among other people of a migrant background. Ewa, for whom ‘Britishness’ would be readily available in this sense, distances herself from that identification and continuously defines herself as ‘a Polish person living in England’. This can perhaps be related to her observation of certain ‘desperation not to be British’ that she sees around her, and that thus makes other elements of identification more interesting and desirable. In the Finnish context, previous studies (Honkasalo 2003, Haikkola 2012) have found the category of ‘ulkomaalainen’/‘foreigner’ a positive category created in relation to ‘Finnishness’, which seems difficult to ‘qualify’ in. All four participants in Turku use the category at times, and describe situations in which their belonging as Finnish has been questioned. The presented examples reflect the various aspects of positioning suggested by Choi (2010), outlined above.

A pattern in the data that deserves a comment is that it seems as if in all settings, the ones to identify the strongest with the dominant national identity category are the ones who are the oldest in their respective
groups, i.e. Minh and Imad in Turku, Susanna in Sweden, and Randeep and Laila in Birmingham. This is not necessarily a question of age (considering that Imad was 22 and Susanna 51 at the time of the recordings), but is perhaps related to the sociohistorical circumstances in which the participants grew up in the respective cities and countries. Minh and Imad both mention that there were not many migrants or children of migrants in their schools and neighbourhoods when they grew up in the early 1990s, and Susanna similarly mentions not having had friends of a Finnish background in Sweden during her childhood in the 1970s. Laila, too, points out that her school was ‘very White’ and that she and her sisters were among the few whose parents had migrated. As children of migrants from India, Laila and Randeep may be seen as exhibiting ‘ethnic markers’ that seem to have become absorbed into ‘Britishness’ to some extent. On the other hand, the younger participants, in this generational sense, may be affected by a contemporary striving for uniqueness and specialness, as expressed by Ewa and Farah. Here, ‘otherness’ becomes an asset with social value, and thus a desirable identification.

No matter what the connotations, negative or positive, desired or undesired, it is the maintenance of boundaries that creates difference and shapes the available categories of identity. The following section will examine the participants’ comments on and accounts of what constitutes belonging to a certain national or ethnic group.

8.3 Negotiation of markers of belonging

As mentioned in the introductory section, it is cultural representation that establishes and maintains what are seen as signs of belonging to certain groups. People may move across the perceived boundaries, and the contents may change, yet the activity of maintaining a boundary through discourse and other forms of social action makes national or ethnic groups persist and seem real (Barth 1969, Wodak et al 2009). As Anthias (2012: 7) remarks, boundaries “construct binary versions of difference and identity, they homogenise within and they construct collective attributions”. This section will look at how these boundaries are made relevant in talk by the participants.
8.3.1 Personal names

Out of the elements given meaning as signs that exhibit ethnic or national identity, personal names are one of the mundane but significant markers that guide categorisation of self and other (cf. Billig 1995). Tabloid newspaper headlines announcing myths about Muhammad having become the most popular baby name in Britain98, or Sara and Mohammed being among the top in Malmö99, are presented as signs of changes in demography. Some of the participants speak about names – their own or those of their children – and attach to them particular feelings and values. For example, Gabriela talks about having wanted to change her name to ‘Annelie’ when she was a child, as she felt her own name ‘sounded wrong’ and stood out in the school register. Having a name like Annelie would perhaps have made her more accepted as Swedish, she thought. Danny, who later appropriated his father’s nickname, remembers his embarrassment when new teachers failed to pronounce his given name, turning it into a female name instead. Ewa, who takes part in the army cadets where people are called according to their surnames, mentions having had ‘about a million nicknames’, and comments on her surname that ‘the English see it as having ten consonants in a row so they get very scared when they see it. It’s really amusing’. But the participant with a particularly difficult story related to her name is Hülya. Referring to her dad as ‘really nationalist’, she explains that she and her sister got their names because ‘he wants to make it obvious we’re Turkish’. Hülya was badly bullied throughout nursery and her school years, and much of the harassment was centred on her name. The whole year knew my name, she mentions, and talks about the form the bullying took: the moment I used to walk into class everyone used to say my name or something and there were times when I used to just walk in they used to say something and then I used to just start crying and stuff. Like Danny, Hülya mentions being afraid of teachers causing more mispronunciations, which would then be used by the students. The bullying only stopped at college, which Hülya describes as good because there were ‘loads of foreign people there’; everyone was so accepting cause everyone’s names were different, you know. Later, Hülya has opted to use her

98 The Guardian 01.12.2014: “Muhammad not most popular boys’ name in Britain”
99 Sydsvenskan 02.04.2005: “Malmö yngsta heter allt från Abbe till Özlem”
first name, which is not used by her family, and that has a less obvious association to any particular culture or place.

When it comes to names for children, Susanna talks about her decision to give her son both her Finnish-associated surname, and that of his father. ‘In some way he does have something Finnish in him after all’\(^{100}\), she says, and admits feeling sadness over the fact that her nephews did not get their father’s surname. In other words, there are some elements of ‘Finnishness’ that Susanna wishes to pass on, but language is not one of these elements. For Laila, giving her hypothetical future children ‘Islamic names’ has always been self-evident: ‘I can’t see it any other way I can’t imagine having a child and calling them something that isn’t Islamic’. At the time of the recordings, Laila was engaged, and mentioned a shift in her thinking to see the matter from the perspective of her fiancé’s family, for whom she says it could be ‘really strange’ to have a niece or nephew or grandchild with an Islamic name. ‘So I think what we’d do is we’d have Islamic names but ones that are you know (. . .) not too Islamic (. .) do you see what I mean that are sort of similar-sounding yeah they could be English’, she says, and mentions a name that would not be ‘too alien for the English side of the family’. The meanings invested into names are thus related to emotion and perception, and viewed as displaying personal as well as collective identity. Apart from Hülya who has started to use her first name, some participants also mentioned alternating their names to sound more like ‘local’ names: in Finland, by adding an ‘i’ to the end of a first name (‘Minhi’), and in the case of Ewa’s brother, by adopting an ‘English-sounding’ version of his name on social media.

8.3.2 Relation to the parents’ country of origin

The comments on personal names may also be related to a notion of heritage, which was something many of the participants mentioned in connection with language maintenance (see Chapter 6). Knowledge about the parents’ country of origin in terms of religion and traditions, culture and history, as well as food and habits, were also mentioned by some participants as important issues that had been passed on to them from their parents, and that they in turn wished to teach the next generation. As was mentioned in Chapter 7, Graham and Howard (2012) present how

\(^{100}\) ”På nåt sätt har han ju nånting finskt i sej i alla fall”
heritage is commonly used as a form of collective memory; when seen through the lenses of nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, and personal history, artefacts and phenomena gain value, which may be cultural or financial. The relation between heritage and place may, however, be ambiguous.

Among the twelve participants, Ewa, Hülya and Cemile regularly visit the countries their parents moved from. Farah refers to Iraq as her ‘home country’ which she feels a strong connection to, but has only been able to visit twice. Imad’s family owns a house in Lebanon, but at the time of the recordings it had been many years since his last visit. Susanna fondly remembers her childhood summers in Finland, which she had not visited much as an adult and has no specific ties to any more. She amusedly says that to her son, ‘Finland’ was the place near Stockholm where Susanna’s parents lived. Minh mentions having visited Vietnam a few times, recently mainly because his friends are interested in going there on vacation. After the eleven years she spent in Chile, Gabriela says she has no intention of visiting it, but mentions that her brother and sister have gone back for visits. Khalid and Danny have not visited Somalia and Kurdistan respectively, partly because of the unstable state of the regions. Randeep and Laila, who both place great value upon heritage and traditions, relate in rather contrasting ways to India as a place. While Randeep has visited several times and hopes to spend a gap year there, a wish he also has for his children, Laila mentions not feeling any particular connection to India. She describes her visit there as a ‘huge culture shock’, and expresses uncertainty about whether she would take her future children there. She explains:

LAILA: I don’t feel any pull towards the country so I can’t ever see why my kids would (.) but that’s just because I’ve been brought up really in the culture and the religion but never having been to the country properly so I just think I don’t need to [laughs] it’s a bit alien to me

It is by no means surprising that the participants display very different relationships to the countries their parents migrated from. These examples nevertheless illustrate that heritage need not be connected to a particular place – Laila, for instance, is one of the participants who talks most extensively about the value of heritage in her life, and refers to religion and language as extremely important elements to pass on to her children.
8.3.3 Comparisons and contrasts in relation to cultural identity

The talk by the participants includes several instances in which national or ethnic identifications are compared or contrasted, for example among siblings in the same family. Ewa, Imad and Hülya position themselves and their brothers and sisters along what seems to be viewed as a scale of identification. Ewa characterises her brother as seeing himself as English, while she considers herself Polish, and refers to the fact that she was taken care of by Polish family members whereas he had an English child-minder when he was young. Hülya likewise describes her younger sister as ‘more English’, supporting her description by saying that ‘everyone who meets her they’re like she’s more English than you’.

Previous research has found that the oldest child in the family is often the most likely to be able to speak the language that the parents spoke in their country of origin (e.g. Spolsky 2009), and this could perhaps also be related to other elements associated with culture and identity. Ewa and Hülya are both the eldest children in their respective families, but comments by Imad illustrate a more complex constellation. In describing his two younger brothers, he finds the elder one ‘more Finnish’ than the other children in his family. ‘Some small cultural characteristics have stuck to my brother really weakly’, Imad concludes. The youngest brother, on the other hand, has ‘embraced’ the Lebanese culture more easily. The kinds of ‘cultural characteristics’ are often described as having to do with behaviour. Imad exemplifies this by saying that when it comes to socialising with relatives, his middle brother is different, and does not seem to view it as very important. Hülya struggles to define what makes her sister ‘more English’, but mentions her views and how she acts:

HÜLYA: it’s just her actions and stuff I think (...) she’s starting to change a bit but before she was more like, I don’t know how it is for you guys, you know when English families they give chores to their kids like they give a list and they do it it’s not like that for us, for example my mum you know she never gave me a chore she would either ask me for my help or you kind of grow up to learn to help her

101 “Yksittäiset pienet kulttuuriset piirteet tarttunut hirveen heikosti mun pikkuveljeen”
because you wanna help because you know it’s your mum so you’ve kind of gotta help her or you feel bad and stuff and she [the sister] wasn’t like that before

In other words, the sister is portrayed as unaware of or not following the implicit family norms that Hülya relates to ‘Turkishness’, which is here illustrated by juxtaposing it with ‘English families’. Imad and Hülya mention that their younger siblings both of them fifteen years old at that time, may be changing as they are becoming older.

These beliefs about ‘behavioural dispositions’ (Wodak et al. 2009) as elements of national or ethnic identity are manifested also in other contexts than comparisons. These stereotypes seem compelling and readily available to be used in order to describe and define people. Susanna describes her son’s ‘Finnishness’ in terms of a certain stubbornness and perseverance, depicted through the concept of ‘sisu’, a stereotype discursively represented as a part of Finnish ‘national character’. Telling a story about a skiing trip, she depicts him as persevering through the adversities of learning how to snowboard, and says ‘he struggled and fought it’s the little grumpy Finn within, the sisu within, like I won’t give up now I’ve decided’\(^\text{102}\). Ewa also compares Polish and English people, describing Polish people as more direct and outspoken:

\[
\text{EWA: they’ll say what they think a bit more, the English are quite proper a lot of the time like they won’t always say out loud what they think, Polish people would just go blablabla and say it, probably offend half the room in the process but at least it’s out there}
\]

Acknowledging that nationality does not ‘give personality’, Ewa concludes that there are some traits of personality that can be attributed to different nationalities. Hülya, after her work period in Turkey, hesitates slightly in her description of Turkish people as clever to the point of being cunning and manipulative, and makes a comparison with ‘people here’, i.e. in England:

\(^{102}\) “han kämpa och han kämpa det är den där lilla surfinnen alltså sisun där inuti jag ger mig bara inte utan nu har jag bestämt”
HÜLYA: people here aren’t really like that you know they you know you’re clever and everything but you don’t try and get the upper hand with your friends and stuff most people are like that over there it’s pretty competitive but (.) that’s when they started to realize that I wasn’t from there because I was more (.) I was just nice to everyone’

These characterisations of Finnish people as persevering, Polish people as direct and outspoken, and Turkish people as clever and competitive in professional settings while English people are polite and nice, all play a part in maintaining and negotiating the representation of the ‘national character’. These stereotypes employed by the participants are built on elements that become relevant in contrast, whether they are presented as positive or negative ones. In these contrasts, their perceptions of ‘national character’ are born (cf. Barth 1969, Wodak et al 2009).

When it comes to comparisons, some participants also speak of limits in terms of displaying ‘too much’ of the characteristics associated with national or ethnic identification. Several participants describe their parents as having become ‘too Finnish/Swedish/British’ to move back to their countries of origin, despite some having planned to do so. These ascriptions are also attributed to the self, such as in Imad’s comment that he is ‘too Finnish’ to live in Lebanon, as his sister has done. Some also mention their parents balancing between raising their children according to the norms and expectations related to two cultures. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Laila’s parents came to change their family language policy because of what Laila describes as a realisation as she and her sister became teenagers and the parents feared they would become ‘too English’. Gabriela’s experiences illustrate an extreme case of a father’s actions due to his perceptions that his daughters had become ‘too Swedish’, viewed by him as a negative and unnatural development, as he saw them as ‘essentially Chilean’ and therefore Chile as the place where their lives should have been spent. She mentions her shock when she discovered that the same thing had happened to 600 children at that time, and says that these phenomena of taking children out of the country for these reasons are stereotypically related to Islam, but are alarmingly common in Latin America. Randeep speaks of his fear that Indian people in Britain have become ‘too assimilated’ and ‘too westernized’:
RANDEEP: we shouldn’t go the other way either we need to try it’s a tightrope we need to tread that middle path (...) you know we’ve got both the fact that we’re British and we’re assimilated into English life and we’ve taken on a lot of the values because a lot of the values are in alignment with the Sikh religion (...) yeah I think we need to pull it back we need to celebrate the fact that we can speak two languages and interact into two cultures (...) we need to really embrace it’

Stating that ‘some other parts of the English society don’t believe it to be true’, ‘we have done everything we can do to integrate into British society but still try and keep some of our heritage’. In other words, Randdeep characterises the integration of Indian/Sikh people to Britain as a process of making efforts both to integrate and to preserve the traits that are attributed cultural value. His friend similarly talks about identities that are ‘all-encompassing’, embracing elements from what are perceived as several different cultural or national identities.

It thus appears that the identity negotiations evolve around exhibiting ‘enough’ of the traits that are associated with a particular category. Blommaert and Varis (2015) claim that in diverse contexts, authenticity requires displaying a sufficient kind or amount of semiotic resources to ‘pass’ as belonging. The participants find it difficult to specify what these necessary resources are, but clearly relate them to behaviour according to unwritten social norms that are related to specific cultures in contrast with others.

8.3.4 ‘Different kinds of X’: the interplay of social class and cultural identity

Finally, a few of the participants also express a desire to disassociate themselves from the current and local stereotypes connected with their ancestry, and distance themselves from the expectations that follow. Anthias (2012: 12) has pointed out that research into minorities has found that some participants use “strategies of locating oneself within an ethnic category where positive ethnic capital was involved, and distancing oneself where this was perceived as negative”. Gabriela and Ewa bring up
social class as a differentiating factor within what is perceived as a group. Gabriela mentions that some people expect her to use a certain variety of language, including a lot of swearing, and to smoke weed, as these characteristics are commonly attributed to Chileans in Malmö. She explains that while her parents arrived in Sweden as political refugees in the late 1970s, the following decade(s) saw a lot of economic migration from Chile (cf. Svanberg & Runholm 1989). Gabriela’s mother grew up in a right-wing, middle-class family, who spoke ‘almost like Spaniards’. Her variety of Spanish has thus led to conflicts with Chileans in Malmö who see her as ‘trying to be better than them’, while Gabriela explains that she grew up with a ‘completely different language’ because of her parents’ background. In a very similar way, Ewa disassociates herself from what she refers to as ‘the post-2004 lot’. ‘I kind of always joke that I’m one of the original immigrants so there’s the pride of having to have a visa’, she humorously comments, and remarks that the recent migration has been from ‘the lower classes of demographics’. Explaining that the class system in Poland is different from the British one, she says - with clear discomfort - that ‘it used to be educated people who moved over’. She sees the development as affecting the image of ‘Polishness’, and gives the example that the one word that people now know in Polish is ‘whore’, while it used to be ‘hello’. ‘I hear builders in the street and the language they use the way do, there are some people who just give a bad impression, and the thing is it only takes a few and I’m like everyone will just have a bad impression’, Ewa continues, in other words expressing concern that the stereotype of Polish people in Britain will be based on a model of ‘Polishness’ that is foreign to her. These contrasts may be related to Blommaert’s (2010) point about the mobility of semiotic resources. Markers of social class may not be easily transportable across contexts, and differences may be blurred when ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ markers are foregrounded in discourses and attitudes related to immigration. This study does not examine in depth the interplay between variables of social class and cultural identities, but this kind of intersectional approach would be an interesting strand for future research.

