Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

http://create.canterbury.ac.uk

Canterbury
Christ Church
University

LANGUAGE USE WITHIN BILINGUAL FAMILIES:

STORIES FROM ISTANBUL

By

Caroline Fell

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis Submitted to Canterbury Christ Church University

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

31st July, 2012

Dedicated with much love to

Yasemin Kurban, Onur Kurban and Altay Douglas Biner,

our little Anglo-Saxon Ottomans

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WORD COUNT: 83,516

TABLE OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

With the onset of globalisation has come mass mobility of people which has led to an increase in individuals living outside their home communities and an increase in bilingual marriages. This investigation looks into the negotiation of languages and identities within such bilingual marriages.

In this study, using a variety of sources of data, including a chronological approach, I sketch a picture of what it means to be a member of a bilingual family with the aim of better understanding the issues these families face. I approach this by listening to what nine individuals in Turkish-English bilingual marriages say about language use in their families, seeing which issues arise and observing what the individuals are saying about these issues. Their stories were collected through interviews and field-notes from 2007 until 2012 in Istanbul, an urban city which, like many other urban cities, has a high proportion of multilingual speakers and mixed marriages.

From the collected data, it appears that many factors, both micro- and macro-, have led to English being the dominant language in these marriages and have led to British cultural norms being preferred within these relationships. These emerging factors include issues of linguistic investment, gain, capital, power, and English being seen as a class indicator in the local community, all of which I believe may spring from the current global positioning and power of English.

I present the outcome of this research as an understanding of the complexities affecting these individuals' daily lives; complexities which I believe are rooted in the dynamics of the globalised society we live in today.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of Focus

The broad focus of this thesis is to investigate what it means to be an individual in a bilingual family in today's globalised world. In this study, using a variety of sources of data including a chronological approach, I collect stories from nine individuals in bilingual marriages, seven females and two males, listening to what they say about language use in their families, issues that arise, and what they say about these issues. From their stories, I try to unpick how they make sense of their worlds over time and in place as their stories illuminate their beliefs. From their stories, factors of language and power, investment and capital, and national and cultural discourses emerge.

This investigation took place from 2007 to 2012 in Istanbul, an urban and cosmopolitan city where multilingualism is common.

Key Issues

Language forms an intrinsic part of one's identity. The language and community into which one is socialised may contribute towards the assimilation of one's values and beliefs, and provide taken-for-granted norms and behaviours. These behaviours act as indicators of one's gender (Piller, 2001), class (Norton, 2000a, 2000b) and nationality (Webb *et al*, 2010) and may affect how one perceives and performs identity.

Each of us is raised in an environment that leads to the languages we acquire and the beliefs, values and norms we assimilate. However, increasingly, in a globalised and mobile world, through migration outside one's home language and country or through international intermarriage, families may encompass more than one home language and spouses may have been raised and socialised in different social and cultural contexts. This migratory pattern has resulted in new family and community profiles, and extended family members and local communities are now finding different family profiles within their midst. Governments, too, are coming to terms with this new profile as they are finding the need to re-evaluate definitions of nationality and citizenship. Intermarriages are becoming more common, and with each new generation, national profiles shift frames of reference for what it means to be a

citizen. With these shifts may come uncertainties and conflicting perceptions of identity for families, local communities and state (Mercer, 1990; Giddens, 1991; Woodward, 1997; Beck, 2000).

Personal Motivation and Justification for Research

My own journey to becoming part of a bilingual family began in 2001 when I met my husband, Cengiz. Cengiz, of Turkish heritage, was born and raised in German-speaking Switzerland, returning to Istanbul at the age of 13. After getting to know each other and our respective families we married in 2003 and after three years we welcomed our daughter, Yasemin; an arrival that turned our English-language home into a bilingual environment as my husband started speaking to her in Turkish. Next, we celebrated the arrival of our son, Onur, in 2008 with an even greater increase in Turkish within our home as Turkish emerged as the preferred language among the children. As the linguistic profile of our family shifts, my friendship with other parents in similar situations continues to develop and discussions continue to emerge regarding the challenges and celebrations we face due to being in a bilingual family.

Professional Motivation and Justification for Research

My professional experiences also provide much motivation for this research. I began my journey as an educator in 1996, a journey that has involved me working as a teacher, teacher trainer, academic manager and school principal in national and international institutions in England, Turkey, Austria, Japan, Portugal, Spain and Taiwan. All of these exposed me to a number of linguistic and cultural experiences and gave me the opportunity to build friendships with a diverse group of people. These experiences brought me into contact with many families who were living abroad, as well as bilingual families with parents from different national and linguistic backgrounds. It is these families' personal stories regarding the languages they choose to use and how they are viewed by others that motivated me to undertake this research.

1.2 Motivations for this Study

As well as being motivated to undertake this research through my family life and professional responsibilities, five specific critical incidents acted as catalysts to this investigation.

The first critical incident was a conversation with my friend, Elizabeth[1]. Elizabeth said she felt she had ruined her son by marrying a foreigner and felt her son was not happy with himself. She said he struggled to understand conventions in Turkey that were expected of him and described how he appeared to shun his Turkish side, saying he longed to live in 'England' with 'English people' even though he had never lived there and his perceptions of England were based on 'BBC Englishness', not reality. Soon afterwards I was told a similar story by a British-Egyptian colleague, Sayed, who described how, when growing up in England, he wished he could 'rip the Englishness' out of himself and just be Egyptian as he felt he was never accepted as British in his country of birth. Elizabeth and Sayed's stories deeply affected me as they raised my awareness that children born into bilingual families might struggle with notions of identity.

The second incident concerned a teacher at the international pre-school where I was working. Aysun was a Turkish national with a Turkish husband, had been raised in the international community in the Middle East, and had attended an English-medium school until, aged 18, she had returned to Istanbul. Having native-like proficiency in both English and Turkish, Aysun decided to raise her daughter, Bade, in English with her husband speaking Turkish to her to provide her with two languages. However, Aysun described feeling increasingly distanced from her daughter, feeling English was not the language of her emotions. She switched into Turkish with her daughter at the age of three, after which she described her daughter withdrawing and being unwilling to speak, especially in social situations. Aysun now blames herself for her daughter's unsettled state and feels she is still not emotionally attached to her and that her daughter has been emotionally damaged through her actions. Aysun's story raised my awareness of the emotional power of language and how important this may be to both child and parent when passing on one's language, culture, history, emotions and stories, no matter how fluent they may be in their second language; issues that I later discovered are discussed in Pavlenko's (2004: 179-203) research into emotions and language choice in bilingual families and De Houwer's (2009) work on bilingual first language acquisition individuals.

---

[1] All names used throughout are pseudonyms.

The third incident also took place at the international pre-school where I was working. A Turkish-Mexican family moving from Austria visited me. The family, a Turkish mother who spoke Turkish to their son, a Mexican father who spoke Spanish to the son, the parents speaking English together, were raising their child in Vienna in a German-speaking community. Their son at the age of three was somewhat delayed in his language acquisition (of Turkish, Spanish and English) so they took him to an English-speaking, Austrian speech therapist who told the father to stop speaking Spanish to the son as she believed the father's interactions were delaying his son's language development. She advised the father to only speak English to his son instead. The father immediately switched to English but described feeling an emotional disconnect from his son. The family felt extremely sad about what they had been asked to do, but wanting the best for their son, decided to follow the advice of the speech therapist.

A fourth incident involved a teacher, Leyla, sharing her son's proud proclamations about his heritage. Trilingual in Farsi, English and Turkish, Nardir came excitedly running in to his mother announcing 'Mum, do you know, I come from three great empires: the Persian, the British and the Ottoman'. The pride I saw in this mother's eyes made me think back to Elizabeth and the regret in her eyes with regard to her son and I wondered what could cause such different outcomes.

Finally, the fifth incident occurred at the international pre-school where I had the privilege of getting to know the multicultural Khoury family consisting of their Lebanese father, educated in the UK from a young age, their Turkish mother, also fluent in English, and two children with Turkish-British-Lebanese nationality. At home, their father mixes between French and Arabic with the children while their mother speaks Turkish; communication between parents takes place in English. They had lived between London and Istanbul with the children attending English-medium schools. The children express pride in their mixed background and languages. Getting to know the Khoury family highlighted to me the positive face of bilingualism and how this may be becoming the new face of a globalised world (Mercer, 1990; Giddens, 1991; Woodward, 1997; Beck, 2000; Cummins, 2001).

These critical incidents, together with my personal and professional experiences helped me realise that we all have different life trajectories and that language and place of birth significantly influence how we see ourselves and how others see us. These experiences also revealed to me that some communities, families and individuals may celebrate their bilingual selves, while others may be dealing with tensions and conflict. I was starting to realise that being an individual in a bilingual family while bringing great joy and pride may also bring challenges, tensions and conflicts. I had also become more aware that bilingual families are a

rapidly growing demographic. I therefore wanted to find out more about issues within the bilingual families in my personal and professional context.

1.3 Raising Awareness of Key Issues

In the first half of the last century, most investigations into bilingualism looked into links between children's bilingualism and intelligence, the majority of which showed negative outcomes (Saer, 1923; Yoshika, 1929; Smith, 1949; Anastasi & Cordova, 1953). This negativity may have reflected societies' growing uneasiness with the rise in immigration; an increase which brought with it foreign languages and cultures. However, by the 1960s, research in bilingual countries such as Canada presented positive pictures of bilingualism (Peal & Lambert, 1962). Suddenly, research subjects represented not a perceived language-deficient immigrant population, but a new breed of elite bilingual linked to economically powerful nations.

This perception of being elite bilinguals that the Canadian families found themselves in is similar to the situation my family and I find ourselves in. In our local community, Turkish is favoured as the language of the community while our minority language, English, is highly desired by the surrounding community, as evidenced by the high demand for English language education. This places families like my own in an advantageous position in society as we are seen as elite bilinguals and a benefit to the local community. This is not how the bilingual, immigrant families that were focused on in pre-1960s research were viewed. They may have been seen as a threat to local communities as opposed to a benefit and this may have influenced research outcomes into bilingualism at the time that purported that these individuals were substandard speakers with lower mental capacities.

The disparity of the negative outcomes of these early studies into immigrant populations compared with later positive outcomes in studies into different socio-economic and national groups heightened my awareness of how languages and nationalities may not be seen as neutral entities. One's native languages and countries of origin are set within global politics, capital and power, and these may affect, positively or negatively, how one's bilingual status is viewed by researchers, the state, or individuals in the local community.

Regarding current research, De Houwer (2009) suggests investigations into bilingualism need to move from much studied micro-contexts of speech production to other areas which include macro factors such as extended family language use, attitudes, and the role of identity. She calls for more in-depth case studies so that some variables may be investigated further to reveal best practice characteristics of the family environment and

communication styles. In order to do this, she believes we need to compare stories to discover why some individuals develop harmoniously and others do not. De Houwer believes we owe it to the multitude of bilingual families in the world to expand research into these areas in an attempt to better understand the issues they face, and, being in such a situation myself and advising other parents in this situation, I am in full agreement.

This initial literature review into previous and contemporary studies on bilingualism opened up many potential lines for investigation and directed my reading into areas such as capital in languages (Bourdieu, 1978) and capital in cultures (Bourdieu, 1982), theories on the social nature of language (Wenger, 1998), communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) issues of power and agency (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; Burr, 2003) and subjectivity (Weedon, 1997; Norton, 2000a).

I started by investigating theories on capital becoming fascinated by the work of French social theorist, Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu's work (1978, 1982) takes an economic stance to aspects that had previously been considered related to social positioning. Through his theoretical frameworks on capital, I started to view language as an economic entity used by individuals for their own gain. I also started to view culture as an economic entity whereby certain cultural practices may be seen to be desired and esteemed if the economic status of one's home country is strong. This means that individuals with a combination of a powerful language and a powerful nation find themselves with symbolic capital; a type of capital that can be harnessed for social or economic gain. While a native of an esteemed language and nation may embody this symbolic capital through socialisation, it is also possible for others to acquire the language and the social norms of that country in an attempt to increase their symbolic capital and therefore increase their status and access to economic capital. With this understanding also came the realisation that how bilingual individuals are perceived and valued may depend on their specific languages and nations of origin and how much capital these are perceived to hold for their local communities.

Next, I looked into earlier research in language learning. This research emphasised the psycholinguistic indicators in language learning, language learning strategies and motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985). Newer theories on 'situated learning' and 'legitimate peripheral participation' (Lave & Wenger, 1991: 29) started to question how much power language learners actually wield in these situations. Researchers started to investigate issues of power with studies looking into how much agency (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; Burr,

2003), and subjectivity (Weedon, 1997; Norton, 2000a, 2000b) learners really have in social interactions. Newer research investigated how newcomers are gradually accepted into a group depending on their identity in time and place in the social world (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the belief that learners are active participants in the practices of social communities and have the ability to construct their identities in relation to these communities (Wenger, 1998).

As research into language learning started to raise theories on power imbalances and sites of struggle (Wenger, 1998) for individuals in a new linguistic host community, further investigations started to look into the interrelationship of language and identity (McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2003; Pellegrino, 2005). These investigations viewed individuals as people with a wide range of needs, a complex historical construction, and shifting social identities (Lantolf and Pavlenko, 2001). In addition, researchers started to view the construction of identity in relation to relationships of power between host-language speakers and non-native speakers, whereby it is believed that the type of power relationship can legitimise some identity acts and attempts at participation while devaluing others (Norton, 2000a).

Identity is an especially important issue for members of bilingual families. In monolingual, single-nationality families, issues of identity may be of less importance than in bilingual intermarriage families (Baker, 2007) as in such families, one parent will be living outside his or her home community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) and be positioned as a foreigner and his or her children may not be seen as being fully 'local'. Customs and rituals that the families engage in may not conflate with local norms (Wang, 2008). In addition, governments and local communities may struggle to accept this type of family as their growing presence challenges previous perceptions of what it means to be a citizen (Eriksen, 1999). This new type of family brings multiple citizenships, multiple languages, varied religions and differing cultural norms which create challenges for communities and the state as previous national definitions are no longer pertinent (Mercer, 1990; Giddens, 1991; Woodward, 1997; Eriksen, 1999; Beck, 2000). In addition, in today's 'crisis of identity' (Eriksen, 1999) rooted in the globalisation which has led to increased mobility and intermarriage, governments and individuals in bilingual families may find themselves at a site of struggle (Wenger, 1998; Piller, 2002) as they try to define their linguistic and national identities.

1.4 The Research Participants

The type of family that I belong to and which reflects my participants involve one spouse speaking Language A and coming from Country A and one spouse speaking Language

Alpha and coming from Country Alpha. Having started this research, I found I needed a term for the purposes of writing and to indicate to the reader which type of families I was investigating. As a researcher, I understand that it is not good form to label participants, but without some form of nominalisation I found it challenging to get ideas across. I started by using the term bilingual-bicultural families. However, it soon became apparent that many of the families in this investigation encompass more than one language and many contain more than one culture. With my own family, my husband was born and raised in German-speaking Switzerland, thus he and his parents are Turkish-German bilinguals. My mother also speaks German as a second language. This means communication between my husband's parents and my parents takes place in German; our lives are touched by more than three nations and three languages. In addition, I realised that many 'bilingual' families may also be monocultural with both parents coming from one country, such as French-English Canadians. There is also the possibility that 'bicultural' families, where the parents come from different countries, are monolingual, such as British-American unions. I therefore initially rejected the terms 'bilingual' and 'bicultural' as labelling devices for this study, even though these are terms the participants often used.

On further investigation, I came across Breger's (1998) term 'cross-cultural marriage', however, I was wary of using a term that incorporates the concept of culture as I feel culture is intangible and has multiple conceptualisations. Therefore, I looked next at definitions incorporating nationality, however, even this proved challenging. I was born British but also hold Turkish citizenship gained in adulthood. Due to many participants having more than one current nationality, I tried to define individuals by their nation of birth. However, for my 'Turkish' husband, his nation of birth was Switzerland, born into a Turkish migrant family. This makes him both Swiss and Turkish. Despite not finding the concept of nationality a suitable definition of the families in this investigation, I found I was in need of a heuristic device to capture the essence of the composition of the unions indicating their differing linguistic and national backgrounds; I therefore, at times, use nationality as a descriptor in this thesis. However, when using the term 'Turkish-English' intermarriages, I am referring to languages spoken, not the precise nationality of the partners as I found this was impossible to achieve. In Piller's (2001) work, I found the closest similarity to the background of my participants. She describes 'linguistic intermarriages' between 'cross-national' couples where each partner comes from a different national and linguistic background (2001: 210). While liking Piller's term, such a long descriptor proved unwieldy in writing and taxing on the reader, I therefore returned to use the term 'bilingual' families to describe the family situations of the participants in this study. While this could encapsulate many types of bilingual family, I use this as a

heuristic device in this thesis to describe families who tend to have one parent who can be considered British and speaks English as a preferred language and one parent who can be considered Turkish and speaks Turkish as a preferred language.

I also discovered that the terms British and English were used interchangeably by both me and the participants. I therefore feel it is necessary to include a short discussion on how I differentiate these terms in this thesis. I use the term 'English' to refer to the English language. For example: a native-English speaker; a Turkish-English marriage; English-medium education; English lessons. I use the term 'British' to refer to aspects of nationality (a British passport, a British citizen, British participants), social identity (British traits, a British accent), culture and community of socialisation (British values and norms, British social practices) and institution and state (the British workforce, the British system). While I follow this differentiation throughout this thesis, the participants use the terms 'English' and 'British' interchangeably when talking about nation (which I believe is also an indicator of the complexity involved in national or social nominalisation). Therefore, if referring to a participant's utterance that uses the term 'English' where I would use the term 'British', I present the term in quotation marks to indicate I am portraying the verbatim utterance of the participant.

While managing to define a label for the type of families I was investigating, as I started the process of data analysis, it became apparent that I was dealing with the perspectives of individuals and not families as such. This moved my focus away from that of the family to looking at each individual's story. My focus therefore shifted from investigating bilingual families to investigating individuals who are members of bilingual families. I therefore refer to members of bilingual families throughout this thesis, but ask the reader to keep in mind that every participant comes from a different family composition which may encompass a number of languages, cultures and nationalities.

1.5 The Research Context
The Positioning of English

I believe it is of great importance that English is one of the languages used by the participants in this study due to its current positioning as a world language. Current research and thinking is focusing on the effects of the wide spread of English across the globe, and the power that English holds. Pennycook (2001) believes there are issues inherent in the global, symbolic capital of English, the effects of how the linguistic centre of native-speakers is viewed, the power of these native-speaker centres and the control they have over language

standards through internationally recognised exams, and the attraction of learning English as a gateway to social and economic capital. Phillipson (1992) observing the current spread of English warns that the predominance and hegemony of the English language is colonialisation by another name; that is 'linguistic imperialism' reflecting that global developments create an even greater demand for English in a vicious circle.

> 'The global language can be seen to open doors, which fuels a "demand" for English. This demand reflects contemporary power balances and the hope that mastery of English will lead to the prosperity and glamorous hedonism that the privileged in this world have access to and that is projected in Hollywood films, MTV videos, and ads for transnational corporations' (Phillipson, 1992: 2).

Holliday, too, sees English as related to its historical background, and describes the symbolic power it currently holds. Drawing on Hall, he says:

> 'Hall (1991: 20) makes the point that even though globalisation is changing its position, "at a certain moment in history" the cultural identity of the English has been built around their "position as a leading commercial world power" to the extent that they feel "they can command, within their own discourses, the discourse of almost everybody else" within 'an all-encompassing "English eye". This is consonant with the long-standing Centre-Western narratives of chauvinism... which drives the particular imaginations of Self and Other which feed the underlying universal cultural processes of how people see each other' (Holliday, 2011: 134).

English, therefore, is seen to hold symbolic power due its historical background, 'which presents itself as the voice which can command other discourses' (Holliday, 2011: 134). The linguistic centre of this power is kept under the control of native speakers through internationally recognised exams with symbolic capital only being attached to certain types of English (Pennycook, 2001). This process is perpetuated by every new individual's desire to learn these specific types of English so that they too can gain from its symbolic power and the privilege it brings (Phillipson, ibid). However, paradoxically, this process may in fact enable these non-English speakers who are learning English to challenge the hegemony and power that monolingual English speakers currently hold.

In Turkey, even though English does not have a 'special role' (Crystal, 1997) and is not used in any official capacity, it does play an unofficial role in the private sector. Increased tourism and foreign investment over the last 20 years have amplified the demand for English and knowledge of English is seen as economic capital for its speakers. This is reflected in the media. There are many English-language satellite TV channels in Turkey which do not dub over English but provide subtitles. The same is true for films at the cinema. English in the media is highly esteemed and regularly watched and, in this way, American (and some British) culture diffuses into Turkish homes through channels such as Fox, CNN and BBC. Turkish parents

believe that if they want their children to succeed, they need them to acquire a high standard of English, a situation which is evidenced by the school system. In schools, English lessons are mandatory for pupils from the age of 11, but most private schools start from the age of six or during kindergarten. Anatolian high schools (part private, part state-funded, requiring candidates to pass an entry exam) are widely available where the medium for core subjects is English. The same situation exists for private schools with core, curriculum subjects being taught in English from grade six. English-medium university programmes have also been the norm for some time (Mango, 2004). These factors have increased the importance of English in an otherwise monolingual society[2], and would seem to be the driving forces behind so many parents in Turkey wishing their children to be fluent English speakers.

Unfortunately, a lack of English may lead to social inequalities with those not able to afford private education or who do not have time or access to English language tuition being marginalised (Tollefson, 1995), and I believe there is evidence of this in Turkey. Through acquisition of English has emerged a 'linguistic class' that is competent in the language, being able to think and work with ease in English, and therefore manipulate it to their own advantage. For this reason, Pennycook describes English as a 'gatekeeper' to 'positions of wealth and prestige both within and between nations, and is the language through which much of the unequal distribution of wealth, resources and knowledge operates' (Pennycook, 1995: 54). While there is the possibility English may add to the creation of a 'linguistic elite', it seems realistic to assume that people will continue to learn English knowing it will provide them with opportunities for themselves and their children. This situation has led to a raised profile of English in Turkey, especially of American English in the media and American, British, Canadian and Australian English through exams such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and IELTS (International English Language Testing System). These types of English are therefore popular in Turkey due to the social and economic capital linked to them. This means native-speaker teachers are in great demand. These current market conditions in Turkey are advantageous to the British participants in this study, all of whom were or are working as English teachers and who benefit from full or partial scholarships for their children at the private schools in which they work which they would not be able to afford otherwise.

1.6 The Research Questions

---

[2] While I have described Turkey as a monolingual society with Turkish being the official language, Kurdish, Dimli (or Zaza), Azeri, Kabardian, Arabic, Armenian and Greek are also spoken to some extent.

Based on the rationale described earlier in the chapter and my final choice of research participants and location, the research questions for this study evolved as follows.

As my primary focus, I pose the questions:

1. What do participants in bilingual families say about language use in their families?

2. What are the issues that arise and what are participants saying about these issues?

I use these questions as a medium through which I investigate the complexity of language use of individuals in bilingual families and how these individuals try to make sense of themselves over time and in place within this complex web.

1.7 Why this Research is Important

I believe this research into language use by individuals in bilingual families is important because concepts of what it means to be a citizen in today's globalised world are currently being challenged. Eriksen describes our current period in history as suffering from a 'crisis of identity'; a situation he believes has arisen through the processes of globalisation which may have eroded communities' and individuals' sense of identity in comparison to previous norms leading to feelings of uncertainty. He believes this uncertainty may have motivated some movements to increase the strength of their sense of local identity against the perceived threat of the loss of local uniqueness, leading them to pull back to more traditional images of national, religous or linguistic identity (1999). This means that increasing numbers of individuals may now find that how they perceive themselves linguistically and nationally may not conflate with how others perceive them. Individuals may also find tensions arise between themselves and their partners as language use and family practices are negotiated within their relationships. I believe these factors are relevant not only to individuals in bilingual families, but to any individual migrating out of their home country, or to any individual who finds themselves in a situation whereby their own perception of their linguistic and national identity may be in conflict with the expectations of the local community.

I therefore hope my research will contribute to our understanding of bilingualism within diverse family contexts.

1.8 Summary and Structure of the Study

I now provide a succinct summary of the location, timing, subjects and methods of this study. I then give an outline of the structure for the study.

This research took place in the urban, cosmopolitan setting of Istanbul, Turkey. The time span for formal data collection was one year, commencing in 2007 and finishing in 2008, although I continued to collect stories in my personal and professional life until 2012. Data was collected via interviews and incidents and observations recorded in my research diary. First, I collected interview data from nine participants (five British mothers, two British fathers and two Turkish mothers) and two periphery participants. Participants are or were in Turkish-English marriages and in each case the English spouse works as an English-medium teacher, reflecting how common these bilingual relationships are in the teaching world in which I work. The peripheral interviews were conducted with a female, born and raised in London by Turkish parents before moving to Turkey as an adult, and a Turkish-national female, raised with English and Turkish languages in the international community in the Middle East. Further data was also collected through email communication (recorded in my research diary) and informal meetings from 2008 until writing.

Throughout this investigation, my role was participatory and I use my own thoughts as researcher-as-respondent, drawing on observations from my professional and personal life which I recorded in my research diary. All the interviews were transcribed, coded and sorted according to theme, and observations and critical incidents recorded in my research diary were also interpreted according to themes. These either extended themes arising from the interview data or proved significant in developing new themes.

This study is divided into twelve chapters. In this first chapter, I have introduced the topic of this thesis, background, catalysts and key issues that led to the current focus. I have also defined my participants before presenting research questions and giving justifications for my research. Chapters two, three and four present a literature review based on current discussions about language, identity and culture; these have been separated into three chapters for ease of writing and reading, however, I do not see these as separate entities but inter-connected phenomena. Chapter five introduces the conceptual framework including a critique of the research methodology; this is followed by a detailed account of the investigation. Chapter six presents a description of participants to lay the stage for the rest of the thesis. Chapters seven, eight and nine present the themes identified in the analysis of the data. These chapters focus on different factors involved in the lives of individuals in bilingual families with regard to how individuals understand their language use, how countries have

shaped aspects of individuals' identities, and how participants perceive the cultural and linguistic practices within their families. These chapters are followed by an additional literature review chapter that discusses areas of interest that arose from the data. Chapter eleven presents a discussion on bilingual identities including what I discovered about people's conceptualisation about their bilingualism, and what my research says about identity, perceptions of nationalism and relations within the family. I also summarise key ideas and themes and discuss the broader implications of how bilingual families may be challenging traditional identities within societies. Finally, in chapter twelve, I present my concluding thoughts as a participant researcher, presenting my reaction to the findings describing how my expectations have been met and challenged and presenting ideas for future work.

CHAPTER TWO

LANGUAGE AND POWER

In order to provide a background to the main themes of this thesis, themes that arose related to individuals' languages, I now provide a discussion of what has emerged from my reading of the literature. While my initial reading took me in many directions, what is presented in the following three chapters represents the threads I believe are the most pertinent to the participants in my study. In this first of the literature review chapters, I tackle the theme of language by discussing how languages are acquired, definitions and perceptions of bilingualism, and discuss the link between language, capital and power.

2.1 Theories on the Process of Language Learning

There are many theories on language learning including linguistic, behavioural, cognitive, memory processes, discourse and social theories. Linguistic-based theories of language learning are founded in a belief in genetic mechanisms and 'universal grammars' (e.g., Fodor, Bever & Garrett, 1974). Behavioral theories, such as operant conditioning are grounded in the belief that association, reinforcement, and imitation provide the most important factors in language acquisition (Skinner, 1957). Cognitive theories such as Ausubel's (1963) subsumption theory suggest that schema, structural rules, and meaning provide the conduit for language learning. Anderson (1976), Craik & Lockhart (1972), Paivio (1971, 1986) and Paivio & Begg (1981) believe memory processes form the basis for language comprehension. Hatch (1983) puts forward theories of discourse, arguing that interaction with other speakers is the critical dimension in learning language in that syntactic structures develop from conversations. For Vygotsky (1962) all cognitive processes develop from social interaction. As my investigation focuses on individuals in bilingual families, and how their language use affects their lives, my main interest in the process of langauge learning lies with social theories such as Vygotsky's (ibid).

Most research into language acquisition can be grouped into first and second language acquisition settings. Within this grouping, patterns of study become clear. Much research has been conducted into the acquisition of first language(s) with children in naturalised settings as this is considered most relevant to the field (Piaget, 1923; Bruner, 1983). Research and theory on first language learning tends to be closely connected to the development of cognition (e.g., Brown, 1973; Carroll & Freedle, 1972; Hayes, 1970). In second language acquisition, research and theory on second language learning tends to come from a number of different

perspectives, mostly conducted into adult learning. One of these perspectives is Brown's (1980) theory that an interlanguage develops due to a learner's analysis of errors made which helps the learner to create a set of rules that map their second language onto their native language. Another is that adults are considered to learn differently from children, relying on experiential learning (Kolb & Fry, 1975) and using literacy in the learning process (Sticht, 1975, 1976). Krashen's theories (1981) differentiate between language learning and language acquisition. He believes language learning involves the metacognition of language and conscious monitoring of language use, while acquisition involves understanding and communication. For Krashen, acquisition is more critical than learning in acquiring a language, meaning he encourages activities that involve communication as opposed to grammar or vocabulary practice. Krashen's theories seem most relevant to the majority of my participants who acquired their second language in a naturalised setting through interaction with the host community.

Another area of investigation in second language learning involves the significance of learner variables including factors such as ability (Guilford, 1967; Sternberg, 1977; Gardner, 1993), cognitive styles (Oxford, Holloway & Horton-Murillo, 1992), learning strategies (e.g., Wenden & Rubin, 1987; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) and motivation (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Hudson, 2000; Gardner, 2001). However, I question theories on motivation later in this thesis, providing evidence from the data that factors other than motivation may encourage individuals to decide to learn, or not learn, a language.

2.2 Defining Bilingualism

The concept of bilingualism is a key theme in this study. However, bilingualism is not easily bounded or defined. In this section, therefore, I present a discussion about what the term bilingualism has come to represent.

In layman's terms, bilingualism is often described as the ability to speak two languages perfectly; however, very few bilinguals profess being able to use both languages equally for similar tasks. This is the stance generally accepted by linguists today who argue that bilingualism should not be viewed as double monolingualism; instead it should be viewed and studied as a separate system (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Romaine, 1989; Hoffman, 1991).

In the literature, definitions of bilingualism have been based on many factors including: characteristics of use (Mackey , 1970; Grosjean, 2010); ability to communicate to varying degrees (Haugen, 1953; Mackey, 1962; Weinreich, 1968; Crystal, 1987); inclusive of

creation and maintenance (Hakuta, 1986; Grosjean, 2010); inclusive of elements of cultural understanding (Beardsmore, 1986; Hakuta, 1986); and characterised by when in an individual's life languages are acquired.

Despite all these linguists' attempts at categorisation, Harding and Riley (1986: 27) point out that:

> 'It is almost impossible to compare an individual's abilities in two, different languages because we are not measuring the same things, (and that this) is central to all discussion of bilingualism... (this) also explains why so many different definitions of bilingualism exist and why, though each may be a valid statement about one type of bilingualism, none is satisfactory or exhaustive'.

Harding and Riley, therefore, believe that the plethora of different types and situations for bilingualism defies direct comparison and definition. This is something Saunders, too, expresses, avoiding the pitfalls of bounded categorisation, coming up instead with the idea of a continuum that encompasses a range of bilingual communicative abilities.

> 'Bilinguals can be ranged along a continuum from the rare equilingual who is indistinguishable from a native speaker in both languages at one end to the person who has just begun to acquire a second language at the other end. They are all bilinguals, but possessing different degrees of bilingualism.' (Saunders, 1982:9)

Saunders' (ibid) description, therefore, encompasses a range of abilities from inaccurate but communicative individuals who acquired the second language in adulthood to individuals raised with two languages from birth. His definition is inclusive of every language learner and language speaker.

As I read the literature on bilingualism, I realised 'bilingualism' and 'multilingualism' are often used interchangeably. I decided to use the terms 'bilingual' and 'bilingualism' as opposed to 'multilingual' and 'multilingualism' to describe participants in this study for the following reasons. Baker, having initially introduced 'bilingual' and 'multilingual' resorts to solely using 'bilingual' to describe speakers of two or more languages (2007: xvi-xvii). This may be because his book focuses mainly on families in two-language bilingual situations i.e. those of immigrant families speaking a minority language at home with a second language being used in the community. It seems 'bilingual' sits more comfortably with Baker than 'multilingual' due to the type of families he describes, with most only dealing with two languages in their lives, although he does use it as an umbrella term to describe speakers of three or more languages. Cruz-Ferreira (2010: 2) uses 'multilingual' to describe speakers of two or more languages:

'Multilinguals are people who use more than one language in their everyday lives. I make no distinction between bilinguals, trilinguals, quadrilinguals, pentalinguals, and so on'.

Adding to the debate, Grosjean (2010: 4) says:

'Bilinguals are those who use two or more languages in their everyday lives.'

His definition covers speakers of three or more languages, much as Cruz-Ferreira used 'multilinguals'. Grosjean's definition emphasizes regular use of languages over fluency, along the same lines as Cruz-Ferreira's. He describes why he chooses the term 'bilingual' over 'multilingual':

'Two reasons come to mind. The first is that some people are "only" bilingual (they know and use two languages) and it seems odd to use the term "multilingual" when describing them. The second is that the word "multilingual" is used less than "bilingual" in reference to individuals. There is a long tradition in the field of extending the notion of bilingualism to those who use two or more languages on a regular basis' (ibid).

Like Grosjean and, I suspect, Baker I find 'multilingual' does not sit comfortably when describing people who speak "only" two languages. I do not describe myself as multilingual, and it is not a term most of the participants used either. My focus is on the investigation into what it means to be an individual in a bilingual (Turkish-English) marriage; additional languages came up on the periphery, not at the centre. For this reason, I decided to follow Grosjean's (ibid) decision to use 'bilingual' and 'bilingualism' for speakers of two or more languages, referring to regular use of those languages every day despite differing levels of fluency, literacy and competence.

2.3 Perceptions of Bilingualism

My research into perceptions of bilingualism enlightened me on how the outcomes of research may be ideologically driven. Historically, it appears bilingualism has been viewed with suspicion by monolinguals believing it to be a stigma, an indication of low IQ, linked to poor, uneducated immigrants or indicative of separatist tendencies, and there has been ongoing debate ever since as to the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism.

In 1915, Williams conducted research into the bilingual acquisition of Welsh/English-speaking children concluding that '…the learning of Welsh by English children within the borders of Wales in the habit forming epoch between 6 and 12 years of age is an intellectual advantage' (Williams, 1915:104). Despite the positive outcomes from this early study, a study

that took place within a native-bilingual community not an immigrant community, the majority of initial linguistic studies showed negative outcomes. These investigations mostly took place in immigrant communities and may have been intentionally geared to showcase bilingualism in a negative light – especially those conducted in the United States during the early 1900s when there was an influx of European immigrants that led to a rapid change in the profile of the US population (Bialystok, 1991). Most research at these times purported to find that bilinguals had lower IQs and deficient language and academic skills (Saer, 1923; Yoshika, 1929; Smith, 1949; Anastasi & Cordova, 1953).

Comparing the positive outcomes of William's (1915) study taking place in what could be considered a monocultural, non-migrant community, against the negative outcomes of research undertaken in immigrant communities at a time of national uncertainty as national profiles rapidly changed, I believe provides evidence that research into bilingualism may have been ideologically biased. Bialystok (1991: 1) summarises this bias as follows:

> 'Much of the early research in bilingualism was motivated by educational needs and policy but biased by particular prejudices against bilingualism (and possibly against immigrants in general). About thirty years ago, for example, the general wisdom held that bilingualism was a disorder that could be corrected through ruthless instruction in a standard majority language, pushing out of the inflicted child all traces of the invading language. This remedy was imposed despite the fact that the unwanted language was often the language of the child's home, heritage and tradition'.

Bialystok's comments reaffirmed my suspicion that initial studies may have been instilled in cultural chauvinism with negative outcomes being attached to poor immigrant communities and positive effects being linked to middle-class communities. Most famously, Peal and Lambert (1962) investigated French-English bilingual acquisition of Canadian pupils in immersion programmes and showed bilingual children performing reliably better than monolinguals on verbal and non-verbal measures and the outcome of the tests showed bilinguals used mental manipulation and reorganisation of visual patterns rather than simple perceptual abilities. They concluded that a bilingual child is:

> '…a youngster whose wider experiences in two cultures have given him advantages which a monolingual does not enjoy. Intellectually his experience with two language systems seems to have left him with a mental flexibility, a superiority in concept formation, a more diversified set of mental abilities' (Peal & Lambert, 1962: 20).

Peal and Lambert's research in Canada was conducted in a bilingual context where both languages are recognised and used by state, creating parity for investigating bilingualism outside the realms of the marginal. It is, therefore, not surprising their results came out in a positive light. By now, bilingualism was starting to be seen as positive with the identity of the

'sophisticated bilingual' emerging (Creese *et al,* 2006: 23-43), with individuals able to switch language or linguistic variety to suit a variety of circumstances. Following in the same vein as Peal and Lambert's (ibid) research, Segalowitz (1977) concluded that a bilingual's verbal and cultural background is likely to be richer due to bilingualism as bilinguals are exposed to an earlier occurrence of certain experiences critical to intellectual development, Hakuta & Garcia (1989) described bilingual children showing higher levels of achievement than monolinguals, and Romaine (1989) described bilingual children having increased cognitive flexibility as they develop an earlier awareness of the arbitrariness of language labels than monolingual children leading to an increased metalinguistic awareness. This theory had previously been put forward by Leopold (1939) while studying his daughter and was later followed up by Cromdal (1999) and Bialystok (2007). Other studies with positive outcomes concluded that bilinguals can handle tasks involving multiple variables more easily than monolinguals, can cope with ambiguity better than monolinguals, are more cognitively flexible, and have better communication skills (August & Hakuta, 1997). In addition, Goetz (2003) and Kovács (2008) believe bilingual children are able to take into account someone else's needs, beliefs and intentions better than monolingual children.

Research into the middle class, bilingual population of Canada (Peal & Lambert, 1962) and the studies that followed (Segalowitz, 1977; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989; Romaine, 1989; August & Hakuta, 1997; Cromdal, 1999; Goetz, 2003; Bialystok, 2007; Kovács, 2008), involved a move away from studies on bilingualism in immigrant communities into a broader field, one in which bilingualism was celebrated instead of looked down upon.

2.4 Language, Capital and Power

The discussion of perceptions of bilingualism reinforced my belief that previous research was biased. Bilingualism, when investigated in poor, immigrant communities was concluded to produce mentally and linguistically deficient individuals. However, when conducted in bilingual countries, such as Wales or Canada and in middle-class communities positive outcomes led to conclusions that bilinguals are mentally superior. I suggest that these vastly differing outcomes may have more to do with the status, capital and power linked to those languages and nations than with the state of bilingualism itself. I believe the outcomes of these investigations may provide evidence that languages on a global scale do not hold equal value and that some hold more power than others; ideas which are present in Pierre Bourdieu's social theories on capital. Based on this belief, in this section, I present Bourdieu's

theories to provide a backdrop for later discussion when I look at how the relative value of each participant's language and national background are perceived.

Bourdieu describes capital as taking three fundamental guises: economic, social and cultural. He believes cultural capital:

> 'in its objectified state presents itself with all the appearances of an autonomous, coherent universe which, although the produce of historical action has its own laws, transcending individual wills, and which, as the example of language well illustrates, therefore remains irreducible to that which each agent, or even the aggregate of the agents, can appropriate (i.e., to the cultural capital embodied in each agent or even in the aggregate of the agents). However, it should not be forgotten that it exists as symbolically and materially active, effective capital only insofar as it is appropriated by agents and implemented and invested as a weapon and a stake in the struggles which go on in the fields of cultural production (the artistic field, the scientific field, etc.) and, beyond them, in which the agents wield strengths and obtain profits proportionate to their mastery of this objectified capital, and therefore to the extent of their embodied capital' (Bourdieu, 1982: 50).

Bourdieu identifies language as a form of capital; something he refers to as linguistic capital. He (1978) outlines his theories on language and capital with a simple formula:

Linguistic *habitus* + linguistic market = linguistic expression, speech

Bourdieu describes each aspect of this formula as follows:

He describes *habitus* as referring to an individual's history, belonging to a genetic mode of thought, a form of capital, but a capital that is innate as it is embodied in the individual (Bourdieu, 1986: 241-258).

Linguistic habitus is the product of social conditions and is a production of utterances adapted to a situation, market or field. Bourdieu reminds us that by referring to the situation, we are looking at the logic of the execution of speech, something that cannot be ascertained simply through competence and knowledge of the language (1978: 79).

Linguistic acceptability requires more than knowing how to speak a language correctly, it also involves understanding the rules of the situation in which you are speaking, levels of formality, and expectations of the interlocutors; in other words, the *linguistic market* (Bourdieu, 1978: 79).

The *linguistic market* takes place 'whenever someone produces an utterance for receivers capable of assessing it, evaluating it and setting a price on it' (Bourdieu, 1978: 79). However, language and the linguistic market change with the times, and speakers need to change too to

get the most from that market. In this way, Bourdieu describes the linguistic market as being 'something that is both very concrete and very abstract' (ibid). At a concrete level, in certain social situations we can take for granted official expectations or social rituals, with a specific group of speakers, knowing where we stand in the social hierarchy. Some of these factors we may be consciously aware of, others only subconsciously; however, all define how we speak in the situation and how well we do so determines how much we get out of our interaction.

As Bourdieu sums up, 'the value of a given competence depends on the particular market in which it is implemented and, more precisely, on the state of the relationships within which the values set on the linguistic products of the various producers are defined' (Bourdieu, 1978: 80). For these reasons, Bourdieu calls for us to replace Chomsky's notion of 'competence' with his notion of 'linguistic capital' which encompasses the linguistic profits that certain speakers can attain.

Following this theory, while linguists look at how well communicative function takes place during speech as being the primary function of language, Bourdieu believes this does not take into consideration aspects of 'linguistic power' where there may be speech without communication. He describes the 'voice of authority' where the authorized speaker has:

> 'so much authority, has the institution, the laws of the market and the whole social space so much on his side, that he can speak and yet say nothing' (1978: 80).

He also describes linguistic capital as having the power to decide how value is attached to language and how one can use this to his own advantage to gain value.

> 'Every act of interaction, every linguistic communication, even between two people, two friends, boy and girl, all linguistic interactions, are in a sense micro-markets which always remain dominated by the overall structures' (Bourdieu, 1978: 80).

He believes linguistic capital can only exist within certain markets, markets which involve power relations and 'laws of price formation' which mean each linguistic producer is not in an equal position.

> 'These relations between two persons are always dominated by the objective relationship between the corresponding languages, that is to say, the relationship between the groups speaking those languages' (Bourdieu, 1978: 83).

Taking Bourdieu's (1978: 79) accounts of power into consideration, Pavlenko (2001) believes languages hold 'symbolic power', as the speaker can convert linguistic skills into economic and social capital providing access to employment, promotion, mobility within social circles and further education. She also believes this view of language as symbolic capital is significant as it connects the individual to the social and traces the process by which particular varieties of

language and their practices become instilled with values or are devalued in the linguistic market. Language as a resource, therefore, may be seen as a combination of cultural capital which in turn can be converted into economic and social capital and this can be used to build relationships of power between people in institutions or the community, thereby giving the speaker access to resources within that community.

Based on this thinking, in bilingual marriages, where two languages come together in one family, lies the possibility that each partner's language may not be seen as equal by the surrounding community, or even the spouses in the relationship. It may be possible that one language is afforded a dominant position and this creates a situation whereby linguistic power relations come into play. Bourdieu's theory is also drawn upon by other linguists (Norton, 2000a, 2000b), Pennycook (2001) and Shi (2006) who have used Bourdieu's theoretical framework on linguistic capital to explain relationships between language and power.

As well as economic capital, social capital is also a desired gain for individuals. Bourdieu (1982) describes social capital as being the aggregate of the actual or potential resources within a network of relationships, for example, a community; the community providing a multiplier effect on what the individual holds. He describes each member of the group acting as a custodian to the group boundaries, defending and protecting their aggregate resources. This group defines:

> 'the limits beyond which the constitutive exchange – trade, commensality, or marriage – cannot take place. Each member of the group is thus instituted as custodian of the limits of the group: because the definition of the criteria of entry is at stake on each new entry, he can modify the group by modifying the limits of legitimate exchange through some form or misalliance' (Bourdieu, 1982: 52).

To enter this group, one must fit the group criteria; a criteria which is fiercely defended as each new entry may modify existing limits on entry and by introducing new members into the family or extended community, the definition of the group and its boundaries are put at stake as they are continually redefined. Bourdieu (ibid) believes this is why decisions on marriage may become the business of the whole network. The social capital that accrues from marriage to someone endowed with social capital, with a great name, nationality or culture is sought after as this increases the capital of the person who becomes attached to it. The position of custodian arises within each group, and forms of delegation take place where one representative speaks for the rest of the group, protecting the group's interests. Bourdieu (1982: 53) believes this happens at the level of nation, party, association and family. The representative's role is:

> 'to represent the group, to speak and act in its name and so, with the aid of this collectively owned capital, to exercise a power incommensurate with the agent's personal contribution. Thus, at the most elementary degree of institutionalization, the head of the family, the *pater familias,* the eldest most senior member, is tacitly recognized as the only person entitled to speak on behalf of the family group in all official circumstances... the institutionalized delegation... also has the effect of limiting the consequences of individual lapses by explicitly delimiting responsibilities and authorizing the recognized spokesman to shield the group as a whole from discredit by expelling or excommunicating the embarrassing individuals' (Bourdieu, 1982: 53).

I see Bourdieu's theories on 'custodians of capital' also arising in Piller's (2001) discussion regarding the attitudes of others towards cross-national marriage. Piller believes that while formal restrictions regarding marriage placed on women within post-industrial Western nations have been removed due to increased secularisation in politics and the rise of women's rights that informal restrictions continue to prevail. She quotes Breger and Hill on this:

> 'Just because there may no longer be any legal barriers to spouse choice does not mean to say informal barriers are not effective, such as negative discourses on foreigners which may influence not only how the local community reacts to the marriage..., but also may influence officials who have discretion in granting visas and entry permits... (Breger & Hill, 1998: 18)

Cross-national marriages are one example when individuals marry outside their group and, unless both individuals' nations have parity of power and status, issues may arise as group members attempt to defend group resources by blocking entry to the group to the outsider.

In summary, based on these theories, it would seem the amount of economic, social and cultural capital that an individual embodies may depend on which nation one is derived from and which language one speaks. This capital can then be used as a system of exchange within social relations. Embodied individual worth may also depend on the capital they possess within a particular field. If an individual finds themselves in a field where their capital is in demand, they are provided with not only power, agency and choice, but also have the authority to voice what should be considered authentic capital and what should be valued within that cultural field (Moore, 2009: 42). The language an individual speaks and the authority given in the linguistic market, therefore, may affect how that individual's value is perceived and may affect to what extent they are welcomed or barred from a group by the protectors of group boundaries.

2.5 Social Discourse Practices

Having discussed how languages may have economic and symbolic value attributed to them which affect how we perceive them, I now discuss additional aspects which may be embodied within language and discourse which may affect how we perceive others.

How we see the world and present ourselves are dependent on our collective history; a process which is constructed and sustained through our socialisation. Discourse practices are an intrinsic part of this process, which means that discourses are more than just language:

> '...they are ways of being in the world, or forms of life that integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities' (Kramsch, 2000: 61).

These discourses come together to create categories of cultural knowledge which are used to construct an image of self and others.

Current research into discourse investigates the co-constructive aspects of communication, how communication is derived from social practice and what individuals do through their discourse (Kramsch, 2000; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). This involves analysing how individuals create concepts of themselves and others and how this is used to create categories in their communication with others, especially cultural categories. There are two main approaches to cultural discourse studies; one that sees social structures and power relations as leading to discourse, and another that sees discourse leading to power relations.

Critical Discourse Analysis - Fairclough

The first approach proposed by Fairclough (1992), originally named the 'critical socially-textually orientated approach' is now more commonly known as 'critical discourse analysis'. The theorists that developed the theory of critical discourse analysis were influenced by the work of Michel Foucault and also by Marxist and Neo-Marxist linguists (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Wodak *et al*, 1999). In critical discourse analysis, discourse is perceived as being social practice which is determined by social structures (Fairclough, 2001). This means that discourse is seen as being text, and both social and discursive practice; in other words, it encompasses the entire process of social interaction (Fairclough, 1992). In order to interpret discourse in critical discourse analysis, interplay takes place between text and people's knowledge of language, representations of the worlds they inhabit, and their values and beliefs. Interpretation, therefore, is determined by the social, institutional and situational context in which the discourse occurs, which in turn is shaped by the context such as the social

institutions in which they take place, and this in turn is shaped by society as a whole (Fairclough, 2001). Fairclough also highlights the dialectical relationship between discourse and social structures whereby social structures both determine and are a product of discourse; therefore there is a relationship between language and linguistic features and dominant ideologies and political forces. This means that macro-factors influence the micro-factors and these in turn recreate the macro-factors (Kress, 1990; Fairclough, 1996, 2003; Gee, 1999; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; van Dijk, 2008).

In critical discourse analysis, discourse is primarily believed to be determined by social structures which are networks of conventions associated with certain social institutions which are in turn determined by ideologies which are determined by relationships of power in broader society (Fairclough, 2001). Reproduction of these structures due to discourse is considered to be secondary. How these structures are reproduced through discourse depends on the specific historical, political and economic setting in which the discourse is generated. Critical discourse analysis therefore acknowledges pressures 'from above' leading to possible opposition to unequal power relations which are presented to societies as social norms (Bamberg, 1997; Scollon & Scollon, 1997; van Lagenhove & Harré, 1999).

Taking these factors into consideration, one of the main aims of critical discourse analysis is to reveal hidden elements of power in discourse and to expose inequalities. Fairclough (1992) believes that discourse as language use is embedded in existing power relations whereby language is a conduit for political and ideological practice in creating, and continuing existing power relations. However, this also means that language can be used as a tool to change existing power relations. While discourse is determined by the social structures in which it takes place, it is also determined by the ideologies inherent in these power relations on a broader scale (Fairclough, 2001).

Fairclough builds his discourse theories on a foundation of Marxist social class theory where it is considered that the relationship between social classes is established in economic production and it is this structure that determines where all members of a society are positioned. The dominant class is the class that controls production of resources whereby it can also control economic and political power which in turn means it controls the ideology presented to the people. In other words, it decides what should be considered right or wrong or normal, taken-for-granted thinking. This means that those who are not in possession of the means of production are under the economic, political and ideological power of those that do. They follow this path either through threat of negative consequences, through coercion or through the dominant class gaining their consent. Through any of these routes, the dominant

class keeps control of the power and the discourse and perpetuates the ideologies that they have created within it. In this way, through the ownership of discourse, the dominant class has a powerful mechanism for maintaining power. This does not happen without a site of struggle. In this struggle for social supremacy, multiple discourses battle for the position of power and it is this battle that ultimately leads to social change.

Fairclough's view is based on Marxist, social class theory which has structuralist tendencies. Economic class relations are seen to be the primary factors in class struggle and therefore the driving force in the perpetuation of ideology through discourse. However, there are many more discourses interacting within a society than simply that of the economic ruling power; counter-discourses are always at play. Taking these multiple and counter discourses into consideration and approaching discourse through the lens of poststructuralism, Foucault instead puts forward the Power/Knowledge model.

Power/Knowledge Theories - Foucault

Influenced by Marxism, postmodernism and poststructuralism, Foucault put forward the Power/Knowledge model which takes a more socially-oriented approach to discourse than Fairclough's. Foucault believes power and knowledge are mutually dependent; one cannot work without the other. In this way, he believes discourse is the epithet of knowledge; without knowledge, there is no power and, indeed, knowledge itself creates power (Foucault, 1980). Foucault perceives discourse to be one of the constitutive and constructive forces of this Power/Knowledge model, influencing human subjectivity and identity, and social practices. By viewing discourse in this way, Foucault argues against traditional Marxist theories of power which see the ruling class, the owners of the means of resources, to be the oppressors of the dominated class in a capitalist society. Instead, discourse to Foucault is multiple, networking, supporting and in contestation every second an interaction takes place. This means it leads to possible forms of behaviour as opposed to restricting the freedom of individuals (Foucault, 1978). In this way, Foucault's thinking moves away from the previously deterministic thought of Marxism rooted in unequal power relations that work from the top down based on economic factors; a system in which only the dominant ruling class are considered owners of the truth and correct practice. In Foucault's view, discourse is everywhere and the relationships between discourses are constantly contested and renegotiated. This means that discourses don't just exist, but shift and fragment, and new discourses can emerge; agency is present and truth and correct practice can be plural. As Foucault describes it:

'...discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it.' (Foucault, 1979: 101)

Foucault sees discourse, therefore, as contradictory; power is in discourse and resistance is in discourse. In fact, contradictory discourses may even exist within a single person or strategy (1978). Based on this, postmodern discourse analysis recognises there may be a variety of discourses working within a text, some of which may be contradictory or open to a variety of interpretations; this means individuals can use these texts for different uses (Bamberg, 1997; Scollon & Scollon, 1997; van Lagenhove & Harré, 1999; Mills, 2000). This also means postmodern discourse analysts are interested in what it is that individuals do with their discursive practices.

Language as a Class Indicator

While Fairclough presents a neo-Marxist view of discourse, whereby the power of discourse is believed to be dependent on the dominant class being in possession of the means of production and therefore economic resources, in today's global world, it seems to me that the English language has become both an economic resource as well as being a conduit for discourse. Globalisation and the spread of a global *lingua franca* has led to discourse itself, particularly in the case of English, becoming a product with economic value more than has ever been the case before with a language. The dominant class may now be the English speakers, the linguistic elite class, with the core, native-speaker countries retaining the essence of this discourse through the global marketing of English language teaching books, resources, schools and exams such as IELTS and TOEFL. English is big business, both economically and ideologically, and native-English-speaker countries currently hold control of this resource, although how long they will be able to maintain this control remains to be seen as counter-discourses are now emerging which are questioning the West's current ownership of English. I believe part of the class struggle that is taking place now in many countries is the struggle for individuals to acquire English to join this elite linguistic class, to gain from the symbolic and economic capital that they believe English will bring them. However, while obtaining English as a class indicator, I believe it is possible an individual may also be obtaining the ideological discourse contained within it, thereby furthering or perpetuating the ideology of the core, native-speaker class of speakers and countries. The spread of English, therefore, may be more than the spread of a language; it may also be the spread of the ideologies

inherent in the power bases within that language. While, following Fairclough's model, this may be considered a possible outcome of the spread of English. However, following Foucault, I do not believe this happens in its entirety – I believe counter-discourses are also at play. As Foucault says, 'discourse transits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines... it' (1979: 101). I believe, therefore, that while ideologies may travel as English is spread around the globe, each individual also has the agency to use their own voice counter to these ideologies.

2.6 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have investigated literature related to language and brought ideas together to help me understand key data from participants' stories about language use in their families. These ideas include Bourdieu's (1982) theories of language, capital and power whereby certain languages are seen to hold more capital and value than others, and Foucault's (1978, 1979) Power/Knowledge theory on social discourse that sees power, knowledge and ideology as being an inherent part of discourse both intra-nationally and internationally while also involving complex counter-discourses. Following Foucault, I approach discourse in this thesis as a vehicle for power and identity, which shapes social practice, structures how we perceive reality, and which contains texts which embody relations of power (Foucault, 1972, 1988).

In the next chapter, I look at aspects of identity such as nationality, class and gender, discuss social learning theories, outline ideas on agency and subjectivity and present theories on identity in a globalised world.

CHAPTER THREE

IDENTITY AND POWER

This chapter looks at research into identity in order to bring together ideas which will help me better understand key data from the interviews during which participants describe their identities and how they believe their identities have stayed the same or changed during their bilingual marriages.

I start this chapter with a discussion of theories in identity from structural to poststructural to place my investigation within current thought. Next, I investigate research on specific factors of identity - nationality, gender and class. After this, I look at 'social learning theory' and 'communities of practice' with regard to theories on how socialisation takes place. I then present ideas on how language, power and agency may play a role in an individual's identity and how much choice an individual may have in the process of socialisation when acquiring a new language and moving to a country in which that language is spoken by the host community. Finally, I present current thought on the role of identity in a globalised world.

3.1 Identity in a Postmodern World

Structuralism

Theories on identity were originally developed by psychologists, such as Erikson (1968) investigating how a person's state can change over time depending on changes in their environment. Theories on identity at this time followed structuralist views meaning identity was considered relatively stable, shifting only at changing stages an individual's life such as childhood, teen years, adulthood, and old age. Aspects such as age, gender, nationality and race were considered set. Following these initial ideas came social-psychological concepts of social identity led by Tajfel who described identity as:

> 'that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership' (1974: 69).

From these early stages, the concept of identity started to move away from being due to changing states of the individual towards being part of group membership, such as a language group, religious group, class group or national group. Despite this shift towards consideration of the group, Tajfel was not without critics, who claimed his theories centred too much on self and not enough on interaction between self and group (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Identity,

though, was still seen as relatively stable. Tajfel's approach was followed by researchers such as Giles & Byrne (1982) who developed a theory on ethnolinguistic identity. These approaches were also criticised as they based their ideas on the framework that identity is unvarying, unchanging and that language and ethnic identity are directly correlated i.e. their work was still based on a structuralist framework. Pavlenko and Blackledge criticised these early approaches as they believed they were based on the supposition that:

> 'conceives of individuals as members of homogeneous, uniform, and bounded ethnolinguistic communities and obscures hybrid identities and complex linguistic repertoires of bi- and multilinguals living in a contemporary global world' (2004: 5).

Poststructuralism

Whereas structuralist thought viewed human and social behaviours as unchanging and bound by universal laws, the arrival of poststructuralism brought a more fluid, multifaceted view of constantly shifting and moving frameworks.

> 'The debates around (identity) today assume (it) is not an inherent quality of a person but that it arises in interaction with others and the focus is on the processes by which identity is constructed' (Sarup, 1996: 14).

From a poststructural position, Omoniyi & White present six 'common positions' that they believe are instrumental in creating identity:

> 'identity is not fixed; identity is constructed within well-known contexts and may differ between contexts; that these contexts are moderated and defined by intervening social variables and articulated through languages; that identity is a significant feature in every communicative context whether or not it is given importance; that identity informs social relationships and inform the interaction that exemplify these arrangements; that more than one identity may be expressed in a certain context in which case there will be a negotiation of the management of identities' (2006: 2).

Duff and Uchida (1997) describe this phenomenon as 'sociocultural identity', Norton (2000a) as 'social identity', Edwards (2006) as 'cultural identity' and Liang (2006) as 'group' and 'individual' identities.

Social Constructivism

With the poststructural movement arrived social constructivism. The fundamental idea of social constructivism is that the world is socially constructed by the social practices of people which, simultaneously, are experienced by them as if pre-given and fixed (Berger &

Luckmann, 1966). In this way, reality is both objective and subjective. Burr (2003) believes that social constructivism involves taking a critical approach to taken-for-granted world knowledge which includes how we see ourselves in relation to others. Burr (ibid) believes social constructivism challenges positivistic views that the world is just so and can be explained through scientific observation alone. Instead, he believes that reality is what we perceive it to be.

When observing identity, therefore, social constructivists, such as Burr, believe identity is not unitary and set, but multiple, fragmented and incoherent, which leads Hall (1996: 4) to describe identity as 'multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions'. In addition, social constructivists see identity as constructed due to the combination of theories on socialisation and discourse, with Sarup (1996) opining that institutions such as family, school, place of work and the media also play a crucial role in the determination of identity. However, Woodward (2000) reminds us that individual agency also plays a role in the social constructivist account of the construction of identity and is not solely reliant on social structures.

As well as the consequences of our past playing a role in the construction of our present identities, Sarup believes how we view our history retrospectively directly affects how we construct our present identity retroactively. In addition, Sarup (1996: 15) believes most individuals view the construction of their identity as happening from both internal sources and from outside determining forces, referring to these as our 'private identity' which is how we see ourselves and our 'pubic identity' which is how others see us. Based on this, Sarup questions the extent to which we can actually choose aspects of our identity or whether these are chosen for us. Despite this, Sarup believes that every individual still has some room to choose aspects of their own identities, retaining some agency in this construction.

3.2 National, Gendered and Class Identity

In poststructuralist thinking, even genetically determined aspects such as age (Coupland, 2001), gender (Butler, 1990; Crawford, 1995), and nationality (Wodak *et* al, 1999; Hall, 2002; Block, 2006; Web *et* al, 2010) can be challenged and reframed as socially determined. How these aspects are currently positioned in poststructural thought is described below.

National Identity

Hall (2002) believes that national identity is derived from where a person is born and through that location they are provided with their group membership, known as nationality. However, within this vast group, it is impossible for each member to know all other members. Wodak *et al* (1999) describe this as an imagined membership, despite not knowing all the members, each individual feels part of the community and constructs their national identity on this group image. However, where an individual is born, their nationality and how they act is open to interpretation in poststructural thought:

> 'identity is no longer fixed at birth and tied to one's birth place; rather, it is an ongoing project, re-created daily through actions such as flag waving and the invocation of historical events to explain present-day phenomena' (Block, 2006: 866).

By embracing a national identity, an individual may gain a sense of belonging and knowing and understanding people around them. Individuals can look around and see in others similar ways of life, of talking, behaving, thinking and interacting. National identity, therefore, has an influence on the way individuals perceive themselves. It is not static, it shifts in relation to how individuals interact with each other and share their experiences, it changes as each new generation adds new elements, removing some of the old, changing the norms, the values and the expectations as every member of the nation constantly questions and redefines the group identity.

Webb *et al* (2010: 90) believe:

> 'The idea that a group called 'us' really exists, and is made up of people who have identifiable and shared characteristics, is found in most nations, and repeated in the calls to arms of any number of politicians and social commentators around the world'.

They perceive what Bourdieu and other authors on national communities have noted is the concept of 'the nation' only exists in the stories and collective beliefs of groups of people which means we cannot understand national communities as being natural or cohesive, instead they are patched together through shared stories, discourses, beliefs and values. We should therefore not see national communities as homogenous, or even based on boundaries; they are a political entity rather than a natural or historically inevitable unit (ibid). Holliday also discusses the political entity of nationality, commenting that:

> 'Nation is often an external frame which may be in conflict with personal cultural identities' (Holliday, 2011: 66).

He observes that that nationality prescribed to an individual may not conflate with the identity they prescribe for themselves.

When describing the concept of national identity, Wodak *et al* draw on the work of Kolakowski in outlining five bounding qualities: national spirit - expressed through certain cultural forms and collective manners of behaviour; historical memory - it does not matter if the content of the memory is true or legendary as long as it is shared, the further into the past the memory lies, the more strongly national identity is supported; common anticipation and future orientation - surviving, worrying about the future, preparing for adversity, planning for future interests; national body - including national territories, nature, landscapes, and physical artefacts; a nameable beginning - legends of the origin of the nation or the founding fathers.

Gendered Identity

Traditionally, gendered identity in essentialist thought has been viewed in a static, binary light. However, contemporary research into links between language use and gender has challenged these traditional views (Tannen, 1990; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2003; Kubota, 2003; Cameron, 2005) and gender is now seen as having multiple layers and dimensions grounded in social interactions and social activities.

Postmodernists, such as Butler (1990) and Crawford (1995) view gender fluidly, believing it to be socially constructed. They do not believe gender is determined by sex, but that the performance of gender is locally constructed and occurs in specific communities of practice including family, school, friendship groups, the workplace, sports teams, and religious affiliations. They also believe that gendered identities are portrayed through our performances (Butler, 1990) and change throughout periods of our lives in various communities of practice (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 1992; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999). These performances may differ across contexts such as families, communities and societies.

Norton and Pavlenko (2004) observe individuals' gendered identities as being culturally embedded, while Ehrlich (1997) believes 'individuals construct or produce themselves as women or men by habitually engaging in social practices that are associated with culturally and community-defined notions of masculinity and femininity'. Piller (2001: 210) agrees, believing our performances also contain aspects of our personal identity such as our professional status, nationality, ethnicity, and social class and in this respect our gendered identity cannot be easily separated from our other identities. She quotes Cameron on this:

> '(It) is less about inhabiting some abstract and unitary category of "women" or "men"
> than it is about living one's other social identities (such as racial, ethnic, regional,
> subcultural) in a particular and gendered way' (Cameron, 1997: 33).

Bourdieu (1992) reminds us that social distinctions, such as gender, which seem to be based on objective differences are difficult to renounce as they seem natural and evident. However, he believes there are never absolute differences; instead attributes of gender should be distributed on a continuum from the very masculine man at one end to the very feminine woman at the other end with everyone else somewhere in between. This change is backed up by neuroscientists such as Jaeger (1998) who challenge previous concepts that understood brain functioning to follow male or female patterns.

Ochs (1992) suggests linguists should approach gender with regard to how it is constituted through acts, stances and activities which are associated with 'culturally preferred gender roles which have context-specific linguistic realizations' and believes there are differences in communicative practices used to socialise babies and children into various local images of women, in particular with mothers. Our perception of gendered-performance within our community of practice, therefore, may be socialised from birth.

This means individuals who enter a new host community may find how gender roles are viewed may differ from how they are viewed in their home culture. Pavlenko and Piller (2001) believe this leaves these individuals with a number of choices; they can attempt to acquire the language and take on the gendered expectations of the host culture, they can try to acquire the language but resist taking on the gendered role of the new society, or they may resist acquiring the new language if they find the expectations of the new gendered role unattractive. Kubota (2003) believes this individual agency allows men and women to choose which language forms and behaviours they wish to perform in social contexts, providing the possibility for transformation of normative gender ideologies socialised in the women or men by their communities of birth. Therefore, the ways in which men and women learn and use their second language is 'not determined by their gender but constructed, negotiated, and transformed through social practices informed by particular social settings, relations of power, and discourses.' (Kubota, 2003: 37)

Class Identity

Many theorists have commented on their perception of why class develops and the effects it has on behaviours. I present some of their ideas here in chronological order.

Norton (2000a) believes class identity is constructed within particular sets of social, historical and economic relationships which are reinforced and reproduced on a daily basis

through social interactions. Kubota (2003: 37), taking a poststructuralist stance, calls for social class 'not to be seen as fixed but as constructed by social practices and discourses whereby individuals attaining a certain socioeconomic status position themselves or get positioned'. Mackintosh and Mooney (2004) see the construction of people's perceptions of class, class consciousness, as being founded in the economic structure of each society. Class groups grow from shared experiences of organisation and class struggle and through the collective actions they take. Devine (2005: 140-162) describes the modern conceptualisation of class as being the 'cultural property of individuals in relation to their beliefs and behaviours', seeing a process whereby social class identities aid in forming individuals' lifestyles and cultural values, while everyday lived experiences aid in the formation of those social class identities. Collins (2006) argues for social class to be viewed as a feature of identity, seeing class as a sense of self in relation to others.

Block draws on Skeggs' (2005) work, describing how, during the 1980s, the study of social class became less popular as poststructuralist theorists began to view identity in a new light. Despite its loss of popularity, Skeggs believes there is still relevance to investigating social class, especially when understood within the framework of Bourdieu's (1977b, 1984, 1991) theories on capital. Bourdieu (1984) sees occupational class and consumption patterns as unrelated but major influences on social class identity. Connel *et al* (1982: 33) believe that class is based not on 'what people are, or even what they own, so much as what they do with their resources'; in other words social class is not just based on one's income, but on the cultural practices of what one does with that income and how that can be converted into more income. Skeggs' work (2005) also exemplifies this, believing that culture itself may be converted into a commodity and this site of exchange also includes the exchange of values. Skeggs therefore sees cultural practices as being at the centre of the formation of modern class, with culture being used as an economic resource and a key factor in how we conceptualise class in our society.

3.3 Social Theory of Learning

In this section, I present theories on how learning is understood to take place within our social worlds and how this may affect our ability to participate in these worlds.

Wenger proposes that learning takes place in the context of our lived experience of participation in the world and that it is 'fundamentally a social phenomenon, reflecting our own deeply social nature as human beings' (1998: 3). He proposes the social learning theory

which he places within a conceptual framework with the following assumptions: we are social beings and this fact is a central aspect of learning; knowledge is a matter of competence with respect to valued enterprises (e.g. being convivial, growing up as a boy or a girl); knowing is a matter of participation in the pursuit of such enterprises, of active engagement in the world; and meaning – our ability to experience the world and engagement with it as meaningful – is ultimately what learning is to produce (1998: 4). The primary focus of Wenger's theory is that learning is based on social participation which:

> 'refers not just to local events of engagement in certain activities with certain people but to a more encompassing process of being active participants in the *practices* of social communities and constructing *identities* in relation to these communities' (ibid).

Wenger believes this kind of participation 'shapes not only what we do, but also who we are and how we interpret what we do' (1998: 4).

Communities of Practice

In 1991, Lave and Wenger developed the idea of 'communities of practice' which consist of groups of people with shared interests and a desire to learn from and contribute to the community with their broad experiences. They believe these groups evolve naturally due to members' shared interests or develop specifically to gain knowledge in a certain field. As experiences and information are shared, group members learn from each other and start to develop professionally and personally (Lave & Wenger, 1991). All individuals are involved in communities of practice daily, such as homes, schools, organisations or whole cultures.

These communities of practice are considered to contain: a domain of knowledge which encourages members to participate and gives meaning to their actions; a community which promotes interaction and sharing ideas; and a practice which is a specific focus which the community develops around while sharing and maintaining its core of knowledge.

Both individuals and communities gain from communities of practice by acquiring social capital: 'a multi-dimensional concept with private and public facets' (Putnam, 2001: 41–51). This social capital is generated through informal contacts, by formally sharing expertise, by learning from others, and by group participation which leads to greater trust and involvement.

Involvement in a community of practice has an effect on an individual's identity and this takes place through a learning process. Lave and Wenger (1991) describe the relationship between social involvement and communities of practice as being essential in identity

construction as this is an encompassing process whereby individuals become active participants involved in the practices of social communities and it is this interaction that aids the construction of identities in relation to these communities which also correspond to the position of subjectivity taken up each moment, each day and throughout an individual's life in the many roles they may play.

Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Lave and Wenger's concept of communities of practice originally developed while they were trying to understand how learning takes place outside classroom environments and while observing how newcomers to a group gradually become established members through participatory progression which they call 'situated learning'. They believe newcomers are gradually accepted into a group through a process of 'legitimate peripheral participation', a process that depends on each individual's identity in time and place in the social world (Lave & Wenger, 1991: 29). Legitimate peripheral participation describes how newcomers go through a gradual process of acceptance whereby they initially observe the group, perform simple tasks in basic roles, learn how the group works and eventually identify how they can participate within that group.

However, Lave and Wenger (1991) warn that the process is not a smooth process, but fraught with conflict, negotiation and transformation, as the concept of legitimate peripherality is bound up with power relations in social structures. Instead of simply positioning oneself into the new community, a power struggle between the newcomer and the community starts which is born from the newcomer's position and identity. However, Wenger (1998) believes it takes a peripheral starting point to achieve any legitimacy and actual participation in the new community. He believes certain amounts of non-participation aid in participation. He also believes there are many ways individuals can belong to a community of practice, whether at the centre or the periphery, and this positioning can change over time.

> 'In order to be on an inbound trajectory, newcomers must be granted enough legitimacy to be treated as potential members... Granting the newcomers legitimacy is important because they are likely to come short of what the community regards as competent engagement. Only with legitimacy can all their inevitable stumbling and violations become opportunities for learning rather than cause for dismissal, neglect or exclusion' (Wenger, 1998: 100).

Block (2006: 865) also describes the process of 'legitimate peripheral participation' (based on Lave & Wenger, 1991) as individuals enter social participation where there are rules of entry; if

an individual is accepted at this point, they gain entry to the community as a legitimate peripheral participant. Block believes all participation must begin on the periphery and if legitimacy is not granted by others, or if the individual decides not to participate as a form of resistance participation may not start at all. Legitimacy is thus needed for newcomers to speak and interact confidently in their new host community, no matter how well they feel they speak the language.

3.4 Identity, Agency and Subjectivity

Agency

Burr (2003: 122) believes individuals have 'agency' in the construction of their identities as they are 'capable of critically analysing the discourses which frame their lives, and to claim or resist them according to the effects they wish to bring about'. This means individuals are created by discourses around them, but also have the capacity to use those discourses for their own purposes, choosing how to create and present themselves. Social construction and human agency, therefore, are intricately linked. Hall (2002: 36-37) believes, from a sociocultural perspective, that agency 'does not represent the motivation of the individual, but the capacity to act, and this capacity is located in the discursive spaces between each user and the conditions of the moment; it is the link between motivation and action that defines the choices of the individual'. However, drawing on Norton (1995), I believe it is the link between 'investment' and action that provide the conduit for individual choice. Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) believe agency is both historically and socially constructed, comprising part of an individual's habitus, and this leads to how people act and react in particular ways. They also believe that how interactions take place with other agents also play a part in individual agency. Relationships may be collaborative or combative, leading to the constant negotiation, construction and reconstruction of agency at the level of individual, those around them and in society at large. Lave and Wenger (1991) believe that agency may only take place within the confines of communities of practice.

Mathews (2000) believes we are not born and raised into our identities; instead we assume an identity and develop it. He likens the choice we have in the construction of our identity to a 'cultural supermarket' in which the individual may choose their identity from an array of possibilities on offer. However, Block criticises Mathews' suggestion, saying:

'the cultural supermarket is not a completely free market where any self-identity under the sun can be assumed; nor is it reality in an equal way for all the inhabitants of

this planet. In the former case, there are social structures within which individuals exist (be these state governments, peer groups, or educational systems) that constrain the amount and scope of choice available to individuals. In the latter case, there are individuals living within social structures that do not allow them to make as many choices (e.g. societies where the roles of men and women are circumscribed by tradition)' (Block, 2006: 865).

Similar to agency, the theory of subjectivity has also been put forward by some researchers.

Subjectivity

Feminist poststructural researchers Giroux (1988), Simon (1992) and Weedon (1997) have used the re-conceptualisation of identity to explore how power relations between individuals, groups and communities influence the life chances of individuals at a certain place and time and the way it links individual experience and social power, creating a theory of 'subjectivity' defined as:

> 'the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world' (Weedon, 1997: 32).

This is in opposition to previous humanist approaches, such as Krashen's (1982) that preferred a set, dichotomous approach to the characteristics of the individual. Weedon (1997) therefore presents subjectivity as signifying a different understanding of individuals than that associated with humanist conceptions which are the prevailing thought in Western philosophy. Moving from concepts of essentialist features to fluid poststructuralism, the individual is seen as dynamic and constantly changing over space and time. Thus, subjectivity should be considered as 'multiple, rather than unitary, decentred rather than centred' (Norton, 2000a: 125).

> 'Subjectivity is produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power in which the person takes up different subject positions as teacher, child, feminist, manager, critic. The subject, in turn, is not conceived of as passive; he or she is conceived of as both subject of and subject to relations of power within a particular site, community and society: the subject has human agency' (Norton, 2000a: 127).

This means the subject position an individual takes is always open to contestation during which the individual may resist attempts to reposition them or even:

> 'set up a counter-discourse which positions the person in a powerful rather than marginalised subject position' (Norton, 2000a: 127).

In this way,

> 'the concept of identity as a site of struggle is a logical extension of the position that identity is multiple and contradictory. If identity were unitary, fixed and immutable, it

could not be subject to change over time and space, nor subject to contestation' (Norton, 2000a: 127).

Sites of Struggle

Wenger (1998: 215) believes there are 'sites of struggle' in every experience of learning and that these automatically lead to a renegotiation of identity which enables one to become a certain person or to avoid becoming a certain person. Other authors who raise the issue of identity being a site of struggle include Wang (2008):

> 'Many psychologists believe a person's identity is influenced by how others perceive them, and in particular, how *they believe* others perceive them' (Wang, 2008: 179).

And Piller:

> 'There may be struggles between the identity one knows others want and other identities one wishes for oneself' (Piller, 2002).

How one presents oneself, therefore, may not always be in agreement with the expectations of others. Holliday believes factors in how people are perceived, positioned and treated are diverse and degrees of annoyance with these perceptions may be to do with how far they can be negotiated and put right, and how far the struggle to be recognized accurately is successful (2011). However, Giddens argues against individual identity being forced by diversity and fragmented, instead, believing individuals should construct:

> 'a distinctive self-identity which positively incorporates elements from different settings into an integrated narrative' (1991: 190).

3.5 Issues of Identity Choice and Socialisation when Acquiring another Language

Emulating Target Language Speakers or Retaining One's own Identity

Jenkins (2007: 197) believes the link between language and identity is just as relevant for the language learner as it is for the individual born into that language and quotes other linguists such as Donato (2000), Norton (2000a), Cook (2002) and Pavlenko (2002), that we should see language learners as primarily social beings and legitimate users of that second language. However, how much subsequent language learners desire to pass as native speakers or assimilate into their host community is currently under debate. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller describe individuals attempting to come across as native speakers as performing 'acts of identity' in an attempt to associate themselves with that group while distancing themselves from the group they do not want to be associated with (1985: 181). However, this style of

approach has been criticised by Rampton (1995) as no clear discussion of identity is provided as a foundation for thought for interactional practices. Despite these criticisms, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (ibid) work created a catalyst for investigation in this area and many other researchers started to theorise on the relationship between identity and language learning, (van Lier, 1994; Block, 1996; Lantolf, 1996).

Current research into identity construction in language learners is coming from many disciplines bringing perspectives to how we understand the interrelationship of language and identity. These include Miller (2003), Pellegrino (2005), McKay & Liang (2006), Omoniyi (2006), and Jenkins (2007). Omoniyi suggests speakers of additional languages put forward 'a cluster of identity options... (which) are... distributed on a hierarchy based on ratings from least salient to most salient' and that a speaker's choice to speak or not speak a language is important in how she portrays her identity (2006: 30). Similarly, Jenkins (2007) discusses the possibility that second language speakers may choose to affiliate to a native-speaker model, or decide not to, depending on the identity they wish to portray or the group they wish to affiliate with. Language learners from a current perspective are therefore seen holistically as people with a wide range of needs, with a complex historical construction, constantly morphing social identities, and each possessing human agency (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001). For a subsequent language learner outside their home culture, however, decisions on how identity is portrayed lie further than just with language. They must also decide how they wish to present their gendered, national and class identities.

Language Socialisation and Developing Identities in a Host Culture

Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) believe language learners have the ability to influence their own developing identities. The extent of this agency is unclear, however. There will always be an unequal distribution of power in the host culture in which the socialisation is taking place. How much each individual internalises and accepts the new cultural and behavioural norms varies greatly and each agent decides how much they wish to participate, learn from and contribute to the host culture as they start the path to acceptance, assimilation or resistance. Therefore, when individuals are participating in the linguistic and sociocultural context of their new host culture, they are constantly making choices based on their agency and evaluating the new values and beliefs they come across while trying to expand their individual agendas. They are also actively negotiating and re-establishing their own language, ideologies and plural identities. These individuals represent the identity of their choice and

construct it at the same time as they are speaking their second language (Shi, 2006). A language-learner's agency and socialisation are therefore inherently linked.

Schieffellin and Ochs (1986) describe this socialisation as the practice by which either newcomers to a community or children are socialised into language and the use of language, the values, beliefs, behaviours and practices of that community, while Watson-Gegeo and Nielsen (2003) opine that the theory of language socialisation adds to our understanding of the complex factors in language learning including cognitive, cultural, social and political factors. Researchers such as Mitchell and Myles (2004) view the process of language socialisation as encompassing a relationship between language acquisition and culture; where both are seen to be inseparable, helping to develop the other. Ochs's views (1996) also follow this line of thinking, suggesting the process of language acquisition and social and cultural acquisition aid each other and as individuals start to understand the sociocultural context through language, they also come to understand the language better through their social experiences.

Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) believe this subsequent intercultural socialisation is something that takes place as individuals move across languages, borders and cultures, with each transforming to new cultural norms with a different tempo and to differing degrees as this process unfolds. In these circumstances, individuals may find new ideologies and performances unacceptable or incompatible with their own ideologies. This leaves them with the choice of embracing the new ideology or sticking to their home ideologies. Shi even describes the situation whereby individuals may find the new ideologies 'more favourable than those in their home cultures', they may even shift how they speak and act (2006: 7).

Language, therefore plays a central role in the negotiation of identity as 'it is through language a person negotiates a sense of self within and across different sites at different points in time' (Norton Pierce, 1995: 13) and the addition of a subsequent language and taking an inbound trajectory to a new community of practice may lead to a renegotiation of identity.

3.6 Identity in a Globalised World

In this thesis, I discuss how I, and others such as Eriksen (1999), believe that how individuals view their identity and the identity of others is gradually shifting due to globalisation and the mobilistion of people. In this section, therefore, I present current thinking on what globalisation is and how it may be affecting how we conceptualise our identities.

Eriksen (1999) describes globalisation as encompassing all the 'sociocultural processes that contribute to making distance irrelevant' and believes this has economic, political, cultural and ethical influences on our lives. He believes with new opportunities that arise through globalisation there also come new vulnerabilities. One example he gives is the increase in the spread of global products which have led to increased literacy and salaried employment in countries, but at the same time created 'a set of common cultural denominators which threaten to eradicate local distinctions' (ibid). Capital and literature become disembodied from their original locations and become global property so that culture is no longer localised and clearly delineated. Eriksen believes these processes have prompted some political movements to increase the strength of their sense of local identity against the perceived threat of globalisation leading to the loss of local uniqueness. He cites examples of the anti-immigration front in France, the rise of the Taliban in Afghanistan and the rise of political Islam in north Africa. Some of these movements have had tragic consequences such as increased genocide; however, others have enabled groups to gain cultural recognition and equal rights. There are, therefore, positive and negative outcomes that come from this process.

Eriksen (1999) believes globalisation creates conditions for 'localization', where groups attempt to create bounded entities which can lead countries to nationalism or separatism. This may happen as strong emotions associated with tradition, culture or religion may be mobilised if people feel threatened. He also believes this process of localization creates issues of identity politics which lead to: competition over scarce resources; conflict as formerly discrete groups are integrated into shared economic and political systems; individuals being grouped as homogeneous; and social complexity being reduced to simple dichotomies. Through this process, Eriksen believes internal differences are 'undercommunicated in the act of delineating boundaries towards the frequently demonised Other' (Eriksen, 1999).

Other researchers who have investigated globalisation and identity include Mercer (1990), Giddens (1991), Woodward (1997) and Beck (2000) who also propose that uncertainties over identity are characteristic of current, modern societies which are part of the globalisation movement. They believe this is having a considerable effect on how identity individual and collective, is viewed whereby simple dichotomies based on nation or language are no longer possible. Due to this, Giddens and other sociologists suggest our prior conceptions of national identity, even ethnicity, should be questioned, especially in areas where the effects of globalisation are most prolific with Woodward even suggesting:

'The extent of change might mean there is a "crisis of identity" where old certainties no longer remain and social, political and economic changes both globally and locally have led to the breakdown of previously stable group membership.' (1997: 1).

Cummins is concerned this reaction means the positive consequences of a diverse society are not currently being seen by host societies who worry that linguistic, cultural, racial and religious diversity may threaten national identity. He believes if diverse languages and cultures are embraced within host societies, in a globalised era these host societies can benefit from the multilingual and multicultural resources within their midst. These resources are socially and economically advantageous in a global forum at a time when 'cross cultural contact is at an all time high in human history' (Cummins, 2001: 16). Cummins believes the way forward is:

'to shape the evolution of national identity in such a way that the rights of all citizens are respected, and the cultural, linguistic, and economic resources of the nation are maximised' (2001: 16).

In summary, identity politics, born from globalisation, may have led to the collective emotions, feeling a sense of loss and a crisis of identity which can happen in situations of rapid change. This can lead to governments and movements taking a more nationalised stance, regardless of the positive resources a more diverse population can bring.

3.7 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have investigated literature related to identity and brought together ideas which I later draw upon when I analyse my participants' stories about language use in their families and how this may affect how they create, view and perform their identities. In these collected ideas, I include poststructural concepts of identity that challenge essentialist or structuralist thought by viewing identity as multiple, fragmented and fluid. In addition, I include social constructivist ideas on identity, that propose how identity is constructed and how one is perceived by others is a complex process based on many intersecting and antagonistic discourses within the process of socialisation (Hall, 1996). I also include Lave and Wenger's (1991) theories on 'communities of practice' and 'legitimate peripheral participation' and current ideas on the 'identity politics' (Eriksen, 1999) that are taking place in today's globalised, mobalised world.

In the next chapter, I review definitions of culture, outline Bourdieu's concept of habitus (1977a: 78), present an overview of cultural paradigms, discuss ethnocentrism, cultural chauvinism and Orientalism, present Bourdieu's theories on culture (1982) and end with a discussion about cultural socialisation.

CHAPTER FOUR

IDEOLOGY IN CULTURAL PARADIGMS AND CULTURAL DIALOGUES

In this chapter, I tackle the theme of culture by discussing some definitions of culture in the literature before presenting a number of cultural paradigms from essentialism to critical cosmopolitanism. Through this, I outline how I believe ideology is inherent in all discourse and research into culture and that it is only now that attempts to address this bias are coming to the fore in research. Discussion into how ideology is inherent in how cultures are viewed is presented here to exemplify the theory that this ideological presence may pervade the lives of all of us. This is particularly pertinent for individuals in bilingual families where two cultures come together.

4.1 Defining Culture

Throughout this thesis, I use the term 'culture'. It is a term which encapsulates complex concepts yet is widely used in our daily lives, often without us reflecting on the meaning. In this section, I outline how I approach the term culture in this study.

Within the literature, there are multiple definitions of culture, with most focusing on collectivity, shared ideals and values. Brislin (1993: 4) describes shared ethos whereby 'culture consists of ideals, values and assumptions about life and that guide specific behaviours'. Triandis (1995) sees culture as providing standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, communicating, and acting, and Jandt's (2004) definition draws on the role of collectivity which involves a community or population being sufficiently large enough to be self-sustaining and which the members consciously identify with. Helman (2001: 2), too, sees culture as 'a set of guidelines (explicit and implicit) that individuals inherit as members of a particular society, which tell them how to view the world, how to experience it emotionally, how to behave in relation to other people... and to the natural environment'.