8.4 Discussion and chapter summary

The examples in this section illuminate what kinds of elements the participants associate with particular national or ethnic categories and
their perceived markers, and thereby reflect how the boundaries that separate them are drawn. As Sealey and Carter (2004: 115) remind us: ethnicity is “not about what one is, but rather about what one does”. This chapter has presented discursive acts through which ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ identities are negotiated.

Personal names, which are presented as visible/audible markers of identity, are attributed great significance for example when it comes to thoughts about the identification of the next generation. They may also function as markers of difference in undesired ways, as was illustrated most vividly in Hülya’s account of the bullying she endured in her childhood and adolescence. Names are by definition also markers of the family or collective in the cases of the twelve participants. The other forms of heritage that were mentioned in the interviews underline the constructed nature of the notion of what constitutes heritage, and how it depends on several interlinked factors. In a similar way as Haikkola’s (2012) findings on how young people construct their own sense of the ‘diaspora’, heritage is also fabricated out of a number of elements in the ‘second generation’ (cf. Blackledge & Creese 2010 on the contestation of heritage and identity). Some of these elements are taught and passed on from the parents, yet they are shaped by the participants to fit into the contexts of their own lives. This becomes relevant for example in the roles attributed to the parents’ countries of origin, which may be regulated by external factors, such as geographical proximity and political stability, but also by the participants’ emotional attachments and the significance that is mapped onto place.

The traits of character that are perceived as representing ethnic or national identity seem to be extremely rooted into ‘common sense’ thinking: comparisons in which for example siblings are seen as ‘more English’ are easily used, yet challenging to explain. They are hence, as Sealey and Carter (2004: 124) suggest, ‘matters of unexamined convention and tacit agreement’. The participants employ stereotypical representations about ‘national characters’ to support their claims, thereby maintaining a boundary around what is seen as the norm and expectation of a certain ‘group’. These boundaries are, however, also negotiated, for example when participants refer to ways in which they differ from the expectation. These ‘differences within’ call into question the notion of ‘community’ and to what extent participants feel as if they belong to the ‘groups’ which through discourse are created in diverse contexts. Taking
into account the different phases of migration for example from Poland to Britain, to what extent can one talk about a ‘Polish community’ in Britain? What connotations are associated with being ‘Chilean’ in Malmö? What representations are these identifications based on, and how do they position the people who are associated with them? The negotiation of boundaries appears to be influenced by deeply engrained discourses, yet discourses that are to some extent elastic and changeable, according to wishes and desires by self or other.

If being ‘too Finnish/Swedish/English/westernized’ marks a sense of ‘un-belonging’ to a particular collective identity, this phenomenon can also be represented as either a positive/neutral or a negative characteristic. When Imad concludes that he is ‘too Finnish’ to spend a longer period of time in Lebanon, it does not involve a wish for this to change, whereas the concerns of parents that their children have become ‘too Swedish/English’ etc. reflect an expectation and a hope for them to fulfill (to a greater extent) the criteria that are associated with belonging to the collective identity that they identify with. This kind of perceptions may be interpreted as partly reflecting a view of ethnic or national identity as preferably singular. The claims by Gabriela’s father that his daughters should live in Chile and ‘act Chilean’ reflects an essentialist view of identity, in which multiple belongings and identifications are impossible and undesirable (or, perhaps, those traits he associates with ‘Swedishness’ are). Randeep’s comments offer a contrastive view, in which several identifications are portrayed with the metaphor of a tightrope. While this perception offers more space for negotiation, it also conveys an image of ethnic and national identifications as two opposite poles, ideally in perfect balance with each other.

Alongside the terms to describe and define national and/or ethnic identity and scales within these terms (‘more British’, ‘too Finnish’), the participants also draw on other identity terms to express belonging, albeit to a much smaller extent in this data. Religious identity is made relevant particularly by Farah, Randeep and Laila, while regional identities are mentioned by Cemile (as somebody who grew up in a particular neighbourhood), Minh and Imad (as people from Turku), and Laila (as a ‘northerner’).

This chapter has aimed at illustrating and analysing the different sides of identification, and how the participants perceive boundaries of cultural identities. Although the participants sometimes describe themselves or
others as belonging on one side of a boundary, and at times another, or having their belonging questioned and denied, the participants’ identifications, however, must be seen in a much larger perspective than as being positioned between two polar opposites. The reasons why national and/or ethnic labels arise as salient in this study may paradoxically partly be explained by the ethnolinguistic assumption, and how talk about language is intertwined with discourse on identity in different forms. The chapter has focused primarily on the participants’ ascriptions and definitions of labels of cultural identity. Some main overarching issues relate to the negotiability of the categories or terms of identification, as well as their shifting appeal and prestige depending on context. The negotiations are always linked with value judgments and preferences, as the participants position and represent themselves in a certain light, to be understood as ‘good people’. All identity negotiations, whether explicit or implicit, contribute to maintaining the boundaries between what is seen as ‘same’ or ‘strange’ (cf Barth 1969). At the grassroots levels that the data for this study represent, the labels are used, at times questioned – by the initiative of self or other – and reproduced, and most of the time perceived and presented as natural and logical to the point that acts of discrimination are portrayed as understandable. These questions will be looked at in the final chapter of analysis.
Chapter 9: Being positioned by others

Ethnic and/or national belonging has up until now mainly been analysed in the talk of the participants in the form of their self-identifications as well as identity ascriptions within their respective families. This chapter, however, shifts focus to participants’ accounts of how they have been positioned by others, in situations that they mentioned in their interviews. It draws on the theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter 8 around the construction of ‘national’ and ‘ethnic’ identities. Moreover, it focuses particularly on situations in which the participants have been ascribed the identity of ‘Other’, and on what their stories about these moments tell about their identity negotiations. The first section briefly discusses the theoretical approaches that will guide the analysis in the later sections, which present participants’ experiences of receiving compliments for their ‘good Finnish/Swedish/English’, their reactions on these compliments, and finally their examples and thoughts around ‘being different’.

9.1 Negotiating identities in small stories

While positioning in talk has been foregrounded throughout the analysis for this study, this chapter will look at it in more detail through a smaller number of examples. It will use similar methods of analysis as Chapter 5 on the re-told migration stories, i.e. Bamberg’s 1997 model for the analysis of positioning in narratives, as well as distinctions between represented and enacted contents (cf. Wortham 2001). The stories presented here do not reflect any major life events, but rather spontaneous, brief moments in daily encounters, which are nevertheless significant, partly because they are reportedly so frequent, and because they are found across the data with many participants. These stories are anecdotes about a specific phenomenon, i.e. situations in which the participants receive a compliment for their good command of the dominant language, and stood out as particularly interesting for the purpose of analysing identity positioning.

As was described in the theoretical overview as well as Chapter 5, what is important in the analysis of narratives in this case is not so much the veritable action or actual exchange of words, but how the story is told
as part of the interview situation. De Fina (2003) suggested that narrative analysis provides a magnifying glass for a close examination of a particular situation. As telling the story offers space for agency, the teller may choose to foreground certain aspects in order to be interpreted in a particular way. A final reminder from the theoretical framework for this study concerns Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) distinction between imposed, assumed and negotiable identities (see discussion in Chapter 2). This distinction foregrounds that self-identification always takes place in a co-constructive relation with both institutional practices (such as those regarding citizenship), and ‘common sense’ ideas of belonging. In everyday life, people are continuously categorised by others, who act and react according to their expectations and understandings related to the associated categories. The following sections of analysis will firstly present the participants’ stories about receiving compliments for their language skills, and secondly their responses to these comments.

### 9.2 Language compliments

Section 9.2.1 presents the data that is the starting point of the analysis in this chapter, i.e. the participants’ comments in which they mention a particular compliment on their language. The extracts will be presented as they appeared in the interviews: most participants only mentioned them briefly, and some spoke more elaborately about their reactions to the compliments. The replies and reactions will be analysed in 9.3. Section 9.2.1 will highlight some aspects of the reported events with the support of the perspectives from narrative analysis presented above.

#### 9.2.1 ‘Your Finnish/Swedish/English is really good’

In the midst of talking about previous workplaces and summer jobs, Imad signals that a certain story might be of interest to my research. He tells about his job as a street fundraiser in Turku, and a comment he heard on an almost daily basis: ‘Hey you speak Finnish really well\(^3\). He explains to me the numbness that he felt after receiving this compliment time after time from well-meaning strangers. Afterwards, I decide to ask the other

\(^3\) “Hei sähän puhut tosi hyvää suomea”
participants if they have similar experiences, and Farah, Khalid, Minh, Gabriela, Danny and Ewa confirm that they do. The participants in Turku in particular comment that they hear it ‘all the time’, and ‘almost too often’. In what situations do these compliments occur? Apart from Imad, Minh and Gabriela also mention hearing this comment in their workplace. They have both worked in bars and restaurants, and the compliments have been given by the customers. When I ask Minh, he replies ‘to me you mean well quite often I’ve got like wow you speak really good Finnish’\textsuperscript{104}, and later specifies that it is especially older people who compliment him. Gabriela mentions seeing a pattern in when she was addressed in English and when she was addressed in Swedish:

\begin{quote}
GABRIELA: when I worked as a waitress when I worked here around the corner (...) if I was standing behind the bar people sometimes asked me in English can you give me a (.) recommend me a beer then I replied in Swedish then ooh okay you do speak Swedish and you speak it really well (.) yeah [laughs] I did a study once based on this because at the bar some people went straight to English or just spoke Swedish from the start (.) if I was picking up dishes (.) then it was English I was never addressed in Swedish [laughs] so I did a study on this based on my colours people might think certain things (.) where else have I heard these when I meet young people (.) young people because I work with honour violence and abuse and there I hear it because almost everyone has immigrant background and they always ask me how can you speak Swedish so well (.) you must be adopted\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{104} "ai mulle vai mulle no aika usein tuliu kyl sillai et tota vau et sä puhut tosi hyvä suomee"

\textsuperscript{105} "när jag jobbade som servitris då jobbade jag här där i hörnet (...) om jag stod bakom baren så kunde folk fråga på engelska kan du ge mig en (.) rekommendera en öl så kunde jag svara på svenska så åå okej du pratar svenska o du pratar jättebra (.) aa [skrattar] jag gjorde en studie en gång utifrån dehär för i baren kunde vissa antingen direkt gå till engelska eller bara prata svenska direkt (.) gick jag o plockade tallrikar (.) då var de engelska jag blev aldrig tilltalad på svenska [skrattar] så jag gjorde en studie i dehär utifrån mina färger kan folk få för sig vissa saker (.) var har jag näst fått de när jag träffar unga (.) ungdomar för jag jobbar ju med hedersvåld o missbruk o där får jag för nästan alla har en
Gabriela thus tells of two different contexts in which her language skills have caused a reaction, by different interlocutors. These will be discussed in more detail in Section 9.2.2.

Farah’s experiences are related for example to hospital visits: ‘if the nurse for example starts talking to me while we’re waiting for some results then they start saying that you speak Finnish pretty surprisingly well’\textsuperscript{106}. This kind of institutional healthcare setting is also mentioned by Khalid, in the story that is the most extensive in the data on this. He has gone to see the school nurse because of stomach pain, and recounts the following story:

KHALID: the school doctor was there and he saw me cause he had time then he asked my social security number then I saw it and he was like oh so you are [first name surname] then I was like yeah then he said okay and we have some doctor x-ray thing then I said oh okay and he told me to go there and I was like oh okay then he was like what country are you from by the way and I was like Somalia then he asked is your mother too then I was like yeah yeah then he like well you do speak Finnish pretty well and how come\textsuperscript{107}

Khalid’s story includes two consecutive situations in which this kind of interaction occurred, as his story continues:

KHALID: then I went like the same day to the chest x-ray and then they called me a few hours later and said there’s something weird with my lungs and

\textsuperscript{106}”jos sairaanhoitaja esimerkiks alkaa puhuu mun kaakun men odotetaan jotai tuloksia nii sit ne alkaa puhuu et sa puhut aika yllättävän hyvää suomenkieltä”

\textsuperscript{107} ”se terveydenhoitaja ei ollu paikal sit siel oliki koululääkäri paikal sit se otti mut menemää sinne sit mä oltaa oo okei et ja sit se pyys mut menemää sinne sit mä olin aa okei sit se oli et minkä maalainen sää muute olit sit mä olin et somalilainen sit se kysys et joo et onks sun äitiksi sit mä olin et joo joo sit se et aika hyvin sää suomee puhut et mistä se johtuu”
like go to the hospital then I went to the hospital and this woman came and when I had talked to her on the phone she probably hadn’t realised I was Somali or something (.) then I went there and she was like oh it was you then I was like yeah and then she like well you spoke Finnish pretty well then I was like well yeah I do speak it pretty well like I dunno I don’t notice it myself then she was like yeah okay and are you Somali I was like yeah then she was like oh okay and that she didn’t expect it at all then I was like okay and then she went in

Khalid’s stories will likewise be given particular attention in Section 9.2.2. A further context in which compliments were intended (even if not voiced) is presented by Danny. He relates it to the start of his university studies in Malmö:

DANNY: there were some (.) native Swedes or whatever you wanna call ‘em they probably lived in a smaller place, they never really had that many interactions with other cultures they wouldn’t necessarily say it but you could tell in their eyes like [whispers] wow like I have never seen anyone speak fluent Swedish as well

Among the participants in Birmingham, Ewa was the only one to mention receiving this kind of comment, in her case as a reaction to her name. She exemplified through quoting a ‘stereotypical conversation’:

EWA: it’s like oh hi my name is bladibla or they’ve seen my name and they’re like are you Eastern European I’m like yes I’m Polish and then they’re

108 “sit mä meni samana niinok päivänä sinne keuhkokuviin sit tota ne soitti mul sielt joku pari tuntii sen jälkee ja sanos et mun keuhkois on jotai häikkää tai jotai et mee t-sairaalaa sit mä meni t-sairaalaa sihhe tuli semmone naine vastaa sit se ku mä olin puhunu sen kaa puhelimes nii ei se vissii ollu älynnyt et mä oon niinok somalilainen tai semmottii (.) sit mä menin siihen ja se olit et ai se olit sää sit mä olin joo ja sit se et sähän puhuit aika hyvin suomee sit mä et nojoo kyl mä aika hyvin puhu et tota no emmää nyt tiä emmää ite sitä huumaa sit se et jaa okei et et oksa somalilaine mä olin joo sit se oli et aa okei et ei se ois odottanu yhtää sit mä olin et okei ja sit se meni sinne sisälle”
like right so half-Polish or quarter mum or dad I’m like no no no fully Polish and then they’re right so you speak it I’m like yeah yeah I do yeah and then we just kind of get to the point when they’re like yeah your English is **really** good

So far, we have seen examples from all the participants who reported receiving compliments for their language skills in the dominant language in their respective cities. The following section will look more closely at how the participants present these encounters, before the analysis moves to their negotiations of them.

### 9.2.2 Analysing the stories about compliments

The mentioned comments are all characterised by a similar occurrence in the story line: a clash in the expectation and reality of the participants’ command of the dominant, ‘native’ language of the countries they live in. In other words, the presented comments, intended as compliments by well-meaning strangers, are likely to be caused by an expectation of the national identity of somebody with certain physical characteristics or certain names, and the linked expectations about what language they are most likely to speak, or not speak. Dennis Day points out how power constellations in which our actions are embedded make it possible for somebody to “disqualify another person from the social group in which they both have a candidate place” (Day 1998: 169-170). Through these compliments, the participants’ full belonging as ‘Finnish’, ‘Swedish’ or ‘British/English’ are at these moments questioned.

Whether the stories consist of a short phrase or are longer, they all involve characters and reported speech. Who then are the characters, and how are they presented? None of them is named, and in Ewa’s case, the story does not give any details of who they are, which positions them as a generic ‘someone’, who is likely to be a British ‘native speaker’ of English. In Imad, Minh and Gabriela’s examples, the characters are customers speaking to employees, in other words engaging in small talk between people who at that moment occupy certain roles. This is the case also in Farah and Khalid’s examples, where the characters are healthcare professionals, and the participants themselves are the patients. Here too the talk is presented as small talk which is irrelevant to the purpose of the
situation, yet the dynamics are such that in all these cases, there is an expectation for polite conversation from both sides. Healthcare professionals are moreover likely to come across encounters with immigrants in their daily work.

Danny’s example relates to his fellow university students, at a point in time when they are not familiar with each other. He further describes them as ‘native Swedes’ from a particular (rural or small town) background, who lack experience of living in diverse environments. This evaluation is given as an explanation of their reaction, and also positions them as certain kinds of people, who are presented as slightly less knowledgeable and aware of the demography in a city such as Malmö. Gabriela’s case is interesting as it mentions that she receives compliments also from people of an immigrant background, which makes its intended meaning slightly different. These characters are described by Gabriela as ‘semilingual’ (see Chapter 6), and the example presents her as a different kind of person with immigrant background.

One of the most interesting features of the stories is the use of reported speech, and what it accomplishes both at the level of the represented and the enacted, i.e. in the story world and beyond. Wortham and Reyes refer to Voloshinov (1973: 115), who characterizes reported speech as not only speech within speech but as “speech about speech, utterance about utterance”. In other words, when a speaker attaches words to another person, they also align themselves with or distance themselves from that piece of speech, and thus make an evaluation. Most reported speech is coloured by the speaker’s intentions and style rather than being a direct report, and the term ‘constructed dialogue’ (Tannen 1986) has for this reason been suggested as an alternative term to better reflect the nature of what is happening when speech is brought into speech. In narrative, the speaker’s position emerges for example when the words of others are used to create juxtaposition between the other and the self (Wortham 2001, Wortham & Reyes 2015).

Looking at the instances of reported speech in the stories, almost all include an exclamation marking surprise (‘hey’, ‘ooh’, ‘wow’). In Danny’s story, which is constructed from the landscape of thoughts, the reported speech is signaled as reactions that he could read from the people’s eyes, and thus imagined speech representing a particular point of view. In Khalid and Ewa’s cases, the action is carried forward almost exclusively by reported speech. Khalid represents the school doctor reacting to his
name, and his question about Khalid’s nationality is presented almost as a delayed reaction to it. The nurse’s comment ‘oh it was you’ highlights that she expected him to look different based on how he sounded on the phone. Both Khalid and Ewa’s accounts include questioning of their ‘Somaliness’ and ‘Polishness’ – they both present being asked whether both of their parents are from that country. This curiously questions also their belonging to the expected ‘foreign’ nationality to which the surprised comments refer, which is also the category they consistently draw on in their self-positioning. The interlocutors’ questions may partly relate to a surprise over these claims. The question of ‘half’ or ‘full’ belonging presented in Ewa’s account has been presented as occurring often to people with parents (or one parent) from other countries, and has been described as insulting (Hassen Khemiri at talk in Malmö, January 2013, my field notes). The implications of ‘incompleteness’ and ‘hybridity’ imply that there is such a thing as ‘full belonging’, which when it comes to identity presents a problematic stance. Gabriela’s example, on the other hand, positions her as someone who ‘must be adopted’, i.e. does not fit the person’s image of someone of non-Swedish background, yet she is not perceived as fully Swedish either, and consequently must belong to a particular category ‘in-between’, i.e. adopted.

A further point to look at in the stories is the participants’ evaluation of what the stories imply, and their presented reactions to receiving these compliments. These questions will be examined in the following section.

9.3 Negotiation in the stories of responses to compliments

When the participants are complimented on their good language skills, they may or may not in the situation be able to address what the compliment implies in terms of their identity positioning. However, in telling their stories about the events, they can evaluate the situation and negotiate their belonging in different ways. While the focus in the previous section was mainly on the first level in the model suggested by Bamberg, i.e. what happens in the story, this section will look at the other levels: how do the participants position themselves, and what is the significance of telling the story in the way they do? The first section will discuss the
participants’ replies to the compliments, followed by a section to analyse how they present the recounted events and what this may mean.

9.3.1 Replying to the compliments

Some of the examples presented in Section 9.2 already included participants’ voicings of their own reported speech as a reply to the compliments on their language skills. This section will present further examples of this, and analyse them in the light of what kinds of identity positions they create. These compliments are, it seems, given with good intentions, yet they are examples of everyday instances of ‘Othering’ and of putting into question the participants’ belonging as full members of the dominant ‘national identity’. Do the participants resist these positionings, and if they do, how? Day (1998: 168) defines resistance of ascriptions of ethnic labels as “the reaction of active agents who are inextricably, and perhaps non-voluntarily, involved in the social activity which paradoxically exteriorizes them”. Moreover, Day specifies that the acts of resistance imply “seizing fleeting opportunities within the activity (...) to signal that what their fellow interactants are doing is making choices about them, and to voice an opinion about those choices” (ibid). These are the kinds of actions this section will examine. Again, the examples will be presented first, followed by analysis of the accomplished positioning.

Starting with Imad, he mentions replying to the compliment by saying ‘thank you yeah I’ve lived in Finland for a long time so I’ve learned it’\(^{109}\), and when I ask him how he reacts to it, he explains:

IMAD: well I dunno (.) I don’t really there’s been so much of it that I’ve kind of become so numb to it already so I don’t react very much it’s like a normal question nowadays (.) at the beginning it was a bit like alright okay (.) nice (.) nice that you noticed (.) perhaps not the most relevant thing but nice that you noticed\(^{110}\)

---

\(^{109}\) ”kiitos joo tässä pitkään asunut Suomessa niin on se tullu opittua”

\(^{110}\) ”no en mä tiedä (.) en mä oikein sitä on tullu niin paljon et mä oon turtunu siihen jo niin pahasti et ei se en mä reagoi siihe hirveestä se en se onni normaali kysymys nykyään (.) et aluks se oli kyl vähä semmonen et jaaha selvä (.) kiva (.) kiva että huomasit (.) ei hirveen ei ehkä olennaisin asia mutta kiva että huomasit”
Referring to the repeated occurrence, he explains his own change in reaction towards numbness, while the fact that he mentions it as part of the interview shows that he finds the comment significant to at least some degree.

Khalid’s reply may be seen as a ‘non-reaction’: in the example quoted in the previous section, he portrays himself mainly replying with a short ‘yeah’, and by telling the nurse ‘well yeah I guess I speak it pretty well I dunno I don’t really notice it myself’. Farah depicts herself as telling the person ‘her whole life story’, and like Imad, she relates her response to earlier experiences of the same kind:

FARAH: I remember that the very first time someone said that I was like wow nice thank you like a positive reaction but now it’s really neutral like it doesn’t excite or puzzle me anymore or make me think like hold on is that person alright so I think it’s because as a person I’m a bit different like I’m a positive person and I don’t like to be impolite to anyone so maybe that’s why I’m like neutral

Farah’s positioning as a ‘positive’, ‘neutral’ and ‘different’ person will be analysed later in this section. Minh has rather elaborate thoughts on the underlying reasons for the compliments, and says that he thanks the person politely because he understands their reaction:

MINH: maybe it’s because we’re still pretty new stuff here the generations who were born here in Finland and have grown their whole lives here in Finland so there haven’t been that many of us yet so it’s only now that there are people like us who speak Finnish like really fluently and maybe sometimes even better than some Finnish people themselves

111 ”nojoo kyl mä aika hyvin puhu et tota no emmää nyt tiä emmä ite sitä huomaa”
112 ”mä muistan et ihan ensimmäisel kerral kun mulle sanottiin se niin se oli sellanen waau kiva kiitos sellanen positiivinen reaktio nyt se on ihan neutraali et enää se ei innosta tai kummastuta tai ollenkaan sillai saa mua epäilemään et hetkinen et onks tol nyt kaikki hyvin et mä luulen et se johtuu siitä et ku mä oon persoonaltani aika erilainen tällinen positiivinen ihminen ja mä en tykkää olla epäkohtelias kenellekään niin sit se varmaan siit johtuu et mä oon aika tälleen niinko neutraali”
because we’ve lived here all our lives so yeah it does
still happen especially from older people they say
you speak Finnish well that’s a good thing\textsuperscript{113}

When I ask him how he answers, he continues:

MINH: I normally just thank them politely and well
for myself it’s self-evident that I speak Finnish
because I consider myself Finnish but (.) in their
eyes I am (.) born in Finland (.) but foreign (.) so for
them it’s not as self-evident as how I think of it\textsuperscript{114}

Minh does foregrounds politeness and understanding, and juxtaposes his
self-identification with how other people perceive him, which he presents
as natural at this time and place. Danny presents his usual reply as ‘thank
you, yours too’, and points out that the compliments are often naïve, yet
at the same time degrading:

DANNY: well I guess that sometimes it’s just like
(.) I guess it’s nothing bad meant but at the same
time it’s also it also means that that person is
prejudiced how do you expect me to talk you
know what I mean (.) and why do you think I
would talk like that (.) and that’s the thing like I
dunno I don’t know if I have the same criteria on
a Swedish person I don’t expect them to speak in
a certain way I don’t they can speak however
they can surprise me every time but no it’s just
prejudiced too really if you think somebody’s
gonna speak in a certain way they are gonna
speak in a certain way or you’re gonna get

\textsuperscript{113} “kai se on sitä tota et me ollaa kuitenkin aika uutta uutta tavaraa sellaset sukupolvet
jotka on syntyny täällä Suomes ja kasvanu koko elämänsä täällä Suomessa et ei: ei meit oo
ollu vielä hirveen paljo et se on vast nyt tullu meikäläisiä jotka osaa puhuu niinku suomee
niinku todella sujuvasti ja ehkä joskus jopa paremmin ku jotkut suomalaiset itskikki koska
me ollaan asuttu koko elämämme täällä et tota kyl sitä tulee edelleen varsinkin vanhoilta
ihmisiltä tulee et puhut hyvin suomea se on hyvä juttu”

\textsuperscript{114} “mä vaan kiitä heitä kohteliaasti ja tota et itteleni se on itsestäänselvyyys et mä puhun
suomee koska mä oon itteni mielestä suomalainen mutta (.) heidän silmissään nii mä oon
(.) Suomessa syntyny (.) ulkomaalainen (.) et totaa heille se ei oo niin itsestäänsvää ku
mitä mä ajattelen siitä”
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surprised and when they get surprised it’s just like it’s unbelievable to them

Here, he marks a clear distinction between himself and ‘prejudiced people’, specifying that ‘they can speak however, they can surprise me every time’, thereby positioning himself as open-minded and knowledgeable. Ewa, taking a humorous stance, says:

EWA: well yeah I just go yeah I kind of go along with it I just answer their questions and see how I have a bit of fun with it sometimes like just try not to give away too much information at a time

These examples will next be analysed in more detail, with particular focus on the participants’ positioning of themselves, and of what the compliment signifies, and thereby its links to larger phenomena and questions of belonging.

9.3.2 Positioning in the replies and in telling the story

The comments presented above display different forms of resisting the ascription of ‘Otherness’, or of accepting it altogether. The ways in which the participants seize these fleeting opportunities differ, and to some extent, if resistance happens, it may only take place in the accounts that they tell about the situations.

What is striking is that all four participants in Turku report replying by mainly thanking for the compliment. Imad explains this by the numbness of having received the compliment so many times, and his reply in which he explains having lived in Finland for a long time supports the position of him as an immigrant. Khalid’s reaction is, as mentioned, a kind of non-reaction, which may nevertheless be telling: by signaling his oblivion to his own Finnish proficiency and casualness to the compliments, he positions himself as a person for whom speaking Finnish in the way he does is self-evident. Farah, by ‘telling her whole life story’, educates the other person and thereby negotiates her identification as somebody who by birthplace, residence, citizenship etc. belongs in the perceived category. In the Turku data, this is the example containing the most active resistance to the positioning taking place. In her story, Farah moreover directly
describes herself as someone who does not want to be impolite, thereby suggesting that there may be a different way of reacting to the compliment. Here, her use of adjectives is interesting: Farah positions herself as ‘really neutral’, ‘a bit different’, and as a ‘really positive person’, a characterization which is employed to explain why she might be ‘neutral’ in the recounted situation. This is also reflected in the reported thought that she presents herself as not thinking, i.e. ‘hold on, is that person alright’. This may represent a story she refrains from telling (cf. Georgakopoulou 2007), which in itself contributes to her identity positioning.

Minh, although he presents his reply as brief and polite, voices its reasons in his story. By his use of the first person plural, he places himself in the collective identity of people who were born and brought up in Finland, and attaches to this group of people very good skills in the Finnish language (‘people like us who speak Finnish like really fluently and maybe sometimes even better than some Finnish people themselves’). Referring to himself as part of ‘pretty new stuff’, he attributes a sense of novelty that he presents as causing the surprised compliments. He moreover specifies the juxtaposition between his own ascription of identity (‘for myself it’s self-evident that I speak Finnish because I consider myself Finnish’) with that of the people giving the compliments (‘in their eyes I am born in Finland but foreign’). In his account, he thus offers an explanation and a kind of rationale for the compliments, placing them in a particular context in time and place, which he cannot change.

Danny’s accounted reply, in which he returns the compliment to the other person, on the other hand marks their sameness and makes it explicit. Acknowledging that their intentions are good, he positions the people as ‘prejudiced’, and in his account, detaches himself from that kind of thinking and thereby marks himself as the opposite, i.e. open-minded and more knowledgeable. Ewa, who expresses no wish to claim ‘Englishness’ or ‘Britishness’, uses the situation for play, intentionally perplexing the other and thereby taking control over the situation. Gabriela does not mention her reply to the compliments, and only briefly comments on the phenomenon by saying ‘based on my colours people might think certain things’ (cf. example in Section 9.2.1). Gabriela often used the phrase ‘my colours’ (Sw. ‘mina färger’), which I interpreted as referring to the colour of her hair and her eyes. I noticed that her sister
used the same expression, and wondered whether it may be an idiomatic expression in the family, and/or perhaps an influence from Spanish.

In these presented stories, the participants position themselves as both characters in the story, responding in particular ways to the given compliments, as well as tellers of their stories as part of the data collection to a research project. Here, their positioning can be related to Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) point about assumed identities – the local understandings of the ethnolinguistic assumption and ‘common sense’ links between the physical and aural characteristics cause a reaction of surprise in encounters with these participants, and presumably many others with the same characteristics. As Minh suggested, this might be related to particular socio-historical contexts and histories of immigration. Some participants did not have any similar experiences, and these stories are also interesting here. Susanna described how her Swedish is seen as particularly refined and beautiful, but did not relate it to any form of negotiation of ethnic or national identity. Laila’s reaction to the question of whether she too receives compliments for her English was utter perplexity, and she commented ‘oh gosh no I don’t think so because I’m a native I guess I’m a native speaker (...) and when people speak to me they usually know me so they know that I was born here and brought up so I don’t think I have anyone commenting on my English [laughs]’. Laila thus positions herself as a ‘native’ and a ‘native speaker’, referring to terms that are widely used and unquestioned, and that she believes others ascribe her. Randeep, who also did not mention experiences of receiving similar compliments, commented that his English is ‘better than that of the so-called indigenous people’, thereby still maintaining a link between the English language and ‘nativeness’. It seems possible that the reasons for these exceptions have to do with physical appearance in two ways: Susanna, as ‘white’, is not associated with ‘Otherness’ in the same way as the other participants. Her first name is also not particularly disassociated from what are considered ‘Swedish’ names, and she can thus use her agency to position herself as Swedish and escape the stereotypes related to Finnish migrants in Sweden. When it comes to Laila and Randeep, there seems to be a sense of familiarity between ‘South Asian’ appearance and ‘native’ English, which is likely to be related to the long the history of migration from the Indian subcontinent to Britain.

Moving from these points to a final, related theme, the following section will briefly account for other instances in the interview data in
which the participants talk about their experiences of ‘being different’. After that, the analysis will be concluded by a discussion and summary of the main points of this chapter.