Chiu and Hong (2007) see culture as a network of knowledge that is procedural involving a learned sequence of responses to particular cues, and also declarative containing representations of people, events, and norms. They believe culture is produced, distributed, and reproduced through a collection of interconnected people. Thus, their concept of culture encompasses macro-level processes, dealing with values and norms; it also governs, organizes and describes expected behaviour and characteristics considered appropriate or inappropriate within that group.

Culture, therefore, can be viewed as a set of shared interpretations, a shared collective meaning system through which values, beliefs and cultural norms are understood. Jandt (2004: 7) believes that the meaning systems in cultures become visible to those within them through symbols and that people from the same culture often share the same interpretation of symbols whereby 'symbols refer to verbal and non-verbal language' and which delineate the beliefs, values and norms of that culture. In these ways, the invisibility of culture becomes visible through the behaviour of individuals and is perpetuated through the teachings of society – through parents, teachers, community, and educational and religious institutions (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997). Our intangible culture, therefore, becomes apparent through our behaviour, guiding us towards behaving in a socially accepted way (Brislin, 1993).

In this thesis, I often refer to the terms 'beliefs', 'values', and 'norms'. I find it necessary at this stage, therefore, to delineate for the reader exactly what I mean by these terms. In this thesis, I follow Lustig and Koester's (1999: 80) description of a belief as an idea that people assume to be true about the world. In describing the term 'values', I follow Hofstede (2001: 6) who sees values as the standpoints from which we discern differences between: evil and good; dirty and clean; dangerous and safe; decent and indecent; ugly and beautiful; unnatural and natural; abnormal and normal; irrational and rational; and moral and immoral. Finally, I follow Lustig and Koester's (1999) description of norms as being the guidelines by which people behave in a socially accepted and expected way.

While many researchers continue to attempt to define and use the term 'culture', Holliday (2011: 55) withdraws from the traditional ways in which the terms 'culture' or 'a culture' are used as he finds them too definite. Instead, he suggests terms he believes are more appropriate 'to capture the less tangible, floating, organic, uncertain, yet highly impactful quality' of what his participants describe: 'cultural reality' to imply that the culture is real to the person concerned but may not be real to others; 'cultural arena' to describe the setting in which cultural realities are situated; 'cultural universe' to describe a rich complex of cultural realities which generate a large number of cultural references; 'cultural marker' to describe something that signifies a cultural reality; and 'cultural trajectory' to describe an individual's personal journey through a series of cultural realities.

It is not my aim in this thesis to provide a bounded definition of culture as, like Holliday, I see culture as being too intangible to categorise in a definitive manner. Instead, I keep in mind the vast array of aspects that encompass the concept of culture so that when later analysing participants' descriptions of experiences I can follow up on thematic threads and relate these back to the literature. I agree with Holliday's (2011: 55) warning that the

terms 'culture' and 'a culture' are too narrow, however, I observed during the interviews that participants tended to use 'culture' within the more traditional definitions. I therefore incorporate Holliday's suggested terms as well as traditional terms for culture within this thesis, in particular using the term 'cultural reality' as a useful heuristic device.

4.2 Habitus

Bourdieu puts forward the theory of 'habitus' to describe how individuals become socialised into their surrounding culture. In the 1970s, Bourdieu developed the theory of 'habitus' or socialised norms that guide thinking and behaviour (1977a: 78). He uses the term habitus to describe 'the way society becomes deposited in persons in the form of lasting dispositions, or trained capacities and structured propensities to think, feel and act in determinant ways, which then guide them' (Wacquant, 2005: 316, cited in Navarro, 2006: 16). Habitus, therefore, is created through a social, not an individual process which leads to patterns that are enduring and transferrable between contexts, but that also change in interplay with specific contexts and over time. Habitus 'is not fixed or permanent, and can be changed under unexpected situations or over a long historical period' (Navarro 2006: 16). Habitus, therefore, does not spring from free will and is not created by structures; instead, it develops between past events and structures and current practices and structures, and it is this process that conditions our perceptions (Bourdieu 1984: 170). Habitus, therefore, is created and reproduced unconsciously, 'without any deliberate pursuit of coherence… without any conscious concentration' (ibid: 170). It creates the social norms by which we understand our world and is continually reproduced through our language and cultural activities, coming together to create a shared reality.

With dominant cultural discourses, however, these process lead to hegemony, a situation whereby groups and individuals either from within or between cultures (habitus) attempt to authoritatively define normative pratice. However, the existence of individual agency also means that these dominant discourses can be challenged (Moore, 2009: 43).

4.3 Cultural Paradigms

From colonialism to present day, cultural paradigms and cultural discourses have been constantly shifting and with these shifts come changes in the ideology inherent in them. In this section, I present theories on ideology inherent in previous paradigms, and how this ideology is currently being addressed, but not eradicated, through researchers' awareness and

admission of ideological factors that may be present in their own work, methodologies, and within previously accepted paradigms of culture. I do this to raise awareness of my own bias and that which may be present in my work. I also do this to historically place this investigation, and the participants, within current thinking and use this as a backdrop to analyse how their lives may have been affected by these paradigms.

Ideology in Essentialist Thought

Webb *et al* suggest that our values and norms are arbitrary and formed due to the environment; the habitus, in which we were socialised:

> 'Because habitus is... entirely arbitrary; there is nothing natural or essential about the values we hold, the desires we pursue, or the practices in which we engage... ... in order for a particular habitus to function smoothly and effectively, individuals must normally think that the possibilities from which they choose are in fact necessities, common sense, natural or inevitable. Other possibilities are ruled out precisely because they are unthinkable. The rules and structures of perceptions that pertain to a particular habitus are inscribed on, and in, individuals as if they were "human nature" or "civilized behaviour", and things outside those rules or structures are usually understood, when forced upon us, as amounting to the horrific and barbaric, or the absurd and comic' (2010: 38-39).

Following Webb *et al*, it would seem that our perceptions of our own culture and the culture of others are deeply and unconsciously embedded and are accepted as natural.

While Webb *et al* discuss how individuals acquire their values and norms through habitus, Holliday (2011) takes this theory further, believing this may be taking place on a global scale which is leading to an unconscious current of world-wide cultural chauvinism. He draws on Kumaravadivelu (2007) who believes a major feature of the twentieth century was that of the West defining the rest of the world. Holliday believes this is a 'state of affairs' which he feels still continues, and which is embedded in history to the extent that it is hard to undo' (Holliday, 2011: 2). He argues that, due to the prevailing Centre-West perception that has become entrenched in how cultures are viewed, there is not parity in how all cultures are valued; instead, there is a persistence in essentialist thinking that leads to dichotomies and bounded stereotypes, aiding the continued Othering of dominated cultures. The concept of culture he believes, therefore, is ideological and essentialism continues to form the basis of how culture is perceived in everyday life.

Holliday (2011: 6) gives Hofstede's work as an example of how, even when trying to repair how differences between cultures have come to be perceived, essentialist thought continues to pervade. Hofstede (2001: 9) presented culture as a 'collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another' believing it free from ideological influence where cultures are represented as scores along a range of dichotomies such as masculinity versus femininity, long versus short-term orientation, and individualism versus collectivism. However, Holliday believes Hofstede's categories possess an essentialist flavour; locating cultural features directly within national cultures. Critics of Hofstede's work focus on the over-simplification of categories and see this approach as naïve (Bond *et al*, 2000: 52-53; McSweeney, 2002: 89-118; Fleming & Søborg, 2004; Gooderham & Nordhaug, 2004; Søndergaard 2004).

To avoid the strict but artificial dichotomy that essentialism and non-essentialism present and to represent the many areas of crossover between the two, Holliday directs his thoughts within two alternative paradigms: neo-essentialism and critical cosmopolitanism.

Neo-Essentialism

Neo-Hofstedians take Hofstede's notions of individualism versus collectivism as their starting point but attempt to avoid over-generalisation and stereotyping. However, Holliday (2011: 7) believes much of this work still remains neo-essentialist in nature due to the retention of essentialist elements that pull the work back towards the use of national cultures as a foundation for categorisation; in this way, behaviours which do not fit the national stereotype are posited as an exception to the rule not a legitimate reality. Holliday (2011: 9) believes the terms 'individualism' and 'collectivism' are examples of neo-essentialism attempting to deny ideology, referring particularly to the works of Triandis (1995) who presented these two labels as being neutral 'prototypes' of national cultures (Triandis, 2004). While they are presented as neutral, Holliday points out these descriptors are commonly used to describe people from individualist cultures as being from North America, North and West Europe, Australia and New Zealand, while people from collectivist cultures are described as coming from Southern Europe, Latin America, South and East Asians and Africans and while descriptors relating to individualist cultures appear positive (self-reliance, assertiveness, open to new experiences) descriptors relating to collectivist cultures appear more negative (satisfied

with few choices, find new relationships difficult), indicating neutrality is not present in the language claiming to be without bias.

As well as Holliday's criticisms, other theorists point to deficiencies in neo-Hofstedian, neo-essentialist thought. Gudykunst *et al* (2005: 25) note the majority of theories following the neo-Hofstedian paradigm originate from within the US and may therefore be ethnocentrically orientated following an objectivist paradigm.

The Cosmopolitan Paradigm

The Hofstedian stance correlates nation and culture and is therefore similar to methodological nationalism, which in itself was derived from the European, nineteenth century idea of nation-state definition of society and politics (Beck & Sznaider, 2006: 2; Crane, 1994: 1-19; and Schudson, 1994: 21-43). Holliday believes to find a more neutral territory to view and describe culture and avoid ideological foundations for thought, it is necessary to work through a postmodern, 'critical cosmopolitan paradigm' that sees ideology everywhere and refuses to acknowledge statements of neutrality in neo-essentialist thought. He believes the interpretivist tradition is not sufficient enough to deal with the issues of constructions of inferiority and superiority or to deconstruct false political realities based on neo-Hofstedian paradigms (2007b: 13).

Followers of the Cosmopolitan paradigm view cultures as being small, continually moving, merging, overlapping and separating systems that take place at the level of families, generations, institutions and work groups, all of which are influenced by centralised systems of politics, education and bureaucracy. The Cosmopolitan paradigm encompasses both Hofstedian positivism and interpretism, encouraging meaning to:

> 'emerge from the disciplined, non-aligned piecing together of what is found by means of thick description, a recognition of the ways in which such dominant notions as individualism and collectivism are socially constructed and a rejection of the "taken for granted" and the naive "realism of conventional writing"' (Holliday 2007b: 12).

The Cosmopolitan paradigm has been presented as a way out of social Othering, as it ascribes to what Holliday calls:

> 'the non-essentialist image of complex cultural realities which are not exceptions to the rule, but are normal in an increasingly globalised world' (Holliday, 2007b: 12).

This paradigm acknowledges many people are born into cultures in which their parents were not. Major contributors to this paradigm include sociologists and anthropologists such as

Ahmad & Donnan (1994: 1-20), Delanty (2006: 5-47), Grande (2006: 87-111), and Kumaravadivelu (2007).

Collier (2005: 254) describes the goal of interpretive scholarship as 'uncovering communicative forms of power at work in cultural systems to enable emancipation and change', therefore the aim of critical cosmopolitanism, taking a strong postmodern line, is to recognise the inequality of ideologies and politics which are at the heart of both neo-Hofstedian and cosmopolitan views of culture. Critical cosmopolitanism, therefore, requires a 'self-problematization and the discursive examination of all claims', which don't see cultures as separate entities, but promote 'openness and public contestation' (Delanty, 2008: 92-93).

4.4 Ethnocentrism and Cultural Chauvinism

The term ethnocentrism was originally conceived by Sumner while he was observing the tendency for people to differentiate between their own group and that of others (Merton, 1996). Sumner defines it as 'the technical name for the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it' (ibid: 248). He believes this leads to pride, vanity, belief in the superiority of one's own group, and contempt of outsiders (Sumner, 1906). However, Merton (1996: 248) warns that if following Sumner's theory, we should keep in mind that centrality and superiority are often correlated, but need to be kept analytically distinct.

In situations in which cultures come together, such as is the case with bilingual marriages, ethnocentrism may become a problem as individuals' beliefs may lead them to think that their own culture is superior to that of others and judge others by the standards of their own culture (Jandt, 2004). This may also lead to people believing that their own way of life is correct while the way of others is wrong (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997). In this way, 'ethnocentrism is a bias toward the ingroup that causes us to evaluate different patterns of behaviour negatively, rather than try to understand them' (Gudykunst, 1991: 67). This leads to individuals magnifying differences rather than similarities in other cultures (Lustig & Loester, 1999). One of the traits of ethnocentrism is that individuals do not realise that their ethnocentrism may deter them from understanding the cultural differences of others (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

I see cultural chauvinism as a form of ethnocentrism in that individuals in one group see themselves as superior to the other. However, I believe the difference in meaning lies in the ideological agenda that underlies this thinking. While ethnocentrism may take place with a

false consciousness, cultural chauvinism may be built on an unreasoning devotion to one's own group and may also contain a political agenda which emerges as acts or through group or government practices.

I use both 'ethnocentrism' and 'cultural chauvinism' throughout this thesis. When referring to 'ethnocentrism', I view this as the situation of one group looking down upon another which could take place between any groups of people. When using the term 'cultural chauvinism', I choose this term to represent my belief that actions are being taken by one group against another and that these actions have ideological undertones.

When ethnocentrism and cultural chauvinism exist, Othering often emerges.

Othering

In order to know oneself, one must have a sense of similarity with some people and a sense of difference from others (Kidd, 2002: 203). However, Kidd believes conceiving of who we are is only one aspect of what contributes to our understanding of self identity; we also need to recognize who we are not and it is only through this that the concept of 'Other' comes up. The 'Other' may refer to anyone we perceive to differ from us in some way. This difference, however, is relational and leads to oppositional thinking:

> ''Them' are not 'us', and 'us' are not 'them'; 'we' and 'they' can be understood only together, in their mutual conflict. I see my group as 'us' only because I think of some other group as 'them'. The two opposite groups sediment, as it were, in my map of the world on the two poles of an antagonistic relationship, and it is this antagonism which makes the two groups 'real' to me and makes credible that inner unity and coherence I imagine they possess' (Kidd, 2002: 203).

'Othering' therefore involves:

> 'constructing or imagining, a demonized image of "them", or the Other, which supports an idealized image of "us", or the Self. Othering is also essentialist in that the demonized image is applied to all members of the group or society which is being Othered' (Holliday, 2011: 69).

Examples of the demonization of 'an imagined foreign other' are common in everyday life from sexism and racism to homophobia.

One of the most prevalent forms of Othering involves Othering whole nations and cultures. This may happen as our language and attitudes are inseparable from political arrangements, relations of power and language ideologies (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004: 1). Othering may be present in the discourse of our everyday lives. However, this is generally denied, consciously or

unconsciously, meaning 'few people acknowledge they are implicated' (ibid). One of the ways in which this can occur is to package Othering as the 'morality of helping the imagined, deficient Other, which is commonplace in today's liberal approach to multiculturalism. This hides the concept of Othering even further and leads to commodification of the non-Western Other instead of an appreciation of the intricacy of cultures involved. Individuals are not without agency, however, in how they are perceived and positioned in the global forum with regard to traditional expectations and set stereotypes and have some elements of power in how they deal with the examples of Othering (Holliday, 2011: 94).

Holliday believes Othering occurs at all levels of society as a fundamental way in which social groups maintain a positive sense of identity, occurring in a specific order: identify 'our' group by contrasting it with 'their' group; strengthen the contrasted images of Self and Other by emphasizing and reifying respective proficient and deficient values and behaviours; manipulate selected cultural resources; and finally, position Self and Other by constructing moral reasons to attack, colonize or help. At the end of this process, the Other culture becomes a definable commodity which they may decide to work with or resist. Through doing this 'the Self can thus be "we the strong" or "we the pure"' (Holliday, 2011: 69-70). However, 'in order to maintain these images it is necessary to construct the Other as "they the weak", "they the impure" or "they the deficient"' (ibid). Regarding Othering on a global scale, Holliday believes that:

> 'How nations, peoples, individuals are or feel positioned within global political circumstances... becomes a major factor in the cultural realities of individuals in their perceived relations with the West and with modernity... People globally position themselves and also feel positioned on a continuum from East to West, which carries with it subtle senses of inferiority and superiority. Periphery expressions of cultural reality are rooted in the complex details of their everyday lives' (Holliday, 2011: 119-120).

Although the term 'Othering' was never used by participants, many examples of what I perceived to be descriptions of Othering came up and is therefore a term I use in this thesis in line with Holliday's (2011: 69-70) description.

Orientalism

A macro-level example of Othering can be seen in the theory of Orientalism. The concept of Orientalism was originally put forward by Said (1978). Said used the term to refer to the collection of false assumptions that form the foundation for Western attitudes to the

Middle East, believing that Western cultures cultivated a romanticized image of the Middle East and Asia and have since used this to provide justification for colonialism and imperialism towards these cultures.

> 'My contention is that Orientalism is fundamentally a political doctrine willed over the Orient because the Orient was weaker than the West, which elided the Orient's difference with its weakness... As a cultural apparatus Orientalism is all aggression, activity, judgement, will-to-truth, and knowledge' (Said, 1978: 204).

Said does not believe that the West has misrepresented 'Oriental essence', but that:

> 'it operates as representations usually do, for a purpose, according to a tendency, in a specific historical, intellectual, and even economic setting' (Said, 1978: 273).

As well as criticising the West, Said is also critical of the Arab elites whom he believes internalised Western Orientalist ideas.

Orientalists believe Western ideas about the East come not from reality or fact, but from essentialist, preconceived stereotypes that group together all Eastern societies, putting them in binary opposition to Western societies. Following Focauldian ideas on the relationship between discourse and power, Said proposes that the Western world has created oppositional terms for its own good, placing the Orient as an inversion of the Occident, the process of which has led to hegemony in the occurrence of Orientalist representations of the East through which it exercises power over the East. In Othering, one needs an Other in order to identify one's Self. Likewise, in Orientalism, the West needs the East in order to define itself.

In uncovering and exposing Orientalism, Said's work focused on deconstructing literature and art produced by European scholars purporting to understand and present the Middle East. Through his work, Said attempted to reveal colonial undertones and the power imbalance that springs from these works and in doing so, became one of the originators of post-colonial research, research that aims to overturn long-held, unconsciously embedded Centre-West ideological biases within academia.

Holliday (2011: 69) believes the simplistic imagery and packaging of Orientalism for the Western eye leads easily to the process of Othering whether consciously or unconsciously. Kidd (2002: 203) believes these beliefs may be 'rooted in an ancient narrative which is sustained into modern times through histories, stories and the media, often with an imagined individualist and clever few defeating an imagined large, despotic collectivism'. Holliday believes this disbelief runs so deep it becomes 'an innocent response to the unknown' whereby the 'imagined features of the Other become routine and considered real' (2011: 69) – a form of false consciousness.

False Consciousness

The concept of 'false consciousness' has its roots in the Marxist theory of social class, although Marx himself did not use this term. False consciousness describes the situation whereby social relations are systematically misrepresented in the consciousness of subordinate classes, thereby concealing the realities of their subordination. In other words, thought is estranged from the real social being of the thinker (Althusser, 1971). According to Althusser, Marx based his social class theory on an analysis of the objective features of the system of economic relations which make up the social order. A person's class labelling is allocated through her position within the system of property relations which constitutes any economic society. Within this theory, individuals also have subjective characteristics such as thoughts and identities, and it is these factors which give the person a mental framework from which she can comprehend her role in the world and the forces that rule her life. In any class society, there is a conflict between privileged and subordinate groups over material resources. Within this system, Marx believes social mechanisms emerge that create distortions and blindness in the consciousness of the subordinated class and that if these consciousness-shaping mechanisms did not exist, the subordinate class, who always form a majority, would rapidly overthrow the system of their domination. Marx believes it is in this way that institutions of power can shape an individual's thoughts in such a way that an ideological false consciousness is created (Althusser, 1971).

Holliday (2011: 189) uses the term 'false consciousness' to describe the lack of awareness that individuals have to how their judgements are not bias free regarding how they observe their own culture and that of others. He believes the false consciousness that is inherent in Western discourses may lead to the Othering of others and self, with values and practices of the West being taken as best practice without the possibility of other non-Western cultures also possessing best practice being taken into consideration. Holliday (2011: 189) describes this as a false consciousness which is 'fed by a confidence in an arrogance of thought' which leads to:

> '(t)he (construction of social reality) (which) is bound up with a series of complex group processes and ideologies, so that what becomes 'taken-for-granted', or 'thinking-as-usual' may being to appear 'real' or as established 'knowledge' when it is not' (Holliday, 2011: 189).

In order to counter this false consciousness, Holliday (ibid) believes it is important for 'the established world to appreciate the degree to which it is based upon the ideologies and

prejudices of the dominant imagined world and to become open to the counter-discourses of the marginal world.' In other words, we need to raise our awareness of the ideologies inherent in Centre-West beliefs and to suspend disbelief of peripheral practices thereby approaching foreign practices in a critical cosmopolitan light.

Poststructural, Post-colonial Discourse Analysis

Current researchers working from a neo-Marxist framework within poststructural and post-colonial paradigms look for connections between texts and events and macro-social structures. This involves identifying relationships in discourses between power and knowledge, dominance and resistance. An example of this is the discourse of colonialism that works to legitimise and continue inequitable power relations. This inequity in discourse is described in the work of Said (1978), Derrida (1982), Bhahba (1984) and Canagrajah (1999). They believe inequitable discourse has led to an essentialist and binary opposition between East and West which leads to stereotypes of 'Self' and 'Other' and that the combination of power and inequality leads to hegemony from dominant systems of cultural representations. In addition, the heterogeneity and agency of colonised peoples problematise strict dichotomies of colonial domination and subordination; this leads to ambivalence in colonised groups resulting in their loss of agency and influence. However, attempts to undermine the power of Centre-West discourse are currently underway with periphery scholars decentralising Western knowledge systems and therefore reducing the power of Orientalism and its cultural representation of the Other (Moore, 2009: 45). Post-colonialists, therefore, challenge accepted dichotomous concepts such as 'Self' and 'Other', 'Centre' and 'Periphery'.

While understanding the dangers of using terms such as 'Self' and 'Other', as these may perpetuate binary-opposed stereotypes, while writing this thesis I found myself in need of a heuristic device to capture the emerging conceptualisation of the participants with regard to how they view their own language group and that of their partner; views that I believe were revealed through their use of dichotomous language (for example, 'they need to know there is a line between the two cultures', 'my husband is on my side now', 'I didn't want my children to let the side down'). In addition, terms such as 'Self' and 'Other' are still commonly used in current literature (such as Holliday, 2011) although used with a deeper understanding of the ideology inherent within them. I therefore find the terms 'Self' and 'Other' useful devices for the purposes of describing participants' perceptions and views and use these terms in this thesis, but I do so with an awareness of the dangers of such use.

4.5 Bourdieu's Theories on Culture

Bourdieu (1982) has tried to understand and explain culture through the relationship between people's practices and the contexts in which they occur, contexts such as institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, appointments and titles which constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produce and transform attitudes and practices as 'cultural fields'. He believes cultural fields are constituted by, or out of, the conflict which is involved when groups of individuals attempt to determine what constitutes capital within that field, and how that capital is to be distributed. Bourdieu sees cultural fields as being fluid and dynamic, rather than static entities. His cultural fields are made up not simply of institutions and rules, but also the interactions between institutions, rules and practices (Webb *et al*, 2010: 21-22). Bourdieu, basing his thoughts in structuralism, sees cultural fields as leading to cultural and relational thinking whereby:

> 'Reality and people are "processed" through the meaning machines that constitute our sign systems; but the signs in those systems mean nothing in themselves; they only "mean" insofar as they are part of a sign system, and can be related to other signs in that system. This means: objective structures produce people, their subjectivities, their worldview; and, as a consequence they also produce what people come to know as the "reality" of the world; and every thing, object and idea within a culture only has meaning in relation to other elements in that culture' (Webb *et al*, 2010: 21-22).

Intrinsically linked to culture, is Bourdieu's theory of 'habitus' which he describes as the partly unconscious 'taking in' of rules, values and dispositions through 'the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations... (which produces) practices' (Bourdieu 1977a: 78). In other words, habitus can be understood as the values and dispositions gained from our cultural history that generally stay with us across contexts. These allow us to respond to cultural rules and contexts in a variety of ways, but the responses are always largely determined by where and who we have been in a culture (Webb *et al*, 2010: 36-37). Apart from individual habitus, communities may also have collective habitus, whereby whole groups of people have shared values, ideals, perspectives on the world, and similar dispositions and behaviours, similar to Holliday's (2011: 55) cultural universe.

Bourdieu (1982: 49) sees culture as containing cultural capital: embodied cultural capital which includes elements in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body such as accents, attitudes and behaviour; objectified cultural capital which can be transferred between people, such as art, machines, dictionaries and instruments; and institutionalised cultural capital - a form of objectification set apart because it confers entirely original

58

properties on the cultural capital which it is presumed to guarantee such as educational qualifications. Bourdieu believes because it is difficult to see the transmission and acquisition of cultural capital, it is predisposed to function as symbolic capital:

> 'to be unrecognized as capital and recognized as legitimate competence, as authority exerting an effect of (mis)recognition, e.g., in the matrimonial market and in all the markets in which economic capital is not fully recognized... Furthermore, the specifically symbolic logic of distinction additionally secures material and symbolic profits for the possessors of a large cultural capital: any given cultural competence (e.g. being able to read in a world full of illiterates) derives a scarcity value from its position in the distribution of cultural capital and yields profits of distinction for its owner. In other words, the share in profits which scarce cultural capital secures in class-divided societies is biased.' (Bourdieu, 1982: 49)

Cultural capital, therefore, is a product accumulated over a long period of time, and how this capital is seen in its objectified state depends on the availability of other similar resources.

4.6 Cultural Socialisation

Cultural Socialisation from Birth

Many linguists believe cultural socialisation takes place through language and that language and culture cannot be separated. This has important implications for the ongoing socialisation of individuals in bilingual families where one partner moves into the host culture of the other. In this section, therefore, I now turn my attention to how cultural socialisation may take place through language in individuals born into their home culture, in individuals born to two home cultures, and in individuals in bilingual families who move into their partner's host community of practice.

Fanon (1967: 17-18) says that to speak means above all 'to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilization'. This concept is also reflected in Hymes' ideas (1974: 127). Hymes believes 'speaking is itself a form of cultural behaviour, and language, like any other part of culture, partially shapes the whole; and its expression of the rest of culture is partial, selective'. In other words, language is interwoven with culture since the way we use our language reflects our culture (Samovar and Porter, 2004).

Skutnabb-Kangas (1981: 2) believes our culture is passed on to us through our language:

> 'Through language we receive the cultural heritage of the past, and by language we shape it anew, recreating it together with other people. We use language, too, to pass on to a large extent this culture we have received to our own children... Language is

what binds us to others... the further we are removed from close physical contact with our immediate physical environment in time or space, the more exclusively dependent we are upon language to preserve between us and others any kind of tie.'

Similarly, Baker believes:

'...merely speaking a language to a child conveys culture to that child. Embedded in the meanings of words and phrases is always a culture. Through language, a child learns a whole way of life, ways of perceiving and organising experience, ways of anticipating the world, forms of social relationship, rules and conventions about behaviour, moral values and ideals, the culture of technology and science as well as poetry, music and history. Culture is reproduced in the child through the fertilization and growth of language' (Baker, 2000: 18).

Theorists, therefore, believe that language, culture and socialisation go hand in hand and this process starts from birth.

Cultural Socialisation through a Subsequent Language

In bilingual families, individuals may come together from different home communities, different linguistic backgrounds and with different norms. Understanding and accepting their partner may involve acquiring a sociolinguistic competence on the journey to acceptance or assimilation into their partner's community of practice. In order to understand the process that may take place for individuals entering their spouse's home community, the closest, most relevant research I came across was from the field of second language learners. While for native speakers and simultaneous acquisition speakers, language and cultural acquisition start to develop from birth, for language learners, this process starts to take place the moment they start learning a new language or enter a new host community.

Schieffellin and Ochs (1986: 163-191) describe this as a process of 'socialisation through language' whereby newcomers to a community are socialised with regard to language and the use of language, the values, beliefs, behaviours and practices of that community. Watson-Gegeo and Nielsen (2003: 164) believe this theory of language socialisation includes cognitive, cultural, social and political factors. Mitchell and Myles (2004: 235) and Ochs (1996) view the process of language socialisation as involving the simultaneous, inseparable and symbiotic acquisition of language and culture with each helping to develop the other. In this way, as language learners start to understand the sociocultural context through language they also come to understand the language better through their social experiences (Ochs, 1996: 407). Holmes (1990), however, points out that for the language learner there is a long journey

from starting to learn a language to fully comprehending the language and sociolinguistic norms that go with it.

> 'When people from different social groups or cultures meet, their sociolinguistic norms may conflict... Acquiring sociolinguistic competence in another language may be a slow and difficult process, since it involves understanding the social values that underlie the community's ways of using language' (1990: 374).

It is not just the underlying social values in a language that have to be learned, mannerisms and body language also form a part of this. Wang describes an acquaintance who grew up speaking French in the USA who told her he felt extremely uncomfortable when he first moved to Paris. He said he felt as if he were speaking English when he was actually speaking French because he used American mannerisms and styles when he spoke French:

> 'My acquaintance apparently did not master the subtle aspects of native people's customs and nonverbal behaviour, even though he seemingly spoke the language well' (Wang, 2008: 121).

Wang therefore concludes that:

> 'Language and culture go hand in hand – learning a language without learning the culture associated with it is incomplete' (Wang, 2008: 121).

4.7 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have investigated literature related to culture and cultural paradigms in order to bring together ideas through which participants' reflections on their bilingual marriages can be analysed. While presenting these ideas, I have challenged existing, colonialist or neo-essentialist cultural paradigms as I believe these encourage individuals to tend towards viewing cultures in binary opposition. Instead, I tend towards the critical cosmopolitan approach to research whose aim is to unearth communicative forms of power at work in discourse in order to enable emancipation and transformation. It is through this lens that I approach the participants' stories as they tell their tales of living in a bilingual marriage.

In the next chapter, I present my reasons for choosing a postmodern, qualitative paradigm, explain how I draw my data from a variety of sources including a chronological approach, discuss the use of critical incidents, and describe how I approached writing this study and the implications this had on my choice of data collection. I also discuss ethical considerations, the process of collecting data for this study, problems with data collection and threats to validity, before outlining the thematic structuring of the data chapters.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK, METHODOLOGICAL RATIONALE AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In this chapter, I discuss the methodological ideology in which my investigation is grounded, followed by a chronological account and rationale for my data collection, research procedures and my choice of participants. After this, I discuss tools used and their appropriateness for this study. I go on to uncover challenges when collecting data and describe the steps I took to address these issues.

5.1 Reasons for Choosing a Postmodern, Qualitative Paradigm

This investigation takes place in the postmodern era when truth is considered subjective and when types of research have become more diverse; the qualitative research paradigm has become part of this diversity.

In choosing to follow a postmodern, qualitative paradigm, I understand that any realities I uncover are the social constructs of the participants, individuals in bilingual marriages, and my understanding of what they have brought to the research. These realities, therefore, come from the stories, anecdotes and actions of these participants at this place and time and my perspectives towards their ideas and described experiences are what Kvale refers to as a 'linguistic and social construction of perspectival reality' (1996: 42).

I believe using a qualitative research paradigm is relevant to my area of investigation as it allows me to investigate and interpret how each individual in a bilingual marriage makes sense of experiences in their lives, in particular, how they make sense of language use in their families. In qualitative research, Holliday believes 'interpretation is as far as we can go' (2002: 5), therefore, in this thesis I present an interpretation of the data; I do not make claims further than this.

Holliday (2004: 276) believes it takes a qualitative approach, with varied methods of data collection, to reveal 'the complex realities of hidden or counter cultures which are difficult to capture by more established means'. I believe the complex realities of making sense of language use in bilingual marriages are best revealed through listening in depth to a small number of individuals' experiences and perceptions, as opposed to through a quantitative, large scale, numerical approach. I believe the emergence of qualitative methodologies in the

field of social science research provides a useful conduit with which to reach and analyse these experiences.

In postmodern, qualitative research, the role of participant researcher is of the utmost importance. Postmodern theorists understand that realities are social constructs that are uncovered as a result of the research process. These realities, therefore, come not only from the stories and actions of the participants but also from the researchers' perspectives towards the participants' ideas and described experiences. Within this paradigm, therefore, researchers see themselves as biographically-situated and fully implicated within the research setting (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995) aiming to capitalise on the complexity of their own presence in a methodological way (Holliday 2007a). As a participant researcher, I find myself in dual roles. I am positioned as both the researcher and a participant in a bilingual marriage and I am aware that these roles have affected how I have approached, directed, analysed, theorised and written about this investigation.

Taking a qualitative paradigm (following Cresswell, 2003), using a chronological-style methodology and seeing myself a biographically-situated researcher, therefore, I allowed the design for this study to gradually emerge. From interviewing individuals in bilingual marriages in their homes, places of work and places of leisure and listening to their stories of language use as well as recording interesting incidents in my research diary, themes arose and gained clarity. This enabled me to form research questions from the emerging data and take an inductive approach to the analysis of my contextual findings. The research questions that emerged are as follows:

1. What do participants in bilingual families say about language use in their families?
2. What are the issues that arise and what are participants saying about these issues?

Through this approach, I was able to gather insights and explore what individuals in bilingual marriages say about language use in their families. In addition, through this approach, I believe the participants and I became more aware of how global processes affect their perceptions of their own and their partners' languages and how this affects their daily lives.

5.2 A Chronological Approach

Having decided to follow a qualitative paradigm in my research, I needed to find or design a methodological approach to best suit the needs of my study; an investigation into participant stories about their experiences of language in their bilingual marriages. As participants telling me stories about their lives plays a major role in my study, I was originally drawn to narrative inquiry which is 'built around the study of lived out and told stories and has developed within the social sciences from realist, postmodern and constructivist paradigms' (Reismann and Speedy 2007: 429). The narrative inquiry approach to qualitative research is both a product and a method which involves the study of experience which is understood through storytelling and presented through storytelling.

The act of participants telling their life stories plays a particularly important role in the study of identity as it provides the researcher with access to an individual's identity through their contextual presentations of self. Lieblich *et al* (1998: 12-13, 112-114) believe the stories presented by individuals about their lives and their lived experience may reveal their inner world (1998). In addition, Schiffrin (1996: 167-203) believes the form of these stories, their content, and the individual's storytelling behaviour all give an indication of the narrators' personal selves, as well as their social and cultural identities. By drawing on participants' life stories, the researcher is aided in understanding individuals' experiences as she may also reach information the individuals do not consciously know themselves (Bell, 2002).

Taking these views into consideration, I decided to create a methodology that draws strongly on participants sharing their life stories, as I believe through them telling their life stories they may reveal their perceptions of themselves in relation to their linguistic identities. However, unlike the narrative approach which both collects stories and presents stories in the narrative, I wished to use a method that collects stories from participants, revealing the chronologies of their lives, presents data as a discussion of emerging themes. For this reason, I refer to my methodology as a chronological approach, not a narrative approach.

The Construction of Participants' Stories

In order to collect data, I invited nine individuals in bilingual, Turkish-English marriages to tell me their stories, to interpret them, and to attempt to make sense of who they are in their daily lives in relation to others. Through doing so, I aimed to help participants understand their past and present in terms of their stories. Participants told their stories to each other and

to me - the researcher - in formal interviews and through informal meetings. These stories, therefore, arose from the co-construction of my ideas and the participants' ideas.

I am aware that these stories were presented for a particular audience at a particular time and place, which means any understandings that arise from these stories are situated. They are situated because the telling of stories is shaped by many factors including cultural conventions, language usage and the audience. This means that 'who the characters are in people's stories, the plotlines people choose to tell and the audiences to whom they tell their stories' all influence the accounts told (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006: 477-487). Freeman also believes that when individuals interpret their past, it is 'a product of the present and the interests, needs, and wishes that attend it (Freeman, 2007: 137-138).

How such stories are constructed for the audience has been investigated in particular by Labov (1972, 1981) who investigated discourse schemata and the structure of narrative, whereby narrators often follow a set pattern to activate the cognitive 'schema' of the listener (Van Dijk, 1986). Labov (ibid) developed a model identifying the structural schema beneath spontaneous, conversational narrative. He states that personal experience narratives are complex and contain many narrative clauses with up to six functions signalling different purposes. Johnstone (2008: 92) states that Labov:

> 'makes reference to events, characters, feelings, and so on understood to have happened or existed outside of and previous to the conversation in which the story is being told. At the same time, each element also structures the ongoing interaction by guiding the teller and the audience through the narrated events and ensuring that they are comprehensible and worth recounting'.

Labov describes narratives as containing: an abstract that summarises the story to come; orientation in which characters, time and physical setting are introduced; complicating action clauses that reiterate a sequence of events leading up to the point of maximum suspense thereby creating tension in order to keep auditors listening; a presentation of result and resolution to explain what finally happened; an evaluation underlining what is interesting or unusual about the story; finally, a *viva coda* may be used to indicate the end of the story (Johnstone, 2008: 93). As Labov predicted, all these elements were presented in the narratives of my participants, an example of which is given in Appendix 1.

The Role of the Researcher in Qualitative Inquiry

In qualitative inquiry, the researcher's presence is of utmost importance as the inquiry starts in the midst of ongoing experiences which may change and shift during the research process for both researcher and researched. These experiences will continue to be lived and told long after the researcher has left. This means the researcher is very much biographically situated, providing her with a collaborative way to attempt to understand and inquire into the experiences of participants over time, place and in social interactions (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 20).

The Conceptual Framework for my Inquiry

For my inquiry, while taking a chronological approach, I decided to draw on aspects of the narrative approach in order to create a conceptual framework formy inquiry.

The factors of time, place and social interaction (temporality, place and sociality) form the three commonplaces which are used to construct the conceptual framework of narrative inquiry. The researcher needs to explore all of these commonplaces in order to grasp:

> 'the complexity of the relational composition of people's lived experiences both inside and outside of an inquiry and, as well, to imagine the future possibilities of these lives' (Clandinin & Huber, in press: 3).

In my conceptual framework, I follow Connelly and Clandinin (2006) by accounting for all three commonplaces (time, place and social interaction). To provide for temporality, I understand that my participants have a past, present and future and are constantly in transition; a transition that continues throughout and beyond the period of this investigation. Providing for sociality, I recognise that my respondents are personal individuals with feelings, hopes, dreams and moral dispositions. I also understand that they are living in an environment containing forces which add to their context and I understand that the relationship between me and the respondents sits within this context; I cannot subtract myself from the inquiry relationship (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006).

Recreating our Past Selves for our Present Audience

When telling stories of ourselves from the past, we are not simply recounting events, but recreating our identities for our current selves, place and audience. Simon picks up on this, saying:

> 'the process of remembering is not merely an act of repetition of the past but an act of re-membering or collecting one's "members" – one's prior selves and the figures and events that belong to one's life story – in a purposeful and conscious way.' (1992: 523)

Similarly Carr (1986) believes that we compose and constantly revise our autobiographies as we go along. In a similar vein, Norton opines that:

> 'it is not only engagement with historical memory that is important in understanding identity and language learning, but also engagement with alternative identities that are site, and not time, specific.' (2000a: 151).

It must be remembered, then, that in describing one's past identity, one is recreating one's present identity. Therefore, as agents, it is possible for us to reframe our relationships depending on where we are and whom we are talking to. I am aware that in this study when participants are retelling stories from past memories, they are constructing identities for the listener(s), relevant to that place, time and relationship. In this way, their identity as viewed through time may shift depending on their audience and their intent.

The Analysis of Texts

In the analysis of narrative texts, Chase (2005) suggests five approaches for analysing told stories: a psychosocial developmental approach; an identity approach focusing on how individuals construct themselves within institutional, cultural and discursive contexts; a sociological approach focusing in specific aspects of people's lives; a narrative ethnographic approach; and an autoethnographic approach. In my study, in which I follow a chronological approach, I follow Chase's second suggestion, approaching participants' told stories by trying to understand how they have constructed their identities within their bilingual marriages and with the people who surround them. I do this by listening to participants' stories, transcribing them, then deconstructing and reconstructing them to represent the chronologies of their life stories, enabling me to look across the same points in each participant's life and comparing their experiences.

5.3 The Use of Critical Incidents

Holliday calls for more qualitative researchers to make 'creative moves in data collection and analysis' to move away from a crippling concern over the 'size and representativeness of interview samples' (2004: 1). He wants to see researchers using new methods of finding out what we want to know and suggests doing this by:

> 'allowing critical incidents to drive research categories; designing new forms of theses – generally reassessing the boundaries of subjectivity and representation, and the interplay of identities of researchers and the people in their research projects' (Holliday, 2004: 1).

In this investigation, I have wholeheartedly embraced 'critical incidents' as part of my research ideology. These critical incidents involved concrete examples of situations and behaviours I experienced in my personal and professional life; experiences I felt presented 'rich detail' (Buchanan & Bryman, 2009: 479) and helped focus my thinking on certain issues. They often involved conversations and experiences with individuals in bilingual relationships, individuals living outside their nation of birth, or educators teaching children with more than one home language. These were recorded in my research diary and drawn upon during interviews to get reactions from participants. Therefore, these critical incidents written up in my research diary in line with recommendations by Patton (2002) together with the stories from participant interviews combined to create the methodology behind my data collection; a combination which I believe allows participants and their lives to be viewed more objectively. I believe taking this approach has allowed me to better reflect the intricacies that arise for individuals in today's complex world at a time when new ways of understanding are being put forward as old certainties are being eroded.

5.4 Writing the Study

In this study, my aim is to search for an understanding of the world in which my participants live through their personal stories and interpretations. In writing this qualitative study, I present sections of participants' stories and their interpretations of their tales as well as adding thoughts from my research diary into the chronologies of their stories. Through my writing, my voice is also presented interwoven alongside the voices of the respondents. To allow the text to flow for the reader, at times I present the participants' own voices verbatim, other times I provide an overview of events without specific reference to the source of that data. In doing so, I follow other qualitative researchers in this tradition of not referencing every event (Norton, 2000a; Miller, 2003; Morita, 2004). Through these verbatim and

described narratives, I invite the reader to capture an essence of the social worlds the participants live in. I am aware that in my writing, objectivity is not possible as 'no human can step outside of their humanity and view the world from no position at all' and therefore any theories or hypotheses they compose come from their embedded assumptions and perspectives of the world' (Burr, 2003: 152).

This thesis has gradually emerged; the interviews led to literature review, new themes emerged leading to different directions in my reading and a rewriting of research questions, and these themes were often dissolved again as I returned to the data, seeing new themes emerge. In this way, data from participants' own words drove the literature review, emerging themes and headings, the final research questions, and the final structure of the writing. This means my research questions were only solidified right at the end of the investigation. In this way, in line with Crotty (1998), Lincoln & Guba (2000), Neuman (2000), Schwandt (2001), and Cresswell (2007), I inductively developed patterns of meaning as opposed to starting with a central theory.