9.4 ‘Being different’

As demonstrated, compliments on language skills became a significant theme in the data when it comes to examples of ‘Othering’. The interviews did not contain questions on experiences of ‘being Othered’ in the form of discrimination, harassment or bullying, as I felt that asking about such themes might have given the impression that those kinds of experiences were expected. In most cases, such experiences were not brought up. Some participants did, however, spontaneously introduce this kind of theme in their interviews. These examples will briefly be presented and analysed here.

Hülya, Danny and Randeep all mention being bullied in their school years for ‘being different’. Danny mentions having been picked on a lot in the ethnically homogeneous neighbourhood where he grew up:

DANNY: I was the only who did look different it was me and my parents and the only kid that was my friend was a kid that had suffered from leukemia a couple times so the poor guy had stopped growing, he was ethnically Swedish but I guess he understood how it was to not be like accepted for who you are

Here, Danny describes a sense of ‘not being accepted for who you are’, which is only shared by his classmate who suffered from illness. Danny’s choice of the word ‘the poor guy’ positions the classmate as a victim, which to some extent is related to him as well through the reference to them as the only ones standing out from the rest of the group. Randeep remembers moving from a diverse part of Birmingham with many people from India, Pakistan and the Caribbean to another part with a very different demography as an ‘eye opener’, and describes how it was only in later decades that people became aware of racist language. He describes his adolescence in Great Barr:
RANDEEP: this is the nineteen-eighties where people thought it is okay to spit at people in the street you know or to you know to bully people (.). some of the teachers were racist as well people thought it was acceptable to use that kind of language it was only in the nineteen-nineties you know last twenty years that people have greater awareness about the power of language and bullying

Randeep, too, uses the word ‘acceptable’, thus pointing to the set of norms that allowed for discrimination. In telling the story, he moreover includes his explanation of the circumstances by referring to developments in awareness that only took place later.

Imad and Minh also mention encountering racist comments. Minh explains racism as ‘something that exists everywhere’, and says that as he was born at a time when there were not many migrants in Finland, the prejudice he endured was ‘in its way understandable’. Gabriela, on the other hand, remembers always having been included in the community of her school class, but being upset by the racism directed towards a Lebanese family that moved to the town where she was living. Seeing the children being bullied at school made her take action and point out to her classmates that ‘that could have been me’, which was encountered with ‘no because I was one of them’115. The Lebanese children were perceived as ‘more different’ as they did not celebrate Christmas, did not eat pork or participate in swimming lessons at school, while Gabriela was positioned as ‘belonging’, but was confused as she saw the appalling treatment of people ‘with the same colours’ as hers.

‘Being different’ is not always presented as a negative attribute. As was illustrated in Chapter 8, Farah mentions that she likes that in Iraq she is met with questions and seen as ‘different’. Several participants also present it as advantageous to be able to position themselves as amphibious, with the possibility of viewing several cultures from ‘the outside’. In a similar way as the value assigned to bi/multilingualism, this is at times presented as enriching and advancing their lives.

115 ‘det kunde ha varit jag’, ‘nej för jag var en av dom’
All examples in the present section have to do with the negotiation and maintenance of borders of what is perceived as ‘same’ or ‘strange’ (Barth 1969). Through perceptions of links between language and identity, well-meaning strangers ‘externalise’ the participants and question their belonging in the majority ‘in-group’ in the respective societies. The participants mention different ways of resisting the positioning as ‘Other’, e.g. toning down the compliment (Imad and Khalid), offering an explanation (Farah), or accepting the compliment as it is (Minh). Danny’s form of resistance, i.e. returning the compliment to the interlocutor and thereby underlining their ‘sameness’, may be seen as the strongest form of resisting the externalising practice in the reported events. What is striking in these examples, as well as in the accounts of bullying, is that most participants seem to perceive the practices of ‘Othering/externalising’ as understandable and to some extent reasonable. Their accounts present the link between physical appearance or name and language skills as a ‘given’: contrary to what most participants said in the group interviews regarding the connection between ‘identity X’ and ‘language Xish’, speaking Finnish and Swedish (and, to some extent, English) is seen as ‘naturally’ linked to ‘Finnishness/Swedishness/Britishness’, and furthermore associated with a particular physical appearance. The participants thereby also contribute to maintaining the ‘common sense’ discourses around them.

9.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has examined positioning from different angles and at different levels: through compliments on language skills, well-meaning strangers position the majority of the participants as ‘Other’, and question their belonging as ‘Finnish’, ‘Swedish’ and ‘British’ – and, at times, their belonging to another ‘national’ or ‘ethnic group’. With the support of approaches from narrative analysis, I have shown how the participants position themselves vis-à-vis other characters in the story, as well as how they position the event itself and how they respond to it. Most participants present the event as common and natural, and few actively resist having ‘Otherness’ ascribed to them. In the stories, however, they may foreground other aspects, such as politeness and openness. The following chapter will connect the chapters of analysis, which have covered the negotiation of identities when it comes to talk about language,
participants’ views on the links between language and identity, ways in which they define their own identities, and how they are identified by others.
Chapter 10: Concluding discussion

10.1 Returning to the research questions and aims

This study set out to examine questions of language and identity among adults who were born to parents who migrated. The aim was to observe, in as much detail as possible, how language and identity are talked about, and thus how identity positions are created and negotiated, across different interview contexts and different individuals. The participants, their voices and their stories, have therefore been foregrounded throughout this thesis. In this final chapter, I will draw together the most important themes of the analysis in a discussion to highlight some of the main potential insights this study has contributed. In doing this, I will review how the analysis responded to the research questions posed at the beginning, i.e.:

- What happens to language in the generation born after migration?
  - How do people whose parents migrated talk about language in their lives?
  - What roles are attributed to languages in their life stories?
- What identity positions are created in interview talk about language and life stories?

Four participants in each of three cities were interviewed for this study. These were, in Turku: Farah, Minh, Imad, and Khalid; in Malmö: Susanna, Cemile, Danny and Gabriela; and in Birmingham: Ewa, Hülya, Laila and Randeep. The criteria for participation were that these were persons who had been born after their parents migrated, or who had themselves migrated before the age of one. Other factors, such as age, educational background, parents’ country of origin and linguistic backgrounds, differed between the participants. The aim was thus to avoid applying a sense of ‘groupness’ to the participants, and instead to see what similar patterns may be relevant across differences, with generation as the shared aspect.

The participants took part in multiple interviews with separate points of focus. The data collection consisted of a photograph-based interview, a life story interview, a place-based interview and a group interview, which
made it possible to look at identity negotiations across different contexts. While the interview is a common means of data collection for social research, its potential remains underexplored, and these techniques were attempts to find innovative ways to examine identity positioning in verbal interaction.

The data analysis involved an individual summary of each participant separately, and it was through this process that the main themes presented in the analysis became visible. I also wrote a summary to each participant of the main themes I had found in their interviews, and discussed these summaries with them. A methodological aim was thus that the people who were interviewed were more than ‘informants’ providing informative data; they were participants in the construction of knowledge, and our social interaction mattered in the production of data. In other words, the answers to the interview questions were not seen as being ‘already there’ to be elicited, but as constructed in their particular contexts.

The theoretical basis of this study builds on the work of Davies & Harré (1990, 1999) and Harré & van Langenhove (1999), and more specifically by researchers such as Bamberg, Georgakopoulou, and Wortham, who combine the study of positioning with studies of narratives in interaction. Barth’s (1969) thoughts on the maintenance of boundaries have inspired the analysis of ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ identities. The study is also influenced by the thoughts of Bakhtin (1981) on the character of language as plural and socially meaningful. Much contemporary research on multilingualism examines language use as ‘languaging’, and look at how speakers draw on resources from their linguistic repertoires without distinguishing between ‘different languages’. Although I embrace this view of language in practice, the focus in this study has been on how speakers talk about language. As was established in Chapter 2, even when we view languages as socially invented, we need to consider what people believe about their languages (cf. Blackledge & Creese 2010) as part of demonstrating the complexities inherent in bi/multilingualism in its different forms. Combining these theoretical aspects has made it possible to illustrate, with attention to details from empirical data, the positioning taking place in talk around language in the ‘second generation’.

These starting points mean that the difficulties of making generalisations are a given from the start. The understanding of identity as ever-shifting and elusive, as well as created in interaction with the equally dynamic identities of others, means that any attempt to capture it
fully would fail. As the focus lies on the individual stories and voices and their uniqueness, drawing large conclusions might risk reducing and overlooking this uniqueness. However, human beings are not isolated, and neither are their stories. It is the sum of this connectedness that provides the means for identifying patterns and pointing to potential explanations. This concluding chapter will look at the analysis from this perspective.

10.1.1 Unique bilingualisms

Looking back at the analysis presented in the preceding chapters, Kathryn Woolard’s (1998) argument, i.e. that talk about language is never about language alone, is immediately confirmed. The separation of questions to do with language, and questions of identity and belonging, is therefore also always an arbitrary and organisational one. This first section will, however, attempt to discuss the findings to answer the first research question, i.e. ‘What happens to language in the generation after migration?’.

First of all, when it comes to whether the heritage languages are spoken or not in the ‘second generation’, it is clear that all participants in this study have at least some knowledge of these languages. The degrees to which they use them, and the contexts in which this occurs, however, vary. The findings resemble those in Weckström’s (2011) study in that they share the same sense of complexity. Many, but not all, say that they use the heritage language to talk to parents and older relatives. Many, but not all, say that they use mainly the dominant language in society in communication with their brothers and sisters. Many, but not all, wish to pass on the language to the next generation, and this is explained by different motivations and judgements. In many cases - but again, not all - it also seems as if those participants who are among the older children in their respective families use the heritage language to a greater extent than their younger siblings, and report having a better command of it. There are thus distinct patterns that follow those mapped in previous research. The variation even across participants, and even across the different reports of one individual, however, makes it difficult to draw definite conclusions. To mention a few exceptions to these patterns, Khalid reports speaking mainly Finnish with his mother and Susanna reports trying to speak more Finnish with her father now that he is elderly, suggesting that they previously spoke mainly
Swedish. Gabriela says that she speaks Swedish with her sister and Spanish with her brother, Imad reports speaking only Arabic with his brothers and sisters, and Hülya reports ‘speaking mixed’. While most participants say that they wish to pass on the language to their children, Susanna’s son speaks only Swedish. Farah, who is the second youngest in her family, reports speaking Arabic fluently, and Khalid, the second oldest, describes his Somali as very limited. It is also evident, as expected, that the reports depend at least to some degree on the context: Hülya, for example, at one occasion describes her Turkish as indistinguishable from Turkish speakers in Turkey, and at another mentions that she does not think she can ever ‘learn Turkish properly’ because she grew up in England.

The heritage languages largely seem to be an audible and integral part of the lives of the participants, albeit to varying degrees. For those participants who present themselves as lacking proficiency in the heritage language, or present their proficiency as rather weak, the language is nevertheless often portrayed as being within their reach, there to be learned one day, should they wish. The participants also assign to themselves some ownership of the language, regardless of proficiency. Fishman (1966) found that one of the reasons why a language shift occurred so swiftly among European immigrants to the United States was that language was not seen as an important component of ‘daily ethnicity’, and was therefore not consciously maintained. This seems the case in Susanna’s family, where a language shift has taken place and her son does not have any knowledge of Finnish. On the other hand, Randeep has made a lot of efforts to ensure that his children learn his heritage language, Punjabi. Many participants in this study seem to view the place of the heritage language in their lives as fairly unquestioned. Farah, Minh, Imad, Cemile, Gabriela, Ewa, Hülya and Laila all present their language skills as more or less natural and self-evident, and while they hope for their future children to also learn these languages, a few of them mention not being sure how this will take place in practice, and many appear not to have reflected on it yet.

What is clear in the stories of the participants is that the languages that needed more support and active management in order to be learned were the heritage languages. The participants’ parents are described as having made conscious efforts to ensure that their children learnt the languages they spoke before migrating. This stands in contrast with Fishman’s
findings regarding European immigrants to the United States. Many participants talk about schemes or rules put in place in the homes, and about how their parents encouraged them to speak the heritage languages. However, these do not necessarily correspond to how well the participants know the language later in life: for example, Khalid who recalls time set aside for learning Somali, as well as consistent reminders to use it, reports not being able to speak in full sentences. The use of the heritage language nevertheless often seems related to the participants’ wishes to be understood as ‘good sons/daughters’ who respect their parents’ wishes, and many mention using the language also with brothers, sisters or cousins if the parents are present, as a sign of respect. Harris (2006: 51) found that the participants in his study wished to protect their parents from accusations that in not ensuring their children speak the heritage language, they have “failed in their duty as parents”. There might thus be, at least in some communities, an expectation to preserve the language as part of ‘culture’ and ‘identity’. It is, however, important not to assume a necessary connection between a language and a particular ‘ethnic identity’: for example, when Ewa speaks English with her brother, she still considers herself to be Polish, and when Gabriela says that Spanish is her preferred language for expressing emotions and love, she sees herself and wants to be seen as Swedish.

When it comes to the questions ‘How do people whose parents migrated talk about language in their lives?’ and ‘What roles are attributed to languages in their life stories?’, the accounts in relation to these involve some interesting positioning both of the self and of what language is taken to be. Through talk about language proficiency, the participants position themselves as particular kinds of people with certain backgrounds and attributes, and attach to themselves representations of what it means to be a ‘good person’ in various ways. When they express concerns about ‘semilingualism’, they simultaneously distance themselves from those attributes that are associated with it. The representations of being ‘good persons’ were related to for example education, upbringing, and manners, in some cases also reflecting ideas of social class. ‘Mixing’ was seen as undesirable language use, even when the majority of participants described it as inevitable in communication with for example brothers and sisters. The ‘moral panic’ noted by Stroud (2004) is reflected also in the talk by at least some participants, who dissociate themselves from the associations relating to varieties they consider ‘poor language’.
Practices of mixing were mainly related in the participants’ accounts with talk among siblings, and in some cases with talk among friends. The study did not set out to map the participants’ social networks in detail, but the interview scheme did include questions on language use among friends. Also, the group interview aimed at finding out how language is talked about at the level of the friendship group. However, their practical language use might have been accommodated to the fact that I was present – should they mix to languages I didn’t speak in their private conversations, this would not be apparent in the group interview. As was demonstrated in Chapter 6, some participants, mainly Farah, Khalid, Cemile and Danny, speak about mixing into several languages as part of their habitual language use, and view this as the norm in the areas where they live.

Moreover, the sense of ownership of the heritage language was reflected for example in talk about the ‘mother tongue’. Here, the heritage language was associated with family and early memories, and in some cases with identity. The talk about ‘mother tongue’, however, also revealed some negotiation of what the concept means (cf. Weckström 2011). Many participants hesitated in what they would refer to as their ‘mother tongue’, as its conventional understandings did not match their linguistic lives. For example, Imad and Minh questioned whether Arabic and Vietnamese could be their mother tongues, when Finnish is the language they are more comfortable using. Imad, moreover, wondered whether he has the right to claim Arabic as his mother tongue without being able to read and write it. In the Birmingham context, it seemed clear that ‘mother tongue’ refers to languages other than English, and all participants saw the heritage language as their mother tongue. On the other hand, Susanna commented on always having considered Swedish her mother tongue and herself as Swedish. The negotiation was sometimes related to emotions, such as in Laila’s comment that she would ‘feel sad’ if her children did not refer to Urdu as their mother tongue. This sense of loss in case the language is not a part of the lives of the next generation was found also in accounts by other participants. Language was often presented as embodying something that cannot be translated, as representing a key to cultures and ways of thinking, and as part of who the participants are.

The presence of the heritage language in the lives of the participants was thus in many cases presented as more important than its instrumental
value, and the level of proficiency in it. The participants present themselves as people who have in their lives, and within their reach, more than one language – in fact, in most cases also more than two. The English language had an important place in the lives of some of the participants who live outside English-speaking countries, and several participants presented bi/multilingualism in general as an enriching and desirable element in their lives. Their linguistic portraits are therefore not characterised by two languages as competing or complementary, but by a range of languages used for different purposes, both in practice and in presentation. Bi/multilingualism was thus often presented as a trait of character, as much as a set of resources.

Another significant topic in the data, introduced partly through the interview questions, was the perceived criterion of speaking language ‘X’ in order to count as belonging in the ‘national identity X’. As the analysis showed, the majority saw that ‘national identity’ depended on other factors than language, such as ancestry or self-ascription. These may in turn be seen as opposing or complementary factors, depending on point of view: if ‘national identity’ is dependent on ‘blood’ i.e. perceived ‘ethnicity’ in the family (such as also in Weckström’s study when it comes to ‘Finnishness’), then it is predetermined and non-negotiable. If, on the other hand, self-ascription is granted priority in the definitions, the categories remain open. Some interesting differences were found between the national contexts, with the group discussions in Sweden reflecting a strong link between the Swedish language and ‘Swedishness’, while the discussions in Finland underlined ancestry and family, and the discussions in England reflected the most flexible definition of ‘Britishness’, but linked ‘Englishness’ with ‘ethnic’ ancestry. These tendencies are likely to reflect a combination of the length of the history of immigration, their respective national immigration policies, and the extent to which the topic of identity has been problematised and discussed, as well as the characteristics of these discussions. On the whole, very few participants saw it as necessary to speak the dominant language in order to belong, or viewed the heritage language as an absolute prerequisite for identification with their parents’ origins. At the same time, regardless of the participants’ own thoughts and self-ascriptions, compliments on language skills in the dominant language reminded them of how their belonging in the majority national identity is, at least at times, questioned. Whereas language skills are used in legal and political contexts as proof of
integration and qualification of belonging, these compliments attest that even a ‘native-sounding’ command of the language does not always suffice to count in order to be seen as fully belonging. These questions will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

In her book *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York* Ana Zentella (1997:5) follows and carefully illustrates the lives of five children, with the argument that “every bilingual’s story is unique”. During the course of the data collection and data analysis, her observation came to have increasing resonance in this study. Not only are the stories that were shared by the participants dissimilar from each other; they also convey that even within the same family, the bilingualisms of the children may differ. The stories are told, in Bakhtin’s terms, in dialogue with other and larger stories, which give them room for creativity, as well as guide them according to conceptions of how things ‘should be’. A range of normative expectations (cf. K. Hall 2002) circulating in political and media discourse were also found in the participants’ accounts, and the larger stories seemed to operate on both the level of the majority society, and in minority communities, to the extent that a community was relevant for the individual participants. In this way, the unique stories are partly orchestrated by a larger composition of stories, as has been demonstrated in the chapters of analysis.

In conclusion, the heritage languages are there, used and at least heard by the participants, and related to in different ways, even if most of them say that they speak Finnish, Swedish and English respectively more and/or better. Moreover, as previous research has established, talk about language must be seen as talk through which boundaries are created, maintained and negotiated. This happens both at the level of the speech itself, and in its contents, i.e. at the enacted and the represented levels (cf. Wortham 2001). This study has shown how boundaries are drawn when people position themselves as speakers of a certain language and with ownership of it, as most participants do regarding the heritage languages in their families, whether they present their command of the language as excellent or limited. The sense of ownership is also negotiated in talk about the ‘mother tongue’, which for several participants becomes a problematic concept (cf. Weckström 2011). Moreover, the participants negotiate boundaries when in the talk about language, they position themselves as ‘good’, as aspirational, as respectful, as educated, or as caring, as the self is always positioned in relation to something else. Emotions such as
concern, regret, hope or commitment are often described as linked to their language stories. Boundaries are also drawn when ‘mixing languages’ is presented as ‘bad language’, even by many of those who report that they usually mix. Here, discourses around purity and monolingualism seem to be pertinent. Moreover, boundaries are drawn by others in the presented accounts of how visual and aural perceptions cause surprised reactions, e.g. when darker features are seen as incompatible with ‘native-like’ speech. The stories that the participants tell are thus unique, but told in dialogue with larger stories, and influenced by ideologies about what language tells about a person that to a large extent seem to be similar across the three national contexts.

10.1.2 Conceptualising the negotiation of ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ identities

Alongside questions of what happens to language in the generation born after migration, this study set out to examine identity positions in relation to the place of language in life stories. The aim was to move away from typical questions such as ‘where do you feel you belong’, and to avoid the common trope of children of immigrants being ‘caught between two cultures’. Thus chapter 5 on re-told migration stories illustrated how telling a story about the parents (or refraining from telling one) can give space to construct more nuanced or other kinds of identity positionings. By foregrounding different aspects in their parents’ identities, the participants aligned themselves with particular characteristics or presented the stories as having some kind of impact on their lives in the present moment. Nevertheless, it seemed as if in talk about language, the participants oriented towards categorisations relating to ‘ethnicity’. Their identity positionings are, however, complex and nuanced, and this section will draw attention to these complexities and how they may be conceptualised with the support of recent theoretical suggestions. As explained in Chapter 2, positioning theory and small story research allows for an account of the “ephemeral conditions” (Harré & Van Langenhove 1992), of the “fleeting aspect of lived experience” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) in which identity positions are continuously negotiated. ‘National identities’ are maintained through everyday practices, as Billig (1995) reminds us with his term ‘banal nationalism’. In line with this, Harris (2006: 118, 9) also points out that identities are played
out in ‘low key ways’ rather than through ‘spectacular cultural practices’. The interview process through which the data was collected offered room for negotiation in low key ways, in small stories told in conversation. This section will discuss some main topics that arise from the analysis of identity positioning, and suggest how they could be conceptualised.

As mentioned in Chapter 8, our view of what it means to be ‘Finnish’, ‘Swedish’ or ‘British’ depends on how they have been represented, as a set of meanings that are continuously maintained (cf. Aly 2015, K. Hall 2002, Weckström 2011). The analysis has shown how for example personal names are viewed as carriers of identity: Gabriela wanting to change her name to ‘Annelie’ in order to blend in as ‘Swedish’ in the school register, and Laila wishing to give her future child a name that is ‘Islamic, but not too Islamic’, are some examples. Moreover, all participants but Susanna have names that have at least traditionally been associated with places outside their country of residence, although, as Chapter 8 mentioned, this is changing. The participants also attach behavioural dispositions or stereotypical traits of character to what it means to hold a certain cultural identity. Socialisation and ancestry are at times juxtaposed to each other, and the participants describe themselves as being ‘more’ of one than another identity category, and compare themselves with others, such as siblings. What importance is given to the country that the parents migrated from also differs, and not just because of the state of the country in question. For example, Laila presents India as peripheral to her sense of culture and heritage, while Randeep wishes for his whole family to spend an extended period of time there.

Interestingly, in contrast with previous studies (see e.g. Haikkola 2012, Honkasalo 2003), most of the Turku participants described themselves as at least ‘partly Finnish’. Imad and Minh position themselves as ‘more Finnish’, and Farah as both ‘Finnish’, ‘Iraqi’ and ‘foreign’, depending on context. Khalid, on the other hand, defines himself as ‘Somali’, with no room for negotiation to be anything else. Research has suggested that ‘Finnishness’ is perceived as a closed category, but the data in this study points to at least some flexibility. ‘Swedishness’ and ‘Britishness’ are, however, presented as more open: when it comes to ‘Swedishness’, speaking Swedish and complying with what is perceived as elements of ‘Swedish life’ seem to suffice, at least in the discussions in this study. ‘Britishness’ is described as a category available for anyone who is living in Britain and wishes to define themselves as ‘British’. It is important to
remember that all three identity categories are presented as flexible to some extent, which was apparent in the group discussions and in how the majority of participants position themselves; yet at the same time, all of them were simultaneously presented as partially restricted.

Desirability appears to be a key factor in the self-definitions of the participants. To the extent to which the participants are able to choose, in any given situation, how they position themselves in relation to ‘national’ identity, they seem to attach their choice to the representations with which they wish to be associated. For example, Farah presents ‘otherness’ as a symbol of uniqueness: she comments that during visits to Iraq, she has appreciated the attention and ‘not being similar to everyone else’. Ewa, likewise, claims ‘Polishness’ at the same time as she described people in Britain as ‘desperate’ to find another category than ‘Englishness’ to adhere to. In discussions with teenagers in Malmö, I heard the comment that being ‘only Swedish’ is perceived as ‘having no life experience’ – being able to claim an identity other than ‘Swedish’ is thus an asset to these young people. On the other hand, this was hardly the case a few decades ago. When Susanna was a child in the 1960s, ‘Finnishness’ was rather associated with social stigma, which is also reflected in her stories about her choice to speak Swedish and to ‘be Swedish’. This is also discussed by Weckström (2011), whose participants were born in the 1970s and 1980s.

Gabriela has personal reasons for detaching herself from ‘Chileaness’, as she relates it to the patriarchal system and the abuse that she experienced. ‘Swedishness’ thus represents values that she seems to identify with, and ‘Latin American’ the culture that nevertheless has a place in her life. Hülya, who before her work period strongly identifies as ‘Turkish’ and disassociates herself from representations of ‘Britishness’, finds that in the work life in Turkey, she was identified as ‘more British’ and perceives herself as different from the norms of communication in the work place there, i.e. her behaviour differs from the norm. In some cases, such as in the comments by Khalid, there is no room for negotiation at all. Choi’s (2010) account of the significance of the hyphen and the various aspects of identity that play a part in her negotiation of identity helpfully summarises these different meanings of the hyphen, as well as their potential significance:

“The hyphen gets me out of conflicting situations, acts as an insider and outsider, bears the weight of
social and political predispositions, presents the possibility of the range of choices available to me and creates a new space as I continue a conflicting relationship with my footed and future cultural affiliations. The hyphen reminds me that the way others perceive or position me is out of my control but their positioning of me helps me to become more conscious of what I would or would not like to take on as I continue to negotiate my identity” (Choi 2010: 71)

In similar ways, the participants seem to draw on elements of categories that carry meaning in a social, political and historical sense, as well as attribute new meaning to the positionings they foreground.

Most participants thus do not position themselves as ‘one’ or ‘another’, and as Chapter 8 showed, they sometimes use umbrella terms such as ‘Arab’, ‘Latin American’, ‘European’, or even ‘foreigner’. Also regional identities are important categories that are underlined for example by Imad, Minh, Cemile and Laila. In politics and in the media, the panic around ‘national identity’ has exaggerated the salience of ‘ethnicity’ and ‘nationality’, which recent research for example in the field of studies of superdiversity tries to overcome. A particularly useful metaphor for thinking about identity, and one that helps conceptualise the sum of the analysis in this study, is put forward by Wortham and Rhodes (2013). They suggest that “[o]f the many resources that might be relevant to identifying an individual, event, or setting, a few generally become salient – somewhat like several musical notes coming together to constitute a chord” (ibid. 536). In other words, the potential resources are all there, like the keys on a musical instrument, and a few of them are played simultaneously like a chord, and are thus the ones relevant for understanding that particular position. The metaphor includes both individual events of identification and trajectories across events, so that “[e]ach event presupposes a set of relevant contexts and resources, like the notes composing a chord, and the trajectory is like a chord progression in which related chords are played in sequence and form a larger whole” (ibid. 540).

How then should the different potential keys be conceptualised? ‘Traditional’ variables, such as gender, age, place of residence, educational background, etc. are surely relevant for the identifications of the
participants in this study, but the resources also go far beyond these features. Does it matter that Gabriela spent so much of her adolescence in Chile, against her own will? Does it matter that Randeep is a father? Does it matter that Hülya was bullied at school? Does it matter that Danny is married to a Canadian woman? Does it matter that Imad is politically active? All of this clearly seems to matter in the lives of the participants, and is thus also potentially relevant to the negotiations of how they wish to be perceived. Moreover, representations of what it means to be for example ‘Indian’ or ‘Polish’ in Britain, ‘Finnish’ or ‘Chilean’ in Sweden, ‘Somali’ or ‘Vietnamese’ in Finland, as well as ‘Finnish’ in Finland, ‘Swedish’ in Sweden, ‘British’ in Britain – or what ‘foreign’ or ‘immigrant’ mean in all of these contexts, matter. The range of potential keys needs to be seen as infinite, in line with the general view of identity presented in the theoretical introduction in Chapter 2.

The notion of identity as a chord is conceptually close to the thinking around intersectionality (as discussed, for example, by Block & Corona 2016, Anthias 2012). Building on works particularly in Black Feminism, intersectionality entails the idea of categories coming together in processes of identification and inequality. Moreover, it implies a critical view of categories: the intersections are therefore not to be seen as a sum of adding different categories together, such as ‘Black’ and ‘female’, but by examining how they are formed in a broader social context. If intersectionality is merged with the concept of potential keys that form a chord, it is thus important to view the keys as constructed and unfixed, so that the chord does not reflect a hyphenating of different ‘identities’, but rather a complex of elements that together create a position in a particular context. Anthias (2012: 7) underlines the importance of examining categories over time, to see how they are created and manifested. This is similar to the idea of a chord progression (cf. Wortham & Rhodes 2013), which entails precisely this kind of examination over time rather than at a single instant. Block and Corona (2015: 511) acknowledge that while intersectionality ideally includes several dimensions in the analysis, focus will normally lie on one or a few particular dimensions. In this study, generation was the point of departure that brought forward an analysis in which particularly questions of ‘ethnicity’ and ‘national identity’ have been foregrounded in the data. By strive towards including as much contextual information as possible, as well as examining detailed and different accounts, I have attempted to underline that these questions do
not exist in isolation, but are at all times part of larger processes of positioning by self and others.

Many previous studies on identity have noted that negotiations of identity involve interplay of structure and agency. In this study, I have referred to them as normative expectations and creative possibilities, following Kathleen Hall (2002). These are also reflected, at least partially, in Wortham & Rhodes’ metaphor. They hold that “[i]n any given case, the chords and chord progressions may be familiar and enduring, like the chords that compose a recognizable genre of music, or they can be relatively unique like an improvised performance” (ibid. 540). Those familiar, enduring patterns are the results of representations and norms, created and maintained through the kinds of meaning-making processes that have been described in this thesis for example through the negotiations of boundaries. As an addition to Wortham & Rhodes’ model, I wish to argue that the chord can also be perceived as either harmonious or as creating a dissonance, depending on the normative expectations of the listener. This happens for example when the participants are complimented for how well they speak the dominant language of the society they grew up in. The metaphor of identity as a chord is important to the discussion of the ‘second generation’, expanded in the following section.

To conclude, this study has found that in positioning along lines of ‘ethnic’ or ‘national’ identities, the participants draw on elements such as names as well as behaviour that is seen as representing a particular category, especially when compared with something or someone else. The extent to which categories of the dominant ‘national identities’ are available to the participants seems to vary, and the group interviews revealed some interesting differences in how the participants defined the place of language in national identity. On a scale, ‘Britishness’ was presented as the most open and flexible category, with ‘Swedishness’ as a category open to those who learn Swedish and adapt some form of ‘Swedish lifestyle’, while ‘Finnishness’ was in many discussions related to ‘ethnic’ ancestry. It must be remembered that this is a qualitative study with a relatively small data, and thus these findings may be seen as indications that would be interesting to explore on a larger scale.

All participants in Malmö present themselves as at least partly ‘Swedish’. In the cases of Khalid in Turku and Ewa in Birmingham, who consistently define themselves as ‘non-British’ and ‘non-Finnish’, the
reasons are different: in Khalid’s case, it seems as if his ‘foreignness’ and ‘Somaliness’ are assumed identities, which he perceives as unchangeable. Meanwhile, Ewa identifies as ‘Polish’ by choice. In this section, I have demonstrated the helpfulness of the metaphor of identity as a chord (Wortham & Rhodes 2013) in conceptualising identities, and suggested how it could be expanded to include the perceptions of others. The openness of categories of ‘national identity’ seems to depend on what chords and chord progressions are familiar and expected in a given context.

### 10.1.3 The ‘second generation’

Although similar studies on language and identity exist and have been mentioned, this study is, to my knowledge, the first to explicitly focus on the adult ‘second generation’ in Finland. It is also probably among the first in Sweden and Britain. One of the aims of the study was to find out whether the lives of people who grew up as children of immigrants share some common elements, and among these twelve participants, nothing stood out as a shared element across all stories. There are nevertheless some remaining phenomena that need to be discussed.