5.5 Data Collection

In this section, I give an account of how data was collected. I start with a rationale for my research setting and then describe how participants were chosen. After this I discuss how I decided on the research tools that I believe best suit this study and raise ethical issues inherent in this qualitative investigation. Next, when, where and how data was collected and the problems that arose are discussed. This is followed by a discussion of threats to validity and reliability to this study within the research design and data collection process and how these were addressed. Finally, I describe how themes arose, developed, dissolved and finally clarified within this study and how I used these themes, grouped using verbatim quotes from participants, to structure the data chapters. Analysis and discussion of the data in line with these themes are presented in chapters seven, eight and nine.

Selecting Participants

When trying to identify participants for this study, I initially approached a number of individuals in Turkish-English marriages in Istanbul with whom I had already cultivated a relationship on a personal or professional level. However, I found that my original choice of participants, the number, nationality and their home languages shifted from my first imagined

group. I had originally planned to find a homogeneous group of families similar to my own; parents in Turkish-English marriages living in Istanbul in bilingual households where one parent was a Turkish national and one a British national. However, I soon discovered that all the participants were different; they defied my desire for clear-cut categorisation. This made me realise that I had been attempting to label and group individuals at the outset of this study. I therefore decided to leave my choice of participants more open. My final group of participants was much more eclectic and included an Iranian-born, British-raised trilingual mother, five British mothers (two divorced), two British fathers and two Turkish mothers. These participants were chosen as I had good access to them, could collect rich data with them and knew I could stay in contact with them over the next few years.

Peripheral Data from a Broader Setting

As described, my initial focus was to discover what a small, bounded group of individuals in bilingual marriages say about language use in their families. In order to investigate what impact bilingual upbringing has on linguistic identity, I decided to expand my group of participants to obtain information about how participants with different backgrounds view their linguistic and cultural identities. I therefore added two peripheral participants to my group of respondents. These individuals were from different types of bilingual families representing a broader picture. They were, however, both Turkish and English speakers. These respondents include a single female raised by Turkish parents in London and a Turkish female born and raised in the English-speaking community in the Middle East currently raising her daughter with her Turkish husband in Istanbul. I believe by expanding the scope of respondents, a broader, richer picture appeared.

Defining the Research Setting

Having identified my participants, I used Holliday's (2007a) criteria for boundedness to check that my chosen group was sufficiently bounded to meet expectations within current qualitative research design. I believe my group of respondents meets these criteria for the following reasons. All the participants in this study are bounded by place (Istanbul) and culture (in bilingual Turkish-English intermarriages). In addition, the chosen group provides a variety of relevant, interconnected data with regard to a sufficient range of families to interview. It includes four British mothers, one Iranian/British-raised mother, two British fathers, two

Turkish mothers, one British woman raised by Turkish parents in London; one Turkish mother raised in the English-speaking community in the Middle East. I believe sufficient richness is provided through different instances of families, age ranges and viewpoints; the core participants, while all in Turkish-English marriages, represent slightly different cultural backgrounds including Welsh, English, British-Turkish, Saudi-raised Turkish, Iranian-British-raised and the families represent a broad time scale for when they brought up or are bringing up their children, from 1974 until present day. By dealing with this number of participants, and by using location in Istanbul as the defining limitation of the group under analysis, I feel I have ensured the setting is sufficiently small enough to make the study logistically and conceptually manageable.

Choice of Research Tools

Having selected a group of participants and checked my research setting was suitably bounded, I needed to decide what type of research tools I would use to conduct the research. First, I needed to clarify what type of information I required and how this could best be collected. In this section, I describe my rationale behind how I chose the tools chosen for this study.

1. Interviews

As the aim of my study is to get participants to give detailed descriptions of their storied lives and to try to make sense of what it means to be in a bilingual marriage in today's globalised world, I needed a medium that would allow me to undertake an in-depth exploration and collect 'data based on emotions, experiences and feelings' (Denscombe, 1998: 111). Interviews, therefore, seemed the most appropriate tool and within the qualitative paradigm are considered to be well-established instruments. In order to set my research process in a social constructivist worldview, I used open-ended questions to give participants room to construct their own meanings and to give me the chance to follow up on ideas as they arose. Most of the participants were interviewed once, but two participants, Shirley and Leyla, met for a second interview at their request.

2. Research Diary

As I embarked upon this inquiry, I became aware of my own stories as a wife, mother, daughter, teacher, principal, and educator and how each of these identities gave me a differing viewpoint, positioning me at different locations in the bilingual marriage landscape. As my study progressed, these viewpoints gradually shifted, sometimes due to a short conversation, sometimes due to a significant event. These were events that sparked my interest, prompted me to ask questions, resonated with my own experiences, or were mirrored in the stories of my participants. Some events took place in interviews with new families at the international pre-school, some during staff meetings, and some as staffroom chat. Others took place as I spoke to other parents at social events, went to lectures; or had conversations with my husband and family. Each event provided a backdrop of opinions, attitudes and perceptions from a broader spectrum of people on how individuals in bilingual families are perceived or perceive themselves, all of which I juxtaposed against the findings of the small 'bounded' group of my participants in Istanbul.

As these incidents occurred, I realised the benefit and insight I could gain recording these as field notes in a research diary, positioning myself and my thoughts with an awareness of who I was within each event. Therefore, whenever I came across an interesting event, soon afterwards I took note of: the place where the observation/situation took place; who was present; a description of the physical setting; social interactions that took place (both verbal and non-verbal); my feelings and reactions to the situation; notes about the potential meaning and significance of what was observed; and insights, interpretations and beginning analyses (Patton, 2002). In addition, I noted events that I was reminded of from my own experience, texts I had read and the reflections of others.

In addition, I also used my research diary to keep a record of emails from participants (Elizabeth, in particular, emailed me with further thoughts on our discussions, and Leyla mailed emailed me information about a conversation she had with her son regarding his languages and family background). I also used my research diary to write comments and ideas that the participants gave when we met to discuss developing ideas and themes in the investigation. In particular, I used the participants' stories and anecdotes directly by inserting them chronologically into the transcriptions of the interviews that I had reorganised into the order of their life stories. I felt this added a breadth and richness and allowed participants' stories to continue to develop in their own words after their initial interviews had been completed.

Therefore, the final content of my research diary contains examples of: critical incidents; unplanned observations; conversations, emails, and evaluative data from participants. Events and critical incidents recorded in my research diary span from January

2006 when I conceived of the research idea, and continued up until writing the final draft in 2012.

My data collection, therefore, includes a combination of interviews, unplanned observations and critical incidents recorded in my research diary as well as ongoing informal meetings at participants' homes or at social events. I believe by using such a range of data collection methods taken from many people in many different settings the risk of my own bias coming through is reduced which I believe strengthens the validity and reliability of this study. A summary of my data collection is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: DATA TYPES

Data from Participants	'Raw' written texts i.e. not provided for the researcher or constructed by the researcher	Reconstructed spoken and/or enacted texts	Researcher Generated Texts
Initial interviews with participants

Follow up interviews with participants | An article: Lambert-Sen, M. (2011) The Privilege of Speaking English. *British Community Newsletter,* June 2011. pp 3-4)

A book: Eyüboğlu, H. (2006) From the Steeple to the Minaret: Living Under the Shadow of Two Cultures. Çitlembik, Istanbul. | Conversations and observations recorded in note form by the researcher

Conversations with families at the pre-school where I was working

Conversations with English-Turkish couples at social events

Anecdotes from friends and colleagues | Field notes

Research diary |

5.6 Ethical Considerations

As part of the body of qualitative researchers who investigate people's lives, I am aware of the importance of considering how I may be affecting the people in my study and the need to make sure I will not be harming anyone involved. Lieblich advocates that narrative inquirers move beyond the institutional narrative of 'do no harm' by learning how to be an

empathic listener by not forming judgments, and by suspending their disbelief as they listen to participants' stories (Clandinin & Murphy, 2007: 647).

In qualitative inquiry, relational aspects are also of prime importance; 'there is an ethical need for fidelity to relationships' (Noddings, 1986), whereby the researcher has a responsibility to maintain each participant's integrity during the inquiry and also after the inquiry has finished as there is the possibility that individuals' opinions or practices may not conflate with their peers or with dominant cultural or institutional narratives. These responsibilities are long-term as the qualitative inquirer understands participants' lives will continue to unfold in the future after research texts are written and published (Huber, Clandinin & Huber, 2006). The relational aspects of qualitative inquiries, thus, compel researchers to pay careful attention to all aspects of ethical matters as these type of inquiries involve the investigation of individuals' lived and told stories, not only who they are but also who they will be. The research, therefore, has to have utmost respect for participants' lives.

Researcher as Manager or Colleague

My choice of participants was partially based on my connections with English-language education network in Istanbul. This meant I had managed, was managing or had worked with a number of the participants in this study. This situation made me carefully consider the ethics of inviting these participants to join my study. However, as the focus of study is not on education but around how individuals make sense of language use in their bilingual families, I felt that their giving information to me would not be harmful to them in a professional capacity and did not, therefore, breach ethical concerns.

In this section, I outline how I have taken ethical issues into consideration. My first step was to take an outline of my study to the university where ethics clearance was negotiated with the head of the graduate school and a meeting was held with the head of the ethics committee. After this, a declaration of adherence to appropriate ethical procedures for research was signed and submitted (Appendix 2).

Researcher as Participant

In qualitative research, there is the issue of whether a researcher should place themselves as a participant or non-participant in the investigation. One of my main

motivations for this study comes from being a member of a bilingual marriage and, through my personal and professional life, an individual who comes into contact with individuals in similar circumstances to me on a daily basis. For this reason, I decided at the outset to include myself as a participant. However, I found that my position often shifted. Throughout the interviews, my relationship with participants was not as clear cut as researcher and researched. I was not only interviewing the participants to hear their stories, but also engaging with them as a joint participant and I found my role was constantly being repositioned by participants as we co-constructed our relationship. How I dealt with this is discussed in section 5.8.

Consent to Participate

Next, I needed a Consent-to-Participate form. Blaxter *et al*. believe:

'Research ethics is about being clear about the nature of the agreement you have entered into with your research subjects or contacts. This is why contracts can be a useful device. Ethical research involves getting the informed consent of those you are going to interview, question, observe or take materials from. It involves reaching agreements about the uses of data and how its analysis will be reported and disseminated. And it is about keeping to such agreements when they have been reached' (Blaxter *et al*, 2001: 158).

For these reasons, roughly following the guidelines of Blaxter *et al*. (2001), I prepared information about my research for the families to sign in advance of the study (Appendix 3) and included: what the study is about; how and when data would be collected; how analysis would be co-constructed with participants; how anonymity would be maintained; where outcomes of the investigation would be published or presented; and how outcomes would be shared with participants.

Anonymity

Sarup (1996) reminds us that the construction of the identities and subjectivities of our participants are often reshaped for the public sphere and by the public sphere, and once they are out there, they in turn shape our participants. They become 'sites of cultural contest' with issues of representation and power. We cannot control how our stories are heard, how they are controlled and how they are interpreted. Anonymity is especially important in research that involves participants telling their stories as the complexity of participants' lives is made visible in the research texts. As writers, we have a responsibility to our participants regarding how their identities are portrayed in the public sphere. I therefore decided to use pseudonyms

to provide for anonymity. Pinker (2007: 322) suggests choice of name may reflect a person's desire to fit in, desire to be unique, and also reflect social trends. I therefore asked participants to choose their own pseudonyms as opposed to allocating names. British participants were asked to provide typically British pseudonyms and Turkish participants typically Turkish names. If children had names that were specific to both cultures, for example Sarah/Serra, I asked the parents to provide suitably cross-cultural pseudonyms.

My research diary, a more hidden form of data collection, raised an ethical issue regarding consent. I found as a researcher I was starting to see every interaction and event as potential data whereas participants may not have seen such relationships as a site of research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). With unplanned observations, I did not make it clear to those involved I would use the subject of our meetings, interviews or conversations in my research as often it was only after the situation I realised the relevance of these incidents in relation to my investigation. I therefore make sure I provide anonymity in writing when drawing on extracts from my research diary.

5.7 The Process of Data Collection for this Study

In this section, I start by describing the process I went through to collect my data. Next, I describe how I undertook the interviews, how these were transcribed, and how data from these were categorised and charted.

Time and Location of the Interviews

All the participants told me they would be living in Istanbul and accessible for the duration of the study. This meant I could easily arrange interviews according to participants' requests. Initial interviews were carried out in October 2007 and took place at locations chosen by the participants in homes, cafés or restaurants. Table 2 shows the date, location and participants present at the interviews.

Participant	Interview Date	Interview Place	Others Present
Shirley	22.10.07 04.04.08	Cafe in Cihangir Restaurant in Taksim	Leyla
Leyla	22.10.07 04.04.08	Cafe in Cihangir Restaurant in Taksim	Shirley
Graham	29.10.07	Graham and Alya's home	Alya
Alya	29.10.07	Graham and Alya's home	Graham
Maureen	29.10.07	Maureen's home	-
Tim	29.10.07	Tim and Hulya's home	Hulya
Hulya	29.10.07	Tim and Hulya's home	Tim
Elizabeth	30.10.07	Bar/Cafe near adult education centre	-
Lynn	30.10.07	Bar/Cafe near adult education centre	Elizabeth
Esma (peripheral)	30.10.07	Bar/Cafe near adult education centre	Elizabeth, Lynn
Aysun (peripheral)	15.02.10	Principal's office	Vice Principal

Undertaking the Interviews

Before undertaking the interviews, I sent the Consent-to-Participate form to all the respondents, on which I had outlined my research, described the interview process, talked about the need for member-check meetings throughout the investigation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 314) asked them to provide suitable pseudonyms for themselves and their family members, and outlined where the outcomes of the research would be published. The participants then let me know when they would be available for interview and set the place where they wanted to be interviewed. These tended to be either in their homes or in local cafes or bars near their homes or places of work.

In preparation for the interviews, I created a proforma to guide my questions as the interviews unfolded (Appendix 4). Following this proforma, I briefly introduced my study and let participants know that the interview duration would be around an hour and checked that that was acceptable to them. I started by asking questions in a chronological order about the participants' backgrounds, including how they came to be in England or Turkey, how they met

their partner, and how their families reacted to their marriages. This was followed by open-ended questions regarding participants' perceptions about their language use, identity and cultural issues. I also took notes in my research diary as a supplement to the recordings (before, during and after the interviews) of if they had chosen to be interviewed together, where they chose to be interviewed and my perception of what their actions showed in these environments; I did this in an to attempt to interpret their social settings. These notes were taken by hand and later typed into the body of the interview transcriptions to create a more narrative text. This meant that some of my notes, such as respondents' attitudes, behaviours and expressions, were written from recall. While this may be an insecure way of collecting data, Kvale (1996: 23) believes it also brings advantages as it allows 'non-verbal' information to be collected as well.

I felt by conducting the interviews in informal settings chosen by participants, it helped them to feel comfortable sharing their personal experiences; in addition, it may have avoided my role as researcher dominating proceedings. I ended the interviews by thanking respondents for their participation, by talking about anonymity and where the outcomes of this research would be published and by getting them to sign and hand back the Consent-to-Participate form.

I found interviewing more than one participant at a time advantageous as I felt it removed some of the power imbalance between researcher and participant and enabled participants to view themselves reflexively by seeing their own views reflected back at them by the other participant(s); this was especially pertinent when they had lived through similar experiences to those being described. I felt as I too am in a bilingual marriage and was willing to share my own experiences, they accepted me first as a researcher, and then as a peer living in a similar situation to themselves. I feel this helped them to relax and talk openly.

At the permission of the participants, I recorded interviews on a Dictaphone, which was tested at the start of each interview, taking a few minimal notes with additional notes written up soon afterwards. Participants could ask for the Dictaphone to be switched off if requested. As well as interviews, I also engaged in frequent face-to-face conversations with the participants in social settings in addition to using phone calls and emails when I wished to clarify ideas. In this way, I collected a broad range of data.

The meeting with Aysun took place at her request; she was not one of my original, intended participants. Our conversation, therefore, was unrecorded and not structured along my proforma guideline. This meeting took place during lunchtime during a normal school day

78

and was much briefer than my other discussions. There was therefore less time to discuss ideas in depth, although from this initial discussion, many further informal discussions ensued over the next five months. While I am aware that the meeting with Aysun is more limited in range than the interviews with other participants, I believe it was important to include as it brought a further perspective from a broader spectrum, and contributed to the rich description of perspectives I was collecting.

Interviews with Peripheral Participants

I also conducted interviews with two peripheral participants, Esma and Aysun. The interview with Esma took place when she joined Elizabeth and Lynn for drinks at the bar during their interview. On listening to our discussion about raising children in bilingual marriages, Esma started telling us about her own experiences as a child, born and raised in London by Turkish parents. I felt her experiences of negotiating languages and identities in a Turkish household living in a British community provided ideas from a different angle from which I could then look back at my participants' situations. As Esma had joined us during Lynn and Elizabeth's interview, I had the opportunity to record her interview on tape.

The addition of my second peripheral participant, Aysun, occurred when she approached me at the international pre-school where I was working. Aysun, a teacher, arranged to meet me, her principal, to talk about concerns she was having with her daughter's linguistic and social development. She was aware of the study I was undertaking and was willing to join as a peripheral participant when asked. I did not record this interview, as permission was only gained for participation after our discussion. However, I wrote detailed notes in my research diary the same evening.

Transcribing the Interviews

After the interviews, I transcribed the tapes aiming for a verbatim depiction of speech while still aiming for a 'full and faithful transcription' (Cameron, 1997: 33). My goal was to recreate the substance, meanings and perceptions that were created and shared during the as participants told their stories rather than show aspects such as vocalisation or accents. This approach is a generally accepted approach in the fields of ethnography (Agar, 1996), grounded theory (Charmaz, 2000: 509–536) as well as critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1993; van Dijk, 1999: 459–460) and involves writing in a conventional, clearly written form, using natural

punctuation based on intonation patterns to make the texts immediately accessible for the reader. Transcribing the interviews was a much more challenging and time-consuming task than I had imagined. Every decision I made involved a judgement call in an attempt to hold true to how I perceived the original, intended meaning of the participants. I am aware that my transcriptions are not an exact representation of the interview. As Kvale says:

> 'Transcripts are not copies or representations of some original reality, they are interpretative constructions that are useful tools for given purposes. Transcripts are decontextualised conversations, they are abstractions, as topographical maps are abstractions from the original landscape from which they are derived' (1996: 165).

I am aware that my transcriptions, therefore, are interpretations of the data. I found when transcribing the interviews that I seldom recognised the value of the transcript at that time; often, the relevance of the transcript only became clear to me after I had undertaken further interpretive work. As I was transcribing interviews, as well as transcribing the participants' stories, I jotted down thoughts on emerging themes.

Categorising and Charting

1. Writing up the interviews into chronological life stories

Having transcribed the interviews, I attempted to reorganise the stories into a framework of meaning in order to create interim research texts that could be used with participants. I did this by taking a chronological approach to writing about each participant focusing on temporality, sociality and place. This process involved focusing on life stages such as leaving one's home or meeting one's partner to inform the order. I also added in comments from notes in my research diary about how participants were feeling, expressing themselves, interacting with others in the interview, and notes on my perception of what was happening (Appendix 5). Taking this approach aided me in making comparisons between participants' stories. The creation of interim research texts also gave me something tangible with which to share my perceptions with participants.

2. The emergence of initial themes

While writing up participants' stories, reactions, and emotions, I looked for shared experiences and patterns which connected across the transcripts so that participants' individual stories became collective ones. Having approached the transcripts in these ways, I added further descriptions of the participants' utterances and of their reactions and emotions that took place during the interviews. Through doing this, new subtexts appeared as I started

to see their experiences from different viewpoints and this in itself opened up many possible meanings, often leading me to meet with the participants again to investigate these threads further.

3. Adding further richness to participants' chronological life stories

As I continued to meet up with participants informally, often at social events, I would raise these emerging threads and possible meanings. During these meetings, participants often revealed additional stories or different perceptions of their stories. As soon as possible after these meetings, I made notes of our conversations in my research diary. These additional insights into participants' lives were then added into the chronological stories of each participant , developing my data base, and adding a greater richness and detail to their life stories.

4. Refining emerging themes / adding headings to the chronologies / initial stages of analysis

Going through this process, helped me to adapt my thoughts and writing, refining, adding or removing ideas for the categories that were starting to form. Due to this process, I felt the themes that were emerging were representative of the many perspectives of the participants and the emerging phenomena. These themes arising from their stories, therefore, started to provide a more detailed discussion of the meaning of the story (Huber & Whelan, 1999: 301-396). At this stage, my description of the stories combined with emerging themes to form the initial stages of my analysis. I also revisited all of the participants' stories, adding in initial headings to highlight the emerging themes.

5. Adding headings to research diary entries

Having created detailed chronological stories from each participant, adding additional descriptions to capture their emotions and behaviour, and adding initial ideas for headings, next, I read through my research diary, adding the same initial headings in areas of similarity or adjusting the headings as more patterns emerged.

6. Checking emerging themes and headings with participants

Throughout this stage of emerging themes and headings, I actively collaborated with the participants by involving them in the research and discussion of my analysis (Clandinin & Connelly, 2006). This was done informally, as I saw all of the participants on a regular basis through my professional roles or social life. Through doing this, all participants were involved

in negotiating the meaning of the stories, including my own story, which I feel added a validation to the analysis (Cresswell & Miller, 2000).

7. Providing codes for the data

As even more detailed headings started to emerge, I decided to undertake coding in order to break down the data, conceptualise it and put back the data in new ways (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In order to do this, I created a coding system to group data from interviews and my research diary, for example 'ICCRD6' represented 'intercultural communication – research diary – entry 6'. These codes were logged into an Excel spreadsheet that contained columns for each participant, my own story, my research diary, and related literature review making grouping of similar themes extremely easy as I could electronically shuffle the entries according to the headings and in line with references from the literature. However, I found two major drawbacks to this approach. One drawback was that I found my reading of the literature and mapping it against the data in this manner was too strongly influencing what I was discovering and how I was creating categories; I felt the literature was starting to drive the research rather than the data. The second drawback was that through my use of a lettered and numbered coding system, I found I was becoming distanced from the people and contexts involved; they were becoming dehumanised. Bateson warns that 'dissection is an essential part of scientific method, and it is particularly tempting to disassemble' (1989: 10). This can become a problem if when the qualitative inquirer leaves the field to begin analysis and interpretation she becomes distanced from participants. In addition, Gergen (2003: 272) warns that an 'analytical method of deconstructing stories into coded piles' could undermine 'the aims of the research' by drawing the researcher's attention away from thinking narratively about experience. I feel this is what happened to me at this stage; my participants had become distant and I had lost their stories in my dissected analysis. I therefore decided to move back to using written headings in order to capture emerging themes and to stay connected to my participants.

8. Rejecting the coded headings and reverting to worded headings / removing references to literature from the analysis chart

Having reverted to using worded headings, I created a colour-coded Excel spreadsheet with columns for each participant and my research diary (with any reference to the literature removed) to track connections and patterns in a visual way between stories (Appendix 6 – reproduced in black and white). I found this helped me to focus on different parts of the data and to see the extent to which an issue was represented and to identify common threads

across cases. This also enabled me to identify in which ways insights from each case may have broader implications. This stage consisted of boiling down points and clarifying the emerging themes from my data base which consists of the interviews and embedded research diary entries and then focusing on areas of commonality and difference. Each time I gave a new heading to categories, I went back to the data to reorganise positioning of interview and research diary extracts in order to allow the picture of each phenomenon to emerge. In doing this, more potential answers began to emerge and, with each cycle, I readjusted my research questions as I began to interpret larger meanings from the stories.

9.   First written drafts of analysis and discussion

For my next stage, I embarked upon my first written drafts of analysis and discussion, using the headings that had emerged and that I had recorded in my Excel spreadsheet.

10. Regrouping according to participants verbatim utterances.

However, at this stage I continued to feel I was too driven by my own ideas and my reading of the literature, not the ideas of the participants. I therefore once again dissolved my headings and groupings, putting all my categorising and charts aside and re-approached the data anew. This time I focused on looking through the eyes of my participants, looking for clusters of phrases, and using these verbatim phrases to inform headings. I started by re-reading all the transcriptions to refresh my feeling for what people were saying. I then roughly assigned chunks of their stories into categories according to key phrases in each, for example 'the line between two cultures', 'seeing both sides', 'not letting the side down', 'my husband is on my side now'. I felt these new groupings better captured the essence of the phenomena participants were describing and allowed the data to drive the categories more than my previous attempts. Having done this, I was satisfied that my categorising and grouping was led by the data, not by own perceptions or my reading of the literature. Through taking this approach, I believe my writing became a method of discovery and analysis in itself (Richardson, 2003) whereby the writing process helped me to reflect on the data and work out the development of each participant's multiple identities in place and time.

11. Grouping themes and creating a framework of chapters

Having re-categorised my data into chunks based on clusters of participants' phrases, my next stage was to group these chunks into larger themes and shuffle them into a relevant order, thus creating the chapters used for the write up. In this way, smaller themes arose first

before overlapping into broader themes; themes which ultimately became the following chapters:

- Chapter Seven: Feeling 'comfortable' or feeling 'false': Taking ownership of one's languages
- Chapter Eight: Identities
- Chapter Nine: 'The line between two cultures', 'seeing both sides'

While I present these phenomena in three discreet chapters in order to inform the writing, in reality they are all interconnected; there are no clear cut divisions. The headings for these chapters and their themes, therefore, were generated and driven by the way the data spoke to me and themes emerged rather than being led by preconceived research questions. In fact it was these emerging sub-themes that led to the final wording of the research questions.

5.8 Issues in the Research Process

Prior to the presentation of analysis in the next three chapters, in this section I discuss some of the challenges that arose during the research process and how I overcame these challenges. I include discussion of why I decided to follow a chronological approach, the issues of reliability in qualitative research, threats to validity, uncovering and minimising bias, representation and generalisability, the relationship between myself and respondents, and the influence of the researcher on the research.

A Chronological Approach

At the outset of this study, I had originally decided to follow a path of narrative inquiry. However, I found the need to adapt this approach arose due to needs that emerged as my investigation began to evolve.

Following a narrative approach, I originally transcribed all of my participants' interviews into extended narratives in chronological order as their life stories progressed. These narratives included notes on where the participants decided to be interviewed, their appearance, their emotions and their interactions during the interviews. I had planned to use these narratives directly in the data discussion chapters. However, as I began the process of analysis, I started to find similar incidences across participants' narratives and wished to present and discuss these in juxtaposition with each other, as opposed to presenting all the

participants' stories individually and then looking back to discuss areas of similarity. This necessitated taking small sections of each narrative, grouping them under emerging themes and then undertaking a discussion. This had the effect of changing the nature of how I present participants' stories in this thesis, moving away from the narrative. It is for this reason that I refer to my approach as a chronological approach, not a narrative approach. However, despite this, I have still followed some of the tenets of narrative inquiry that form my conceptual framework; tenets such as accounting for time, place and social interaction in stories. In my investigation, therefore, following a chronological approach, the data itself is comprised of the extended, chronological stories of the participants. Their stories are not, however, presented as narratives in the final write up but as groups of dialogues that have been placed together to show and support the emergence of certain themes.

Reliability

In qualitative research, the researcher and the researched, their backgrounds and their relationships are all an integral part of the study which can make reducing objectivity challenging. In order to increase reliability, in line with Lincoln & Guba (1985) I made sure I used a precise audit trail of my research process including indexing, charts and tables to show how understanding and the themes developed. Following Silverman (2005), to obtain reliability, I also made sure I took good quality tape recordings to provide clear data for transcribing, I included notes on emotion and setting in my transcriptions (at times I use these in my data presentation, for example, when Alya becomes irritated, frustrated, angry and upset with Graham I add notes to the transcription to describe how the emotion of the interaction unfolded). I also used multiple coders to analyse transcript data. However, as previously described, after initially using multiple coders to group the data, I moved back to worded headings as I felt the data was becoming too depersonalised and I was losing my feel for the participants.

Threats to Validity

Qualitative researchers no longer question whether validity can be proven, but how threats to validity can be ruled out in order to provide for credible and valid conclusions. In particular in qualitative research there is much subjectivity. However, as I am following a

constructivist paradigm, I see this not as a weakness to be avoided but as a tool to inform meaning.

Maxwell (1996: 88) sees validity as the 'correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretations or other sort of account' and suggests a typology of validity for researchers on which I draw. One of the major threats to the validity of qualitative research is that of interpretive validity. It is possible for the researcher's subconscious, or hidden feelings to distort the messages of the participants if they do not consciously work against this. Activities I undertook to avoid this included the use of open-ended questions, acknowledging that the process of transcription from tapes is an act of interpretation, and keeping an awareness of the possibility of my own bias throughout. In addition to Maxwell's (1996) typologies, I drew on Cresswell's (2007) depiction of 'validation' and particularly liked his description of researchers providing a representation of their thoughts.

In order to provide for validation within my research, I therefore pursue the following strategies: I clarify my researcher bias at the outset of the study for the reader to understand my position and any biases or assumptions that may impact the inquiry (Merriam, 1988), in which I comment on past experiences, prejudices and orientations that may have shaped my interpretation and approach to the study. In addition, I undertake 'member checks' on my findings and interpretations which Lincoln & Guba (1985: 314) consider to be 'the most critical technique for establishing credibility'. I did this by taking interpretations back to participants in order to provide 'critical observations or interpretations' (Stake, 1995: 115). This involved staying in constant communication with participants and asking them to reflect on the accuracy of my preliminary ideas and analyses and listening to their views and ideas of what may be missing; their feedback then informed my writing. Finally, throughout the writing I acknowledge the participants' accounts, understanding that their stories 'can no longer be given an alternative interpretation by the researcher who then offers their accounts as truth and privilege' (Burr, 2003: 155).

Uncovering and Minimising Bias

In qualitative research, there is much possibility for researcher bias and, as such, I needed to minimise these effects. I found I had revealed initial biases to myself in writing up the critical incidents. These biases included: my initial surprise there may be issues for children in bilingual families; advising parents to ignore speech therapist's advice that I felt was harmful; and describing my feelings of joy at hearing a child celebrate his multicultural

heritage. These stories gave me a clear picture of what I felt was right or wrong, and I believe paint a clear picture of my biases for the reader too. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) believe it is impossible to eliminate these biases; it is therefore the responsibility of the researcher to minimise the effects of these. In order to do this, I comment on any bias throughout this thesis for the benefit of myself and the reader so this bias is transparent and considered in the interpretation and discussion. During interviews, I tried not to show my bias, aiming to avoid swaying participants' opinions. I also took care with my reactions to their stories, as 'reactivity' may influence participants and therefore be a threat to validity (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995).

Another possible area for bias was my research diary. Incidents often sparked memories of experiences I had had in my life, which meant I was writing about them at a much later date whereby I may have been seeing and recreating myself in the past from a present perspective (Clements, 2001). There is always the danger in this of having a faded or distorted memory. In addition, I was viewing these incidents from my personal viewpoint; these incidents may have been viewed differently by others. Searlemann and Herrmann (1994) refer to these viewpoints as 'self-schematas' in which the writer may embellish, exaggerate or centre oneself in the story more than was the case. This is what Clements (2001) refers to as 'fictive'; in other words, an autobiographical recreation of the event. I kept these warnings in mind when approaching data from my research diary, questioning my choice of words in an attempt to understand my values and biases and how these may have influenced my memory of events.

Representation and Generalisability

My investigation focuses on a small group of individuals in Turkish-English marriages in Istanbul and listens to what they have to say about language use in their families and the issues that arise. However, I understand that my participants' stories are not representative of all such families. My study is located in the urban city of Istanbul, the prestigious, economic and cultural centre where English is much in demand and much used. I therefore believe this study can only be considered representative within the context of Istanbul, not all other areas of Turkey. In addition, although the data collection phase lasted over four years, I consider this a relatively short period in terms of individuals' lives. I understand that my participants' stories will continue to evolve and develop over time.

Researcher and Respondent Relations

Throughout the interviews, I kept in mind the warnings of Cohen *et al* (2007) that: the presence of the researcher may influence participants who may wish to avoid or impress her; the researcher may tend to trust the participants whose definition of the situation may be selective, partial or false; and that the researcher may identify too closely with the participants and neglect some aspects. All of these factors lead to reduced reliability and validity.

I believe my relationship with the participants affected their responses in a number of ways. Some participants were friends, leading to informal and relaxed interviews; however, I believe these interviews were also more candid and frank than those with participants I knew less well. Some interviews were with former colleagues whom I had previously managed. Some participants I was managing at the time of the interviews which I believe had an effect on how they presented themselves; either putting on a more formal air, or testing hierarchical boundaries outside our normal work environment. At the time of writing the analysis and discussion, due to taking up employment at a new institution, I was no longer managing any of the participants.

I now briefly outline how I believe my roles and relationships with participants affected the interviews in the following ways.

1. As an Insider

At times, participants saw me as being one of them, an insider - a parent in a Turkish-English marriage. On these occasions the participants reflected questions back at me, wanting to hear my opinion as a mother. I embraced these opportunities and was willing to participate as researcher-as-respondent finding it useful to hear participants reflect my opinions back at me or provide for different perspectives. When I felt I had been repositioned from researcher to participant, I made a note of this in the transcriptions.

2. As an Outsider

At other times I was seen as an outsider and my presence created tension, such as when Tim became protective of his wife's English and jumped to her defence.

Tim: I'm not being rude, but Hulya is more conscious of her English now because you are here, you know, but when it's just the two of us, she speaks… I don't know, better, she only becomes conscious when other people are there.

This made me aware that I was holding the interview on my own linguistic and therefore cultural grounds and I realised it was impossible to create linguistic parity in the interview for Hulya to express her feelings about raising her child in her own language. Even if I did have fluent enough Turkish to do so, she would still be talking to a non-Turk, and therefore outside her own cultural reality. This realisation made me see my own researcher position better; I realised all my interviews had an Anglo-centric slant as British parents were being interviewed in their own language and cultural reality while Turkish parents were not.

3. As a Manager

One of the identities I brought with me was that of principal. In the interview with Leyla and Shirley, Shirley took pleasure in the opportunity to position me outside the role of her manager.

Shirley: (referring to me in an incredulous manner) Your Turkish is atrocious! I don't know where you got your accent from. Where have you got this accent? You speak like a Kurd. ...It's really weird, but where have you learnt it from? ...But the accent, you're not even speaking with an English accent! ...Like Janet speaks Turkish with a New Zealand accent. You don't even speak with an English accent. Your voice goes all twisty and ropey. I was quite shocked. You should hear her (speaking to Leyla) it's really weird.

At this point Shirley was fully enjoying herself, pointing out how poor my Turkish accent is. Seeing what she was up to and smiling, I conceded to her jibes and let her have her fun with me.

4. As a Friend

With Elizabeth, in her sixties, I suddenly felt myself repositioned from peer to comparison with her children and back to peer.

Elizabeth: So, three years between them, right?

Caroline: Yes, like me and my brother. I was born in 1973 and my brother was born in 1976.

Elizabeth: What do you mean, you were born in when?

Caroline: I was born in 1973.

Elizabeth: I can't believe that. Steven is like a babe! And you're an equal.

Elizabeth and I laughed as we worked this out, and I was flattered by Elizabeth's comments. We have always had a good friendship, despite an age difference of nearly thirty years. I think this was the first time we had actually said out loud how much of a difference there was and realised I am the same age as her eldest son.

While my relationship with the participants may have affected their responses and affected validity and reliability, as in the examples above, I kept an awareness of these threats throughout the interviews and noted in my research diary and alongside the transcriptions when I believed my presence had altered participants' responses in order to reduce this threat.

Influence of the Researcher on the Research

I understand that the nature of participatory research means my presence and research methods are entwined with the politics inherent in the social world I am studying (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 16) and in which I am living. As such, I know that the outcomes of this research are not free from my embedded values as I have intrinsically brought my social world with me to this investigation. I therefore do not present this research as being 'value' or 'bias'-free (Janesick, 2000: 385). In fact, in order to uncover and make transparent my own bias, I have drawn upon researcher reflexivity by continually objectifying my own position and de-familiarising my world view (Bourdieu & Lacquant, 1992).

In this section, I critique how my presence as participant researcher may have caused bias in this research either due to my inability to free myself from my own prejudices or, in an attempt to counter this, through a tendency towards espousing certain ideals in an endeavour to decentralise my own voice.

On starting this study, I saw this investigation as a collective undertaking, believing that my own views and biases and those of the participants would balance each other out (Webb *et al*, 2010). However, one of the major problems with my fieldwork is the limited number of Turkish participants that I invited to join (no Turkish, male participants joined) and also the necessity of having to conduct all of the interviews in English due to my limited proficiency in Turkish. In addition, while some British participants were interviewed without their Turkish partners, neither of the Turkish participants were interviewed without their partners; a situation that quite likely influenced answers given by these participants.

As discussed in section 2.5, I believe how we view our world and present ourselves is derived from our collective history; a process which is constructed and sustained through our socialisation. This means that language is more than just a mode of communication but also contains a way of being in the world, how we act, what our values are, what we believe and how we form and present our social identities (Kramsch, 2000: 61). This may mean that when I ask Turkish participants to provide their opinions through the medium of English, it may not be the best conduit through which they can discuss their own socialised acts, values and beliefs. Instead, for them, it may act as a borrowed medium which intrinsically carries the imprint of someone else's social discourse practices. This can be seen in Fairclough's critical discourse model where discourse as language use is believed to be embedded in existing power relations such that language acts a conduit for political and ideological practice and is also determined by the ideologies inherent in these power relations on a broader scale (Fairclough, 2001). This would mean that Turkish participants being interviewed in English would neither be speaking their own language nor, ideologically speaking, owning the language they are speaking. Taking this model to the extreme, this would mean that no Turkish participants would be able to put forward their true selves in a language into which they had not been socialised. However, I do not believe this extreme situation to be the case.

On reflection, my first reaction to this issue is that by asking all the participants to undertake the interviews in English conducted by myself, a British researcher, the environment in which interviews took place was pre-framed by linguistic specifications and by macro-level discourse factors inherent in my own background. My aim, therefore, of my own views and biases and those of the participants balancing each other out may not have come to fruition as, through my choice of participant profile and choice of language in which to conduct interviews, I created an environment which was more suited to hearing and encouraging voices similar to my own, with individuals who share similar backgrounds.

On the surface, it seems this may have been what happened. What emerges from the interviews with Turkish participants (described in chapter 9) are stories describing tendencies towards British values and norms in family practices. This would seem to follow Fairclough's model whereby the dominant discourse takes over as the subordinate group assimilates or moves to emulate the dominant discourse. However, this outcome may not simply be based on choice of language for the interviews. I believe a key problem with my data collection is that no Turkish participants are interviewed without their British spouse present. It may be common social practice to moderate one's opinions to suit those around in order to avoid offence and maintain a good relationship. If Turkish participants were tempering responses, it

may not have been that they were constrained by forces of social discourse within the language, but that their views were influenced by the presence of their spouse.

In summary, as a participant researcher, I am aware that I bring to this research my own cultural history, ethnicity, class, educational and linguistic background and these factors are all embedded within my investigation. In addition, the medium through which I conducted my interviews and through which I theorise and write is English. As discussed, no language can claim neutrality as each comes embedded with cultural discourses. I am aware, therefore, that I cannot claim to separate myself from or rise above these forces in the course of this investigation. However, throughout this writing I have strived to make transparent my own biases to myself and the reader and in this section I have critiqued how my choice of interview grouping and language, and how my preferred language may have affected the findings and key ideas in this study.

5.9 The Thematic Structuring of the Data Chapters

Having described how I attempted to reduce issues in the research process, I now present how I conceptualised the thematic structuring of the data and discussion chapters while also following the policy for doctoral theses from the Department of Applied Linguistics at Canterbury Christ Church University. I first focus on the data in individual chapters after which I include additional issues that arose in a subsequent chapter.

In structuring the data chapters, I attempted to group emerging themes into three data-discussion chapters under three overriding themes: language, identity and culture – themes that had continually arisen from participants' stories. However, while grouping the data this way, to aid in writing and to aid the reader, I do not believe there is a clear distinction between these chapters. Through the intrinsic way in which language, identity and culture are linked, all coming together in each individual to create their perceptions of who they are, overlaps occur between the chapters. This means that throughout the data chapters, certain elements may appear more than once. In addition, certain themes could be placed in any of the three chapters. I place these themes under the chapter heading I feel most suits the content; this does not indicate, however, exclusivity of the discussion to this chapter alone.

Table 3, below, outlines the final headings and groupings of data that emerged and how I organised them into four chapters. In the next chapter, I introduce the participants.

TABLE 3: FINAL STRUCTURING OF THE DATA

Chapter Seven Feeling 'comfortable' or feeling 'false': Taking ownership of one's languages		Chapter Eight Identities		Chapter Nine 'The line between two cultures', 'seeing both sides'		Chapter Ten Issues Arising from the Data: Discussion of the Literature	
7.1	'I feel false in Turkish'	8.1	'I will never become a Turk!', 'Don't forget, you are not English!'	9.1	'She's only marrying you for your passport and money!'	10.1	Do individuals wish to emulate a target language model?
7.2	'You are not really speaking the same language, because it means something different'	8.2	'I was not going anywhere except for a council flat with five kids!', 'I was one of those BA jet set kids'	9.2	They have no 'free thinking', 'truth' or 'rationality'	10.2	Investment as an alternative theory to motivation in language learning
7.3	'If your Turkish is really good, you put up a barrier to people'	8.3	'If you are foreign, you can't pick up on clues like local accents or clothes'	9.3	'You judge people on your own culture – it's so wrong, but it's difficult not to'	10.3	How the English language affects language use and migration in bilingual families
7.4	'Sometimes they value the fact she is married to an Englishman'	8.4	'As a man in Turkey, there is pressure to provide not just for the wife, but for her family as well'	9.4	'When you come to a country where people don't even use a knife and fork, it's easy to think they are not cultured'	10.4	How being a proficient speaker may not be enough to gain legitimacy
7.5	'If you complain about your own country, it's quite different to if you complain about another country'	8.5	'The fact that if I go to visit a woman, I'm upsetting the husband, that's crazy!'	9.5	'I think it is important, whatever culture, that the children know there is a line and are able to see both sides'	10.5	How Turkish spouses have been accepted as legitimate speakers
7.6	'Had it been another language, I would have made a real effort'	8.6	'You will never be able to assimilate because you look too foreign', 'People get confused because I look Turkish'			10.6	Sociolinguistic competence in a second language
7.7	'If you live in a country & don't learn the language, it's like living in a cage'	8.7	'I like living in an English bubble', 'When I speak Turkish, I think and feel Turkish'			10.7	The ownership of truth
7.8	'I feel emotionally disconnected from my daughter in English'	8.8	'Two languages and two countries is like being two people', 'My son is more positive in English than in Turkish'			10.8	The identity adjustment dimension
7.9	'Stop speaking your own language to your son or you will damage him'	8.9	'My son doesn't want to be Turkish, he wants to be English and live in England, but he doesn't really know English people'				

CHAPTER SIX

INTRODUCTION TO DATA CHAPTERS: MEET THE PARTICIPANTS

6.1 Biography of the Participants

In this section, I introduce the participants, with the aim of providing sufficient background information to set up a discourse of understanding for the reader, so that from this initial picture the reader can start to develop a relationship with them and gain their own perceptions on their stories as the analysis chapters unfold. Table 4 below gives an overview of the participants, their nationalities, their spouses and their children.