What does the ‘second generation’ imply, in terms of belonging and perspective? Chapter 8 mentioned some particularly interesting comments by for example Laila and Minh. Laila mentions that ‘there are some things you only get if you’re you know (...) in the generation like I am where you sort of you’ve got parents who are from like home from India or Pakistan and then you’ve got the rest of the world’, thereby positioning the ‘second generation’ as a position of its own. This position is attributed an advantage in having a more extensive access to two different perspectives. Other participants, too, either mention this advantaged position, or enact it in their descriptions of different people and cultures – however, inevitably leaning at least partly on cultural stereotypes. Gabriela evaluates her adolescent ‘identity crisis’, and says that when it comes to identity, it is not about being one or the other, but a new composition representing something new altogether.

New concepts have been introduced in the past decades to account for these ‘new’ identities. Labels such as ‘Black British’, British Asian’ and other terms for ‘hyphenated identities’ have become part of daily
vocabulary. Some participants use these (namely Cemile and Randeep), but in the data over all, these are not marked as important resources for the participants in their identity negotiations. Aly (2015: 200) presents a critical view of these terms, and states that “[t]he hyphenated identities of multiracial and multicultural systems where one is Black-British or African-American are a testament to race logic, for what are these labels if not binaries with the enigmatic hyphen attesting to their dissolution”. He also asks himself how these labels are formulated, and whether it is articulatory factors or deeper implications that determine in what order the elements appear.

In an attempt to overcome the essentialism and dichotomy of terms such as ‘British Asian’, Harris (2006) suggests the term ‘Brasian’ for the adolescents taking part in his study (young people of South Asian descent born or brought up in Britain). He remarks that these young people “inhabit a number of ethnic and cultural subcommunities which they articulate together in ways which draw both on residual traditional elements informed by diasporic influences and on emergent local elements, with different emphases dominant at contingent moments” (Harris 2006: 118, italics in original). He further points out that this takes place in “low key ways with little or no overt sign of crisis or serious discomfort” (ibid). The term ‘Brasian’ is thus intended to offer an alternative to the hyphenated identity labels, and to transcend the binary perception of ‘new’ and ‘old’, as well as the sense of cultures as separate and clearly bounded.

Although these arguments for the use of ‘Brasian’ as a term point in a positive direction when it comes to conceptualisations of identity, the term is still imbued with many previous dilemmas. The term is helpful in its ability to present elements as melting together rather than representing two different worlds, as well as in Harris’ emphasis on the quotidian and ordinary instead of the spectacular and outstanding. However, the national or ethnic labels remain overemphasised, and their contents hazy. What does the ‘Br’ from British signify in terms of ‘Britishness’, and what is the meaning of ‘-asian’? The reference to ‘residual’ and ‘traditional’ elements also falls short of capturing the complexity, not least when considering how notions such as ‘heritage’ are reconstructed and negotiated. The term does thus not truly succeed in overcoming the dichotomies related to earlier terms.
One question that remains is whether new names are needed, and for what purpose. El-Tayeb points out that the lack of vocabulary around the growing minority population makes it continuously possible to ignore the discrimination and maintain the one-sided narrative of ‘Europeanness’. It is my view, based on the analysis of identity negotiations in the present thesis, that new names or terms are helpful, if they are helpful for and desired by the people to whom they apply. In other words, if the names develop in a bottom-up manner, they need to be recognised. However, new names are not ends in themselves, in academia or elsewhere. If new terms do not also bring about development in thinking about identity, for example by diverting focus away from ‘ethnicity’, their contribution will be limited.

A last point to further discuss has to do with the aspect of novelty in Minh’s comment in relation to the compliments he, and many other participants, receive on their ‘good skills’ in the dominant language. ‘Me ollaan kuitenki aika uutta tavaraa’ / ‘After all we’re still pretty new stuff, was Minh’s explanation of why he receives compliments for his Finnish. In their accounts, if not in the actual events (which this study does not have access to), the participants have the possibility of resisting the ascription of otherness (cf. Day 1998), but many present the comments as understandable and to some extent inevitable. Recounting a similar incident, Yue (2000), who writes about ‘not looking German’ in Germany, argues that the significance given to visual practices, and the continuous discrimination based on appearance, is enabled by the ideological narratives of ‘European identity’ as based on whiteness. Drawing on personal experience of reactions to his ‘fluent German’ and ‘Chinese looks’, as well as on examples of the persistent question ‘Where are you from?’ Yue points to the dangers of these phenomena. El-Tayeb (2011: 168) builds on Yue’s paper, and asks why the visual reality is given priority over the aural one in his examples. She argues that the compliments and the question ‘Where do you come from?’ are “not motivated by curiosity, but a desire to affirm a preexisting knowledge, namely “You are not from here””, with the consequent question ‘How can you speak my language’. The metaphor of dissonance that I suggested in the previous section would reflect this precise phenomenon, and it is important to note that it is a perceived dissonance, depending on the listener’s perception.
El-Tayeb suggests that this phenomenon means that “every acknowledgement of a nonwhite presence always seems to happen for the very first time”, and, in line with this, a nonwhite native speaker of the dominant languages “again and again appears as a curious contradiction, never quite becoming unspectacular and commonplace” (ibid. xxiv). The participants in this study, especially those in Turku, Finland, express receiving compliments on their language skills ‘all the time’ and ‘almost too often’. The youngest participants in this study were born in the early 1990s, and even in Finland, with the shortest history of international immigration from countries further away, this generation has by now reached adulthood. As pointed out by Heikkilä (2016, my translation): “Finnishness is not changing. It has already changed. It is time to get used to the thought”. The events of immigration from countries such as Somalia and Iraq are part of Finnish history, just as Sweden shares a history with the Balkan countries, Chile, etc., and Britain with its former colonies. Furthermore, the Second World War, and the patterns of migration related to the aftermath of the war, took place approximately seventy years ago; a time frame which holds at least three generations. Europeans of colour are simply not ‘new stuff’. The problem thus lies in the narratives of identity, in the stories upon which the imageries of national identities are built, according to which European cultures and migrant cultures only recently met each other.

The endurance of the representation of people of migrant descent as not fully belonging is reflected in the terms that are used when talking about these individuals, and multilingual practices relating to certain languages in particular likewise “trouble binary conceptualisations” (Harris 2006: 33). Practices such as mixing are presented as ‘poor language’, even by the speakers themselves. Moreover, the representation of the inability of individuals and communities to belong is framed as a personal or cultural failure, such as in the aftermath of riots in towns in northern England, in Paris, in Malmö and elsewhere in the past few decades. What seems to permeate these conceptualisations is an insistence on ‘one-ness’, which despite being an illusion is presented as the norm and the most natural state. Just as nobody is ‘monolingual’, no identity is as unitary as perceived and presented. This attitude is, however, reflected both in views on multilingualism and multilingual speakers, and in ideas about identity.

Finally, the metaphor of identity as a chord may also be useful in understanding how generation – in this case, ‘second generation’ – can be
negotiated in identity positioning. While this kind of positioning has often been conceptualised as involving keys representing one ‘culture’ or another, the ‘second generation’ may also constitute a key of its own (cf. comments by Gabriela and Laila on pages 133-134). Referring to this in terms of hybridity (whether for example ‘British Asian’ or ‘Brasian’) would thus be misleading: this position does not imply a mere sum of two components, but a more complex position, which, in addition, is combined with an endless range of potential other keys. Moreover, it need not be activated at all, such as in many of Susanna’s examples, where she chooses ‘Swedishness’, and in situations that may be seen as chords where no particular ‘cultural identity’ is relevant. Reactions to chords, or their perceived ‘dissonance’, as discussed in the previous section, are thus likely to be related to the narratives of ‘national identity’ in the different contexts. The sense of novelty, as suggested by Minh, has elsewhere been explained as a result of exclusion of certain positions from the narratives of what it means to be ‘European’ (cf. El-Tayeb 2011). The participants in this study are twelve out of millions of European citizens whose parents or grandparents moved here from elsewhere, and their life stories have been played out mainly in Europe. Their stories, moreover, contribute to what it means to be ‘Finnish’, ‘Swedish’, ‘British’ or ‘European’ in general.

10.1.4 Summary of the main points of analysis

This study provides a glimpse into ongoing linguistic patterns as presented by individual speakers at a specific point in time and space. This chapter has attempted at drawing conclusions from data in which individuals’ accounts and details in them were foregrounded. How the participants talk about language, and the importance attributed to heritage language by the participants as well as by their parents, represents unique bilingualisms that are nevertheless affected by larger stories in the forms of language ideologies. These ideologies are moreover linked with narratives of ‘national identity’ and the place of language within these narratives. ‘Ethnicity’ and ‘nationality’ are currently overemphasised in much discourse around identity, which comprises a range of other, potentially more salient elements. In this study, I have suggested to expand Wortham & Rhodes (2013) metaphor of identity as a chord to include a metaphor of ‘dissonance’ based on perceptions of
familiarity and expectation, and proposed that ‘second generation’ may involve a key of its own, which may be available in positioning the self. Recognising this key as part of the chord of ‘Europeanness’ would reduce the sense of novelty suggested by participants and by their accounts about being complimented for their good language skills in the dominant languages. The implications of these findings, as well as suggestions for future research, will be discussed in the following sections.

10.2 Limitations and suggestions for future research

This study has offered a partial account of some aspects of the lives of the twelve individual participants, and attempted to relate them to wider social phenomena. By choosing participants of different backgrounds, it was aimed at examining what common elements there might be in stories about language in the generation born after the event of migration. Some of the differences are likely to reflect these backgrounds, such as what decade the participant grew up in, or what attitudes there were towards foreigners in general and the nationality of their parents in particular. In some cases, it would be interesting to see if the participants’ accounts are echoed by more people who share some of the same background factors. For example, would other people of Somali background share Khalid’s consistent view of ‘Finnishness’ as an impossible category for him, and ‘Somaliness’ as an automatic and unnegotiable one? If a phenomenon such as this is reflected across several life stories, it must reflect some larger structures, which this study can only suggest. Nevertheless, the decision not to outline a ‘group’ based on ‘ethnicity’ from the outset of the study is a choice I stand by, for reasons outlined in the introductory chapter.

Moreover, the data collection for the study was conducted in three different national contexts which due to the small number of participants in each place cannot be truly compared to one another. There were some indications of different tendencies, for example in how language and national identity were linked in the group interviews, but these would need to be confirmed by more empirical data.

While the purpose of this study was to look at how the participants talk about language in their lives, it would be interesting to also observe how they use the languages in practice, and what identity negotiations arise across events in their daily lives. In the scope of this doctoral study, that
would have been too large of a project, and also difficult to carry out. However, many contemporary studies are investigating these phenomena and contributing with new insights of social life. A hope for future research would be to move the focus away from children and adolescents to people of all ages, to see how these negotiations are played out in different contexts. Moreover, it is my hope to see more studies of multilingualism conducted in what are still seen as ‘monolingual’ settings. By shifting focus away from ‘diversity’, it might be possible to show that similar patterns of negotiation, of inclusion and exclusion, as well as of identity positioning, happens in all kinds of language use.

In this study, I have chosen to focus on the elements of identity that were foregrounded by the participants in the interview discussions. There is a range of possible other elements, such as gender, which could have been analysed. While this study believes that it is in the interplay of different identity elements that positionings are created and maintained, it was here not possible to account for all potential elements. This is why I chose to be guided by the data and by my impressions of what were the most salient themes. These were, of course, affected by the research questions and the topics of conversation in the interviews.

As in any qualitative and empirical study, much of the analysis depends on the researcher’s thinking and previous knowledge. The process, from the choice of questions and topics and the actual encounters with the participants, to the procedure of transcription, analysis and presentation, has been based on my decisions and judgements. In this, I have tried to take necessary caution, respecting ethical guidelines and considering both the integrity of the individual participants and the contributions to the research community.

10.3 Implications for the study of language and identity

Aly (2015: 199) suggests that “constructivist approaches have resolutely failed to help in overcoming the grotesque consequences of ethnonormative thinking”. In the concluding chapter of his book, he underlines that we must continue to try to understand the power of ethnonormativity (as well as hetero- and class normativity), and never “show any resignation towards the project of putting these structures in
their rightful place” (ibid. 213). This means that research cannot be “content to argue that voluntary ethnicity is the ideal of race relations or that ascription is inevitable” (ibid). Like Aly, I believe that social research needs to be committed to doing more than describing existing practices and presenting them as unavoidable. Block and Corona (2015: 519) argue that a focus on intersectionality makes activism more possible, as it “makes clear that injustice is never about just one dimension of being” – taking into account the many dimensions of identity will allow for a more holistic approach to the processes that produce and maintain different forms of social inequality.

As suggested in previous research (see e.g. Bhambra 2016 and El-Tayeb 2011), in order to contribute to challenging the constraints of ethnonormativity and other structures of limitation in the present and the future, we need to acknowledge the history of the present narratives. In relation to this, I would like to argue for a shift perspective in what counts as ‘recent’ or ‘novel’. In other words, it is time to start viewing events that took place in the 1990s as historical. In much of the current research around diversity the 1990s are portrayed as a kind of turning point, and this could be argued for in the cases of Britain, Sweden and Finland. This was the decade when ‘diversity became diversified’, or when the reasons and routes for immigration became increasingly varied, in line with the ideas around ‘superdiversity’ (Vertovec 2006). Even though these events took place a generation ago, they are often still presented as ‘recent’. People who moved in the 1990s are no longer ‘new migrants’, and nor are their children, many of whom are by now adults. Without careful attention to how events are presented, we end up reinforcing the narratives that exclude people, even if the objective is the opposite.

From a methodological point of view, this study has explored some novel ways in which research interviews may be designed, and suggested how this may help elicit a broader range of data than traditional, question-based interviews. I have also taken particular care in accounting for the methods in this thesis. These methods helped find data which is rich in detail, and while this makes it challenging to draw general conclusions, it can also be drawn on to illustrate complexity, as I have done by applying the metaphor by Wortham and Rhodes (2013) and suggesting how it may be expanded.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, a move away from presenting the ‘second generation’ as simply ‘caught between two cultures’ is
necessary, and is in fact already taking place in much scholarship. The study of multilingualism has likewise moved towards focusing on speakers and resources. How we talk about issues and phenomena is important, and the range of potential names for ‘multilingual’ forms of communication, as well as the concepts used to describe the ‘new ethnicities’, show that this has been noted. Whether these new names will remain or soon be replaced by new ones, they signal that perceptions are undergoing a change. It is my hope that this study, too, has contributed to rethinking some assumptions around questions of language and identity, and to shedding light on the complexity involved in everyday, ordinary identity negotiations.

10.4 Final reflections

This study ends at a point in time very different from when it began. What was labelled the ‘Arab spring’ had just passed, but its consequences were not yet very visible in Europe. Demonstrations against the war in Iraq had become silent long ago, and many conflicts never evoked any protests at all. Europe was struggling with recession and austerity. The arrival of a relatively large number of refugees in 2015, compared with previous years, seemed to surprise many countries, and the response was to a large extent reactionary and rather hostile. Borders were closed, as national identities and systems were perceived to be under threat from a notorious ‘Other’. In national politics, populist parties such as UKIP, The Swedish Democrats and The Finns have by now gained ground, and the discourse around immigration has become increasingly blatant and inflamed. The UK referendum concerning its membership in the European Union led to a spike in hate crimes, as did the election of Donald Trump as the President of the United States, and in recent weeks, the attack in which a young man stabbed ten people in the city centre of Turku has unleashed a wave of anti-immigrant discourse from both politicians and a part of the general public.

In the introduction, I wrote that stories of immigration are among the loudest stories of today. At the point of writing these final remarks, the stories that are voiced by the media – not least on social media - are particularly aggressive, questioning people’s characters and motives, and reducing their humanity. Muslims in particular are continuously
portrayed as representing the opposite of ‘Europeanness’, and this affects how European countries are responding to ongoing humanitarian crises. In the aftermath of the referendum and the US presidential elections, there are reports on social media of children and grandchildren of immigrants being told to ‘go home’. This has a bearing on the identity negotiations of millions of people, and it is alarming to see how political developments are currently justifying and giving fuel to such acts of exclusion.

But stories can change. Perspectives can widen. Boundaries of collective identities can transform, while constellations of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ in different ways remain an inevitable part of social life. Positions can shift, and power over them can be distributed in more equal ways. This requires efforts both at local, national and international levels. This is already taking place in many areas of society. A bright example of the voices aiming to change the stories is author Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, who spoke at the United Nations Humanitarian day in 2016: “Nobody is ever just a refugee. Nobody is ever just a single thing. And yet, in the public discourse today, we often speak of people as single things. Refugee. Immigrant. We dehumanize people when we reduce them to a single thing.” It has been an objective of this thesis to represent people as much more than solely descendants of refugees or immigrants. To underline this, the epilogue will include their own stories of what they would include in a hypothetical book of their lives, given as replies to a question asked at the end of the life story interviews.

I wish to end this thesis with an extract from my research journal. In May 2016, I visited Malmö to attend a research seminar and talk about the findings of this study. While I was there, I had the chance to meet one of the participants, Gabriela, whom I had not seen in approximately two years. Afterwards I wrote these notes, reflecting the character of identity positions as ephemeral and ever-changing:

*Notes, 10 May 2016*

*Gabriela meets me at the statue by Möllevångstorget, which used to be our meeting point before the recordings. As soon as I spot her leading her bicycle up the street, I can sense that something has changed. I catch myself thinking that*
she looks so much more stereotypically ‘Latina’ than I have seen her before. She is wearing a long wide skirt with a belt and a short jeans vest. Her hair is much longer than it was when I last saw her, and she has plaited some of it back. We go to Folkets Park to catch up. After a while of talking about changes in our lives in these almost two years since we last saw each other, she tells me she has started to be in touch with her ‘Chilean roots’ much more, and that she now socialises with other people of Chilean heritage or origin in Malmö. She adds that when people ask her where she’s from, she now says Chile, because “that’s what they want to know anyway”. Should they be interested in getting to know her better, only then does she tell the story of how she was actually born in Sweden. Gabriela also tells me that Danny and his wife have divorced, and that she has moved back to Canada.

So much has changed, before the thesis is even written. The recordings on my USB-stick have travelled with me across countries and times, and gained a sense of permanence that was necessary for conducting the analysis. Meanwhile, life has kept moving for all these twelve individuals. Circumstances have changed, positions have changed. All these words are slipping into the past as they are being written. And that’s the beauty of it.
Epilogue – ‘The book about your life’

Below, the participants’ answers to the question ‘If you wrote a book about your life, what things would you like to include?’ will be presented. Khalid and Gabriela are missing in this list, due to unexpected situations in the data collection. In Khalid’s case, the interview was interrupted by someone needing the classroom we were recording in, and I forgot to return to the question at a later interview. With Gabriela, I made the decision not to ask the question at the end of the life story interview, as its contents had been emotional and dealt with traumatic experiences. In hindsight, I thought I should have asked her anyway. Although it is unfortunate that their stories are missing, it reflects the character of the interview process with living participants and dynamic circumstances.

FARAH

“I would probably write about every phase of life like every main phase for example how my parents came here would be the prologue I would probably start there and then birth and then probably nursery and preschool and primary school and secondary school and upper secondary school and it would probably be a really big book there’s so much that would go into it so it would become a really thick book actually (.) even if there’s only been childhood and adolescence there’s so much that goes into it”

MINH

“mm no (.) ainaki rasismi ja sen kaa eläminen ja sen kasvaminen se on mulle sellainen asia mitä toivottavasti se olis mieltä avartava (.) et nii varsinku suomalaisille ja varsinku ihmisille jotka on lähellä mua nii heille se olis jotenki mielen avartava ja vois niinku kattoo et onks he ite tehny samanlaista tai muuta
“hmm well (.) at least racism and living with it and how it’s grown that’s the kind of thing that hopefully it would broaden the mind (.) so yeah especially for Finnish people and especially people close to me that would broaden their minds and they could check if they’ve done the same or something similar (.) so not because it would have been like an exceptionally traumatic experience more like a character-building experience”

IMAD

“well (.) I don’t know maybe some significant things that I’ve done for the first time like hobbies that I’ve done and liked over the years (.) skydiving for example would be good to include (.) and then of course (.) well all this going into politics etc and then successes and failures I’d probably write about things quite extensively (.) after all I’ve done so many things it’s really hard to choose certain things that I’d write about well one thing is encounters with different people sometimes I think of individual encounters with some people and they’ve just stayed in my mind somehow (.) so probably quite a lot of that”

SUSANNA

“ååh det är svårt (.) jag skulle nog vilja berätta om min barndom jag tycker det är fantastiskt med de här somrarna i Finland till exempel dom skilde sig från allt annat både det jag berättat det var mer spartanskt och mer fattigt där och det man upplevde det skulle jag vilja berätta om och skriva ner kanske teckna ner och titta på hur det ser ut där idag där man var när jag var barn hur ser det ut nu det här landet med äkrarna och hela den här biten i sig det ser säkert inte likadant ut (.) sen skulle jag nog vilja berätta om (.) skolan har jag inte så mycket mer att berätta om det tycker jag inte utan det skulle man nog hoppa över men vänskap och det
jag upplevde med mina vänner och vad deras familjer bidrog med och liksom arbetet på Arlanda och människorna man mötte faktiskt (.) och sen dom fantastiska människorna och mötet med dom och vad det innebar med [sonens] gudmödrar mina bästa väninnor arbetena som liksom förde mig framåt hela tiden och det här hur jag hamnade här och så (.) och min bästa väninna och våra resor också ja och upplevelser (.) och det skulle jag kunna visa för [sonen] och så berätta det här är dom stora händelserna i mitt liv”

***

“ooh that’s difficult (.) I think I would like to tell about my childhood I think it’s fantastic with these summers in Finland for example how they were different from everything else both what I’ve told you it was poorer there and everything we experienced I’d like to tell about that and write down and maybe draw and look at what it looks like there today where I was as a child what does it look like now these land with the fields and everything it probably doesn’t look the same (.) then I’d like to tell about (.) about school I don’t have much more to say I don’t think so that could be skipped but friendship and what I experienced with my friends and what their families contributed and the job at Arlanda and the people I met (.) and then the fantastic people and encounters with them and what that meant [son’s] godmothers my best female friends and the jobs that took me forward all the time and how I ended up here and so on (.) and my best friend and our travels too and experiences (.) and I could show this to [son] and tell him about this these are the big events in my life”

CEMILE

“i alla fall förkorta de men ha med ha med mitt liv (.) steg för steg mm (.) svårigheter inom arbetet hur man har lyckats liksom för nu de som e bra e att dom här unga människorna dom har sett mej jobba lite på olika yrken jag har vart som kassabiträde jag har vart på seven-eleven här i Malmö Möllan seven-eleven i Danmark skolan så o redan där märkte dom att hon jobbar hårt att komma nånstans (.) o att de inte liksom (.) ha kommit fram ba direkt (.) för de e ingen som erbjuder dej en tjänst på de sättet o den resan hade jag tatt lite med faktiskt för att kunna motivera ungdomar liksom o inte ge opp utan att man måste självt a framsteg väldigt mycke (.) och barndomen för jag sa till dej de bästa jag visst att va ung också va roligt men att självt barndomen ja hur de har varit hur man har haft kontakt med grannar o liksom såhär (.) mm jag tror mest (.) o så dehär med självtklart med tjänsten men också på min fritid för de mesta såsom jag har nämnt tidigare dehär med föreningslivet och dehär med de projekt som jag jobbar för [förening] att hur min tid går åt för att gynna dessa ungdomarna för jag självt vill ge och få tillbaka att jag lär mig mycke av dom samtidigt (.) för att kunskap e
kunskap jag lär mej jättemycke utav dej jag lär mig jättemycke utav mina kollegor”

***

“at least shorten it but include my life (.) step by step mhmm (.) difficulties in work how you’ve succeeded like because now it’s good that these young people they’ve seen me work a bit in different professions I’ve been a cashier I’ve worked at seven-eleven here in Malmö Möllan and seven-eleven in Copenhagen then school and already there they noticed that she’s working hard to get somewhere (.) and that it hasn’t like (.) come to be immediately (.) because nobody will offer you a position like that and that journey I’ve taken a bit to motivate young people not to give up but you need to take steps forward yourself very much (.) and childhood like I told you the best thing of course to be young but also childhood and what it was like and how you were in touch with neighbours and so on (.) mm I think mostly (.) and of course also my work but in my spare time as well as I’ve mentioned to you the associations and these projects I’m working for [association] and how my time is spent on benefiting these young people because I want to give and get back I learn so much from them at the same time (.) because knowledge is knowledge I learn so much from you I learn so much from my colleagues”

DANNY

“I would definitely include (.) I would definitely include my wife (.) I would definitely include (.) I would know this is gonna be hard but I would just like you said it is a difficult question I would have to talk about every I would include everything that has defined me as a person and I think that would be a lot about my background obviously (.) and it would be my encounters with other people that I believe has inspired me or pushed me in the direction I needed (.) it would be my trip from Stockholm to Malmo it would also be my trip from Malmo to Toronto cause even when I moved from Stockholm to Malmo it was still in the same country it was a scary step it was I’d never lived by myself I was twenty-one years old I had an apartment in my name loan and laundry for the first time I was like what the hell but it was it wasn’t really: it wasn’t like (.) shockingly new it was still the same country I’d been to Malmo twice before that so it was somewhat familiar even though I didn’t know anybody here but Toronto I didn’t know anyone before moving there I had no clue how things worked I’m glad I spoke the language obviously that helped a lot I wouldn’t I don’t even wanna know how it would be not knowing the language but (.) that I have to definitely write about and I would have to write about the last (.) no I actually have to say
the time from when I came back to Canada which was from two thousand and
ten until now I would include that period too (.) cause a lot of stuff has happened
to me (.) mentally (.) I came to a lot of revelations if you wanna call them maturing
I guess that’s also a good word it could be that maturing it could be the things I’ve
seen (.) that made me mature (.) whatever but the last three years I think has
definitely defined me as who I am as a person (.) the rest was more of a build-up (.) so I would have to include everything that defines me that what makes me me (.) so yeah (.) very interesting”

EWA

“I think it would probably be (.) like I’m not just saying because of this but it
would probably be quite still it would probably be like (..) angled from a way like
of a Polish person growing up in England rather than just an English person and
have this like (.) yeah ehm (.) I don’t really know [laughs] I haven’t really thought
about quite honestly I haven’t really thought about writing a book about my life
(.) I think it’s pretty much starting now with like uni and everything that’s (.) apart
from a few early memories I think it would probably start around uni”

HÜLYA

“I’d want it to be a book that shows other people like one thing that really annoys
me (.) people here like me who are foreign or Turkish usually Turkish people here
own like kebab shops et cetera most of the shops make loads of money their kids
instead of going to uni just stay and work and live off their dad really upsets me
cause when I go to Turkey I see people work really hard to go to uni system in
Turkey uni exam for everyone and basically you don’t go to the subject you
picked unless you get a certain number of points most of the population don’t
study what they want pretty easy here cause even crappiest uni would take you
in Turkey 2 year or 4 year I will have to study again and go for four year I see
people here who just don’t take the chance people like me like Turkish people, I’d
want to say that they’d have their lives easy they’ve been rich had their family
and I’ve had no one I grew up under a kitchen table and was bullied I’m not a
person who resents people even if now someone says I don’t hold a grudge I’d
want it to mean something to that person so they’d get something out of it”

LAILA

“hmm (.) okay (.) that’s an interesting one (.) ehm (.) a lot of what we’ve talked
about really (.) I think primarily it would be a funny book [laughs] I have a lot of
funny stories from my childhood and growing up and (.) it’s funny cause it’s there
are some things that you only get if you’re you know (.) in the generation like I am where you sort of you’ve got parents who are from like home from India or Pakistan and then you’ve got the rest of the world (.) you know England and when you’re a child like me it’s just there are some things that are so funny and strange and you can’t really explain it to (.) you know I can’t explain the silly things my mum and dad say to my English friends and then the jokes of my English friends my parents just don’t get (.) so it’s quite funny (.) but I think and then the boring side would probably be my career but it’s because it’s it has been quite a huge part of my life I think sadly I’ve not really travelled or you know taken a year out and done anything exciting like lots of people I’ve just you know (.) done a degree and then another degree and then another degree [laughs] sort of built that career up but then I’ve had a lot of fun doing that and I’ve met some great people and I’ve made some lifelong friends and (.) so I don’t feel like I’ve missed out (...) I think it would definitely end in Birmingham though the book (.) if all goes well”

RANDEEP

LINDA: a last question that might be a difficult question but I find it quite nice to ask if you wrote a book about your life what are the things that you would most certainly want to include
RANDEEP: I think the first thing is that I don’t think anyone would want to read it [laughs]
LINDA: [laughs] why
RANDEEP: because I don’t think there’s anything ehm to me my life is not interesting (.) I don’t know if it is but for me it’s not interesting (.) my life’s quite mundane [laughs] and I’ve never thought of my life as interesting material
LINDA: right yeah
RANDEEP: I’ve just I’ve never reflected or thought about it in that way (.) as anything extraordinary or interesting (.) ehm possibly quite the opposite actually quite boring [laughs] so I don’t know [laughs]
LINDA: yeah I guess one of the reasons is also that I think now we’re kind of living in an era where reality TV
RANDEEP: and blogging
LINDA: blogging exactly are very big and in a sense everybody’s story is kind of interesting in this way so that’s where the question kind of comes from
RANDEEP: so what was the question about what was the
LINDA: what would be the things that you’d like to include
RANDEEP: oh what would I include (.) I think I’d definitely include some of the childhood stuff around some of the childhood experiences about the games we used to play what we used to do (.) and I’d definitely include some of the things about my grandparents that I remember (.) ehm I’d include some stuff about
living in the growing up in the seventies and eighties and some of those experiences and the juxtaposition about being in from being a majority to being a minority (.) that’s interesting (.) ehm I’d write about my experiences as a parent (.) being a parent myself (.) because that’s a challenge (.) that’s probably the most difficult thing I’ve had to do in my life (.) something which is assumed that it’s such a natural thing but actually it’s the biggest challenge (.) because these children bring their own karma with them (.) they bring so much baggage with them (.) and everyday you’re battling through it yeah whether consciously or unconsciously (.) so that’s interesting (.) ehm I’d write about marriage as well in terms of again I think living with somebody in a married situation again is one of the most difficult things you have to do
LINDA: probably yeah
RANDEEP: yeah definitely definitely yeah and again something which is assumed is a natural thing (.) and something which you know you’re just expected to get on with but it’s actually very difficult and parenting is so difficult (.) as well (.) so write about those things (.) maybe I’d write about some of the other projects that I’ve been involved with in the past ehm some of the work that I’ve done with gurdwaras some of the ehm business that we’ve been involved with in the past so yeah and probably (unheard) side of things so yeah (.) yeah I don’t know if anyone would read it or whether it would be of interest to anybody but [laughs] I don’t know what I’d call it [laughs] I’d call it don’t read this but in case you do [laughs]
LINDA: right yeah in this interview this question is also kind of a way of seeing if there’s an area that I haven’t asked anything about that is important so it’s also kind of yeah
RANDEEP: yeah I think what I’d like to write about is I’d like to write about spirituality actually (.) I think that would appeal to me more than my own life (.) and maybe within that there could be some reflection that in my life this is what I did these were the things these were the pitfalls and this is how I got out at the end so that would be maybe that’s how I would write it it would be more about spirituality and spiritual teachings and then using my life as a case study (.) that I did this and this was such a mistake and then I realised I should have done this (.) and if only I had done this and then the story unfolds (.) in that way (.) so (.) so it may be a bit like that (.) that’s how I can visualise it (.) but it’s interesting because I’ve (.) I’ve never thought of myself as an inspiring person (.) whereas other people have told me that I am (.) and the first time somebody said it I was so shocked [laughs]
LINDA: really
RANDEEP: yes I was I was so shocked (.) I was really really really deeply shocked that somebody would say that about me (.) because I’ve always thought about myself to be a really really boring ordinary person
LINDA: really
RANDEEP yes [laughs] yeah I’ve never considered anything that I’m doing to be interesting to anybody else or exciting or or whatever I’ve always considered it to be just you know (.) you know of insignificance I suppose (.) and maybe that’s to do with my own insecurity as a person
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Svensk sammanfattning

Världen ekar av berättelser, och i den tid där vi befinner oss ljuder berättelser om invandring högt: i politiska debatter och mediediskurs, liksom i vardagligt tal, skyms de individuella berättelserna bland rubriker om den ”flyktingkris” som nu pågår. Samtidigt har miljoner av européer under de senaste årtiondena vuxit upp som barn eller barnbarn till personer som av olika orsaker flyttat till ett nytt land. I denna avhandling undersöker jag hur personer vars föräldrar var invandrare var invandrade talar om de roller som olika språk har i deras liv, och hur deras identitetspositioner skapas i intervjuerättselerna. Den så kallade ”andra generationen” förknippas ofta med förutfattade antaganden om att ”sitta fast mellan två kulturer”, och även i tidigare forskning förekommer exempel som avslöjar en tanke om till exempel nationell identitet som något som enbart rymmer en nation. Avhandlingen tar avstånd från essentialiserande idéer både vad gäller språk och identitet, och granskar hur informanterna positionerar sig själva och andra i det material som samlats in genom olika sorters intervjuetekniker.