TABLE 4: OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS, THEIR PARTNERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

British Partner	Turkish Partner	Children
Shirley	Mustafa	Ali, Lara
Leyla (Iranian born, British-raised)	Ahmet	Nardir
Graham	**Alya**	Eren, Can
Maureen	Fatih	Meryem, Efe
Tim	**Hulya**	Louie
Elizabeth	Mehmet (divorced)	Steven, Mark
Lynn	Erman (divorced)	Yeşim, Jale, Azra
Caroline (author)	Cengiz	Yasemin, Onur

Peripheral Participants	Background	Children
Esma	Raised in London by Turkish parents	Bora (born two years after the interview)
Aysun	Raised in an English-speaking international community in the Middle East by Turkish parents	Bade

Participants are shown in bold (including participant researcher)

Shirley

Shirley is a British woman in her forties. She and her three siblings were brought up in Birmingham in the UK, in a single-parent family in a council house. She reveals it was 'tough' growing up. Her parents had divorced and her father was away. Her mother worked 'three jobs' to keep the family and I perceive from how Shirley talks she has a strained relationship with her mother. A strong influence in her life was her grandmother whom Shirley describes as the cornerstone of the family, providing stability and love. Shirley has a Turkish husband, Mustafa and two children entering their teens, a son, Ali, and a daughter, Lara. She has no formal teaching qualifications but has many years of experience working in English-medium pre-schools in Istanbul.

> Shirley: I met Mustafa while I was travelling in Turkey and I went back and Mustafa came over. He was opening a shop in Paris, so he was in Paris and came to Birmingham, and I liked him and thought 'he's a businessman, who is this person who wears nice hand-made clothes?' He was in his element and he came over and I said 'I'm working, but I will come over for a few weeks, see how it goes'. But I didn't, I gave up everything, gave up my job and came here and it was lovely and I stayed.

In addition to her husband owning his own business and them owning their own home, Shirley and her husband now own a number of properties in Istanbul which they rent out. Their children are both on partial scholarships at their school – one of the benefits of Shirley's employment.

Leyla

Leyla, also in her forties, comes from a well-educated, Iranian family. She was born in Iran, but her father decided he wanted the family, two daughters and a son, to be educated in England, and wanted the children to be fluent English speakers 'due to the global status of English'. Leyla therefore grew up between two homes in Iran and England. Leyla has no extended family in Turkey but they often visit from the UK and Iran. Her husband's parents live in England, travelling back to Turkey when they stay in their summer house. Leyla works as a teacher in an international pre-school with Shirley. Iranian by birth, with the right to reside in the UK, trilingual in English, Farsi and Turkish, Leyla has a Turkish husband with whom she has a trilingual, eleven-year-old son, Nardir, to whom she speaks English and Farsi – he responds to her in English. Her husband's family, a well-established, high society family, are very involved in their lives. Her husband works in the stock exchange.

Leyla first travelled to Turkey in the early 1980s at the age of sixteen where her husband, Ahmet, completed his Master's degree and military service. In 1986, Leyla and her husband returned to England, staying for 3 years before returning to Turkey. Their son, Nardir, was born in 2000. At the time of interview he was on a scholarship at a private Turkish school, sister school to the international school where Leyla works.

Alya and Graham

Graham is a teacher at an international school. He is a British citizen, originally from Lincoln. He is married to Alya whom he met in England in 1999; Alya was living in outer London. After this, Graham found a teaching position in London and they moved in together, getting married in 1999 and moving to Turkey in 2001 where their two sons, Eren and Can, were born. Eren has a full scholarship at the international school where Graham works.

Graham reveals a history of travel and intercultural relationships in his family.

Graham: The thing is, with my family, my brother has lived in Nigeria and he's had a German girlfriend and my other brother had a French girlfriend so it's not really that unusual the thought of having a foreign girlfriend and maybe it's not unusual for them, I don't think. They don't make a big issue out of it. I mean, they'd like us to live around the corner... My mother actually grew up in India; she lived in India for the first thirteen years. So my parents haven't got an issue with it at all. I mean, I think they love the fact we live in different countries, but I suppose that's because they've some kind of foreign thing going on in our family.

Graham and Alya live with their sons on the outskirts of the city near the Belgrad Forest.

Maureen

Maureen is in her thirties. She is originally from Wales. Maureen lives with her husband, her 11 year-old daughter, Meryem, and her three-year-old son, Efe. Efe has a full scholarship at the international pre-school where Maureen teaches and Meryem goes to a Turkish state primary school. Maureen first came to Istanbul to work as a live-in nanny/English teacher in 1991. She met her future husband, Fatih, through a mutual friend and married in 1994 at a local Istanbul registry office. She and her husband live in the flat that they own in central Istanbul with their two children.

Hulya and Tim

Tim, in his mid-thirties is married to Hulya. For the interview, I sat in the living room of their flat with their four-year-old son, Louie. Tim told me he first met Hulya when he went to a bar with friends where she was having a drink with colleagues from work, a charitable organisation that fights for the rights of Roma and the disabled in Turkey. They have been married for eight years. Tim is a teacher trainer.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth is in her mid-sixties and has lived in Istanbul for over 40 years. For our interview, Elizabeth took me to Kafe Pi in Beşiktas.

As Elizabeth talked, she painted a picture of a privileged family background:

Elizabeth: We came from an old family and you had a certain life-style. Mother toured Europe as a girl. We found her books and photos when she died. It was like a different world, but it's all gone. I mean, mother never spoke anything but English and when she went to Europe, everyone spoke English… Our family business was started in 1834 and I remember writing to Lady Buller, because we managed their estate. I remember my father wrote a letter and wrote 'My Dear Lady, I remain your most obedient servant'.

Elizabeth met her future husband, Mehmet, a man from an esteemed Turkish family, in 1960s England where he was at university. Soon afterwards, to the surprise of her parents, Elizabeth announced her plans to wed Mehmet and to move to Istanbul. It was in Istanbul that Elizabeth settled for the next forty years. She also saw her family grow with the birth of her sons Mark and Steven in the 1970s. Sadly, her marriage ended in divorce in 2001. Elizabeth still resides in her four-bedroom flat in an exclusive area of Istanbul. Now retired, she lives with her son, Steven, recently back from a ten-year stint in the UK. She is often visited by her elder son Mark and his Turkish wife who live in a flat nearby.

Mark and Steven started their education at a state primary school in Turkish then later went to French-medium schools. Mark studied literature and medicine in France before dropping out and taking Spanish literature at a university in Istanbul; he speaks English, Turkish, French and Spanish. However, he wanted to be a musician and went on to study music. Steven studied philosophy in Istanbul in English and then did a Master's degree in television and film production in the UK after which he worked in the UK for ten years. Elizabeth worked as an English language teacher before retiring.

Lynn

Lynn is in her late fifties. Like Elizabeth, she has been in Istanbul for many years and, like Elizabeth, after many years with her husband, her marriage ended in divorce. Elizabeth and Lynn are good friends. Their children are similar ages, with Lynn's daughters, Jale, Yeşim and Azra, in their twenties and thirties. While Elizabeth settled in Turkey, Lynn and her family spent time moving between the two countries due to her husband's business needs.

> Lynn: When I first came here I was in Ankara in the sixties, Elizabeth was in Istanbul then, and I went back and then I came back in 1975 and stayed until 1991 and then I went back to England again and came back in 2004 permanently. But during that period of time I have been back a lot. I enjoy it here, but I enjoy going back too.

> Lynn: My daughter Jale was born in the UK and she was there until she was five. Yeşim was born in Turkey and then we went back to the UK for a while, and Azra came when she was nearly three. They all went back in 1991. We were a family that kept coming and going. My children have all been back (in Turkey) for about 10 years now.

The children's schooling was between England and Turkey. Jale went to pre-school in England for two years, Yeşim for one year and Azra went to pre-school in Ankara for one year in Turkish. The girls started at an international school in Istanbul, but Lynn said it was too far and transport was difficult so she sent them to a local Turkish school. Later, the girls were educated in Turkish at a prestigious High School. Jale attended an English-medium University in Istanbul and now has an engineering company. Yeşim studied English literature at a university in Istanbul, and Azra went to college in the UK and is a professional make-up artist. All three live in Istanbul.

Esma

Esma, in her mid thirties, is a teacher trainer and a colleague of Elizabeth and Lynn. Her Turkish parents moved to England in 1974, two years later Esma was born, followed by a sister. Esma completed her pre-school education in a 'multicultural' school in London. She says her father didn't like England, so he kept coming and going but eventually stayed there for seven years until the family moved back to Istanbul where she completed her primary education. After this her family moved back to Britain where she completed her education. Esma returned to Turkey when she was twenty-one to teach English. Her parents still live in the UK, but travel back and forth on business. Esma is married to a Turk, Bedrihan. Three years after our interview, Esma had a son.

Aysun

Aysun, a Turkish citizen, was raised in the English-speaking international community in the Middle East, attending an English-medium school until her return to Turkey aged 18 where she went to university. Aysun is employed at an international school as a native-English teacher, the only teacher employed in this position who is not American, Canadian or British. However, despite being employed as a native-English speaker, Aysun vocally rejects this term.

Acquiring English and Turkish simultaneously, but describing Turkish as her mother tongue, Aysun decided to raise her daughter, Bade, by speaking English to her while her husband speaks Turkish. However, when her daughter was three, Aysun described feeling emotionally disconnected. She expressed that as she was not speaking to her daughter in her mother tongue, to which her emotions were intrinsically linked, that this was damaging her relationship with Bade whom she felt had become withdrawn. Therefore when her daughter was aged three, Aysun switched to Turkish. She expressed great regret that she had ever started speaking to English to Bade.

Additional Information

In this investigation, the majority of the British participants are employed as teachers, which may be indicative of my social circles; however, this may be linked to Turkish state legislation that limits employment opportunities for foreigners:

> 'Several professions... are forbidden to foreigners and so is any type of work for the governmental agencies... except for teaching positions in the private sector and secretarial jobs, hope of finding work is almost nil. (This law was changed in February 2003 and foreign spouses have been placed in a special category. Work permits are easier to obtain)' (Eyüboğlu, 2004: 293)

All the participants in this study moved to Istanbul before 2003.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FEELING 'COMFORTABLE' OR FEELING 'FALSE': TAKING OWNERSHIP OF ONE'S LANGUAGES

I present now, the first of three data and discussion chapters, starting with a discussion about language. In this chapter, through the lens of poststructuralism, I view which languages an individual uses throughout their lifetime as being fluid and, taking a social constructivist approach, believe these changes in which languages are used are co-constructed between individuals and surrounding interlocutors. Based on these theories, this chapter examines what participants say about language use in their families, places of employment and the surrounding community and also looks at their perceptions of their children's language use. To accurately reflect how participants negotiate and co-construct their intricate and intimate patterns of language use and which factors may influence this, I present their utterances verbatim. I start by presenting how participants describe the use of their languages and how their children use their languages.

Except for Leyla who acquired English at the age of four, all the participants in this study and their spouses were born into a one-language family environment. Their children, however, were born into a two-language family environment. This is a distinction that the participants often draw on in their descriptions of their family languages, identifying difference between their own language socialisation and language use and that of their children. This situation is complex and in the interviews it becomes clear that everyone is trying to explain what is going on.

During the interviews, participants often referred to the difference between their original language and later added languages by using the term 'native speaker' as a descriptor for the language they were born into and the language in which they feel fully proficient. As this is a term the participants use and a term I am drawn to due to my background in teaching, I discuss what I understand by this at the start of this chapter to explain how I, and the participants, make distinctions between people when talking about language.

Piller (2001) uses the term 'native speaker' to describe when an individual's primary socialization and first language were acquired within one national culture. From the interviews, this seems to be the situation participants describe. While the term 'native speaker' can be used to describe the first language that participants were socialised into, it does not describe subsequent languages that participants have acquired or learnt. A term commonly used is 'Second Language Acquisition' (SLA) learners, but this is generally used to

refer to language students involved in formal education. This is not the profile of my participants. While the Turkish participants undertook formal education in English, either at school, university or study abroad, they are not involved in formal education now. In addition, hardly any of the British participants have undertaken any formal study of Turkish; instead they have acquired the language in a naturalised setting. While I believe there is no clear distinction between being a learner and becoming a speaker, as both happen continuously whether in formal education or not, I feel it is important to make it clear to the reader that my participants' profiles differ from the profiles of second language acquisition learners in current research. I therefore refer to my participants as subsequent language speakers throughout this thesis. It also becomes apparent in this chapter that participants question whether as adult learners they will ever be able to become bilingual, even if it brings many advantages. I believe this indicates they see subsequent languages as different from native-speaker languages and perceive speaking like a native as an ideal they may not able to reach.

While Piller's description of a 'native speaker' portrays the language socialisation of the participants in this study, it does not accurately describe the language socialisation of their children who are acquiring two languages within one nation and who were born into two or three-language home environments. Haugen (1956) describes this situation as 'simultaneous infant bilingualism', Swain (1972) as 'bilingualism as a first language', Huerta (1977:) describes 'native acquisition of two languages' and Wode (1978) as 'first language bilingualism'. Kornakov (2000) uses the term 'native bilingualism' or 'simultaneous acquisition of bilingualism' whereby two languages are acquired simultaneously during the initial stages of language development which often occurs in inter-linguistic families. De Houwer (2009) prefers 'Bilingual First Language Acquisition' (based on Swain's 1976: usage) which she describes as the development of language in young children who hear two languages spoken to them from birth.

While understanding the limitations of trying to define a concept as complex as what kind of speaker someone is, I tend towards Piller's description of 'native speaker' for my participants. When describing their added languages, I refer to them as 'subsequent language' speakers. I do this as I feel both labels create a heuristic device with which I can describe the initial language socialisation of the participants and their subsequent language acquisition. For their children, I use Kornakov's term 'simultaneous acquisition bilingual' which I feel best describes the linguistic development of the children and is an easy term for the reader. Again, I am aware this is a heuristic device to facilitate the writing and reading of this thesis and that the term does not capture individual complexities of each child's language acquisition.

7.1 'I feel false in Turkish'

When talking about her proficiency in Turkish, Maureen assesses her Turkish proficiency based on her perceived communicative competence.

> Maureen: I would say my Turkish is satisfactory. I don't often have problems making myself understood. It isn't really grammatically correct, but it is very communicative; people can understand me.

However, next she associates her bilingualism with feeling different, feeling false whereby she positions herself as an outsider and believes others still position her as an outsider, despite her competency.

> Maureen: But I feel false in Turkish conversations; it doesn't come naturally... I can speak enough Turkish to get by, and later on, taxi drivers would turn around and say 'ah, you're not Turkish are you?' and I would say 'no, I'm foreign'.

After that, she uses grammatical accuracy as an indicator to describe her bilingual abilities.

> Maureen: Because I didn't learn Turkish in a language school, I know my endings and past tenses are not always right, but the person opposite me always knows what I am saying.

She then indicates her notion that one has to be '100%' in order to be bilingual and that she is not there 'yet', indicating that she sees the journey towards bilingualism as some sort of progression.

> Maureen: But I am not one hundred percent bilingual yet. I am not going to say 'yes, I'm perfect'. But I find I'm fluent enough to get by in most circumstances.

While Maureen sees herself as communicative but inaccurate, she reveals her advanced abilities when she describes how the only time she doesn't understand her husband's family is when they use Ottoman terms.

> Maureen: Sometimes with my husband's family they use a word I don't understand and then it turns out they have used an old-fashioned word I wouldn't know.

Elizabeth conceptualises bilingualism as being when one speaks two languages equally well.

> Elizabeth: I don't know if I would go as far as saying I'm bilingual. I can speak, but it's different. I would say being bilingual is when you speak two languages equally well but I wouldn't consider myself bilingual.

However, despite her many years in Turkey, she still describes finding herself positioned as a foreigner based on her language abilities.

> Elizabeth: I can think and get myself understood, but yesterday I took a taxi... and the taxi driver said 'My gosh your Turkish is bad!'

However, like Maureen, Elizabeth indicates that she sees bilingualism on a continuum of continual improvement.

> Elizabeth: For two years in this country it is probably OK, but not for nearly 40 years.

While Maureen described feeling false in Turkish, Elizabeth describes not wanting to be *thought of* as Turkish.

> Elizabeth: But, it's not so much that, after a time, if I'm speaking to someone for quite a time, I think my Turkish improves. But, I don't *want* to be thought of as Turkish.

Elizabeth may have put a limitation on how much of her Turkish linguistic abilities she reveals so she doesn't come across as Turkish but maintains her British persona. This self-imposed block may have more to do with retaining her perception of her identity than with a lack of language learning ability. This thread is taken up later in this chapter when I discuss the role of language use and accents in the projection of one's identity.

It seems, whether mistaken for a native speaker or not, Maureen and Elizabeth who use both languages on a daily basis may reject the label of bilingualism to describe their abilities, saying they do not feel 'comfortable', or reject the option of using more fluent Turkish as a way of reasserting their original identity. There is therefore a disparity between the labelling of linguists such as Saunders (1982) and Grosjean (2010) and the perceptions of individuals regarding their beliefs in their bilingual status. Li Wei speculates that these beliefs may be rooted in growing up in monolingual communities:

> 'where monolingualism and uniculturalism are promoted as the normal way of life (and people) often think that bilingualism is only for a few 'special' people' (2000: 5).

For Maureen and Elizabeth, this may be the case. The concept of considering themselves bilingual did not appear to be perceived as a viable self-description by either of them.

As well as describing their own linguistic abilities, Maureen and Elizabeth also described the language use of their children who had been raised in Turkish and English. Maureen's description of her perception of her daughter's bilingual ability is based on 'comfort'.

> Meryem is bilingual, she doesn't struggle in English, but I think she feels more comfortable in Turkish.

However, Elizabeth's measurement is based on 'awareness'.

> Steven and Mark are much more aware of things than I am, definitely bilingual.

Elizabeth goes on to give an additional conceptualisation of bilingualism.

> Elizabeth: They can change in another language; they can deal with situations in another language. I mean, to be bilingual, you really have to speak both the languages and you have got to be fluent in both the languages.

Maureen and Elizabeth, therefore, both label their children as bilingual, a label they base on 'comfort', being 'fluent' or their children having the ability to change between languages and situations. Another participant, Leyla, described her own route to bilingualism as a child, stating that she had 'acquired' her English.

> Leyla: My Turkish is as good as my husband's English.
> Caroline: Why do you think that is?
> Leyla: Because I'm talented at languages.
> Shirley: She's clever. I'm lazy and I never learnt another language. You learnt another language as a child, didn't you.
> Leyla: No, I *acquired* it.

Leyla's implication is that this is somehow a better way or a true way to become bilingual.

In summary, participants who have acquired their subsequent languages later in life do not seem to consider themselves to be bilingual, even if they are mistaken for native-speakers at times. However, they indicate it is not impossible for them to become bilingual as they may see themselves on a continuum, slowly moving towards bilingualism. Unlike themselves, they label their children as bilingual based on comfort, awareness and being able to deal with different situations. From how Maureen and Elizabeth view their own bilingualism compared to how they view their children's, and from Leyla's comments about acquisition, a notion arises that acquiring a language is somehow better than learning a language. The age at which a language is added and the linguistic environment in which it is added may therefore play a role in participants' perceptions of what it means to be bilingual.

7.2 'You are not really speaking the same language, because it means something different'

In this section, participants describe their beliefs that both linguistic and cultural prowess are integral components in bilingualism.

> Graham: I definitely think bilingualism means knowing two languages and knowing two cultures as well, like if your parents are from one. Because if you can speak English and Turkish, I wouldn't say you were bilingual, I would say you can speak two languages, but if your parents are from two then you are bilingual.

His comments reinforce Maureen and Elizabeth's notions that the true bilingual has to be born into both communities of practice. Graham's wife, Alya, mirrors Graham's views on the importance of culture.

> Alya: I would say I am bilingual in language and culture then, because if you say it's just the language, I wouldn't say I can speak English like a British person, because I'm not. But if you include them, my English is very good, and if I include culture as well, yes, I can say I'm bilingual. I've managed to get a job in different countries. I can get by, you know, when you can get by, you are more comfortable as well.

She positions knowledge of culture as higher than knowledge of language in her definition of bilingualism. Interestingly, she describes herself as bilingual based on her understanding of British culture in addition to her language abilities although she doesn't speak 'like a British person'. For her, bilingualism includes feeling 'comfortable' in both the country and the culture, a notion that was also expressed by Maureen.

Another participant, Tim, questions whether he will pass on his British culture through his English language when his son is being raised in a predominantly Turkish environment.

> The jokes, I'd like to be able to share that with him… I'm not saying it's better, it's just what I know… but I actually think it's better, it will be better for him, you know… but I also like irony, that sort of thing... but am I being unrealistic to expect that? Will he learn it off me? Will he learn the ironic terms and the jokes and that sort of thing, or will he just learn my jokes… I don't know.

Tim wants to be able to share jokes with his son; however, he questions whether that will be possible. He thinks his son may pick up surface level aspects, 'learning the jokes', but may not pick up his cultural understanding, 'the irony'. He questions whether it is 'realistic' to expect his son to pick up this deeper level of understanding from him, despite his desire for Louie to do so and, through his comments, reveals his belief that British humour is 'better' than Turkish humour. While Tim questions whether aspects of his culture, such as humour, will be passed on to his son, he also questions whether his cultural values will be passed on to his son through his language.

> Language changes the way you think, how you look at things, the way you approach your objectives, the way they sort of align, yeah. It's probably objectives... centralising certain things, different ways of talking about time, you can't separate your thoughts from language, I really don't think so. I'm English, aren't I, and I want Louie thinking in ways which I can relate to.

It seems Tim believes it takes more than proficiency in a language to relate to someone. Alya, too, picks up on the concept of fluency in language not necessarily leading to being able to relate to someone. She describes trying to speak in 'the English way' in order to make herself understood to her husband, Graham.

Alya: I want to make myself clear, especially because if I'm going to have to speak the English way, in feeling your culture to make Graham understand... because the way I feel... I'm more confident in the way we say it in Turkish, and when I try to make that clear to Graham, it doesn't make sense... it's difficult to make it clear what you are saying, you know what I mean, language and culture are linked together.

Graham: Yes, I think your underlying culture comes into your language a lot, because you can't separate yourself from your culture.

Graham and Alya's utterances reflect the view that language and culture are interlinked and that the way we speak and what we say reflects our culture (as suggested by Hymes: 1974; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; Baker, 2000; Samovar and Porter, 2004). This is similar to Tim's view that 'you can't separate your thoughts from language'. Elizabeth's utterance, too, provides evidence that exemplifies this.

Elizabeth: ...because your language is also a part of your culture... and you could be married for many years and you could speak the language perfectly, but you are not really speaking the same language because the language *means* something different... I mean that's the reason I'm against mixed marriages. Because I don't think you are on the same wavelength. The language doesn't *mean* the same.

Elizabeth's description echoes Halliday's (1975) views that learning a language also involves learning how to mean in that language. Shirley, too, expresses similar sentiments.

I find even when Turkish people are speaking English, I can't understand them! I just can't, I can't get exactly what they are saying.

I also found an example in my research diary from an occasion when Aysun, one of my peripheral participants, was observed by a native-English speaker, Sally.

Sally (a native-English teacher at the school) passed comment to me about speaking to Aysun (employed as a native-English speaker at the school). Sally described Aysun as speaking impeccable, native-speaker-standard English but that she couldn't quite 'get her'. 'She is speaking English but I feel I can't understand her, my expectations don't match'. Sally described how when she spoke to her as an English person, she couldn't quite understand her, but when she spoke to her in English as if she was a Turkish person, she could understand her better. She said that once she had re-categorised Aysun as Turkish, she felt things made sense. (Research Diary, March 2009)

This issue of language meaning something different to different people is discussed by Cruz-Ferreira who believes 'words and grammar may reproduce one another more or less accurately across languages, but the original flavour of the whole thing will be left behind' (2010: 14). This seems to be what Alya is sensing when speaking to Graham, what Elizabeth experienced with her husband, why Shirley feels she is 'not on the same wavelength' as Turks speaking English, and why Sally has to reposition Aysun as Turkish in order to understand her.

In summary, from the utterances above, it emerges that participants believe one's culture is embedded in one's language and that cultural understanding is required to fully speak a language and be understood.

7.3 'If your Turkish is really good, you put up a barrier to people'

Elizabeth describes how her accent had changed and then settled over the years.

> I had elocution lessons when I was young. And when I had to go to the grammar school when my convent school closed, I had to change my accent because people wouldn't speak to me because of my posh accent.

Elizabeth describes three different accents in this utterance. Her initial accent was transformed through elocution lessons to suit the class-based expectations of her convent school. However, having transformed her accent to suit the convent school environment, the school closed and she entered the local grammar school, positioned in a lower class bracket, where her 'posh' accent acted as marker of difference leading students to shun her. This reaction to how students perceived her identity caused to her to shift her accent once again to suit her new environment.

> I then got a Devonshire accent, because everyone at the grammar school had one.

She then describes changing her accent. However, changing her accent may not have been enough to fit in. Elizabeth had been socialised into a different class from the children at the grammar school.

> And at the grammar the people came in from the country and I didn't fit in.

'Not fitting in' led to many problems for Elizabeth; she even describes being physically attacked.

> And they tormented me and they did awful things to me, tried to break my arm and all sorts.

Her response to this was to assimilate an accent similar to her peers, and it is this accent that she has kept to the present day.

> So then... I got a Devonshire accent. And you would have thought I would have lost it after all these years.

Perhaps in doing so, Elizabeth was seen less as an 'imposter' and more of an 'authorised speaker' (Bourdieu, 1978: 80). From her childhood experience, therefore, Elizabeth describes how a change in accent, from 'posh' to 'country' helped her fit in with the pupils at a local

grammar school who were bullying her as she had previously been educated in a prestigious convent school. She may have discovered at a young age the way in which one's accent, i.e. one's linguistic identity, can help to portray whom one is and change how people react. While Elizabeth found comfort, protection and acceptance from her peers in switching to a Devonshire accent when she was young, I perceive she finds comfort, and possibly an anchor to her identity in keeping that accent in Istanbul, even forty years after leaving the UK.

The issues of language use and accents also arise later in Elizabeth's narrative when she describes her life in Istanbul.

> I mean, I've got a friend who speaks perfect Turkish and she's got two children too. And nobody helps her like they help me. Nobody's friendly to her like they are to me. Everybody is ever so nice to me, the bus drivers, everybody. I mean, they really treat me nicely.

Elizabeth implies she is accepted by the local community when she comes across as an imperfect Turkish speaker. However, she feels her friend, whom she describes as speaking 'perfect Turkish' is not accepted in the same way. She goes on to describe why.

> If your Turkish is really, really good, you put up a barrier to people... I really think Turkish people in particular try to be helpful and kind to you. So when you go somewhere and you mumble a bit and you can't get round a bit, they rush to your aid. So I think for that reason I don't speak Turkish so well.

Elizabeth feels she gains from painting herself as someone who is struggling to get by in Turkish, 'mumbling a bit' and in need of help, describing people as 'rushing to her aid'. She uses this as a reason for not wanting to further her Turkish proficiency. I believe by acting in this way, Elizabeth is showing that she is not claiming the same 'linguistic right to power' (Bourdieu, 1978: 80) as someone born in Turkey. Elizabeth believes her fluent friend, on the other hand, receives more resistance from the host community when she speaks Turkish. Following Bourdieu (1978), I believe the community may not be willing to accept Elizabeth's friend as one of their own, registering her instead as a sub-standard speaker or 'imposter'. In addition, Elizabeth's friend may be in violation of Lave and Wenger's theory on 'peripheral legitimate participation' whereby an individual joining a new group needs to start on the periphery and slowly work their way in to be accepted. When meeting new individuals, interlocutors may be unsettled by a perceived outsider showing proficiency in Turkish, an act in which the speaker appears to be placing herself at the centre, not the periphery of the group, and this may cause her interlocutors to reject her. It seems Elizabeth's attempt at non- or partial participation through using less-than-perfect Turkish and a Devonshire accent

actually aids in her participation whereas her friend's attempt at full participation through proficient language use is met by resistance.

Leyla and Shirley also discussed their accents.

Caroline: Leyla, how's your accent in Turkish?
Leyla: I can get away with it. It depends if I'm tired and the time of the day.

By 'get away with it', Leyla infers she can be mistaken for being Turkish at times. Shirley agrees.

Shirley: I never hear you with an accent. You speak very clear and you speak very confident.

Shirley indicates that confidence in the language is also a factor in Leyla coming across as Turkish. Shirley, however, is not attempting to gain a Turkish accent, 'fighting to keep' her Birmingham accent saying it is her identity and she doesn't want to become Turkish.

Elizabeth, Shirley and Leyla, therefore, may all use their accents in Turkish for differing purposes. Elizabeth, using her agency, may keep her Devonshire accent as she perceives this brings her greater advantages in the local community. Shirley describes using her agency to actively maintain her Birmingham accent as a statement of her identity. However, Leyla has acquired a Turkish accent of such accuracy that she can be mistaken for being Turkish in the host community; she is the only participant who has actively acquired Turkish in order to enter the workforce, and this may have had a bearing on her attempts at assimilation. All three participants, therefore, have acquired the target language, however, only Leyla is modelling her Turkish on target language models. For Elizabeth and Shirley, they feel they have more to gain from keeping indicators of their English-linguistic identity.

Jenkins (2007) believes that these days language learners' personal identities are an important factor regarding the extent to which they want to identify with the target language culture and that not all learners want to fully affiliate or claim group allegiance with the target language community. In addition, Omoniyi (2006) believes individuals may utilise their languages and accents depending on the identity they wish to portray. There is evidence in support of both Jenkins' and Omoniyi's (ibid) theories in Elizabeth and Shirley's utterances. Leyla may be aligning herself with a native-like, Turkish accent to assimilate into her host community, whereas Elizabeth and Shirley may be retaining their British accents in order to bring more perceived advantages from the local community such as avoiding potential rejection from interlocutors or as an act of resistance against being viewed as Turkish.

7.4 'Sometimes they value the fact she is married to an Englishman'

Alya and Graham raise the issue of how being a peripheral member of a culture may be a symbolic asset.

> Alya: Even if you don't have any qualifications, if you speak English, it helps.
>
> Graham: Yes, when Alya goes to job interviews and they say 'do you speak very good English?' and then they say 'oh, your husband is English as well' sometimes they value the fact as a culture, so therefore when she goes to work she has the added value there and they know she is going to be more flexible, a bit more adaptable... Alya, the last company said they would employ you whenever you want. And I think that's not just because you speak English, but the way you speak English and communicate culturally.

Interestingly, Graham adds in the behavioural traits of flexibility and adaptability that he feels Alya may be perceived to have acquired through her assimilation into a British community, once again indicating his belief that cultural behaviours are embedded in one's language. I believe this also indicates that he perceives flexibility and adaptability as being British behavioural traits.

My husband, Cengiz, has found himself in a similar situation to Alya. Ten years ago, Cengiz decided to learn English in a formal environment to improve his job opportunities. Since learning English to an advanced level, he now uses English professionally on a daily basis when dealing with overseas suppliers and is the official company employee who entertains foreign visitors due to his advanced proficiency. I am often asked to join him at company dinners to chat to overseas visitors as I provide English conversation and an international profile. I believe his English language skills and his membership in a native-English-speaking community have directly aided him being viewed as a great asset to the company.

From Alya and my husband's experiences, therefore, it seems that having an English-speaking, British partner may increase the complexity of others' identity perceptions (Norton, 2000a) affecting the way they are positioned by employers as they may be seen as being more culturally and linguistically complex than had been assumed. This may lead to employers viewing them more favourably as the linguistic and cultural legitimacy of their English is perceived to increase which, in turn, raises their symbolic and social capital and may provide access to employment, promotion, mobility within social circles, and further education (Pavlenko, 2001). Alya and Cengiz may have also gained legitimacy by being seen as on an 'inbound trajectory', being 'potential members' of the target language community (Wenger, 1998: 100), which in turn may open up even more opportunities for social interaction and access to resources within those communities. This was certainly the case for Alya who worked

in companies in England, and also the case for Cengiz who now deals with all his company's foreign clients.

7.5 'If you complain about your own country, it's quite different to if you complain about another country'

While talking about her sons' school, Elizabeth describes feeling she didn't have the right to make a complaint

> I went to the children's school some days, you know, for parents' day and meetings, and I *couldn't* complain about things, I couldn't complain about the toilets. The Turkish people felt exactly the same as I felt, but I couldn't complain because if you complain about your own country, it's quite different to if you complain about another country.

Her reluctance to make a complaint seems to be based on her notion that foreigners do not have the same rights to make complaints as locals.

> So I never felt I could speak Turkish enough, but perhaps you never could get that, to be able to say things without offending people. To do it in another language is something quite different if you're not 100% sure of the culture. I think if you don't grow up in that culture, you never learn it, and that's the difference.

She seems to believe that only someone who has grown up in the culture would be sure enough of themselves to be able to put across a complaint, thus mirroring the earlier discussion whereby participants conceptualised that for one to have a true understanding of a language, one must also have a true understanding of the culture. As well as indicating that she does not believe a foreigner has the right to make a complaint, Elizabeth also indicates that people in the host community may not be willing to accept a complaint.

> If a foreigner comes and does it (complains), everyone's up against you.

This may mean that when it comes to being critical of one's host community, advanced linguistic proficiency may not be enough to either feel sure enough to put forward a complaint or for host speakers to accept that complaint. Being raised in that culture, therefore, may be seen as a prerequisite for the authority to complain.

7.6 'Had it been another language, I would have made a real effort'

On starting this investigation, one of my original beliefs was that people who are more acclimatised to a country have better language skills and accents. At first, in Leyla's narrative, I found evidence to support this.

111

> Twenty-five years ago, when I came, I refused to learn the language because I did not like it here... and I felt 'I want to go back to England as soon as possible'. My whole aim was 'I want to go, I want to go'... and we came back after five years and Turkey had changed immensely and I think in another five years it had changed again. It was more... not the language... but an overall change.

Leyla believes her initial refusal to learn the language was based on her dislike of the country. However, on her return, she found the country had changed and, I suspect, she had probably gone through a process of change herself, getting used to her new identity and incorporating the 'cultural universe' (Holliday, 2011: 55) of her Turkish husband. While Leyla's early comments mirrored my initial belief, other remarks indicate she does not believe that acculturation leads to high levels of linguistic proficiency. At one point during the interview, Leyla finished my sentence for me.

> Caroline: I love being in Turkey, I wouldn't live anywhere else apart from Istanbul, but my Turkish is rubbish. And I don't think my feelings about Turkey…
>
> Leyla: ...are affected through my language.

Leyla emphatically finished my sentence for me in such a way that made me address my own beliefs. As described, I had originally thought, possibly due to my background in teaching English as a foreign language, that linguistic proficiency was best gained when an individual had a strong connection with the host community and a desire to assimilate. However, through my exchange with Leyla, I realised that my personal views differ from the feelings I was expressing. I feel a strong connection to Turkey and I love the people and love living in the country, but do not feel that my linguistic abilities in Turkish are at the level they should be considering my commitment to the country. It was only during this exchange with Leyla that I realised what I had believed to be the case for my students and what I was experiencing personally did not conflate.

After this realisation, during interviews with other participants, further evidence started to appear to indicate that acculturation or love of the country may not be factors in the effort put into learning that language. Elizabeth implies she has not made an effort to learn Turkish as she perceived Turkish to lack 'importance' as a world language.

> English is important and Turkish is not very important. I mean that's how I look at it. I really feel had it been another language I would have made a real effort, but I did think learning Turkish would be a waste of time, I'll be honest, because it was no good anywhere else outside the Turkish Republic, and I haven't really learnt it properly myself... because you always have this thing that you are going to go back.

Elizabeth perceives limited advantages in learning Turkish compared to learning languages with wider use, describing learning Turkish as a 'waste of time' as it is 'no good anywhere else

outside the Turkish Republic'. Even though Elizabeth has settled in Turkey, she makes it clear she always thought she would return home, 'you always have this thing that you are going to go back'; she therefore perceived she had little use in investing in Turkish. Elizabeth's initial decision not to learn Turkish may have been based on practicality – it takes a lot of effort to learn a language; should one put in the effort if it does not have widespread use outside the country? However, her comments may also reveal that she ranks languages based on their relative global use. While Turkish may not bring gains on a global scale, within a marriage where one's partner speaks Turkish it raises the question: should one not make an emotional investment in learning one's partner's language? However, Elizabeth is not alone in her opinions. I found similar sentiments mirrored in an article in the British Community Newsletter (a locally-produced, amateur publication) written by a Canadian:

> 'Despite the competitive advantage a proficiency in English confers, there is also a complacency… after four years, I… have learned little more than a survival level of Turkish... Indeed, my motivation to improve my Turkish had started to seriously wane when I realized how much I could do with only English… I'm pretty fluent in French and I'd studied Spanish… at university. So what was it about Turkish? True, it's not really spoken anywhere else in the world, so in a sense it's of limited use' (Lambert-Sen, 2011: 3).

She, like Elizabeth, sees Turkish as having 'limited use', not having the 'competitive advantage' or widespread use that English, French or Spanish hold. In Elizabeth and Lambert-Sen's narratives, therefore, their belief that Turkish is neither a widespread nor useful language led them to not invest in learning it. This follows Norton's (1995) theory that an individual will not invest in a language unless they can gain directly from that language. As well as seeing limited gain in learning Turkish, Lambert-Sen also discovered that she could get by in life by using English, a language that individuals in Turkey are striving to acquire. She therefore had no need to learn Turkish above a 'survival level' in her daily life. It took an embarrassing incident that affected her sense of self for her to eventually become motivated to learn Turkish.

> 'There are also many very good reasons why I *should* have made more of an effort to learn it, not the least of which is that we are living in Turkey! Somewhere along the line though, I decided to take the "easy" way out. I could still make a happy life for myself here, I could still get by. But at what cost? As it turns out, at a most precious cost: my independence and self-esteem' (Lambert-Sen, 2011: 4).

Her more recent move to acquire Turkish indicates an investment in her 'independence' leading to increased 'self-esteem' in an attempt to 'feel at home' and 'fully participate in society'; it seems she is now ready to make an emotional investment.

7.7 'If you're living in a country and you don't learn the language, it's like living in a cage'

The issues described by Elizabeth and Lambert-Sen regarding the perceived importance of Turkish also arose in an extended refrain between Graham and Alya. However, there is a strong message throughout that Alya is upset that Graham is not making an emotional investment in learning Turkish.

> Alya: I mean sometimes when my family ask, I mean nobody's forcing him to learn.
>
> Graham: It's my own fault!
>
> Alya: And I tell them, he will. It's not about proving to my family he can speak, that I've taught him to speak; it's not just about that.
>
> Graham: Once I put my mind to something, I can do it.
>
> Alya: But you have to want it Graham.
>
> Graham: Yeah, I do.
>
> Alya: (sounding sad) But if you don't want it, or if you don't feel ready for it. I mean, you want it, but...

Alya appears to be embarrassed when with her family about Graham's lack of effort, but she feels there is more to it than just being able to communicate with her parents. Graham concedes that he could learn if he wanted to, but both are aware that he has no desire to do so. In defence of not learning, Graham gives the following reasons.

> Graham: (sounding slightly guilty now) I have excuses not to do it.
>
> Alya: No, I understand Graham; you've just got no time to do it.
>
> Graham: Yeah, at the moment.

However, Alya redirects the conversation away from logistical reasons for why he can't learn back to the issue of his motivation.

> Alya: You have to want it, really. When I was in primary school, I really got the desire to learn about England and learn English; it has always been my thing. I always wanted to learn English.

For Alya, her investment in learning English has paid off as she has gained employment in both Britain and Turkey due to her linguistic skills. It is unlikely, though, that Graham would gain in the same ways through learning Turkish. However, his wife's emotional need for him to learn her language is starting to become apparent. Graham directs the conversation away from motivation and back to logistical reasons for not learning.

> Graham: That's the reason my Turkish is a bit bad, because I have all these conflicts within, and I've got two small children and I'm tired and have no free time and don't always have the money to do lessons. But on the other hand, I'd love to come home and practise with Alya, but I couldn't because she might be tired at the end of the day.

Next, Graham mirrors Elizabeth's sentiments that she never thought she would permanently settle in the country and would therefore not have the need for Turkish outside the country.

> Graham: It's a bit like when I was going to come back to Turkey again, so I went away and I thought, 'I've done my bit, I've learnt a bit of the language, I've had a good time, it's been interesting'. And now, when I come back, I feel my self-confidence goes a little, but because I've got that old problem that I've got to learn it – so there's your answer. I didn't have any motivation to learn it, apart from 'I have to'.

In this utterance, Graham clearly identifies that he believes he has nothing to gain from learning Turkish, and therefore no 'motivation' apart from 'I've got to learn it', 'I have to'. Alya shows some acceptance in Graham's sentiment.

> Alya: No, Turkish isn't spoken in many other countries.

She acknowledges that Turkish is not widespread and, I suspect, is beginning to realise that Turkish is not a globally-used language and thus Graham will be less likely to invest in learning it. Like Lambert-Sen, Graham also concedes that due to English being his native-tongue, used by many people in the community, and the language of his employment, that he has limited exposure to and limited use for Turkish.

> Graham: Well, I'm not exposed to it because, and this has always been the case, I wake up, get to school, speak English, the children speak English, I do private lessons and I speak English there, I come home and speak English to my sons. Occasionally, I feel I need to speak Turkish, but not for long.

In this way, Graham's need to invest in learning Turkish for communicative or economic gain is removed. However, Graham skips over these issues and returns to berating himself for being 'lazy'.

> Graham: And the other reason is because I'm lazy with it. Well, lazy may be a bit strong. The fact I've got two children I'm playing with when I come home, and the last thing I want to be doing is picking up a book. I really, really want to put all my heart and soul into it, *but*... I can't.

Interestingly, Graham's idea of learning a language seems to be through books, not through the people around him. However, after first berating himself for his laziness, next the blame for his lack of desire to acquire the language is directed at Turkey, which I believe may reflect Schumann's acculturation model (1978: 34).

> Graham: You know, sometimes, I don't like this nation and I don't want anything to do with it. I don't want to learn the language because the people really annoy me, their attitudes really annoy me. But then sometimes I'm in a group of really nice people and I desperately want to communicate with them, but I always have this thing where sometimes I don't want anything to do with Turkish culture and then I definitely want

to, that's how I am. And it's also an excuse not to learn it because learning something is an effort.

However, in taking this path, Graham deeply upsets his wife. Her frustration at his unwillingness to learn Turkish becomes apparent, despite showing an earlier understanding of reasons why he may not be attempting to learn.

> Alya: (showing frustration) I think if you're living in a country and you don't learn it, it's like living in a cage.

Graham reiterates again that he has no need for better Turkish proficiency in order to manage.

> Graham: The thing is, I can get by, not a problem, I can.

However, Alya is not satisfied with his answer, returning to berating him for not making an effort. Her strong emotions may come from interpreting his lack of effort in learning Turkish as evidence that he doesn't value her or her culture.

> Alya: (getting exasperated) I know, but you need to get out there. Once you try to speak in Turkish, they will definitely try to understand you. I think the reason is you can't be bothered.

I believe Graham and Alya's interaction highlights that while the British partner may see little advantage to learning Turkish their spouse may perceive a lack of investment in learning their language as indicative of their partner not valuing them or their culture. Investment in the language, therefore, may be needed as evidence of emotional commitment to the relationship.

7.8 'I feel emotionally disconnected from my daughter in English'

Another story where the link between language and emotion arose involved the second critical incident.

> Aysun, employed as a native-English teacher at the international pre-school, is a Turkish national who is native-like in Turkish and English. She was raised by Turkish parents in the international community in the Middle East. While her parents spoke Turkish to her at home, the language of her education and friendships was in English.

> On requesting a meeting with me, Aysun described how she had chosen to speak English with her daughter, while her husband spoke Turkish, so her daughter could be raised with two native languages (as she, herself, had acquired Turkish and English in her childhood). She felt bilingualism would be advantageous for her daughter's future career. (Research Diary, April 2010)

Aysun perceived that her daughter would gain from having two native-like languages, just as she had.

However, having undertaken this path, Aysun described becoming increasingly agitated, feeling she was not connecting emotionally to her daughter in English due to her own emotions being embodied in Turkish. (Research Diary, April 2010)

This emotional distance that Aysun describes is a situation that Baker warns about whereby parents speaking in a different language from their mother tongue may feel it is 'artificial', 'impersonal', 'distant' and 'distasteful' (2007: 48). Pavlenko (2004: 179-203) and Yamamoto (2005: 588-606) also warn that parents taking this path may experience an emotional distance from their children, even if they are fluent speakers of that language.

Next, Aysun described how when her daughter turned three, she switched to Turkish with her, but felt her daughter withdrew and suffered from social issues after she had done so. (Research Diary, April 2010)

Aysun told me that her daughter withdrew completely and barely spoke at all for two years. This situation is also described by De Houwer whereby 'parents who stopped talking Language A to pre-school aged children who were fluent in two languages… told… how their children seemed to miss Language A and were very unhappy' (2009: 277). De Houwer postulates that this may be because the children interpret their parent's switch 'as a sign of rejection or even punishment'. She believes children under the age of five are especially disposed to negative emotions and feelings of loss when a parent switches completely to Language Alpha (De Houwer, 2009: 316). This seems to have been the case with Aysun's three-year-old daughter. Now aged five and attending an English-medium school, Aysun feels her daughter is starting to communicate more. However, she still blames herself for her daughter's difficulty in social situations and still describes it as challenging trying to make an emotional attachment with her.

At the end of our meeting, Aysun expressed regret she had started speaking English to her daughter at birth instead of Turkish. (Research Diary, April 2010)

In most families, there is no real choice involved in raising children bilingually. However, in Aysun's case she had a choice and made a decision which she later regretted. I believe the cause of Aysun's current distress is regret over her decision to raise her daughter in a language that she does not feel is her own.

7.9 'Stop speaking your own language to your son or you will damage him'

The third critical incident also involved a parent describing feeling emotionally disconnected from his son after a speech therapist told him to switch from his native Spanish to English.

A Mexican father and Turkish mother who spoke English together told me how they took their three-year-old son who was somewhat delayed in his language acquisition (of Turkish, Spanish and English) to an English-speaking Austrian speech therapist where they lived in Vienna. The therapist told the father to stop speaking Spanish and start speaking English to the son as she believed he was delaying his son's language development. (Research Diary, March 2010)

Cruz-Ferreira (2010: 53) warns about this type of advice from speech therapists:

'Multilingual children who may indeed have speech-language problems often end up being diagnosed with multilingualism itself, for which the standard "medication" is the peculiar recommendation to use only one language with them' (ibid: 56).

While the family followed this advice, it did not sit comfortably with them.

The father described how he switched to speaking English with his son but felt an emotional disconnect. He said it just didn't feel right, but he had been told by a professional to drop his own language and felt he would be damaging his child if he did not follow that advice. (Research Diary, March 2010)

When this father was asked to stop speaking his native tongue to his son, he became unhappy as Spanish was the language in which he had built an emotional attachment. This impersonal feeling when a parent changes to a language that is not their mother tongue is discussed by Pavlenko (2004), Yamamoto (2005) and Baker (2007). I was particularly interested that the therapist had advised the Mexican father to give up speaking Spanish and switch to English, believing the therapist's advice to drop Spanish as opposed to English may be related to how she perceived the relative status of each language and culture. I perceive the speech therapist had not taken into consideration the father's emotions, his culture or his heritage when asking him to speak to his son in English. De Houwer believes:

'the advice to parents in bilingual families to stop speaking one of the languages to their children can be harmful to children and is also unethical. The fact parents are never advised to give up speaking the majority language also shows an ideological bias that is not professional. Furthermore, it shows no respect for families' cultural heritage' (2009: 316).

I believe it is possible that an underlying chauvinism against the father's heritage and language may have played a part in the therapist choosing Spanish to be dropped from the child's linguistic repertoire; this was also felt by the father who felt sure it was his Mexican heritage that had caused the therapist to request that he drop Spanish and switch to English.

7.10 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter, I have presented evidence that the language individuals tend towards in their bilingual relationships and their daily lives must be understood in relation to global

concepts of language and power. These factors come together for each participant, forming numerous subjectivities which work within a complex network so that the language they tend towards in their relationships is the one that brings the most gain, financially and symbolically. It appears if their second language does not bring financial or symbolic gain it tends to settle at a level of proficiency which matches their communicative need for use. While participants show some awareness of these global forces that affect their linguistic investment and patterns of use, there are also micro-level needs within each family which may provide a low level counterforce to these macro-factors. These include the need for an individual to make an emotional investment in a language in order to form a strong bond within the relationship, whether that language brings financial and symbolic gain or not. It emerges that individuals also have an emotional need to pass on their language, heritage, memories and meaning to their children. It also seems when families pass on both of their languages and their linguistic selves to their children they provide a fertile environment for them and their children to build strong linguistic and emotional relationships.

How much participants accept or resist forces that affect which languages they use and how they adapt their language use within their relationships, with extended family, at work or in their local communities differs for each person. I believe this reveals they all have distinct experiences depending on what is required or expected by their families, whether they require the language for employment (for financial and symbolic gain), how much they wish to assimilate, or how much they wish to be accepted as a legitimate speaker by the target language community. Each individual's concept of what it means to be a speaker of more than one language, therefore, may be disputed, reinforced or reformed throughout their lives depending on their perception of their need for that language and their skills in using it.

In the next chapter, I present participants' perceptions of their identities and how they maintain, shift and present those identities in relation to nationality, gender, class and appearance. I also present how participants perceive their children's identities in light of their dual status.

CHAPTER EIGHT

IDENTITIES

I believe discourse analysis is important in the study of identity as power relations embedded in discourse affect our identity. An individual's identity is comprised of many factors such as ethnicity, social standing, linguistic background, cultural background, national background and gendered performance, all of which are developed within a social framework that contains discourses. It is these discourses that can both create and change our identities and it is these discourses that can change our perceptions of these frameworks. Individuals have agency, they can challenge and change the images that others have created of them. However, this agency is not without restrictions; the objectives of each interaction with that individual need to be taken into account as well as factors embedded in institutional structures. In this respect, factors at the micro-contextual level will necessarily inform and be informed by factors at the macro-level (Moore, 2009). Keeping this multi-levelled construction of identity in mind, when analysing data from my participants, in this section I try to explore the relationships between the people, what is being said, perceptions of Self and Other, while exploring potential underlying dominant ideologies and underlying power structures that are present in the social practices of the participants. My analysis, therefore, contains both macro-contextual and micro-contextual factors into consideration.

This chapter examines participants' identity and personality formation process during the course of their bilingual marriages and participants' perceptions of their children's identities. To show how participants navigate and negotiate their complex bilingual lives and actively construct their identities, their own voices are presented throughout. I believe how participants have painted themselves within the elements of nationality, gender, class and language and how they have incorporated these factors into their sense of who they are can paint a picture of how their identities have evolved over time. The ideas in this chapter are based on poststructuralism and social constructivism. Through the lens of poststructuralism, I see individuals as possessing conflicting tensions and knowledge claims towards their nationality, language, gender and class and through a social constructivist lens, I see identity as co-constructed between the individual and the surrounding community, all of which takes place within macro- and micro-contexts of discourse. The aim of this chapter is to illuminate how participants have portrayed themselves in light of these factors.

8. 1 'I will never become a Turk!' 'Don't forget you are not English!'

In this section, I look at how individuals label their own nationality and the nationality of their children in comparison with the citizenships they possess and what factors they draw upon in choosing this label. Before embarking on this discussion, I provide a chart (Table 5) to identify the nationalities of each of the participants to aid the reader in understanding their stories.

TABLE 5: NATIONALITY OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Participant	Nationality	Nationality of the Children
Elizabeth	British	British/Turkish
Lynn	British	British/Turkish
Shirley	British (Turkish through marriage)	British/Turkish
Leyla	Iranian (Turkish through marriage) with the right to reside in the UK	Turkish/with the right to reside in the UK
Maureen	British (Turkish through marriage)	British/Turkish
Graham	British	British/Turkish
Alya	Turkish	
Tim	British	British/Turkish
Hulya	Turkish	
Caroline	British (Turkish through marriage)	British/Turkish
Cengiz	Turkish (formerly dual Swiss/Turkish)	

Graham and Tim decided not to obtain Turkish citizenship as they would be obliged to undertake national service.

In the participants' stories, there are examples of individuals claiming a nationality or rejecting a nationality for themselves. Maureen, Graham, Tim and Elizabeth describe themselves as British or English, perhaps as each hold only a British passport. However, with their dual national children, there is more scope for describing their nationality.

Elizabeth describes how her dual-national son, Steven, clearly labels himself as Turkish, resisting being identified as 'English'.

> Steven said he could never be English, never. And in England, when they ask him his nationality, he says 'Turkish'. Well, he could just as well say English, but he never says English, he says 'I never say that, I wouldn't consider myself to be English!' He says 'I've grown up in Turkey, I've got the culture, I look like a Turk, so I'm not English'. They call him 'Steve the Turk' and he's happy with that.

Elizabeth says Steven bases his claim to be Turkish on the country in which he was raised, the culture he has acquired and his physical indicators. While she easily labels her second son, Steven, as Turkish, this picture is not so clear for her first son, Mark.

> Steven loved it when people made fun of him, when they called him Turkish Steven. But Mark is very much Turkish in that sense in that he can't deal with it. He didn't used to be able to, now he's more able to.

Interestingly, she says that Steven loves it when people joke about him being Turkish. However, having a sense of humour about this is something she implies is British. She attributes Mark being unable to deal with people teasing him as a Turkish trait. She then attributes both British and Turkish sides to Mark indicating it is his choice to reveal these sides, but once again labels Steven as being Turkish.

> And he's happy to show his English side. But Steven is Turkish. He's spent ten years in London but he's still a Turk.

Lynn, whose children moved regularly between Turkey and the UK when they were younger, found it harder to put a label of nationality on her children as she perceives their national identity has shifted over time.

> Lynn: With my daughters, I always thought they were very Turkish. But now, the older they get I can also see they are very very English.

This interests Elizabeth who tries to identify different degrees of being Turkish between their children.

> Elizabeth: Would you say your kids were more Turkish than mine, Lynn?
>
> Lynn: I think so.

She refers to degrees of being Turkish, concluding that Lynn's children being more Turkish has helped them to assimilate into Turkey society more.

> Elizabeth: That's what I feel. Your kids seem much more Turkish. They fit in better than mine.

While Elizabeth emphatically labels herself as 'not wanting to be thought of as Turkish', Lynn does not feel so dichotomous.

> Lynn: I think I've been able to take on board both cultures. I mean, I feel very British, but I lived, when I first came to Turkey, with my mother-in-law and during that time, I'm quite an adaptable person, and I think now I don't really have a problem with the culture.

She attributes her assimilation to the point where she 'doesn't really have a problem with the culture' to her adaptable nature and the fact she lived with Turkish relatives. Lynn's narrative

ememplifies Block's (2006) conceptualisation that when individuals construct their identities, they incorporate resources of their past and the nation of their present.

While Lynn feels her identity has developed due to time spent in two different countries, Shirley rejects this option, despite holding naturalized Turkish citizenship, and strongly identifies herself as British even though she implies she will live in Turkey for the rest of her life.

> Shirley: But I'm still here on holiday by the way! I will never become a Turk, I will never become like a Turk... I'm here, this is my life.

Shirley, like Steven, divorces her concept of nationality from citizenship; she may have dual citizenship, but she only lays claim to one. Shirley's claim for her children's nationality is British despite them being raised in Turkey and holding dual nationalities.

> Shirley: Ali is so British, but I have never tried to make them Turkish, they never had nannies. I've kept them that way.

As Shirley positions the nationality of her children for them, similarly London-born Esma describes how her Turkish parents tried to position her nationality for her.

> Esma: I always felt there was a strong Turkish side at home, and it was always like, 'you have to know your culture, you have to know your origins, you have to know where you come from, you're not English' they always said that 'and don't forget you're not English!' But I feel more British than Turkish.

Despite Esma's parents' attempts at keeping her Turkish, she describes herself as feeling 'more British than Turkish', something that comes out more vividly in the next chapter when Esma describes how she feels more English when she meets Turkish cultural norms that do not conflate with her own ideals. It therefore seems that Esma does not dichotomise nationalities, claiming one over the other, but sits somewhere on a continuum between both.

Leyla describes how her son, Nardir, lays claim to English nationality, despite not being a British citizen.

> Every year, I make sure we go to England, for me and my son and he feels very comfortable there. He doesn't feel like he's going to a foreign place. He's home. He doesn't feel like an outsider. And actually, he thinks he's English. He insists on being English, he says 'I'm English'.

From Leyla's description, Nardir anchors his identity not on citizenship (although he does have the 'right to reside' in the UK) but on where he feels 'home'. Leyla, however, attempts to reposition Nardir by labelling herself as Iranian, her husband as Turkish, and pointing out Nardir was only *born* in England.

And I said 'your father is Turkish, your mother is Iranian, by birth you were *born* in England'

However, Nardir resists her positioning.

Leyla: And he said, 'No, I'm English; you are Iranian and he is Turkish' and I said 'okay' and we accepted it.

While she accepts Nardir's 'English' label for himself, she reinforces that they are introducing him to all cultures.

Leyla: But, we are involved and he gets all the Turkish culture.

She then shares how Nardir proudly lays claim to all three lines of heritage.

And Nardir said something really interesting recently, because he's learning about history now. He said 'I come from three great empires' so I was excited about that, but it's true.

Nardir, therefore, a Turkish citizen with the right to reside in the UK, not only labels himself British but also proudly claims heritage to the Persian and Ottoman empires.

In the interaction above, when Nardir claimed he was British, his mother tried to reposition him as Turkish or Iranian, his claim to Britishness did not conflate with her perceptions, it was a site of struggle. I came across another example of discrepancy and struggle between a claim by self and the perception of another in my research diary.

Yann, born French and emigrating to the US aged three, described being positioned as American and reprimanded at school by his music teacher for not singing the American national anthem. He said he refused because he was 'French at the time'. (Research Diary, August 2011)

His perceptions of self 'at the time' were not accepted by his American teacher who was trying to position him as American – a position that Yann now embraces as part of his cultural identity. This provides an example, therefore, whereby claims to nationality may shift over a person's lifetime. While Yann initially laid claim to his French heritage of birth, as he grew older he came to encompass and lay claim to both French and American identities.

In this section, some participants (Elizabeth, Tim, Maureen, Graham) have described their nationalities in an essentialist light, drawing on the nation of their birth and the culture in which they were socialised, describing themselves as British despite living in Turkey for many years and, in Shirley's case, despite holding Turkish citizenship. However, Lynn shows a more

fluid approach to identity, seeing aspects of identity such as nationality and culture as changing over time and socially constructed in specific communities of practice (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 1992; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999, Block, 2006). This fluid approach to nationality was also apparent in participants' descriptions of their children's nationality, as well as in the stories of Esma and Yann, all of whom perceive they tend towards one or another of their cultures at differing times while encompassing both of them within their identities.

It also arises that while individuals may describe themselves with a national label. This does not always conflate with the label given by state, as is the case with Nardir whose claim to be British is not backed up by citizenship.

8.2 'I was not going anywhere except for a council flat with five kids' 'I was one of those BA Jet Set kids'

Shirley's description of her family background is steeped in British working-class imagery. She uses many gender-based perceptions of the role of British, working-class women such as being a single mother and living on state support.

> I was brought up in a real poor background. My Mum was divorced with four children. I was not going anywhere except for a council flat with five kids.

She predicts her future would have followed her mother's path. This may initially have led to her having few plans for her future.

> And I didn't know what I wanted to do. I was asked what I wanted to do at sixteen, I was told to choose a career and I went 'What? I don't know what I want to do'.

However, after leaving school Shirley undertook part-time employment before going travelling.

> So I went to work, I went part-time to college and part-time as a secretary and then I decided to travel with a boyfriend and I ended up travelling around, working in Greece. I did everything, I was hostessing, I wasn't going back, I would never go back, I knew I couldn't go back and then I came here and I didn't want to be here either.

Shirley, therefore, found her way out of her family home through traditionally female routes such as secretarial work and 'hostessing'. I believe through her protestations 'I wasn't going back, I would never go back' and by staying in Istanbul, she was actively resisting what she saw as a pre-destined path for her as a working class female in Britain. I believe her resistance took the form of travelling abroad where she believed other options were open to her, although she

didn't feel entirely comfortable with her decision to live in Turkey either, 'I didn't want to be here'.

Shirley now presents herself as a middle-class teacher in Istanbul although she doesn't directly use the term 'middle class, it is implied through her description of her lifestyle and assets which include a 4x4, owning her own house, buying and developing property and becoming a landlady. She is clearly proud of what she has achieved in comparison to her modest roots. I therefore believe Shirley has managed to reposition herself by attaining a certain socio-economic status within the community (Kubota, 2003) and moving from a secretary to teacher has advanced her occupational class (Bourdieu, 1984). In order to do this, Shirley drew on her native tongue, English, as a cultural and symbolic resource, or as Skeggs (2005) conceptualises it, she turned her language and her culture into a commodity.

That English is her native tongue is crucial in Shirley's current placement in society. In Norton's (2000a) study of mostly female second language acquisition speakers, she discovered that most of them had lost much of their economic, cultural and social capital when they moved to Canada as they were suddenly thrust into an environment where they were second language speakers; for Shirley, she has kept her mother tongue in her place of work, her source of status and income, and this has put her in a strong position. I believe Shirley's story reflects Skeggs' (2005) view that culture can used as an economic resource and is a key factor in how we conceptualise class in our society.

With Leyla, her utterance describing her pride in the cultural experiences of her youth reveals the class she positions herself in and is also indicative of the wealth that her family has. She tells stories of international education, homes in two countries, and of constant flying.

> I was born in Tehran. My father actually decided that it would be good to send all the children to England to get an English education, an English *language* education. So he sent us all over to England.

The importance that English played in this, for prestige and to provide advantages in life, is also stressed.

> Leyla: My father really believed that that was the way it was going to be, that English was going to be the international language. So we decided to have *two* homes, one home in England and one home in Iran. So I went backwards and forwards, I travelled a lot. I was one of those BA jet set kids; I was awarded awards for flying so much!

After describing her privileged childhood, Leyla describes acts of rebellion perhaps to resist being positioned as a 'good', middle-class Iranian girl, perhaps as a reaction to the loss of her father. First, as a teenager, she flew to Turkey with her Turkish boyfriend; her brother's university friend who was studying in England.

> Leyla: I left school, I finished my O levels, my seven O levels. I was a *good girl!* And we decided to get married. My Mum had a mini heart attack and my whole family came to the airport and they were screaming and shouting at me 'where are you going?'... Yes, I was a bit rebellious and I went off on holiday even though I was going to his parent's house, I was invited by them, they knew them, it was still a big thing.

Leyla describes how, while only sixteen, she had the autonomy to take this step.

> I paid for my ticket with my own money, because I had been living by myself because my father died, so my mother had to go back to Iran. So I was living with my twenty-three-year-old cousin who was my guardian.

Leyla laughs as she shares this. Now in her forties, she obviously finds it amusing that a twenty-three year-old student was her responsible guardian. Continuing her story, Leyla describes her actions at this time as rebellious.

> That's quite adventurous really. I was rebellious when you think about it. Then he came back with me to England and his parents came together and then we decided to get married and all hell broke loose because I was still too young.

It seems her family's protestations against the marriage were based on age – her being 16 -, not on difference in nationality. After this, Leyla and her Turkish boyfriend married and moved to Turkey. However, on her arrival in Istanbul, she felt her Iranian background was being looked down upon by her host community. She also found her new host community lacking in the services she had grown used to in Iran.

> Leyla: I hated it, really. Because I arrived in a country that didn't have water, didn't have electricity, didn't have shops I could go in to and look at. In Iran we had five TV channels, we had English programmes, we didn't have electricity cuts or water cuts. Iran was at its best at that time; it was a bit confusing for them.

Leyla resisted being positioned as inferior, instead, repositioning Iran as more advanced, drawing on resources available in Iran not Turkey (Connel *et al*, 1982). Again, she draws on English as a sign of status with which she repositioned the status of Iran as higher than Turkey - 'we had English programmes'. Next, Leyla describes how she and her husband went back to England, staying for three years before returning to Turkey. From her story, it appears she enjoyed rediscovering her autonomy back in England. The power in her relationship may also have shifted towards her as her husband was not working for some of that time.

Leyla: And I had the best time of my life, I worked for Laura Ashley, I was a manager, I was in my element and then we came back because he couldn't get work, well, he did get work, he was working for Merrill Lynch, the broker, the American company.

Leyla's story shows how the power soon shifted back as her husband accepted a job in Istanbul where his experience of working abroad and his English language proficiency were valued and in demand.

Leyla: And then he decided that he wanted to come back here. He had a good opportunity. At that time the stock market in Turkey was just starting up again, so he came back and he was one of the only people who had work experience in a foreign company. So we came back, I couldn't say no. And I went straight to work again.

On her return, Leyla learned Turkish to a proficiency that enabled her to enter the Turkish workforce where she became financially independent. Leyla, who had already acquired native-English at the age of four, is the only participant in this investigation who has secured employment and economic capital through learning Turkish. All other participants have utilised their English to this end.

In the ways described above, I believe language (English as an early-childhood acquisition language and Turkish as an acquired language) has played an important role in how both Shirley and Leyla have positioned themselves in Turkey regarding class and independence. For Shirley, she was able to use her native-English language and nationality as a combined resource of cultural and linguistic capital which she managed to convert into economic and social capital, gaining employment in educational institutions leading to economic gain and extended networks within the educational community and securing scholarships for her children at a top private school. For Leyla, on her move to Turkey, she discovered herself in an especially weak position, culturally, linguistically and financially in relation to her husband. However, by acquiring proficient Turkish, she managed to strengthen her position and empower herself linguistically and financially by entering the Turkish workforce. I believe Shirley and Leyla's stories show examples of how linguistic capital can be harnessed to unlock social and economic capital. In Shirley's case, she was able to transcend the class boundaries of her birthplace; in Leyla's case, this enabled her to re-establish her middle-class position in society instead of being positioned as an Iranian immigrant. Both Leyla and Shirley's perceptions of their class identity have shifted through their life trajectories as they have moved abroad and repositioned themselves in new cultures.

8.3 'If you are foreign, you can't pick up on clues like local accents or clothes'

In the previous chapter, some participants expressed how they felt an understanding of culture was an essential part of understanding someone's meaning. One example of this was when Shirley described how she found even when Turkish people were speaking English she couldn't understand them or get exactly what they were saying. During this refrain, she also talked about being blind to their cultural backgrounds.

> Shirley: I can't get exactly what they are saying, I can't understand their background, where they come from, I can't understand what kind of person they are; which I *never* thought would happen. I can't understand people's mentality... If you are foreign, you can't pick up on clues like local accents or clothes to get an idea of their background. You can do that in your own culture, you can't do it when you are foreign.

Shirley's thoughts were also reflected in one of the incidents recorded in my research diary.

> Sibel (a Turkish manager) talked about the choice of Turkish husband that two of the foreign teachers had made expressing that they had married below themselves and had chosen poorly. She said had they been Turkish women, they would have understood the warning signs, but because they were foreign, they couldn't understand the type of man they were marrying. (Research Diary, November 2009)

In this example, Sibel's comments may have come from not understanding how the foreign teachers could not pick up on the Turkish social class indicators that she was able to pick up on. Similar to Shirley and Sibel's comments, Elizabeth too perceives she is unable to pick up on capital markers in Turkey:

> Elizabeth: You don't understand the other culture for *years.* And you don't understand the social status of the other country.

She indicates she believes it takes an extremely long time to become familiarised with social indicators in a country.

> Elizabeth: And you look at people and you look at their background and the homes they come from, as though they were upper-middle class in your own culture, whereas you put them down as peasants almost. And then you sort of live here a long time and you see the rest of the people and you realise these people all went to a private university and their families must have had a good background.

Elizabeth is aware that the social markers used in Britain are different from Turkey and over the years has come to recognise them. However, her choice of language indicates that she does not agree with these social practices and still feels superior to them saying 'you put them down as peasants almost' even when referring to groups in the community that would be considered upper-middle class.

In these narratives, participants express how living outside one's community of practice may leave one at a disadvantage with regard to understanding others' social and class backgrounds (Montgomery, 2007), essentially leaving an individual with limited sociolinguistic competence (Holmes, 1990). This may lead to foreign partners inadvertently marrying below their own socioeconomic level as they are unable to pick up on social indicators that they would be aware of in their own society. However, this same situation has also worked to Shirley's advantage. For native-speakers, it is relatively easy to identify groups or social formations based on accent; something that often goes 'hand in hand with differing degrees of access to material resources, to knowledge, to power' (Montgomery, 2007: 63). However, these differences and group boundaries are not so clear to non-native speakers who have not been raised to identify these social markers. In this way, by living abroad, Shirley may have transcended UK-based class distinctions such as her accent that position her as working class; an accent that she proudly retains as part of her British identity in Turkey.

> Shirley: I'm totally British, from Birmingham. But I always fight it, to keep it. It's my identity in a way. I don't want to be a Turk. I don't want to become Turkish.

Shirley may have been able to release her linguistic capital on her move abroad precisely because her working class accent is unheard by foreign ears which are unable to distinguish unfamiliar British linguistic indicators of class, background and level of education.

8.4 'As a man in Turkey, there is pressure to provide not just for the wife, but for her family as well'

Tim describes how he feels there is a lot of pressure in Turkey for husbands to provide for their spouse's extended family.

> Tim: I think as a man in Turkey, there can be more pressure to provide not just for the wife, but for the wife's family as well. Two of my British mates with Turkish wives are extremely stressed because of this and are always feeling the family pressure.

It seems Tim feels these pressures from the external family may not be as pronounced in Britain where the sense of family is more focused on the nuclear. However, Tim perceives that in Turkey, in line with gendered expectations, it is important for the male to act as provider for extended family.

Graham's perception of gendered expectations differs. He expressed concerns he had over expectations of his behaviour as future husband from his wife's family when he first met them.

> Graham: I was nervous about meeting them, but it was the day of the earthquake (17th August 1999) and I just threw on some shorts. I didn't know what to wear or how I should come across, and in the end I think they were just happy I didn't run away (because of the earthquake). But it's difficult, you know, meeting them for the first time. You don't know what they have in mind for their daughter, what they are expecting.

This reminded of my own family situation.

> As Graham told me about first meeting his in-laws and the worry about what to wear and how to act as a male meeting his potential father-in-law, I was reminded of my husband's concerns and the acclimatization period with my own family. Cengiz, too, had to go through the cultural conundrum of meeting foreign in-laws for the first time, wrestling with getting the right level of formality for the occasion. What I perceive as the formal, hierarchical way of speaking to elders in Turkey can come across as overly formal in Britain. I believe for a long time my father felt he hadn't made a connection with Cengiz and this frustrated him as he wanted to have the close relationship with his son-in-law he had always envisioned. I remember struggling to explain the different cultural expectations between children and parents in Turkey and how Cengiz was following the Turkish pattern of how a man should speak to his father or father-in-law. However, as a couple of years passed, Cengiz started to feel comfortable stepping into a role closer to my father's expectations, and now he and my father have a close relationship, conspiring to slip out of the house to their local cafe on the Bosphorus to watch whichever football match is on. (Research Diary, October 2007)

While my husband has shifted his gendered 'performance' (Butler, 1990) with my father, I find I too shift my gendered performance. When visiting his family, I go and help his mother and sister in the kitchen, cooking and preparing the food and clearing the table. At home, Cengiz will always help with these tasks, however, when we visit his family, we follow the more traditional expectations for Turkish roles. Cengiz also actively prevents my father from offering to help, ensuring he does not emasculate himself in the eyes of my Turkish father-in-law. In this way, I believe Cengiz and I shift our gendered identities, based on gendered expectations in our own communities of practice and that of our extended families' communities of practice whereby, even if we do not feel entirely comfortable, we find a balance between our gendered values and the gendered behaviour we need to perform. In this way, we reconstruct ourselves as a woman or man by engaging in the social practices that are associated with our partner's community-defined expectations of gendered roles (Ehrlich, 1997), thereby using our agency to accept the gendered expectations of our partner's host culture (Pavlenko & Piller, 2001). I believe Cengiz and my own behaviours exemplify Kubota's (2003) theory that individuals use their agency to choose which behaviours they wish to perform in certain social contexts, which leads to the possibility of transformation of the normative gender ideologies from their communities of birth, the communities in which they were socialised.

8.5 'The fact that if I go and visit a woman I'm upsetting the husband, that's crazy!'

Regarding gendered separation in Turkey, Graham, based on his own cultural norms strongly objects to what he sees as Turkish norms.

> Graham: The fact that if I go and visit a woman I'm upsetting the husband, that's crazy. I just don't understand the mentality either.

Norton and Pavlenko (2004) suggest that an individual's gendered identity is culturally embedded. This means that when cultural norms differ from place to place, sites of struggle may arise in the individual. This may explain why Graham is so vocal in his disapproval of what he sees as the Turkish practice of gendered separation and why he can't 'understand the mentality'.

> Graham then shifts his attention from Turkey to the global sphere.

> Graham: Sometimes, I think internationally there are still whole areas of issues because of male chauvinism.

Graham, therefore, shows resistance to accepting the different style of gendered relationship in Turkey compared to that he has been socialized into in Britain, finding the new option unattractive. I therefore believe his utterance shows evidence of him using his agency to resist Turkish, gendered relationship patterns as he feels they do not conflate with his own beliefs.

Gendered expectations between spouses may also differ. For Elizabeth, she viewed her marriage as a friendship between husband and wife, possibly based on her experiences of how she views relationships are performed in Britain.

> And I must have been married for 20 years and my husband said to me 'Elizabeth, you are not my friend, you are my wife! If you want a friend, find a girl'

Her husband viewed their relationship in a different light, expecting friendship to take place between individuals of the same gender, not between husband and wife. Her husband's expected norms of what a married relationship entails were based on different expectations from Elizabeth's, which meant their cultural and gendered expectations for relationship norms did not conflate. In their case, Mehmet used his agency to resist Elizabeth's attempts to bring their relationship towards the friendship she envisioned based on her British expectations of marriage; she was unable to change this resistance.

During my interview with Esma, Elizabeth interjected and expressed her concern about how Esma was acting and how this may be coming across to her Turkish husband.

> Elizabeth: I'm not Turkish, but I sometimes feel I should tell you about Turkey, I really do, you know.

In her utterance, Elizabeth positions her British identity against Esma's dual nationality, but implies that she has superior cultural understanding of Turkish norms, especially regarding gendered relationships.

> Elizabeth: ...How you behave and how you act. Because you act in such an English way and I sometimes think about your poor husband. Because sometimes I think he is unaware of the situation you are in.

Elizabeth indicates she believes Esma is acting out her gendered identity within British cultural expectations and that her husband may not realise Esma's behaviour is drawn from British cultural norms. She warns Esma about going out socially with men.

> Elizabeth: I get a bit worried about you at times. I mean, you've got to be careful about going out with anybody else!

Esma's response to Elizabeth's comments about how to act, especially towards other men, was uncontrolled laughter. Through her laughter, I perceive Esma was showing resistance to Elizabeth's perceptions of how the wife of a Turkish husband should behave. I believe this incredulity was based on her own expectations of the performance of a British wife differing so much from the picture of a Turkish wife that Elizabeth was painting; she could not take Elizabeth's suggestions seriously. Ehrlich (1997: 436) believes 'individuals construct or produce themselves as women or men by habitually engaging in social practices that are associated with culturally and community-defined notions of masculinity and femininity'. Esma's desire seems to be to continue engaging in British social practices of gendered relationships. Elizabeth's suggestion, therefore, regarding changing her behaviour, appears to be a change that Esma is not willing to make to her identity.

In summary, from participants' stories of gendered expectations and performances, I observed acts of resistance. For years, Cengiz resisted adapting to my father's expected norms of a British son-in-law. Tim seems to resist the idea of male being provider for extended, not just nuclear, family and Graham resists the idea that it is not considered acceptable for men and women to socialise the same way in Turkey as they do in Britain. As well as acts of resistance, I also observed acts of acceptance and assimilation in my husband's and my own behaviours when visiting extended family. However, these acts of acceptance are confined to the localised community of practice within his family's home, and in this way we are not fully practising the gender ideologies of each other's cultures. Instead, we are only enacting them at

times beneficial to ourselves. None of the participants appear to have fully taken on the gendered performances of their spouse's host culture, although each may be developing an intercultural-gendered behaviour along a continuum matching neither the home culture nor the host culture. In terms of her own gendered self-image, Elizabeth seems to be the most flexible in adapting to the new gendered behaviour and ideologies of the target community in Turkey, although failure to do so in the past has been a site of struggle with her husband. I therefore believe Elizabeth had great personal investment in acquiring localised norms. This may have led to her heightened perception of gendered roles in Turkey, and her earnest advice to Esma regarding how she interacts with her British male colleagues for the sake of her marriage.

From these narratives, in line with poststructural theories on identity (Butler, 1990; Crawford, 1995), it would seem that Elizabeth, my husband and I have been constructing and reconstructing our gendered identities over time to bring personal gain or acceptance within our host community or our spouse's community of practice (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 1992; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999), even if this is at times only a temporary construction. However, other stories, such as Graham's and Esma's, appear to show acts of resistance whereby participants have formed strong gender identities based on their home communities of practice that they seem unwilling to give up. Individuals can therefore be seen to use their agency (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001) in making the choice to resist or assimilate to gendered-performance expectations in their new community of practice.

8.6 'You will never be able to assimilate because you look too foreign!' 'People get confused because I look Turkish'

Appearance in relation to identity arises as a factor in Maureen's story. There are also many examples of the role appearance plays in how individuals are perceived in my research diary.

> Maureen: I mean we go to the park together and things and he sees other children and runs up to them and says 'Hi' and they don't know what to do. Because with me, not looking particularly foreign as well... ...that when I speak in English with Efe... I think the other children think Efe is Turkish and they think 'idiot' why is he trying to speak to us in English.

Brown-eyed, dark-haired Maureen describes how she and her son are positioned as Turkish by individuals in the local community based on their appearance. This leads to confusion when Efe speaks English as the children he is talking to have positioned him as Turkish and expect

him to speak Turkish. While Maureen feels she and her son are positioned as Turkish based on their appearance, I find my daughter and I are regularly positioned as foreign based on our appearance. An extract from my research diary provides an example of this.

> Before Yasemin started pre-school, she was looked after by a Turkish nanny. She is also looked after by my mother-in-law with whom she often stays for a number of weeks each summer. I can already see her Turkish mannerisms coming through which cause people to stop and stare in the street. Yasemin has white blonde hair, a fair complexion and green eyes. People assume she is foreign and are extremely surprised when they hear her speaking Turkish. Often, in restaurants, especially if they have heard Cengiz and me speaking English, Turkish children will come up to Yasemin to try to practise their English. 'Hello, what is your name?' is usually greeted by Yasemin with a confused expression as she can't understand why the children she knows are Turkish are trying to speak to her in English. (Research Diary, June 2009)

As well as the experience described in my research diary, I find that when Yasemin and I are out together, we are often party to comments about what we are doing or how we are talking by passersby, unaware we understand everything they are saying. Perhaps as Turkish is less widely used globally, these passersby assume we have not made the effort to learn the language; this may be why they are comfortable talking about us in Turkish in our earshot. At these times, I perceive we are being positioned based on our fair-skinned appearance; it appears they assume we either are not Turkish or don't speak Turkish. There is often embarrassed surprise from the passersby when we turn around and start speaking Turkish.

Being positioned based on appearance is something that Piller (2001) found evidence of in her research. Some of her participants felt they were identified as foreign at times without even uttering a word. This left them feeling frustrated as they found themselves reduced to their original nationality without their newly acquired identity which incorporated two (or more) national cultures. How others saw them was not always the psychological reality of how they saw themselves. While I find myself positioned as foreign based on my appearance, I am aware that I am a naturalised Turk and was not born Turkish; I don't have Turkish blood running through my veins. For my daughter, however, the situation is different, she has Turkish heritage, was born in Turkey and is a native speaker of Turkish. However, her appearance is noticeably different from the majority of the Turkish population which can lead to her being positioned as foreign. Using Piller's (2001) concept, how Yasemin perceives herself may not be the psychological reality of how others see her. Efe finds himself in a similar position; however, his appearance is noticeably similar to the Turkish population leading to him regularly being positioned as Turkish, even when speaking English.

When appearance does not conflate with expectations of language use, surprise may arise in onlookers. One of the participants finds this same surprise when observing her own son:

> (One of the participants) said her son jokingly asked her if she had had an affair before he was born. Her son is fair with blue eyes and expressed he can't understand how this is possible when his father is Turkish. She says she still finds it strange to see her British-looking boy turn around and speak in fluent Turkish to his father. (Research Diary, October 2009)

When I described this conversation to a friend, Sally, she made the following observation:

> Sally, on hearing these comments, said she thought (this participant) and I would never be able to assimilate in Turkey in the same way she and Leyla could, due to their dark hair and brown eyes. She said because of our blue eyes and blonde hair, we would always be identified as foreign before even opening our mouths. (Research Diary, 2009)

Sally's observations conflate with the experiences of Piller's (2001) participants. Her comments had a real impact on my understanding of how I am seen in Turkey. While knowing I appear foreign in relation to the local community, I had never considered the extent of how this may position me in the eyes of others. For my daughter, this means she may continually be positioned as foreign in her country of birth. This is similar to British-Egyptian Sayed's situation whereby he was regularly positioned as Arabic while growing up in England. However, unlike Sayed, Yasemin is in the more advantageous position of being positioned and linked to a desired culture and language by the local community while Sayed suffered for his Arabic heritage due to the current positioning of Arabs and Muslims in the eyes of the West whereby people of Middle Eastern origin suffer worse because of the association between Islam and Terrorism (Delanty, 2008). Sayed's story provided one of the critical incidents that acted as a catalyst for this study during which he described wanting to 'rip the Englishness out of himself'. I believe his strong feeling was a response to finding himself continually positioned as Arabic even though he was living in the country of his birth, a native-speaker of English and being raised by a British mother. It appears strongly that how others saw Sayed was not the psychological reality of how he saw himself. Despite his ongoing resistance, at one point he seems to have angrily given up trying to position himself as English, wanting to 'rip this part out' and resort to the identity that others kept positioning him into. This experience is something Phinney describes, believing:

> 'increasing numbers of people find that the conflicts are not between different groups but between different cultural values, attitudes, and expectations within themselves' (1999: 27)

The fact that Sayed can be both Arab and British did not seem to conflate with the opinions of those around him in England while he was growing up, seemingly leading to him believing this himself. However, in adulthood, he professes to having embraced both parts of his identity and has reclaimed agency over his sense of self.

> After Sayed's description of how he used to want to 'rip the Englishness out of himself', we talked about how he feels now. He described being proud of his dual heritage, proud to walk into Egypt as an Egyptian and into England as an Englishman, enjoying the surprise on customs officials' faces as he switches between English and Arabic. (Research Diary, April 2011)

The conversation with Sally regarding my foreign appearance started me thinking about the extent to which people expect to hear English from me. I have already described how passersby feel free to talk about me (either positively or negatively) assuming I don't speak Turkish. However, I believe my appearance also affects people's ability to 'hear' me speaking Turkish. On occasion, I have to directly tell people that I am speaking Turkish as they are expecting to hear a foreign language and don't seem to realise I am speaking Turkish. This does not happen with Maureen and Leyla who both describe 'getting away with' being mistaken for Turks. With Shirley and me, I don't believe this will ever happen; our appearance is an identity marker that precedes any attempts at speaking Turkish. This leads me to speculate whether Maureen and Leyla's proficiency in Turkish has exceeded mine and Shirley's as they are assumed to be Turkish speakers immediately without having to go through the struggle each time of identifying themselves as speaking Turkish. Piller (2001) believes the question of to what extent fluency, be it native fluency, near-native fluency, or second language fluency, is a matter of perception rather than performance needs to be investigated further. She believes her data suggest the distinction between native and non-native may be partly in the eye or ear of the beholder. I believe my own experiences and evidence from participants' stories and my research diary reflect this view and I, too, see this as an area for further investigation.

8.7 'I like living in an English bubble' 'When I speak Turkish, I think and feel Turkish'

Shirley explains how she maintains her foreignness.

> Shirley: I do like, now I realize, living in a bubble, and I've created that bubble. I can walk round the street and I can be totally foreign. But I don't switch from culture to culture. I'm terrible. I know it sounds bad, and I know I come across totally wrong and I always get in trouble for it, but I mean I just don't.

Through her description, Shirley is using her agency (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001) to resist assimilation into the host community by 'creating' and 'living in' a bubble that allows her to be 'totally foreign'. She is choosing to portray the identity of her home culture, not her host culture (Omoniyi, 2006). However, she indicates a sense of guilt about doing this, saying it is 'terrible' and 'sounds bad'. Shirley also implies that her behaviour is not always accepted by others who think she comes across 'wrong' and which may lead to her 'getting into trouble'. However, her resistance continues. Despite this strong resistance, Shirley describes how she also has the ability to use her agency to shift between cultures if she so desires.

> But I can come out of that bubble. I can pretend to be Turkish. I can be part of the Turkish community if I want to.

Through using different discourses, Shirley reveals the contradiction she feels about her 'bubble' and shows that she uses different strategies for making sense of her life. She is vocal about living in her English 'bubble' but is aware of her agency to step outside this 'bubble' to become 'part of the Turkish community'. It seems she does not see herself as being part of two communities at once, but part of one community, with the agency to enter into the other as a guest if needed. Jenkins (2007) believes individuals have the ability to choose to affiliate or not to affiliate with the target language community depending on the identity they wish to portray or the group they wish to affiliate with. It seems Shirley uses this agency when the need arises but Turkish assimilation is not her preferred identity. Leyla, unlike Shirley, expresses ease in switching from culture to culture.

> I switch cultures. When I speak Turkish, I think and feel Turkish. Because there are some words and feelings and emotions that are definitely Turkish and I don't have it in Farsi and I don't have it in English.