I centrum för analysen står berättelserna av tolv informanter i tre städer: Farah, Minh, Khalid och Imad i Åbo; Susanna, Cemile, Danny och Gabriela i Malmö; samt Ewa, Hülya, Randeep och Laila i Birmingham. Samtliga namn är täcknamn. Det som förenar personerna är att deras bägge föräldrar invandrade till Finland, Sverige eller Storbritannien innan informanterna föddes eller då de var mindre än ett år gamla – i övrigt är de av olika ålder, utbildnings- och yrkesbakgrund, och talar olika språk. Städerna Åbo, Malmö och Birmingham valdes ut för att de alla är större städer i de tre respektive länderna, och särskilt kända för sin mångfald vad gäller nationaliteter och språk bland invånarna. Intervjuprocessen bestod av fyra sorters intervjuer: fotografibaserad intervju, livsberättelser, en platsbaserad intervju där informanterna visade sitt Åbo/Malmö/Birmingham, och slutligen en gruppintervju där informanterna tillsammans med några av sina vänner deltog i en diskussion kring påståenden om språk och identitet.

Avhandlingens teoretiska grund består av positioneringsteori (Davies & Harré 1990, 1999; Harré & van Langenhove 1999, Bamberg 1997), som beskriver identitetsskapande som en diskursiv och interaktiv process där personer presenterar sig som tillhörande vissa kategorier, eller

Analysen är indelad i fem kapitel. I det första står informanternas berättelser om deras föräldrars migrationsresor i centrum. Berättandet ger en möjlighet att betona andra identitetsmarkörer än deras ”invandrarskap”. Två av analyskapitlen fokuserar på språkets roll. Då man talar om språk talar man alltid om mer än språk, och de sätt på vilka informanterna talar om språk i sina liv representerar unika tvåspråkigheter som samtidigt påverkas av större, kollektiva berättelser i formen av ideologier kring språk och dess betydelse. Bland de tolv informanterna fanns inga enhetliga mönster vad gäller vad som händer med språket i ”andra generationen”: många sade att de använder ett språk med föräldrar och äldre släktingar, och samhällets majoritetsspråk med sina syskon, men inte alla földe detta mönster. Över lag är det viktigt att notera att även för de informanter som sade sig ha svaga kunskaper i det språk som deras föräldrar talade, kunde språket ändå ha ett stort värde. Likaså är begrepp som ”modersmål” i många fall komplexa, och deras traditionella definitioner motsvarar inte den levda verkligheten.

Ideologierna om språk är nära sammankopplade med konstruktioner av ”etnisk” och ”nationell” identitet. Identitetskonstruktioner bygger på representationer och särskilt på gränsskärningar mellan det som uppfattas som lika och annorlunda eller främmande, till exempel genom att hävvisa till namn, karaktärsdrag eller andra identitetsmarkörer som betonas som kännetecknande. I materialet ingick exempel på hur det ”etnolingvistiska antagandet” binder ett särskilt språk med en särskild identitet: särskilt informanterna i Åbo och Malmö berättade om komplimanger som de får för sin ”goda finska/svenska”. I dessa välmenta men förfrämligade utbyten, och i de sätt på vilka informanterna berättade om dem, illustreras hur personer födda...
som barn till invandrare, särskilt om de till utseendet skiljer sig från representationer av majoritetsbefolkningen i landet i fråga, gång på gång uppfattas som något nytt och annorlunda. I avhandlingen bygger jag på Wortham och Rhodes’ (2013) metafor om identitet som ett ackord, där olika tangenter görs relevanta på en gång och skapar en helhet. Jag föreslår att språkkomplimangerna metaforiskt kan konceptualiseras som en dissonans i den andra partens uppfattning baserat på förväntningar. Genom att utvidga uppfattningarna om ”finländsk”, ”svensk”, ”brittisk” eller ”europeisk” identitet, och inbegripa den gemensamma historia som europeiska länder har sinsemellan och med länder utanför kontinenten, kunde man ändra på de dominerande berättelserna om vilka vi är.
APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

Introduction

Welcome to participate in the research for my Doctoral dissertation at Åbo Akademi University in Finland. I study multilingualism and identity in three urban contexts; Turku (Finland), Malmö (Sweden) och Birmingham (UK). The data will mainly consist of recorded conversations individually and in small groups. The data collection in Birmingham will take place in 2014.

Participants and participation

The four key participants in Birmingham will be at least 18 years old and born in the UK to parents who migrated there, or born abroad and moved to the UK before the age of two. The participants in the group interviews need to be at least 18 years old. Participation is completely voluntary.

Confidentiality

All data is treated confidentially, and all names are changed to protect anonymity.

Publication of results

The data is mainly used for my Doctoral dissertation and other academic purposes, such as scholarly articles and conference presentations. The data cannot be used by other people without the consent of the participant.

Contact

If you have any questions, please contact me on: LIB323@bham.ac.uk / 07946 395400.
Consent of the participant

I, ____________________________, participate in the research for Linda Bäckman’s Doctoral thesis. I have read and understood the given information.

Date and place

Signature
APPENDIX II: LIFE STORY INTERVIEW

QUESTIONS (UK VERSION)

Family background

1. When and where were you born?
2. How did you get your name? Does it mean something? Is it pronounced differently in X and in English?
3. Who are your family?
4. What language(s) do you speak with your family members?
5. Would you say that you (your family members) are more similar to or different from each other?
6. With whom did you spend most time as a child?
7. What language(s) did you speak?
8. What was your neighbourhood like?
9. Can we talk about your grandparents? Are you/have you been in touch with them? What languages do you speak?
10. Are you in touch with other relatives? What languages do you speak?
11. What do you know about your parents’ arrival in the UK? How do you know (did they tell you?)?

‘Institutions’

12. Were you in nursery? What kinds of memories do you have from there?
13. Do you remember what it was like to go to school?
14. What subjects did you like and dislike?
15. Who were your friends at school? What language(s) did you speak?
16. What was it like to go to secondary school? What kind of student do you think you were?
17. What hobbies do you have and have you had?
18. What was your first job?
19. How did you decide what you wanted to study?
20. Are you working at the moment? How would you describe your job?

Language

21. Do you ever mix languages when you speak?
22. What languages? What does it sound like? Is it something you think about?
23. Do your friends who don’t know X ever use words for example from X when they speak?
24. Do you know X (the language(s) that the parents speak)? Is it important for you to have some proficiency in it?
25. How did you learn it? Did you take lessons?
26. Can you read and write in that language? Is it important to know how to read and write?
27. Do you think your parents (/other relatives) consider it important that you know X?
28. If I asked your brothers and/or sisters these same questions, do you think they would reply in the same way as you?
29. If you have children (now or in the future), do you consider it important that they know X?

Ending the interview

30. If you wrote a book about your life, what would you include?
APPENDIX III: GROUP INTERVIEW

QUESTIONS

1. Background question: Who are you and how do you know each other? How often do you meet? What do you normally do?

STATEMENTS:

1. If you grow up speaking more than one language, you never learn any of them properly.

2. There are no limits to how many languages you can learn if you just want to.

3. You can be Finnish/Swedish/British without speaking Finnish/Swedish/English.

4. In a multicultural society, it’s important to have one common language.

5. If you speak the same language, the risk for conflicts is smaller.

6. The Finnish/Swedish/English language is suffering because of influences from other languages.

7. What do you think about the future of multilingualism in the city/country you live in?
APPENDIX IV: RECORDINGS

Farah:
1 Photograph-based interview: 24:53
2 Life story interview: 50:37
3 Place-based interview: 1:06:48
4 Group interview: 31:13
(Extra: phone interview: 10:39)
Total: 2:58:10

Minh:
1 Photograph-based and life interview: 55:43
2 Place-based and life story interview: 30:59
3 Group interview: 49:50
Total: 2:16:32

Imad:
1 Photograph-based interview: 28:20
2 Life story interview: 55:10
3 Place-based interview: 45:32
4 Group interview: 1:10:52
Total: 3:19:54

Khalid:
1 Photograph-based and life interview: 39:35
2 Place-based and life story interview: 42:23
3 Group interview: 29:20
Total: 1:51:18

Susanna:
1 Photograph-based interview: 1:16:10
2 Life story interview: 56:41
3 Place-based interview: 1:01:36
4 Group interview: 56:52
Total: 4:11:19

Cemile:
1 Photograph-based interview: 53:39
2 Life story interview: 1:09:49
3 Place-based interview: 1:16:44
4 Extra interview instead of group interview: 5:32
Total: 3:25:44

Danny:
1 Photograph-based and life story interview: 1:57:34
2 Place-based and life story interview: 1:10:15
3 Extra interview: 21:33
4 Group interview: 1:03:00
Total: 4:32:42

Gabriela:
1 Introductory life story interview: 33:17
2 Photograph-based and life story interview: 1:22:55
3 Place-based interview: 56:59
4 Group interview: 1:03:00
Total: 3:39:09

Ewa:
1 Photograph-based interview: 54:28
2 Life story interview: 49:03
3 Place-based interview: 39:57
4 Group interview: 34:02
Total: 2:57:30

Hülya
1 Photograph-based interview: 45:18
2 Life story interview: 36:06
3 Place-based interview: 01:37
4 Group interview: 23:36
5 Extra interview (before Hülya left for Turkey): 8:06
Total: 1:54:43

Laila:
1 Photograph-based interview: 43:24
2 Life story interview: 36:20
3 Place-based interview: 4:56
4 Extra interview instead of group interview: 24:28
Total: 1:49:08

Randeep:
1 Photograph-based interview: 59:42
2 Life story interview: 53:19
3 Place-based interview: 1:04:25
4 Group interview: 42:27
Total: 3:39:53

TOTAL: 36:36:02
APPENDIX IV: EXAMPLE OF SUMMARY TO PARTICIPANT (EWA)

SUMMARY

Thank you for taking part in the study for my doctoral thesis! A total of 12 people participated in the research; four in Turku (Finland), four in Malmö (Sweden) and four in Birmingham (England). I have transcribed all the recordings (i.e. put them into written form) and changed all names. Your name in the study is Ewa. Every participant has said many things that are extremely interesting to me, and I am very grateful for it. It will not be possible to include everything in the final thesis, and some of the material will be used for conference presentations and publications in academic journals. The analysis is ongoing at the moment, and I know that I will focus at least on language use in the family and thoughts related to it, definitions of ‘national identity’ and how to analyse identity in stories. Below is a summary of the main themes I have identified in our recordings. If you have questions or comments, I would like to discuss them with you when we meet.

1 Language practices and beliefs

Ewa came to England before the age of one, and grew up in a southern English town. As a child, she was taken care of by family, which she mentions as the reason for identifying as Polish and having a high proficiency in the language. Her younger brother, who had an English-speaking child-minder, is reported to prefer English, and as seeing himself as more English than Ewa does. Ewa also attended Polish school in London throughout her school years, and thus completed the Polish curriculum and has a very high proficiency in Polish.

EXAMPLE 1 “What language do you speak with your brother?”
LINDA: what language do you speak with your brother
EWA: ehm when it’s just me and him it’s English unless we’re in a group with English people and I don’t want
them to hear what I’m saying to him ehm (.) yeah it’s mainly English if we’re around our parents we’ll speak Polish (.) like cause he prefers English so it’s easier for him whilst I’m kind of I don’t really care so [laughs]

The question ‘what language do you speak with your brother’ reveals some of the flexibility of the language practices in the family, especially among the children. The choice of language depends on participants and situation, and alternation between English and Polish can be used to achieve different goals. At the time of the interviews, Ewa was active in a Polish association. She talked about the negotiation between what language to use in relation to events, and strongly advocated for the use of English to include everybody instead of making it a ‘Polish only’ group. The value of bilingualism is very high in Ewa’s accounts, and she confirms that she would see it as important for her potential future children to learn Polish, for the sake of the benefit of being bilingual as much as for keeping in touch with the Polish culture. Ewa was also at the time of the interviews a student of languages, and saw languages as part of her career plans for the future.

2 ‘I am Polish but I live in England’

Despite arriving in England at a very young age, Ewa consistently refers to herself as being ‘a Polish person living in England’. The move to England was initially seen as temporary, which is part of the reason why Ewa completed the Polish curriculum. She has also regularly visited Poland, and it seems as if her parents have put a lot of effort into teaching her about elements associated with Polish culture, such as food and music. The following extract presents the surprise of other (Polish) people over her familiarity with Polish culture:

EXAMPLE 2 ‘You’ve lived here for eighteen nineteen years how do you know these things’

EWA: I think people are also quite a bit surprised by (.) like (.) again thanks to my parents like taking care of it like last night my friend came over for some pierogi so he can’t cook them himself he’s useless yeah and he was I was like saying these things and he was like you’ve lived here for eighteen nineteen years how do you
know these things like I was talking about like cabarees and singers and stuff and then I just went well my parents taught me it like and my family so yeah I think they’re always a bit surprised by how much I know I don’t think they expect me to

The way of presenting Ewa as somebody who has ‘lived here for eighteen nineteen years’ emphasises her roots in another country. In relation to the Polish association and definitions of ‘Polishness’, Ewa concludes that anybody who defines themselves as Polish can be Polish, regardless of language proficiency, name, or other element commonly seen as criteria for belonging to a particular national identity. This self-definition is also presented as one of the key differences in the ‘extents of Polishness’ between Ewa and her brother, with the brother presented as a ‘more natural bilingual’ and with a stronger identification with ‘Englishness’ than Ewa.

3 Definitions of Polishness and the ‘post-2004 lot’

While Ewa strongly identifies as Polish, there is some negotiation within what is commonly portrayed as ‘the Polish community’ in England. Ewa’s family arrived in 1994, and were therefore part of a group of rather highly educated professionals, who needed a visa to move to Britain. In the interviews, Ewa makes a difference between her family and the ‘post-2004 lot’. While Ewa clearly felt uncomfortable in describing those who have migrated since 2004, the talk about them included some extremely interesting positioning, not least when it comes to language. Ewa mentions the language of the more recent migrants as more crude, and refers to the word for whore in Polish now being the most commonly known Polish word among non-Polish speakers. The following extract includes some positioning within the group of ‘Polish migrants in Britain’:

EXAMPLE 3 ‘I’m like one of the original immigrants’
EWA: I kind of always joke that I’m like one of the original immigrants like so that the thing of pride of having to have had a visa [laughs] ehm no I it’s not really I don’t actually care but (.) yeah
LINDA: and I guess it becomes a little bit of a (.) like you said a class issue as well
EWA: yeah it does change who (.) it’s just who’s migrated over has changed it used to be edu- it used to be educated peop- [laughs] I hate saying it cause I know there are people who are educated and have moved over

Jokingly referring to herself as ‘one of the original immigrants’, Ewa differentiates between the different groups among Polish people in Britain. Education is reported as one of the main differences, although positioning herself as part of the ‘educated people’ is something she seems to feel uncomfortable in saying. Through the comment ‘I don’t actually care’, as well as references to not wanting sound snobby, Ewa positions herself as knowledgeable and tolerant of the different social categories, whilst distancing herself from the more recently arrived people. ‘Polishness’ is thus presented as existing in England in various forms, not necessarily relating to each other.
People born to migrants, i.e. the ‘second generation’, are often portrayed as being ‘caught between’ two cultures, two languages and two nations. This study aims to provide a detailed account of questions of language and identity as experienced by the ‘second generation’ by taking as its starting point interview narratives of twelve individuals in three cities: Turku (Finland), Malmö (Sweden) and Birmingham (UK). It examines the processes of identity positioning in their talk about language and life, and illustrates the complexity involved in both how they present themselves, and how they are positioned by others. These processes of positioning are tied to overarching contemporary stories of sameness and strangeness, which are now highly relevant in most parts of Europe.