Leyla's experience is different from Shirley's. While Shirley feels she can 'pretend to be Turkish', Leyla describes 'speaking, thinking and feeling' in Turkish, drawing on Turkish emotions and words that she finds lacking in English and Farsi when she is portraying her Turkish conceptualisation of self. She describes doing this so well that at one time her mother-in-law did a double take to see if it was Leyla that had expressed a typically Turkish sentiment.

> Leyla: There was something very unusual where my mother-in-law was – 'What did you say!?' I was looking at a programme on television about soldiers from Turkey and America and other countries (In Turkey, all males have to do national service as opposed to in the US where it is a voluntary professional military) and I looked at the Turkish soldiers and I said 'I feel where they come from' You know, that they sat at home and had *'beyaz peynir'* (white cheese) and *'annesi demiski "kendini bak oğlum"'* (his mother said 'take care of yourself, son'). So you know where they come from. Whereas, you see, the American soldier, he doesn't come from that family background. Mum's a drug addict and Dad's been boozing round with other women and he's in jail, and you can see that in him. Whereas, I 'm sort of standing there like

this and feel... ah, they're just the boy next door (referring to the Turkish soldiers) and you can express that in another language, you can turn around and say *'uh, oğlum terlidi'* (literally – my son sweated)*. That's the Turkish culture coming through'.*

Leyla's narrative describes how she could empathise and make a connection with the Turkish soldiers, she could 'feel' what they were feeling, where they came from, what they were used to eating, how their mothers were feeling. She could not render the same emotions for the American soldiers with whom she had no connection even though she shared their language. Her mother-in-law's surprise may have come from both the maternal connection that Leyla felt with the Turkish soldiers and also the colloquial way in which she expressed this feeling to the point where she came across as Turkish. I believe it is possible that as Leyla had already been exposed to more than one culture and language by early childhood, she may already have developed an advanced ability to detect, process, and organise everyday cultural meanings (Benet-Martínez *et al*, 2002) giving her the ability to use her agency to culturally frame-switch between two cultural meaning systems in response to cultural cues from the surrounding environment (Hong *et al*). Her narrative encapsulates the ease with which she does this. Through the actions she describes in her story, I perceive Leyla has managed to incorporate Turkish realities into her own 'cultural universes' (Holliday, 2011), taking ownership of the Turkish language and mannerisms, empathising with the soldiers on the television and her mother-in-law, transforming into a Turkish recreation of her sense of self (Lam, 2004). Ochs believes the process of language acquisition and social and cultural acquisition aid each other whereby as individuals acquire the language to a higher proficiency, they also understand their sociocultural context better through that language (1996). This certainly seems to be the case with Leyla's narrative and may be the reason why she now 'feels' in Turkish when speaking Turkish.

Alya, too, describes her ability to switch comfortably between cultures which she puts down to her previous travel and work experiences and also spending time with her husband's family and feeling part of that family.

Alya: I was an au pair, and I worked in families and, of course, I'm married to Graham and I've been working in all parts of Britain as well, so I have an English side, and I have a Turkish side. And after I got married to Graham, I spent more time with his Mum and Dad and it became a family thing ... I am bilingual in language and culture.

Her comfort in 'cultural frame-switching' (Hong *et al,* 2003) is implied in her description of her 'English side' which I perceive means that she may have managed to incorporate British realities into her Turkish 'cultural universe' (Holliday, 2011). In her move to the UK, her career and her family, I believe she has taken ownership of the English language and British culture

and used her agency (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001) to transform herself into a British recreation of herself when needed.

8.8 'Two languages and two countries is like being two people' 'My son is more positive in English than in Turkish'

From the interviews with participants and from examples in my research diary, stories arose of how individuals were perceived to have more than one identity or to perform differently within each identity. Lynn describes how her middle daughter 'suddenly realised she had another identity'.

> My second daughter, for a long time she wasn't very good in English, but in the last ten years her language has improved a lot. I think suddenly she realised she did have another identity.

Lynn's perception is that her daughter started to improve her English as a reaction to wanting to identify with the other part of her identity; an interest that only arose as her daughter became older.

> I think growing up and going to school in Turkey she felt completely different, but later I think she became more aware of the fact she is half English and she suddenly came and talked to me about my family background and history. Before that she didn't really show much interest.

Lynn believes her daughter's initial lack of interest in her British 'family background and history' may be due to her being socialised in Turkey where she 'felt completely different' by which I believe Lynn means that she felt Turkish and wasn't interested in her British roots. It was only with age when she 'became more aware of the fact she is half English' that she started to explore all aspects of her identity and started to ask about her heritage – a shift that Lynn believes also improved her English proficiency. Her daughter's change of heart reflects Kumaravadivelu's U-shaped phenomenon (2008: 4), when interest in one's languages and language cultures wanes when one is a teenager with renewed interest arising in adulthood.

Unlike Lynn who conceptualises her children as having two 'halves', Graham and Alya conceptualise their children as being 'like two people'.

> Graham: Alya's family say they think the children are quite fortunate they have two options in this world, Eren's got his English and his Turkish and it's like being two people.

> Alya: Yeah, like one language is one person and two languages is like two people.

They clearly identify one language with one identity and the other language with another identity, something they think will bring their children advantages in life as it will open up more 'options'.

> Graham: They've got two options, they've got two languages and two countries and two personalities.

While Graham refers to two 'personalities', Maureen too, perceives different personalities emerging in her children arising as they perform their 'English' and 'Turkish' identities.

> Maureen: I would say Efe is much more positive in his English than his Turkish, though his Turkish, as I say, is weaker.

She indicates she believes Efe's positivity in English may be because this is his stronger language.

> Maureen: With my daughter she is more balanced, but I would say with both children they are more positive in English.

However, when she analyses her daughter's performance, even though she feels her daughter's languages are more 'balanced' she still perceives her daughter to be more positive in English.

> Meryem is much happier, more comfortable in fact. Maybe because she uses her English more when she is on holiday and she relaxes, because she can be quite sort of solemn in Turkish.

She elaborates on her description of 'positive', describing Meryem as 'happier', 'more comfortable' and 'relaxed' when speaking English. Looking for a reason for this, she draws on contexts in which Meryem is relaxed such as when she is on holiday. She compares this to her everyday performance in Turkish which Maureen describes as 'solemn'.

The concept of performing different personalities in different languages and having two different conceptualisations of self also arose in my research diary.

> Sayed (raised in Britain by a British mother and Egyptian father) says he is more excitable when speaking Arabic and a lot more staid when speaking English. (Research Diary, April 2011)

His perception is something that I, too, have seen. When speaking Arabic, I observe Sayed to be much more animated and expressive than when he speaks English. As well as Sayed's story, I found another example of an individual being seen to perform different personalities in my research diary.

Katy, an English-language kindergarten teacher, divorced from her Turkish husband, has a ten-year-old son, George, who is currently attending a Turkish kindergarten. Katy says her son 'acts Turkish when he is at school with his Turkish friends', and 'acts English' when he is at home with her. (Research Diary, May 2011)

Katy describes how George performs or 'acts' different identities depending on the setting he is in; being Turkish at school and English at home whereby he may culturally frame-switch between two cultural meaning systems in response to cultural clues from the surrounding environment (Hong *et al*, 2003). Katy describes this cultural frame-switch (ibid) as being so great that when he is in a native-English-language environment she can see changes to his personality.

'However, when we visit England in the summer, he acts much more English and I can see him change, he is much more calm and relaxed and laid back in English, he is quite hurried in Turkish'. (Research Diary, May 2011)

Maureen describes her daughter as more relaxed, comfortable and happy 'in English'. Similarly, Katy finds her son's identity performance is more laid back in English. This may indicate that they view being 'laid back' and 'relaxed' as being a British trait.

In the examples given above, there are stories of individuals using their agency to perform one aspect of their identity or another depending on the linguistic and cultural surroundings they find themselves in. While individuals have the agency to make changes to these performances, I found examples in their stories and in my research diary of when cultural frame-switches occur involuntarily, the result of which is that the individual may reveal foreignness. From my research diary, one example involved Yann, born in France but raised in the US by French parents from the age of three.

When discussing Yann's dual heritage, I commented that even when he was speaking English, I was picking up slight French mannerisms in his body language; something he said he was aware of and that he had been told before. (Research Diary, October 2011)

While I found I was picking up on French paralinguistics when interacting with Yann's performance of his American self, I also had the opportunity to witness a native-French speaker, Antoine, picking up on Americanisms when Yann was conversing with him in French.

When observing Yann speaking French to Antoine (the school French teacher), Antoine tried to reposition him, saying he spoke French like an American not a Frenchman, but conceded if Yann had true French patriotism in his heart, he would accept him as Frenchman. (Research Diary, September 2011)

It seems Antoine, therefore, conceptualises having French patriotism as a stronger indicator of being French than linguistic ability.

> Maureen, too, perceived that her children's performances showed foreignness to individuals in both of their cultural communities.

> I think they may not seem very British to the British, but they may not seem very Turkish to the Turks.

This was also expressed by Esma who felt she was not seen as 'fully British by the Brits or Turkish by the Turks'. Following Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2007) these individuals who have been raised with two languages and cultures from a young age should be able to switch between cultural schemas to the point where they are accepted as 'Turkish by the Turks' and 'British by the Brits'. However, from the examples above, there is evidence that this is not always the case. Baker believes:

> 'It is possible to speak a language fluently yet not really understand, fully experience or fully participate in the culture that goes with a particular language. This is like saying about a person "they speak Italian but don't act Italian". It is paradoxically possible to be bilingual yet relatively monocultural' (2000: 18).

An individual may intend, therefore, to blend into a group, but idiosyncrasies from their other language or culture could seep through that may be identified by their interlocutors.

8.9 'My son doesn't want to be thought of as Turkish, he wants to be English and live in England – but he doesn't really know English people'

Some utterances described a perceived discomfort with individuals' cultural identities. Elizabeth, in particular, expressed her concern for her son, Mark.

> When Mark watches television, he prefers British programmes, he doesn't like Turkish television. He now wants to go and live in England. If he has money, he will go to England. He doesn't like Turkish *people!* And I don't like that! Because he doesn't really know English people, only the ones I know, and that's not really the same. And he watches BBC and there are old people on the television and he thinks they're all like that. So Mark has probably got a false view of England.

She describes Mark as 'not really knowing English people' and drawing on British cultural media, and her British friends to paint a picture of England; a picture that Elizabeth believes is 'false' and possibly rooted in time gone by; 'there are old people on the television and he thinks they're all like that'. She implies Mark resorts to idealization to fill this gap in his knowledge. Not only is she concerned that Mark does not like Turkish people, she is also concerned about how well he fits in to his local community.

> Mark just feels he doesn't fit in though. I mean Mark, Mark… I'm not happy about Mark. I'm really not happy. Because I don't think he's well adjusted. He doesn't want to be thought of as Turkish, he wants to be English and live in England. If he has money, he will go to England.

Elizabeth expresses concern that her son is 'not well adjusted'. I believe she sees Mark's identity as a site of struggle whereby he is rejecting his Turkish heritage, showing allegiance to England instead, planning to move there - to a country that he has not lived in and of which he has built an idealised picture. Zahiri-Farnoody (n.d.) describes a situation of 'social marginality' whereby individuals may feel anxiety related to social acceptance, feel rejected by one culture or torn between 'two competing sets of cultural norms and values'. I believe Elizabeth's description of Mark's perception of his own identity is indicative of 'a conflict within' whereby he does not feel comfortable with the cultural expectations of himself. In addition, Elizabeth's younger son, Steven, expressed to Elizabeth how he felt somewhat of an outsider in Turkey.

> Elizabeth: Steven said to me 'we didn't know how to behave in Turkey, because Father wouldn't show us'. I don't know how they coped with the *Turkish* family side, let alone the British. They don't feel comfortable in their Turkish side. They don't know what to do.

Elizabeth indicates her sons believe their father neglected to show them Turkish cultural norms which they feel has left them culturally lacking in Turkey. She believes that for this reason, 'they don't feel comfortable in their Turkish side' and 'they don't know what to do'. I believe her utterance 'I don't know how they coped with the *Turkish* family side, let alone the British' indicates that she had some expectation that they would pick up Turkish norms from being raised in Turkey, and felt it was more likely they would struggle to pick up British norms. However, it seems they have not picked up the Turkish norms to the extent that they feel they need to in order to feel comfortable. Despite this, she believes her sons' dual heritage has led them to have some level of awareness of both cultures.

> Elizabeth: So they are more aware of the differences, and they look at the difference in both sides through different eyes. They can see both sides of the story.

While Elizabeth believes her children have an awareness of 'both sides' this does not necessarily mean they feel comfortable with their cultures. Holliday believes that 'one does not have to be nationally foreign to feel foreign in relation to cultural practices in the society one inhabits' (2011: 182). This is what Elizabeth describes of her sons, 'not knowing how to behave', not 'feeling comfortable' and 'not fitting in'. She gives reasons why she thinks this is so.

> Our children can never really learn English culture because they haven't grown up in it, and they can't really learn Turkish culture unless they've had lots of grandparents around them, but mine didn't.

Elizabeth expresses the importance of community socialisation in acquiring cultural norms, believing her children didn't acquire 'English culture' as they were not raised in England and that they didn't acquire Turkish norms as there was not a strong enough Turkish family presence around them when they were growing up.

> They wouldn't know what to do if somebody died, they don't know what to do if someone gets married. And when visitors come they hardly know what to do. It's because they don't know the rules.

A couple of years after this interview, Elizabeth told me about attending the funeral of a family friend with her son, Mark. At a Turkish funeral, men congregate at the front while the woman stand at the rear. Elizabeth described how Mark refused to leave her on her own and insisted on standing at the back in the women's section with his mother as an act of resistance against this practice. She also described her concern when she helped Mark to plan his wedding (to a Turkish bride); she said neither of them had any idea about the norms of Turkish weddings and found it difficult to know what to plan. Elizabeth's narrative reveals that Mark may have acquired the socialised norms of neither Britain nor Turkey. This does not conflate with Baker's views. Baker believes that these children will end up with 'two or more worlds of experience':

> 'One of the advantages of a bilingual... is having two or more worlds of experience. With each language goes different systems of behaviour, wise folk sayings, valued stories, histories, traditions, ways of meeting and greeting, rituals of birth, marriage and death, ways of conversing different literatures, music, forms of entertainment, religious traditions, ways of understanding and interpreting the world, ideas and beliefs, ways of thinking and drinking, crying and loving, eating and caring, ways of joking and mourning. With two languages goes a wider cultural experience, and, very possibly, greater tolerance of cultural difference and less racism' (2007: 4).

Wang believes that children can 'pool' their cultural knowledge.

> 'Children who know more than one language are often able to use resources from all of their languages as they engage in social interactions and learning situations, and they actively construct their identities and communication styles by pooling their knowledge of language conventions and cultural norms across their languages' (2008: 183).

Mark, therefore, may have Turkish nationality and be a native-speaker of Turkish, but he is missing a lot of knowledge on Turkish cultural norms and I believe this is what leaves him 'feeling foreign in relation to the cultural practices in the society in which (he) inhabits' (Holliday: 2011: 182).

8.10 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter, I have presented evidence that the negotiation and construction of identity within family and society must be understood in relation to national concepts of identity, perceptions of class, and gender-based expectations in each culture as well as linked to appearance. These factors come together for each participant, forming multiple subjectivities working within complex networks of social expectations and practices. How much individuals accept or resist these identities and how they interact in these situations differs for each person, thereby reflecting their unique experiences depending on class, gender and how they anchor and define themselves according to their nation of birth and the nation of their partner. Each individual's concept of gender, nationality, and social class, therefore, may be challenged, reinforced or reconstructed during their life trajectories.

CHAPTER NINE

'THE LINE BETWEEN TWO CULTURES', 'SEEING BOTH SIDES'

In this chapter, I present examples from the data of how participants believe outsiders or extended family members view their bilingual marriages, how they view their own cultural values and practices in relation to those of their partner, how they perceive their children deal with cultural differences, and how they may reveal their preference for their perception of one culture's values and norms over another through their choice of language. To aid in drawing meaning from this data, I draw on notions of capital – both linguistic and cultural – in relation to class (Bourdieu, 1978, 1982) and the concept of Othering (Holliday, 2011) to unpack participants' notions of language, culture and meaning.

9.1 'She's only marrying you for your passport and money'

The participants in this study are not just in relationships with their spouses, they are also married into their partner's extended families.

Elizabeth's family and her husband's family were extremely unhappy with her marriage. She describes how her husband's family looked down upon her own family.

> My parents didn't like our marriage, that I was marrying a foreigner. They were very *very* unhappy about it. But my mother didn't stop me, because she thought she knew me. Mehmet's family were very unhappy about it as well.... I mean, one of my sister-in-laws still doesn't really accept it. My husband's family were sort of Ağa[3] or whatever they call it. So they were sort of the village chiefs. So they thought themselves *really* superior. And my husband always thought he was superior to me. I mean they looked down on people, it was horrendous.

From Elizabeth's narrative, she describes how neither side of the family were pleased with her and her husband's decision to marry. From her family, their unhappiness may have come from her marrying a foreigner. From her husband's family, formal feudal chiefs from a region further east in Turkey, issues of class may have been at play. Elizabeth feels her husband's family never really accepted her, that they felt 'superior' and 'looked down' on her and others. They may have perceived their son as having married below himself. Elizabeth is not the only participant who received negative reactions from extended family. Tim's father made derogatory accusations, questioning his wife's reasons for marrying him, accusing her of wanting to get into the British system to better herself.

---

[3] Turkish feudal chiefs

> While Hulya said her family were happy for her to get married to Tim, as long as they were living in Turkey, Tim described a different situation whereby his father accused Hulya of only marrying Tim for a passport and for money. (Research Diary, October 2007)

Tim's father's view about foreigners only marrying for passports and money reflects a view that is currently common in the UK and the West. As well as being protectionist of the country, Tim's father's concerns may also be class based, seeing Tim's wife as lower than his own family and only marrying his son in an attempt at social climbing.

> Lynn's tale, too, tells of a disapproving father.

> My father didn't speak to me for two years. He refused to see me for two years. My mother didn't mind, but I found it difficult, I couldn't really see her... My husband's mother and father accepted the marriage. They had no problem with it. I think with my father, it was the fact he was a Turk. I don't think he would have minded if he had been French or Spanish.

In Lynn's case, through his silence, her father may have attempted to 'expel' and 'excommunicate' (Bourdieu, 1982: 53) what he perceived to be his daughter's embarrassing act and to 'limit the consequences of (her) behaviour' within his group (ibid). Lynn sees her father's perception of group to extend to include France and Spain, i.e. the European group, but not to include Turkey. By delineating which groups he may deem acceptable for his daughter to marry into and belong to and which he may not deem acceptable, I believe Lynn perceives a notion of cultural superiority in her father. The story of Lynn's father shows similarities with Tim's father.

> Lynn and Elizabeth also tell a story of a British consulate official trying to dissuade them from their upcoming marriages.

> After their interviews, Elizabeth and Lynn both told me how they were called into the British Consulate before getting married and given a strict talking to by the local official about how their marriages would never work, how they were making a mistake and how they should reconsider what they were doing. (Research Diary, October 2007)

9.2 'They have no... 'free-thinking', 'truth' or 'rationality''

Many participants told stories whereby they perceived values in one culture to be better than the other, either overtly or through their descriptions, and through this I believe they reveal their 'cultural agendas' (Holliday, 2011).

> Tim: Attitudes towards lying or guilt, that's when it's going to make more of a difference. Now he's not aware of that, but later on, I don't like the bits, maybe... free thinking, which I don't like here. You should make your own choice whether it is okay

or not, and have some rationality behind it. I think that's when it's going to matter. It's not the individual cultural stuff... the philosophical outlook – that's what will matter... ideas about lying and truth.

Tim appears to see the concept of truth working in a different way in Turkey to Britain. He also implies free thinking and rational thought are British, not Turkish norms.

Esma, too, has a strong perception of what are British norms and what are Turkish norms and adds:

There are things that get on my nerves here, like when things just seem to happen.

Similar to Tim, she implies free thinking is not a cultural norm in Turkey.

I feel they are not making an effort to open their minds.

She then describes how when her perception of cultural norms do not conflate with her personal ideals she positions herself as being more British than Turkish indicating she believes her personal values more closely conflate with those she identifies as British.

Things like that get to me; so I feel more English at those times as well.

I believe her reaction to cultural norms to reveals whether she is tending towards her British or Turkish identities. Both Tim and Esma, therefore, appear to have created a picture of British cultural life and norms which they may use to reinforce their own perceptions of their identities.

Elizabeth also presents her ideas on British and Turkish cultural norms, possibly reflecting her own sense of self.

You know, I used to phone up my mother and say 'can I come and visit' and she would say 'when do you want to come Elizabeth, I must check my diary'.

Like Esma, Elizabeth identifies planning with being a British cultural norm. However, having to make plans to visit one's close relatives she believes is perceived as extremely insulting by her Turkish friends, to the point that it could even ruin a relationship.

Elizabeth: And my Turkish friends said if their mother said that to them they would never visit their mother again; that would finish their relationship.

Elizabeth perceives that her Turkish friends don't have the ability to understand this difference in cultural practice.

It's different..., and they can't understand.

As Elizabeth continues, she starts to reveal her perception of British and Turkish norms.

Steven's more Turkish than Mark, you know and he likes living in Turkey. But like Mark, he's not jealous and he believes in equal rights.

She describes how Steven is Turkish *'but'* is not jealous and believes in equal rights, implying that she believes he is Turkish despite these traits, or that a British streak exists in him which is shown through these norms. That equal rights may also be encompassed by Turkish norms is not entertained as a possibility; instead, Elizabeth projects these norms as solely being British.

9.3 'You judge people on your own culture – it's so wrong, but it's difficult not to'

While I believe Tim, Esma, and Elizabeth's stories show a sense of superiority of British norms over Turkish norms, and perhaps a sense of being from a higher class and more civilised than their perception of the Turks, Graham's projections are full of contradictions. He sees the positives and negatives in Turkish norms and the positives and negatives in British norms. He seems to be drawing his British imagery from a lower social class than his Turkish imagery.

Alya was saying about children here, how they are not allowed to be so creative, but on the other side, they are very respectful; they respect their elders and their surroundings, they're not yobs.

Graham implies respect is a strong Turkish norm, but indicates his belief that this may come at the expense of children's creativity. He also indicates that he believes this freedom of creativity may lead to yobbish behaviour which he perceives as 'acceptable' behaviour in Britain.

Here (Turkey), it is not acceptable to be a thug or hang about or drink in public.

While he seems to admire the 'community of respect' in Turkey, he seems to view vandalism and drinking in England as 'usual' behaviour. At one point, he implies the Turkish part of his son's identity may shield him from getting involved in the negative British behaviours.

I think it is quite good that he's English and Turkish, because he's got this different background, he wouldn't get dragged into some of the usual kind of cultural norms which can be quite negative, like hanging around, drinking and vandalism. And I think it helps that he's got that slightly different character. He might draw from that, like you've got to be a bit more respectful about these things.

Graham's narrative, then, seems full of contradictions. I believe these contradictions may reflect a struggle over Graham's self-identification. Seeing the positives and negatives in both countries, being pulled and pushed in two directions seem to have left him in a state of ambivalence. Despite appearing to struggle with his decision to live in Turkey, Graham's narrative presents quite a balanced picture of Britain and Turkey, unlike the narratives of Tim,

Esma and Elizabeth which may indicate of Othering (Holliday, 2011) and a sense of superiority. Graham does not, therefore, appear to Other Turkish culture; he is suggesting that he has a greater awareness of his own 'norms, values and beliefs' at home, something he lacks in Turkey where he does not have a localised set of norms on which to base his judgements.

> I just feel I am a world apart from the people here, but I could say that about people in my own country, but I'd be a lot more clear, my norms, my values, my beliefs, my interests.

Elizabeth, too, despite the perceived Othering in her previous utterances, expressed a belief that one's value judgements are based on one's own culture.

> Because you judge people on your own culture, it's *so* wrong. It's very difficult not to, when you go to somebody's house and you see the way they eat and behave.

Elizabeth seems very aware that her prejudices are not acceptable, not to her and not to others. This may create a tension in her.

> But I mean it's awfully difficult. I mean, it takes you years to get over that thing of, probably colonialism again... I have the same cultural background as my grandmother.

Elizabeth seems caught between what she perceives was acceptable in her grandmother's generation at the height of colonialism and what she perceives is acceptable now. While she shows awareness of her prejudice, she also indicates that much of this is subconscious; what Holliday refers to as 'false consciousness' (Holliday, 2011: 189).

> You are influenced by all this and you are prejudiced. We all are. And your prejudices are horrendous. And you are not aware of those prejudices within yourself though and you *are* prejudiced.

Again, the tensions in Elizabeth become apparent as she describes these prejudices as 'horrendous'. However, she prescribes 'tolerance' as a way of overcoming this prejudice.

> I think you have to become very tolerant if you do live in a foreign country.

Like Graham, Elizabeth perceives that her value judgements and her cultural norms are based on the norms of her own socialisation – her local habitus (Bourdieu, 1977a).

> So then I began to wonder if you only acquire the culture of your *family*. To a certain effect the surroundings, but, you know, you really are protected by your surroundings, your vision of life is based on your own family, isn't it, and the people you mix with.

Thus, while I believe Elizabeth shows evidence of Othering in her narrative, she also shows awareness of this Othering, indicating it may stem from a family background and home country rooted in colonialism. Elizabeth also identifies that she believes her cultural values

have been created by her own family and the people around her, as does Graham, thereby supporting Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus' whereby an individual, partly unconsciously, takes in the rules, values and dispositions through 'the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations... (which produces) practices' (Bourdieu 1977a: 78). In this way, the values and dispositions from our own cultural history stay with us across contexts meaning responses to cultural rules and contexts are mostly determined by where and who we have been in a culture (Webb *et al*, 2010). This means we are likely to judge others behaviours on our own cultural habitus and we may find it difficult to accept the culture practices of others as they seem unfamiliar and strange in comparison to our own socialisation. This is something that happens between groups within groups in a single country as well as cross-nationally.

9.4 'When you come to a country where people don't even have a knife and fork, it's easy to think they are not cultured'

In this section I analyse participants' perceptions of cultural norms and etiquette. Elizabeth, raised in an upper-middle-class household where etiquette appeared to be of the utmost importance, has the most to say on this issue.

> If you are brought up to believe how you use a knife and fork is a very important thing, then you come to a country where people don't even have a knife and fork, they use a spoon instead, it's easy to look down upon them and think they are not cultured.

I believe the superiority in the beliefs that her own cultural norms are the correct way are evidenced in Elizabeth's use of the word 'even' which she uses as an intensive to indicate surprise at this unexpected and, in her eyes, unacceptable Turkish cultural norm. She does not seem to question why this is the norm (spoons are often used with dishes that are liquid based) or why her own behaviours should be considered correct. I therefore believe Elizabeth's narrative indicates Othering (Holliday, 2011) of Turkish cultural norms. However, on some level, I also believe Elizabeth shows awareness that she is doing this and an awareness that these feelings may be due to the environment in which she and her children were socialised. To help us understand this process, Elizabeth gives us a glimpse into her family when she describes how her mother aided her in raising her sons with her idea of proper British etiquette.

> When I took the children to England, I was terrified they would do the wrong thing. And my mother was worried they would do the wrong thing.

From her description, it is clear that etiquette was extremely important in Elizabeth's family; this pressure appears to have been exacerbated by having the added pressure of having her

sons raised outside of Britain where they would not be acquiring British cultural norms through community socialisation. While Elizabeth describes her mother's 'worry' about her son's etiquette, this rises to 'terror' for Elizabeth.

> And we had to go to this expensive hotel in Torquay, the Palace Hotel, so the boys could learn how they should behave. And they were only little, and they had to have jackets and ties.

From her repeated use of the term 'had to', I perceive Elizabeth felt pressured and directed by her mother to instil the expectations of her mother in her children.

> Everybody was over 70 and I was really young at the time. And my mother taught them how to pull out a chair for a lady when she sits down and how to hold a knife and fork, all those kind of things, so they weren't to let the side down.

Elizabeth describes how she didn't want her sons to 'let the side down'. Through this, I perceive she means so that they did not embarrass her family by not showing the expected etiquette in her family's circle of friends. Elizabeth does not seem to entertain the possibility that there may be different ways of doing things that are acceptable in Turkey.

> So whenever I went anywhere in Turkey where I thought, 'I've got to put on my best behaviour' then of course you use the same things you were brought up with. And then you teach your children the same things.

So, perhaps not having knowledge of Turkish norms of etiquette, or perhaps in an attempt to retain her perception of British etiquette, wherever Elizabeth went in Turkey, she drew on the cultural resources of her past, the things she was brought up with. She doesn't describe how this came across in Turkey, but she does describe a great 'cultural pressure' on her sons when they visited England.

> So poor Mark, the cultural pressure on him was horrendous when he went to England. All my friends looked at them to see how they behaved and how they acted.

The pressure on her sons came from the scrutiny of her friends regarding their behaviour. However, Elizabeth was not immune from this pressure either, saying:

> I felt the weight of it too.

As well as feeling the scrutiny of her friends, Elizabeth also seems to impose a great pressure onto herself, making sure her sons did not disappoint her or embarrass her.

> I couldn't let the boys do anything wrong because I felt they were letting me down. It's awful now when I look at it, because they had to do the right thing too.

While Elizabeth worried about her sons learning the correct etiquette, she also worried about her husband's behaviour in front of her family in England.

> I always felt my husband let me down, because he didn't behave properly.

I perceive Elizabeth is basing her judgements of his behaviour on her own cultural expectations. She doesn't seem to entertain the concept that his cultural norms may be different from hers; she is adamant he wasn't behaving 'properly' and therefore 'let her down'. I believe her utterance may reveal an inflexibility in seeing that different cultures have different norms for etiquette, may be indicative of class or cultural-based snobbery, or her prejudice may be driven by racism: our way is proper, their way is wrong. Whatever has led to her beliefs, part of this may have been driven by the extreme pressure she felt from her family and from her own expectations.

> Elizabeth: Because, you know, we worried *so much* about etiquette.

While Elizabeth clearly paints her perception of British etiquette as being 'proper', other participants' stories also indicate a tendency towards a belief in the superiority of British cultural norms. For Maureen, good British manners are to be found in queuing.

> It's more of a push thing here as opposed to queuing. For a few years Meryem would never push through a crowd to get to something, everyone would run forward and she would look at me and I would say 'go on, run along' and she would go in and would say 'but they are all pushing me' and she would come back. She didn't have that feeling. She thought 'Why did that happen?'

From Maureen's description, it appears she has raised her daughter, Meryem, with British norms regarding queuing, to the point where Meryem feels uncomfortable with local norms, not having the 'feeling' of the process, even questioning what is going on. Interestingly, while Maureen's narrative implies she believes British queuing is superior to the Turkish 'push thing', I believe it also reveals that her daughter struggles with these local norms which may be because she has not been familiarised with them. I believe this raises an interesting issue. If a parent living outside their home community of practice decides to raise their child with the norms of their home community instead of the norms of the local community in which they are living, is that parent disadvantaging her child by teaching the child practices that are not common according to local norms?

9.5 'I think it is important, whatever culture, that the children know there is a line and are able to see both sides.'

While it emerged that differing cultural norms may create some tensions for individuals, even more tensions arise surrounding differing child-rearing norms in Britain and Turkey. Kidd (2002: 203) believes that differing cultural norms provide an easy forum in which 'them' and 'us' can be played out whereby individuals, basing their perceptions on what is they believe is right or wrong on their own culture, look down upon the differing norms of the Other. I believe there is plenty of evidence of this taking place in the stories of the participants. Esma, of dual nationality and raised by Turkish parents in London, gave a strong response to the following question:

> Caroline: If you have children, will you raise them in Turkey?
>
> Esma: Not with the social standards and values they have here, no way!

Maureen's narrative, too, contained judgemental discourse. She describes her ideas on the 'correct' way to raise children and indicates she got her husband on 'her side' regarding putting child-rearing practices in place, bringing his parents over to her way of thinking away from the 'unnecessary' Turkish ways.

> I think at the start for my husband it was quite hard, because he hadn't seen a European child being brought up, all the wrapping up and stuff, but luckily he was on my side. And now we can say even his parents agree with the things we do, because the Turkish things sometimes we think are very unnecessary.

Maureen seems pleased that she has managed to get her husband and 'even his parents' 'on her side' by getting them to assimilate British practices. Maureen seems to see differing cultural practices as a trade off.

> I mean they both dressed themselves from a very early age. And people used to say 'why do you let him feed himself, look, he's small' but if you look at him, he doesn't sit still for more than two minutes and he is always running around and I say 'what would you prefer, a child that is fatter and looks nice or a child that is healthy because it is active and capable of doing things for himself'.

She uses the argument of physical health and independence to support her claims that British child-rearing is superior. Maureen goes on to describe her mother's surprise at the Turkish practice of strangers involving themselves in how children are raised.

> At the beginning there were probably a lot of things they worried about, like the cold… That was a surprise for my Mum, she only used to think it was his family, but when we used to go out, people would come up to me in the street and tell me he didn't have enough on and my Mum would say 'what did she say?' And when I explained she said

'You're joking, she's a complete stranger!' It's eye-opening you know, some of the things.

Implicit criticism of Turkish people involved in this practice comes through in Maureen's utterance as she says 'it's eye-opening' reinforced in her mother's reported utterance 'you're joking'. Maureen compares this practice against the norms of Britain.

> And I think of back home, especially now you wouldn't say those sort of things to people, you wouldn't talk about their children or touch the children, you would be afraid to, they would see it as interfering in what you are doing.

It is common practice in Turkey for individuals to comment on children's well-being when out in public; this, as Maureen notes, is not acceptable practice in Britain where it would be seen as 'interfering'. Coming from a British background, depending on how acclimatised one has become to the practice, my experience tells me being approached like this may come across as either totally inappropriate or endearing as a total stranger shows concern for your child. Maureen's journey as she struggles to deal with this practice emerges as her story unfolds. At times she does not know how to respond to these advances; however, a process of acculturation emerges.

> Yes, I used to say 'thank you, but I know what I am doing'... I mean, a few times I have probably insulted people because I have said 'it's none of your business' or sometimes I say 'sorry, I'm English'... and I wonder if it is possible to let this go over my head a million times,

At first, Maureen describes deflecting comments by thanking the individual for their concern but telling them she knows what she is doing. However, she reveals how she has lost her patience at times by saying 'it's none of your business'. On other occasions, she uses indirect resistance by using a national identity marker as an explanation for her child-rearing practices, 'I'm sorry, I'm English'. However, her irritation comes through as she says 'I wonder if it is possible to let this go over my head a million times'. Next, she tries understanding the perspective of those approaching her.

> But then you get to looking through their eyes and you start thinking well that's what they know, fair enough, I will accept it, and I say 'I've got a blanket in the bag'.

While Maureen tries to look through their eyes, her belief in her own correctness is shown when she says 'well that's what they know', as opposed to saying 'they may be right' or 'that might be a good idea'. She seems resigned to accepting this practice, appeasing her interlocutor by saying 'I've got a blanket in the bag' so that they leave her alone, but not actually taking the action that is being suggested. I therefore believe that Maureen's narrative shows that she is learning to deal with different cultural practices, even if she is not fully

accepting of them. While Maureen describes how she resists being approached by individuals in the community, contradictory feelings arise as she also implies an appreciation of the feeling of community she gains from these approaches.

> In that respect, when I go into shops here, people chat to the children and I am quite happy to relax because I am comfortable just to know Efe is near and everyone is watching out for him, but obviously I realise when you go back to the UK this is unheard of.

Next, Maureen turns to direct criticism of Turkish practices while also commenting that Turks criticise British practices too.

> I feel Turks overdress their children and make them too hot, but they think we aren't dressing them properly.

I perceive evidence of Othering (Holliday, 2011) and perceptions of 'them' and 'us' (Kidd, 2002) emerge in her narrative where she describes 'a line' between British and Turkish child-rearing practices.

> I think it is important, whatever culture, that they know there is a line and they know the expectations and to be able to see both sides.

I believe her utterance may provide evidence that she sees Turkish and British cultures as a dichotomy. She also indicates that her children would benefit from being able to see 'both sides' of this dichotomy. However, from the previous utterance, it emerged that her daughter may already be disadvantaged by not understanding the Turkish practice of queuing; in this instance, Meryem does not seem able to see 'both sides'; she follows the British 'side' and does not understand the Turkish 'side'.

> Maureen and Elizabeth both use judgemental expressions to articulate how they feel about Turkish child-rearing practices.

> Maureen: I think we are quite disciplined with them, you know, but with the Turkish children it is all or nothing because they are allowed everything whenever they want.

> Elizabeth: I don't know whether that is related to upbringing or something, but (Mark) is like a baby. Turkish children are very spoilt, aren't they.

Interestingly, Hulya and Alya, Turkish participants, also express favouring British norms of child-rearing.

> Hulya: When Louie was born, Tim's mother came over and I learnt a lot of things from her, because in my culture we do very hold the children, you know. If they don't want to sleep, they stay up, if they want something and they cry and scream 'I want these, I want these' and the mother has had enough, then they say 'okay'. We put Louie to bed at eight o'clock which we say is on time, but before, he was going at nine, ten. But

> Tim's Mum taught me he can cry, he can say 'no' but I don't say 'okay you don't have to go to bed' because of the crying, and now he knows it's bedtime.

Hulya identifies 'holding' the children as a Turkish practice, by which I believe she means the children are given less autonomy than British children or more things are done for Turkish children than British children. She sees boundaries and rules as British, while giving children whatever they want as Turkish. Hulya seems appreciative of the 'teaching' she received from Tim's mother; she seems to have fully accepted her mother-in-law's practices as the right thing to do.

Similar to Hulya's suggestions that British child-rearing practices encourage autonomy, Alya also identifies 'personal space' and letting children try things for themselves within 'boundaries' as British child-rearing traits. She sees this as leading to 'confident' not 'spoilt' children, specifically identifying this with 'Western families'.

> Alya: About the way children grow up, and having their own personal space and letting children try to do what they want to, I think it's different. Because in Turkey, in our culture, the trouble is, I think the way children are brought up, they lose a little bit and children become spoilt and I don't want them to be like that. I want them to be confident. I don't want them to be quiet and they don't say much in their parents' eyes. I want them to be confident, like the Western families do with their children. I mean, in all classes in all Turkish schools, that is where the children acquire their personalities and they actually become spoilt you know, and I think it is an increasing thing, not like the English thing with boundaries. I want my children to learn the boundaries.

In the participants' narratives, above, Turkish and British child-rearing practices are clearly delineated and so clearly dichotomised by Maureen that they are seen as different 'sides'. Wang (2008) believes this is inevitable as different parents, and their extended families, bring their varied childbearing beliefs to the childrearing practice, especially in bilingual families where parents come from different cultural practices. However, these views are not just confined to British participants. Even Esma, raised by Turkish parents in London, showed a strong preference for British cultural values and norms, saying there is 'no way' she would raise a child in Turkey 'with the social standards and values they have'. Hulya and Alya, too, showed a preference for British child-raising norms. British child-rearing norms being perceived as superior, therefore, seem to have been accepted as 'taken-for-granted' and 'thinking-as-usual' (Holliday, 2011: 139) by participants whether Turkish or British.

158

9.6 Summary of Chapter

In summary, in the narratives presented in this chapter, participants tell their stories with a strong link between their language and their culture. It may be that by linking one language to one culture they are trying to make sense of their lives through the values and beliefs they perceive are linked to certain national cultural ideals.

There are many examples of participants using their own national label to construct their value bases and expected norms. For example, many participants paint a picture of Turkish values and behaviours as deficient to British norms. They may also have perceived their extended family members or officials seeing Turkish values and norms as being inferior, showing their feelings through their disapproval of marriage to a Turkish spouse.

From the data, it seems the perceived positives of 'Western' values and behaviours given by participants outweigh the positives given of Turkish national beliefs and practices; a situation which I believe may be indicative of Othering. This was particularly seen in narratives which packaged Turkish society into simplistic images of 'us' the superior against 'them' the inferior (Holliday, 2011: 70). In participants' stories, these images were portrayed through superior and judgemental language being used to compare cultural practices: we queue – they push, we use a knife and fork – they use a spoon. Holliday believes the Other is 'so much more obscure to the Western eye that it suffers from overgeneralizations' (2011: 76). Individuals may be unaware of the complexity and depth of other non-Western cultures. I believe this may be evidenced in participants' stories. Concepts used to describe British culture include: sense of humour, equal rights, free thinking, rationality, truth, creativity, independence, discipline and self-confidence. However, only two concepts were used to describe Turkish culture: respect and sense of community. Interestingly, Graham presented the least biased picture of British and Turkish culture with utterances often in contradiction to each other. The outcome of his mixed feelings seems to be a high level of ambivalence regarding living in Turkey and learning Turkish, an ambivalence not seen so much in other participants.

Holliday suggests 'the Western Self *needs* the foreign Other to be inferior' to maintain its perception of idealised Self and therefore 'constructs an imagination that is so' (2011: 80). Based on this concept, I believe it is possible that through constructing an idealised picture of British culture, British participants gain a sense of security by retaining the cultural norms they were socialised into, using these norms to position themselves in line with their home community more than with Turkish culture – a culture which data indicates they may perceive as inferior. In marginalising Turkish norms, these individuals may be reinforcing their sense of belonging to the British community and their sense of superiority. Their comments publically

express their beliefs that British culture is superior and may lead to the maintenance of their group's perceived superiority over Turkish culture.

However, this idealised picture is not only heard in the narratives of British participants; Hulya and Alya also expressed a belief that British child-rearing practices are superior. I believe there are a number of possibilities as to why this may be so. It is possible that these participants are involved in self-Othering, seeing British norms as superior to their own Turkish norms and therefore tending towards them in their daily practices. I believe there may also be issues of class involved. In Istanbul, the ownership of not only English language, but also Western norms is considered a status symbol and this means English language and practices work as class indicators; ownership of these forms of linguistic and cultural capital increase an individual's symbolic capital, which ultimately leads to increased economic capital (Bourdieu, 1978, 1982: 50-63). Tending towards British family practices may therefore be a way in which these participants are following class-based expectations of the local community, a way of social climbing. Putting Othering and class issues aside, there is also the possibility that these participants are simply making choices based on their value judgements. They may prefer these family practices as they think they are best for their children – the issue of which culture they are perceived to be attached to may not come into it.

In summary, a preference for British values and norms emerged from the data, from both British and Turkish participants, which, in the case of the British participants, I propose could be due them reinforcing their sense of national identity. This pattern of preferences could also be indicative of Othering or self-Othering of Turkish values and practices with British values and norms considered to be superior. Alternatively, a preference for British norms could be an attempt by individuals at creating a certain class-based identity and lifestyle in line with class-based norms in the local community. There also exists the possibility that participants' choices are simply due to individual preference for family practices.

In the next chapter, I present issues arising from the data and a discussion of further literature. Discussions include whether or not subsequent language speakers wish to emulate a target language model, the possibility of investment being an alternative theory to motivation in language learning, and how the English language affects language use and migration in bilingual families. In addition I examine if being a proficient speaker is enough to gain legitimacy, review how Turkish spouses are accepted as legitimate speakers by their partners, and discuss the need for sociolinguistic competence in a second language. I end the chapter by considering the concept of the ownership of truth and discuss the identity adjustment dimension.

CHAPTER TEN

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE DATA: DISCUSSION OF THE LITERATURE

While the three literature review chapters at the start of this thesis put forward dominant ideas in the fields of language, identity and culture, in this section, I present a further investigation of literature based on issues which arose in the data.

10.1 Do Individuals Wish to Emulate a Target Language Model?

From the data, it emerged that British participants have differing opinions on how much they want to acquire Turkish in both proficiency and accent. I was interested to see that learning Turkish to an advanced degree, to come across like a Turk, is desired by some participants but not by others and decided to investigate what the literature had to say on a learner's desire to speak like a native speaker. My investigations first took me to Gardner's theories on orientation leading to motivation (1985).

The concept of language learner motivation has been popular since the 1970s when theories on motivation were derived from work by socio-psychologists attempting to quantify and define individuals' commitment to learning their desired language. Initial research was started by Gardner and Lambert in 1972 and followed up by Gardner in 1985. Gardner's theories on motivation (1985) take a structuralist stance whereby motivation is considered ahistorical and fixed in each individual and he believes this is their key or barrier to the resources of the target language. Gardner believes the motivation to learn a second language is complex involving 'the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language' (Gardner, 1985). He therefore believes the goal of language learning is to provide an orientation for the amount of aspiration and energy expended and that these aspects are related to a greater or smaller positive affect. Most well known are Gardner's concepts of integrative orientation and instrumental orientation (1985). Integrative orientation refers to the desire to learn a language in order to interact with, or maybe to identify with, members of the target language community. Instrumental orientation refers to reasons for learning a second language that will help towards practical goals such as improving one's career or gaining an academic qualification. In the early work of Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972), they suggested that an integrative orientation would provide a better forecast of eventual proficiency than an instrumental orientation as an integrative orientation is related to positive attitudes towards the target language community.

For Leyla, on her first arrival in Turkey, she had no desire to learn Turkish; she did not like being in the country, nor did she want to assimilate; she therefore had no integrative orientation or desire to be there. However, on her return to the country, she started to learn Turkish to an advanced degree enabling her to join the Turkish workforce, a process which started her assimilation into the community. She is now able to operate so well in Turkish that she can often 'get away with' being thought of as Turkish. Her motivation, therefore, may have evolved through an instrumental orientation whereby learning proficient Turkish enabled her to get a good job. However, that her motivation went from limited interest to a high level of interest goes against his structuralist position that motivation is ahistorical and fixed in each individual. It appears Leyla's motivation to learn shifted depending on how comfortable she felt in Turkey and also depending on what she could gain from learning the language; a situation which I believe reflects Norton's (1995) theory on investment which is discussed in the next section (10.2). I therefore believe Leyla's story demonstrates how motivation is not a simple matter, nor is it a fixed and stable aspect of language learning.

As for my other participants, looking for parallels in these situations, in the literature, I found relevant research in the field of second language acquisition. Researchers such as Dörnyei *et al* (2006) believe, due to the changing identity of English language speakers globally, Gardner's initial ideas on integrative motivation may no longer be so relevant. Instead, Dörnyei *et al* (ibid) believe individuals currently learning a second language may not wish to fully integrate with, or associate themselves with, a native-speaker culture. Although they were referring to English language learners, the comments of Dörnyei *et al* (2006) seem just as relevant for Shirley and Elizabeth. For Shirley, she expresses wishing to be able to operate in Turkish while keeping her British identity. For Elizabeth, she says she does not wish to attempt full integration as she worries that in attempting this, she may meet resistance from target language speakers.

10.2 Investment as an Alternative Theory to Motivation in Language Learning

As described in chapter seven, on first starting this investigation, I had previously felt that proficiency in one's second language sprang from two factors: a desire to assimilate into the host community and high motivation to learn. While there was some evidence of this emerging from the data, such as Leyla's original refusal to learn Turkish due to her initial dislike of Turkey, the majority of British participants' utterances point towards different factors. I perceive these factors indicate that participants are unwilling to invest time and effort into learning Turkish as they believe there is limited use for Turkish in their future lives. The

emergence of this finding led me to investigate theories of investment, taking a sociological approach, as a development to theories on motivation in language learning.

Norton puts forward the concept of 'investment' for language learners, believing:

'the conception of investment rather than motivation more accurately signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of the (learners) to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it' (1995: 17).

She supports her theories, placing motivation as synonymous with economic gain, with reference to Bourdieu's (1977b) ideas on 'cultural capital' whereby:

'If learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. Learners will expect and hope to have a good return on that investment – a return that will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources... this return on investment must be seen as commensurate with the effort expended on learning the second language' (Norton, 1995: 17).

Norton takes a poststructuralist stance regarding how language learners approach the target language. She believes theorists, such as Gardner (1972, 1985), have not come up with a satisfactory, conceptual framework of the relationship between language learners and the social world as they have not framed a theory for social identity which integrates both the learning context and the learner. She has therefore called for a re-conceptualisation of social theory in line with poststructuralist thought of social identity as 'multiple, a site of struggle, and subject to change' (1995: 9). Norton, therefore, believes the concept of 'investment' rather than 'motivation' incorporates language and social interaction in a symbiotic relationship as:

'The notion of investment... attempts to capture the relationship of the language learner to the changing social world. It conceives the language learner as having a complex social identity and multiple desires. The notion presupposes when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. Thus an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner's own social identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space' (Norton, 1995: 17-18).

Much previous research into investment has been conducted in immigrant communities, as opposed to the individuals in this study where English is the minority language in the community. This can make a vast difference in the experiences of these individuals in their host community of practice. Norton (2000a: 91) gives the example of Katarina, a Polish woman in Canada who wanted sufficient competence in English to secure her employment to make her life 'normal' again as a teacher, employment that would give her a good income, an

intellectual challenge and access to social networks of educated Canadians, thereby giving her the opportunity to resist being positioned as an immigrant. This kind of investment is not required by the British participants in this investigation, who are employed as native-speaker teachers, as their mother-tongue provides employability, access to professional networks and financial independence. They do not need to resist being seen as immigrants, as Katarina did, as they are viewed as a symbolic resource by the surrounding community. This, therefore, puts these native-English individuals in a different position to most foreign spouses who are:

> 'at an economic disadvantage both in the employment market and in the marital relationship (whereby) economic asymmetry or downright dependence in the marriage relationship creates a potentially conflict-laden power imbalance' (Breger, 1998: 145).

Norton (1995: 13) believes it is through language that a person negotiates a sense of self and can gain access to powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak. In this way she believes language should not be conceived of as a neutral medium of communication but understood with reference to its social meaning' (Norton, 1995: 13). It appears Katarina saw learning English as a site of struggle but also as influencing her social interaction, giving her the agency to provide herself with a symbolic resource, ultimately providing her with power (Heller, 1995: 373-405). However, the British participants in this study already hold this 'symbolic power' (ibid) putting them in a different situation with regard to symbolic power in their host communities of practice and I believe this has an influence on how much effort they put into learning Turkish.

When reading the data regarding participants' efforts in learning the language of their partner, my findings at first appear to mirror Norton's (1995) theory on investment. When participants' efforts at language learning are rewarded with economic and symbolic gain, they are likely to invest in learning the language; this may explain why Turkish participants have learnt English to an advanced degree but British participants have not achieved the same proficiency in Turkish. This outcome follows Norton's (1995) theory on investment that places motivation as synonymous with economic gain, based on Bourdieu's (1977b) ideas on 'cultural capital'. However, as was seen with the dialogue between Alya and Graham, there is more at stake in a bilingual relationship than simply economic gain. There is also an emotional investment that is expected by each spouse whereby linguistic proficiency in one's spouse's language may be equated with investment, or love, in the relationship. Alya needs this emotional investment in her relationship. For Canadian, Lambert-Sen, another participant, her need to invest in learning Turkish came when she felt the need to invest in her autonomy and her self-respect, being able to operate to her full capacity without hindrance in Turkey. Her

investment in language learning was for her self-esteem at this stage, not for economic gain. While Norton's (1995) theory on investment may embody the reason behind most of the participants' drive for learning a language in this study, it does not address the issue of emotional investment. I therefore feel that this is an area that needs further research.

10.3 How the English Language Affects Language Use and Migration in Bilingual Families

With every couple in this investigation, individuals met their partner in English and have continued their relationship in English. This finding sparked my interest as to whether this is a documented pattern of language negotiation in relationships where one of the languages is English. In addition, with the participants in this study, the majority involve a British wife married to a Turkish husband living in Istanbul. There are only two British husbands living with their wives in Istanbul, although one, Graham, has expressed a desire to move his family back to Britain. While this pattern may be representative of my group of contacts, more female than male, when looking at the migration patterns of Turkish-English marriage couples in my acquaintance the majority of British wives have stayed in Turkey with their husbands while a number of British husbands have returned to the UK with their Turkish wives. This motivated me to look into the literature to see if this gender-based migratory pattern has been researched. My reading of the literature in these areas led me to Piller's (2001) research into bilingual marriages.

One of the challenges that partners with different native languages face is how to deal with the presence of two languages and how to negotiate which language to use under which circumstances. In her article 'Linguistic intermarriage: Language choice and negotiation of identity', Piller (2000) discusses how our understanding of intimate relationships has changed over the years, moving from marriage forming economic units, to marriage for romantic reasons. She believes how spouses communicate has gained importance in recent years as a good spouse is now expected to be a good communicator for the romantic relationship to work. How this communication takes place in intermarriage relationships with more than one language is even more critical. Piller quotes Fitzpatrick (1990: 433) on the topic:

> 'Communication difficulties are a major cause of marital unhappiness and marital failure. With communication as a constitutive factor in the make-up of a modern romantic relationship, what does it mean for people to live in a relationship with a partner who has a different first language? How do they choose their language as a couple? What are the reasons behind those choices? Which identities do they construct for themselves in societies that continue to see monolingual and

monocultural marriage as the norm? Do they celebrate a new bicultural consciousness or deplore their outsider status between two cultures?'

In linguistic intermarriages, by definition, each partner brings a different language and that means that a choice must be made regarding which language is used for communication. Piller's (2001) research investigated which language couples met in and which they continued in. She asked couples to discuss their language choices within their (German-English) relationships and discovered:

> 'English (was very) likely to be the language of first interactions – no matter where the couple will eventually settle down' (Piller, 2001: 215).

In addition, two factors, habit and compensation, played a major role in continuing in English. Her research showed that couples, therefore, tend to continue in the language in which they first met and this language frequently is English. This is the case with each of the participants in this investigation. Apart from Maureen who reports that she and her husband are starting to use more Turkish together, the rest of the participants have continued to use English as the language of their relationships. Piller also believes couples find it challenging to change from the language of their first meeting due to a strong link between language and identity. She refers to studies by Ervin (-Tripp) (1964, 1968) who believes choice of languages is guided by many more factors than just choice of medium for communication.

> 'If we say different things in different languages, it is obvious why cross-cultural couples stick to the language of their first meeting; they might lose the sense of knowing each other, the sense of connectedness and the rapport derived from knowing what the other will say in advance if they switched' (Piller, 2001: 215).

Once again, I agree with Piller's (ibid) thoughts. My relationship with my husband is set in English. I do not feel as if I am portraying my true self when speaking Turkish, and I do not get the sense of my husband that I am used to when he speaks in Turkish. This does not mean that we do not switch languages when necessary, such as when we visit his family. However, during these times, we are performing in the roles of Turkish husband and wife that we perceive his family expects (as discussed in section 8.4).

Despite relationships tending to stay in the language in which they were conceived, Piller's research shows evidence that there may be more than habit and comfort at play. Piller gives examples of perceived compensation in keeping the relationship language in English. One of her participants, an English speaker living in a German-speaking community described one of the factors keeping their relationship in English as being compensation for the sacrifice she had to make by living with her husband in the community of his language. Piller believes:

'In cross-cultural relationships the partner in whose native country the couple live is privileged in society at large: legally, economically, and usually socially, too. In the linguistic construction of reality, power may also accrue to a person through being an undisputed expert manipulator of a code, a native speaker... Being a foreigner and having to use a non-native code places a person in a doubly weak position, while living in one's native community and using the native code places a person in a doubly strong position. The compromise to let one partner be the native, and the other the native-speaker may well be conducive to a more egalitarian distribution of power in a relationship' (Piller, 2001: 215-216).

In other words, there is a power imbalance in communication as, in many linguistic intermarriages, at least one partner is not living in their native country and is therefore positioned as a migrant and non-native speaker by society. With my own relationship, my husband and I are aware that if we moved to Britain, both the balance in our relationship and the economic advantages available to us would disappear. Cengiz would be positioned as a Turkish migrant, a non-native speaker in the workforce thereby losing the status and economic strength that he currently holds in Istanbul. My linguistic and cultural background would neither be in short supply nor greatly demanded by the employment market which means I may lose some of the symbolic and economic capital attached to my native English language. In addition, both the language and surrounding community of our relationship would be in English, thus leading to a power imbalance between Cengiz and myself. When I discussed this with participants, there was general agreement over this theory, except with Graham and Alya as Alya has already been successfully employed in the British workforce and feels culturally and linguistically comfortable in England. This may be one of the reasons why they are considering a move back to the UK.

With the relationships in this study, just like my own marriage, one partner is living outside their host language and community of practice while the other is living within it. This means that one partner is seen as a 'native-speaker' by the local community while the other partner is viewed as a 'non-native speaker' (Piller, 2001: 211). Piller believes these concepts are important indicators in the construction of partners' identities in linguistic intermarriages, by themselves and by others. She uses Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) 'acts of identity' to describe how couples coming together in a community of practice from two different linguistic backgrounds construct their identities and through which they proclaim their chosen identity to the world. For this reason, Piller believes investigations into language choices made in linguistic intermarriages provide a rich site of investigation into the linguistic construction of identity. She sees native-speakers who retain their language within the relationship as taking a powerful position while the partner who relinquishes their mother-tongue as giving up a certain amount of control.

The gendered make up of such unions may also affect linguistic negotiation and patterns of language use, as well as which country couples choose to live in. From her investigations, Piller believes gender has a role to play in language choices within linguistic intermarriages, with female partners in her investigation being more willing to put themselves in the weaker position by migrating to the male partner's country and speaking his language. Piller describes 50% of the female partners putting themselves in 'a doubly weak position' whereby they have 'given up their status as natives and their status as native speakers' (ibid). However, only three male participants placed themselves in a doubly weak position. Piller describes an equal number of couples who have reached a compromise by 'compensating' for migration with the use of the minority language, although some of these she describes as 'weak compromises' as partners engage in some level of code-switching. She feels her investigation may give a clear picture of gender issues within linguistic intermarriages as all the participants reside in either Germany, Britain or the United States, countries with similar distributions of wealth meaning gender issues can be focused on outside the usual socioeconomic circumstances that pervade most research into intermarriages. She believes wives move to a doubly weak position while their husbands do not due to economic reasons.

> 'In Western countries, husbands continue to earn more than their wives, and as migration is likely to involve downward occupational mobility, couples will figure that downward occupational mobility of the husband would hit the family as an economic unit harder than downward occupational mobility of the wife' (Piller, 2001: 216-217).

Piller quotes Breger to back up her argument:

> 'the foreign spouse is at an economic disadvantage both in the employment market and in the marital relationship: economic asymmetry or downright dependence in the marriage relationship creates a potentially conflict-laden power imbalance' (Breger, 1998: 145).

While this pattern of migration can be seen in the gendered make-up of the relationships in this study and also matched by my experience of the gendered make-up of my acquaintances' relationships, I believe Piller and Breger's theories on why this type of gendered migration takes place in their studies may not match the reasons that may underlie why the participants and I have settled in Istanbul in our relationships. In my own marriage, due to English being in demand in the local community, I find myself not at an economic disadvantage to my husband, but in an advantageous position, gaining not only a good salary from my employment but also full scholarship for both our children at a top, private school. Other female, British participants in this study are in a similar situation. Once again, I believe this advantage is derived from the cultural and linguistic power of the English language that can be turned in economic capital. This means that there is a parity of power in these

relationships as both partners have status, income and professional connections based on their native-tongue and culture – a different situation from that described in Piller's (ibid) research. If English is the minority language in the relationship, therefore, opportunities are more likely to arise for the migrant partner that may not arise for migrating spouses whose native-tongue is not globally widespread and in demand in their host community.

10.4 How Being a Proficient Speaker may not be enough to Gain Legitimacy

In section 7.5, I described how Elizabeth expressed how she felt that she did not have the right to complain at her children's school even though other parents felt the same way. Despite her proficiency in Turkish, Elizabeth felt that as she was not Turkish herself, she did not have the right to complain.

I believe Elizabeth's narrative reflects Bourdieu's (1978) theory of the 'legitimacy effect'. Bourdieu believes the legitimacy effect plays a major role in interactions where the effects of domination take place in all linguistic markets. In other words, power relations are always at play. Bourdieu describes there being unwritten rules of which everyone is aware on what legitimizes a speaker. People are aware of the formality of situations and the kind of language required; however, not all are able to perform this language.

> 'The more formal a situation is, the more the speaker himself has to be authorized. He has to have qualifications, he has to have the right accent, so the more it is ruled by the general laws of price formation' (Bourdieu, 1978: 84).

Ignorance of these laws is no defence. He also believes how legitimate speakers are painted and how they are perceived may be different in the eyes of different beholders. Instead of members of the working class believing there to be beauty in the legitimized speech of the elite, they are more likely to find themselves 'at a loss for words' their speech 'fractured' and they will 'shut up, condemned to silence' (ibid) in the presence of a legitimate speaker. Bourdieu believes this state is viewed by the elite as silent respect when it is the laws of the market exerting 'censorship' on those only able to talk in 'plain talking' situations. By not being able to utilize the legitimized speech of the elite and finding themselves at a loss for words the plain talkers:

> 'are condemned to silence in the formal situations in which major political, social, and cultural stakes are involved' (Bourdieu, 1978: 85).

Bourdieu also describes what makes a speaker worthy to speak and worthy to be listened to:

'The linguist considers the conditions for the establishment of communication as already secured, whereas, in real situations, that is the essential question. He takes for granted the crucial point, namely that people (who) talk to each other, are 'on speaking terms' that those who speak regard those who listen as worthy to listen and that those who listen regard those who speak as worthy to speak' (Bourdieu, 1977: 648).

He describes how four conditions must be met for an utterance to be considered legitimate: it must be uttered by an appropriate speaker not an 'imposter'; and it must be uttered in legitimate situations; it must be addressed to legitimate receivers; it must be formulated in legitimate phonological or syntactic forms (Bourdieu, 1978: 80).

This situation is mirrored in Norton's (2000) work. Norton, when investigating legitimate speech in language learners, believes when non-native speakers interact socially, power relationships come into play based on whether or not they are deemed to be a 'legitimate speaker' by the target language speakers and through this she believes the learning process for non-native speakers and the re-establishment of their identity should be understood in context, with reference to much larger and frequently inequitable social structures (2001).

I believe Bourdieu's (ibid) theory describes the situation Elizabeth found herself in. While Elizabeth may have had the social standing and language proficiency to make a complaint at the school, it is clear she felt that as she was a foreigner, an 'imposter', and felt she would not be granted legitimacy. It seems it may therefore take more than just fluency in a second language or sustained contact with the dominant community (Bremer *et al,* 1996) to be considered a legitimate speaker who is able to make complaints; being born into or raised in that community may act as a prerequisite to acceptance.

10.5 How Turkish Spouses have been Accepted as Legitimate Speakers
In this investigation, all of the couples met and continued their relationships in English, a situation which I believe has created a supportive environment for Turkish spouses to develop their English in a natural, language-learning environment; a situation that other language learners may not be privy to. As described in the previous section, Bourdieu (1977) believes that due to power relations in social interactions, not every interlocutor may consider a speaker 'worthy to listen to' or 'worthy to speak'. This is something that Norton discovered to be the case in her research with language learners attempting communication with target language speakers. Her (2000a) studies revealed that language learners' attempts at

interaction with target language speakers were a site of struggle where power relations were prevalent.

However, unlike in Norton's research, the Turkish spouses' experiences of natural language learning with their partners are generally described as positive, unlike the situation for many language learners in Norton's study. This may be because, through their relationship and extended British family, they are able to command the attention of their listeners and are automatically given 'the right to speech' (Bourdieu, 1977: 648) that so many other language learners are not. I believe these participants are not seen as language learners by their partners, but as people in their own right, with a need to communicate not a need to acquire English. Bourdieu (1977: 648) argues that when a person speaks the speaker wishes not only to be understood, but to be 'believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished' and I believe this is what the Turkish spouses find in their native-English partners. Usually, a speaker's ability to command the listener is unequally structured for different speakers because of the symbolic power relations between them. However, I believe this is evened out in these relationships whereby the Turkish partner's English may be legitimised through their relationship to a native speaker thereby giving them greater linguistic power.

10.6 Sociolinguistic Competence in a Second Language

In Section 8.3, I presented examples from participants and from my research diary whereby individuals felt they, or others, could not understand the social background and class of individuals they were interacting with or marrying. They felt they were blind to indicators that people in the host community could pick up on. As Shirley puts it:

> I can't get exactly what they are saying, I can't understand their background, where they come from, I can't understand what kind of person they are... I can't understand people's mentality... If you are foreign, you can't pick up on clues like local accents or clothes to get an idea of their background. You can do that in your own culture. You can't do it when you are foreign.

Elizabeth also says:

> You don't understand the other culture for *years.* And you don't understand the social status of the other country.

In addition, from my research diary (November, 2009), there was the example of the Turkish manager who was scornful of the choice of husbands that two of the teachers had married, believing had they been Turkish they would have seen the warning signs and known not to marry them.

In order to investigate this issue further, I started by reading Bourdieu's theories on 'capital markers' (1982: 50) such as accent and class that indicate an individual's social standing, and how these may not have been picked up on by the foreign brides. Bourdieu (1982: 50) believes that in the matrimonial market class homogeneity can be continued through the use of linguistic capital which he believes reflects one's background, class and level of education and by like marrying like, these class boundaries, identified through language, are kept rigid. Linguistic indicators of identity are also taken up by Montgomery (2007) who states:

> 'variations in pronunciation (are) powerful indicators of regional identity and affiliation. Indeed, they form part of our everyday commonsense knowledge about language' enabling us to make 'unconscious, almost trivial acts of recognition' (Montgomery, 2007: 63).

Through understanding local accents, we are able to locate groups of speakers and use these perceived differences as a:

> 'site for the interplay of social judgements as part of the intricate symbiosis between language and society. For just as any one language encompasses a variety of ways of speaking it, so any one society encompasses a variety of ways of living within it – or on its margins' (Montgomery, 2007: 63).

This is what Holmes refers to as 'sociolinguistic competence':

> 'The attitudes people hold towards different languages and accents are part of their sociolinguistic competence... these reflect the social status of those who use the varieties or the contexts in which the varieties are customarily used... Being able to recognise the prestige variety is part of a person's sociolinguistic competence, even though they may not choose to use that variety themselves' (1990: 375).

What the participants and the Turkish manager may be referring to, therefore, is the lack of sociolinguistic competence that individuals may exhibit if they have not been socialised in a certain community of practice. For Shirley and Elizabeth, they are aware of their lack of sociolinguistic competence. For Shirley, this situation in reverse works to her advantage. She has repositioned herself as middle class in Turkish society, which may have been easier for her to do abroad as her British, linguistic, class indicators may be unheard by foreign ears. For Elizabeth, she draws on her awareness of her lack of sociolinguistic competence to remind herself that social indicators in different communities differ, although her use of the word 'peasants' reveals a level of ethnocentrism.

> Elizabeth: And you look at people and you look at their background and the homes they come from, as though they were upper middle class in your own culture, whereas you put them down as peasants almost.

Despite this, Elizabeth realises that extended time in a country may raise one's sociolinguistic competence.

> Elizabeth: And then you sort of live here a long time and you see the rest of the people and you realise these people all went to a private university and their families must have had a good background.

With the situation of the teachers who were perceived to have married below themselves, from their husband's speech, they may not have been able to differentiate a prestige version from a less prestigious version leading to their decision to go ahead with the marriage. However, there is always the possibility that the teachers were aware of their husband's status but did not prioritise this as a factor in their decision to get married.

10.7 The Ownership of Truth

In section 9.2, I presented examples from British participants' narratives regarding their perceptions of universal values such as truth. What emerged were tales of ownership, where certain values were portrayed as being attached to specific nationalities. Truth, free-thinking and rationality, according to some participants, are British traits, not Turkish. The ownership of truth, or correct practice, also arose in utterances where participants presented their child-rearing ideas. Once again, the correct path was expressed as being the British way, not the Turkish way. The emergence of this dialogue on truth being attached to one nationality, not another, prompted me to return to Foucault's Power/Knowledge theory of discourse to investigate how he believes truth works within discourse. Foucault believes:

> 'Truth is of the world; it is produced there by virtue of multiple constraints... Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is the types of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true: the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which each is sanctioned: the techniques and procedures which are valorised for obtaining truth: the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true' (1979: 46).

This means that multiple discourses from many societies take ownership of truth and authority which leads to a conflict between other discourses and social practices as each struggles to take or keep ownership of truth. A bilingual marriage, therefore, seems to be ideally situated for a site of struggle regarding ownership of truth.

While a site of struggle was clearly described between Elizabeth's extended families, this is not the pattern that arose between Tim and Hulya or Graham and Alya. In these families, both Hulya and Alya described believing British ways of child-rearing to be correct.

This may be indicative that British and Turkish discourses hold a different status in these relationships, whereby British discourse is accepted as counting as true knowledge, while Turkish discourse is seen to hold a lower status in the relationship thereby sanctioning its statements as potentially false. I therefore put Foucault's Power/Knowledge model forward as an additional suggestion for why most participants expressed a preference for perceived British values and norms.

10.8 The Identity Adjustment Dimension[4]

It emerged from some of the critical incidents and participants' narratives that some individuals born or socialised into two or more cultures and languages are seen to celebrate and embrace their diversity, while others are seen to struggle with their perception of self. This emergence prompted me to revisit the literature on individuals socialised into bilingualism and plural cultures.

I discovered these findings reflected in Trudgill's (2000) comments. Trudgill believes that languages provide the potentiality of engaging in multiple cultures, of thinking and acting in various different ethnic groups, of identifying with each group or, alternatively, none of the groups. With regard to having difficulty identifying with one's own ethnic groups, Baker believes language itself may be a vehicle through which identity tensions may occur in some bilinguals whereby their self-identity, cultural identity and ethnic identity may become a problem (Baker, 2007).

Baker believes at one end of an 'identity adjustment' dimension are individuals who learn to shift between two cultures as easily as they do their languages; they have few problems of cultural mixing or identity being able to celebrate being fully British and fully Turkish. This would describe Yann who takes great pride in having both a French self and an American self. This is how Graham and Alya describe their children: 'it's like they are both two different people'. Baker also identifies those who celebrate being hyphenated; a blend of two or more national identities whereby individuals do not feel purely Turkish or British. Baker believes these individuals have a 'broadened repertoire of custom and culture that allows high-self-esteem, a positive self-concept, and a potential for choosing for oneself which cultures to accent in the future'. I believe Leyla and her son, Nardir, provide examples of this celebration of blended culture; enjoying every aspect of their identity and how they come together in one family. However, Baker believes at the other end of the identity adjustment

---

[4] (Baker, 2007: 69)

dimension are 'those who experience rootlessness or dislocation between two cultures, feeling neither one ethnic identity nor the other' which can lead to 'hopelessness, an ambiguity of cultural existence, or feeling lost in a cultural wilderness.' (Baker, 2007: 78). Similar to Baker's views, Phinney describes the situation whereby bicultural individuals may suffer conflict within themselves with their cultural values, attitudes, and expectations, believing:

> 'increasing numbers of people find that the conflicts are not between different groups but between different cultural values, attitudes, and expectations within themselves' (1999: 27).

This description seems fitting of Mark who, by Elizabeth's account, seems ill at ease with his sense of self. This description is also apt for the young Sayed who described wishing to 'rip the Englishness out of himself' before embracing both his British and Arabic heritage. It may also describe Aysun's apparent struggle with how she perceives her identity as an English or Turkish-speaking mother and as a native English-speaking teacher. Like Phinney (1999), Zahiri-Farnoody (n.d.) believes 'biculturals' may suffer a conflict of identity, something she refers to as 'social marginality'. She describes this as 'a conflict within one's individual identity which may result in high levels of anxiety related to social acceptance and fear of not fitting in socially'. The individual may feel rejected by one culture or torn between 'two competing sets of cultural norms and values' (ibid). I believe Mark, Sayed and Aysun's tales all contain elements of Zahiri-Farnoody's 'social marginality' and Phinney's (1999) 'conflict within'.

Instead of creating categories, Baker puts forward an 'identity adjustment' dimension with bicultural individuals being placed somewhere along the cline (2007: 69). However, Kumaravadivelu disagrees. He believes it is possible to:

> 'live in several cultural domains at the same time – jumping in and out of them, sometimes with ease and sometimes with unease... In fact one does not even have to cross one's national borders to experience cultural complexity. If we... go beyond the traditional approach to culture that narrowly associates cultural identity with national identity... then we easily realize that human communities are not monocultural cocoons but rather multicultural mosaics' (Kumaravadivelu, 2007: 5).

As Block puts it, it is possible for individuals to feel both 'a part and apart' (2007: 864). It seems being born into or raised with two cultures and languages may not be enough for an individual to feel fully bicultural or at ease with their linguistic and cultural identities; conflict may arise.

10.9 Summary of Chapter

In this additional literature review chapter, I have presented a further investigation of existing research based on issues which arose from the data. I have added this chapter in order

to develop my thinking and analysis of what is going on regarding the emerging phenomena. Themes that emerged and which I have developed further include: whether or not individuals acquiring a second language desire to tend towards a native speaker model; investment as an alternative theory to motivation in language learning; how the English language may affect language use and migration in bilingual families; how being a proficient speaker doesn't necessarily bring with it legitimacy; how Turkish spouses have been accepted as legitimate speakers; the importance of having sociolinguistic competence in a second language; and the concepts related to identity adjustment in individuals born into plural languages and cultures.

In the next chapter, entitled 'Bilingual Identities', I present my analysis of the data, discussing what I discovered about individual's conceptualization about their bilingualism and what my research says about identity, perceptions of nationalism, and relations within the family. I then present a summary of key ideas and themes in this thesis before discussing the broader implications of how I believe bilingual families are changing identities within societies.

11.1 Introduction

In this investigation, I have asked the following questions:

(1) What do participants in bilingual families say about language use in their families?

(2) What are the issues that arise and what are participants saying about these issues?

Based on what participants say about their language use, I believe the story that has emerged is a complex one which involves interdependent factors springing from an individual's perception of their bilingualism and linguistic identity, and their perception of what it means to affiliate oneself to and to perform certain national identities.

In this chapter, I provide a discursive, theoretical discussion of these themes with references to the literature, underpinned by the understanding and knowledge that I have gained through the course of this inquiry. While I previously touched upon these themes in the literature review chapters, in this section through broader discussion I attempt to widen and contribute to the knowledge on language use in bilingual families by presenting what I uncovered in my research in relation to my research findings. I call this chapter simply 'Bilingual Identities' as I believe this encapsulates the overriding findings from this investigation. I present my key themes and ideas under two main headings:

(1) What I discovered about my participants' conceptualisation about their bilingualism.

(2) What my research says about participants' identity and relations within the family.

I start with an analysis of how bilingualism is conceptualised by the individuals in this study.

11.2 What I Discovered about my Participants' Conceptualisation about their Bilingualism

Many findings emerge about how individuals conceptualise their bilingualism or, more pertinently, how they do not always identify themselves as bilingual even if this is something others may refer to them as. Part of their conceptualisation, therefore, may involve a debate over whether it is possible to become bilingual or whether one has to be born bilingual. In addition to this finding, a discussion on issues of language, power, capital and investment emerges. It is these key themes and ideas that are discussed below.

Most participants in this study appear to have taken refuge within their traditional identity concepts based on the language of their birth, rejecting the label of bilingualism despite high communicative levels of proficiency. However, as far as descriptions of bilingualism exist, what the participants have to say does not conflate with what some of the linguists have to say. Saunders (1982: 9) describes bilingualism as encompassing anyone from the learner who has just started a language to the equilingual indistinguishable from a native speaker, and Grosjean (2010: 4) believes the term bilingualism includes any individual who uses two or more languages in their everyday lives. This raises the question 'why do laypeople view their dual language use so differently from the professional linguists?' There were a multitude of reasons that emerged in participants' stories indicating why they do not see themselves as bilingual. These are discussed below.

Some participants indicated that they did not consider themselves fully bilingual in a language if they felt they could not build an emotional relationship in that language. With the individuals in this investigation, while one individual in each of these bilingual marriages is conducting a relationship outside their mother tongue and has therefore made a linguistic sacrifice and compromise in order to conduct their relationship, it seems this is something individuals are unwilling to do when they have children – preferring to speak to their children in their native-tongue. I therefore believe part of how individuals conceptualise their language may relate to the strong connection they have to their socialised and historical self and sense of identity. I believe it is this identity, intrinsically entwined and encapsulated within an individual's language of birth and socialisation that they wish to pass on to their children. This was particularly apparent in Aysun's case. Despite speaking English to a standard where she is perceived to be a native-speaker and therefore bilingual by other English speakers it seems this is not enough for Aysun to feel she can pass on her full, emotional self to her daughter in English. This finding is paralleled in the findings of Pavlenko (2004) and Yamamoto (2005). Therefore, the process of speaking to and raising one's children may involve not only passing on one's language, but also one's sense of self and one's linguistic and cultural identity which individuals may not feel is fully possible outside one's mother tongue. I believe this finding points back to individuals not conceptualising themselves as bilingual unless they are born into both languages.

A similar story arose when participants talked about wanting to pass on aspects of themselves or their culture, such as a type of humour or a pattern of thinking. Some participants felt that as language and culture are intrinsically linked, language means something different when spoken by a non-native speaker and the message, therefore, that is

sent or received is not the same. Their feelings support the theories of Hymes (1974), Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), Baker (2000), and Samovar and Porter (2004). These feelings also support the ideas of Cruz-Ferreira who believes 'words and grammar may reproduce each one another more or less accurately across languages, but the original flavour of the whole thing will be left behind' (2010: 14), such that even if one learns another language to an advanced degree, perhaps one has not acquired the ability to mean in that language.

Once again, I believe this points towards participants feeling that one has to be born into a language to be able to fully understand and mean in that language. Only two participants in this investigation give an indication that they feel capable of doing meaning in their acquired language. Leyla gives the example of empathising with the Turkish soldiers in the documentary to such a colloquial and impassioned degree that she surprises her Turkish mother-in-law, and Alya describes having a cultural understanding of Britain and the British that leads to her having an 'English side'. Their conceptualisations of bilingualism sit more comfortably with Halliday's (1975) belief that learning a language also involves learning how to mean in that language. However, both of these participants acquired their subsequent language in childhood at school before travelling abroad, or during their teens due to moving to the country, not in adulthood like the other participants. I therefore believe they have had more chance to be socialised into the language through time spent living in the host community.

There are contradictions, therefore, in participants' conceptualisations. Some believe it is possible to fully express meaning in their subsequent language, but the majority do not believe they are capable of doing this. From these findings, it appears the majority of individuals view the concept of bilingualism as only encompassing those born into a language; in other words, one is only a true bilingual if one can be defined along the lines of Haugen's (1956) 'simultaneous infant bilingualism', Swain's (1972) 'bilingualism as a first language', Huerta's (1977) 'native acquisition of two languages', Wode's (1978) 'first language bilingualism', Kornakov's (2000) 'native' or 'simultaneous acquisition bilingualism' or De Houwer's (2009) 'Bilingual First Language Acquisition'. All of these describe the development of language in young children who hear two languages spoken to them from birth or a very young age. Other examples of bilingualism seem to be rejected.

Another conceptualisation that arose which may reveal why participants do not see themselves as bilingual involves whether or not individuals feel they hold native-speaker rights in their subsequent language. Elizabeth expressed her belief that one has to be a native-speaker of the language, born into that country, in order to have the right to complain; a

situation which is in part reflected in Bourdieu's (1978) theory on which conditions need to be in place for one to be considered a legitimate speaker in order to avoid the linguistic market exerting censorship on the speaker. One of those conditions involves the speaker not being considered an imposter; another involves the speaker using legitimate phonological or syntactic forms (Bourdieu, 1978); both aspects that may affect a non-native speaker's interaction. However, it also emerged that participants feel that proficient Turkish (i.e. speakers using legitimate phonological and syntactic forms) may cause Turkish interlocutors to put up more 'barriers' in an attempt to keep out the imposter. In these cases, it appears interlocutors may feel more comfortable seeing someone positioned as an outsider, and therefore not a threat to group identity.

I believe Bourdieu's theory on what makes a speaker legitimate not only describes why a non-native speaker may feel they do not have the full right to speak in their host community, but may also provide a reason for why both the Turkish participants, when interviewed together with their partners, were so vocally supportive of British values and norms. They, too, may have felt it inappropriate to be critical of British values and norms in front of their British partner or the British researcher. If the same linguistic market forces were at play that Elizabeth described when she felt unable to complain, the presence of British participants in itself may have created a form of censorship against Alya and Hulya's responses. I believe this raises the question, 'can any individual speaking an acquired language to a native-speaker ever be given full legitimacy by their interlocutor?' I believe this is not an easy question to answer as the complexities and power relations in every interaction differ. Linguistic ownership may be only one factor in a myriad of factors including how one's age, ethnicity, nationality, class, educational background and gender are perceived by the interlocutor in the linguistic market conditions of each interaction. Thus, like Norton (2000), I believe that when non-native speakers interact socially, power relationships come into play regarding how their legitimacy is perceived by target language speakers, and each individuals' experiences of this may affect how they view their identity in their subsequent language, and whether or not they feel they are able to achieve legitimacy. In other words, if they do not feel they are being accepted as legitimate speakers by members of the host community, they may not see themselves as being fully bilingual.

It also emerges from my data that marriage to a target-language spouse may increase one's legitimacy. This was expressed in Graham and Alya's narratives based on their experiences of how Alya is perceived by potential employees. Norton (2000a: 66) believes this situation may arise as these individuals' identities are seen as more culturally and linguistically

complex than had been assumed by their interlocutor. Marriage seems to provide acceptance by others that the speaker is part of the linguistic and cultural club and therefore acceptable or at least on an inbound trajectory to legitimate acceptability (Wenger, 1998).

It therefore emerges that the majority of the participants' unwillingness to conceptualise themselves as 'bilingual' is a complex issue which may be built on individuals' beliefs of how emotion, meaning, legitimacy and markers of linguistic difference affect how they perceive themselves and how they are perceived by members of the host community. I believe that as participants describe their children as bilingual, they reveal the belief that being born into two linguistic communities is a prerequisite for bilingualism. This may indicate that they see their children as being members of more than one community at once, and more than one culture at once; a situation which they do not perceive is the case for themselves.

It also emerged from the data that many participants showed resistance to learning their partner's language. However, with this finding, a dichotomy occurs with Turkish participants being much keener to acquire English than their British partners are to acquire Turkish. I believe this occurs because native-English speaker participants in Istanbul have been able to transform their English language and British nationality, in other words their linguistic and cultural capital, into symbolic and economic capital in the employment market. As Bourdieu (1982) puts it, these participants are 'agents who have wielded their strengths and obtained profits proportionate to their mastery of this objectified capital and therefore to the extent of their embodied capital'. This means that holding on to their English linguistic identity is socially and financially advantageous to them and, therefore, these individuals may have little to invest in learning Turkish or fully assimilating into Turkish society as this may lead them to losing the capital they embody in their British identity. This conceptualisation is also voiced by Norton who believes investment as opposed to motivation more accurately signals the socially and historically constructed relationship that individuals have to the target language and the ambivalence they may feel towards learning and practising it (1995). It seems, therefore, that participants conceptualise language acquisition as an investment. If they gain symbolically and financially from English, their mother tongue, in their host community, they may feel they have little to invest in acquiring Turkish.

For Turkish participants, I believe this cycle works in reverse. They have much to gain from learning English. As Norton observes, if individuals 'invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources,

181

which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital' ultimately giving them 'access to hitherto unattainable resources' (Norton, 1995: 17). The Turkish participants, therefore, have experienced a return on their investment in learning English which they feel is 'commensurate with the effort expended on learning' that language (ibid); an experience which is not felt by their British spouses who have not gained in a similar way. In addition, it emerged that the more they tend towards native-like English or construct an 'English side' by assimilating into their spouse's British culture, the more symbolic capital they acquire and the more they are potentially seen as legitimate English speakers (based on Bourdieu, 1978: 80) by the institutions that employ them. This means Turkish partners have a lot to gain from investing in the acquisition of English and assimilation into British cultural norms. I believe this explains why relationships start up and continue in English thereby ensuring English as a symbolic resource is maintained by the Turkish spouse and passed on to the children, so that everyone in the family gains from this investment.

In all of the marriages in this investigation, similar to Piller's (2001: 215) findings, all the relationships have started and continued in English. This means that for Turkish participants, the language of their relationship is English. However, what also emerged is a tendency for these participants to acquire some level of British cultural norms. I believe this may occur due to the perceived economic and social advancement that comes with this acquisition. If the acquisition of English leads to a better social standing, then I believe this means acquisition of the English language is conceptualised as a class marker by these individuals; especially as it costs a lot of money to gain access to English language education.

I believe one advantage that the Turkish partners have regarding the tendency towards English in their relationships is that their efforts towards acquisition of their partner's language – English - give the impression of more linguistic and cultural commitment to the relationship whether these are the real underlying motivations for their acquisition or not. Conversely, the limited effort put into learning Turkish by British partners, despite the possibility that this limited effort is based on the forces of the linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1978: 79), may appear to their spouse as if they are putting less emotional investment into the relationship.

Taking account of all these factors of language, power, capital and investment, I believe that both macro- and micro-forces affect these bilingual families. Each time an individual makes a language choice this choice takes place within macro-level discourses which may provide the guiding framework for linguistic patterns in their relationships. The British participants are living in an environment where the dominant discourse of their home

language provides them with a social power they would not have to the same extent back in Britain. For Turkish partners, acquisition of this dominant discourse may lead to symbolic and economic advantages, which effectively raises their class standing in the local community. This situation may lead both partners to perceive the dominant discourse of English as superior, thereby exemplifying Foucault's theory that discourse itself is the vehicle for power. This may explain why the relationships tend towards this language.

In summary, based on participants' descriptions of English language use in their relationships and lives, I believe this investigation develops some new understanding of the previously little documented issue of how language acquisition and use is affected when an individual's native language is a minority language within the community but a majority language. As emerged from participants' stories, issues of language, power, capital, and investment are entwined in each individual's daily language use. I believe these issues are rooted in macro-level matters that reveal themselves on a micro-level within these families and affect their life choices, including which language they predominantly use in their relationships. It seems that Bourdieu´s 'cultural capital' model (1982) on which Norton's (1995) model of investment is built may explain why these linguistic patterns are used in these bilingual families as they perform and present their linguistic and class identities. I therefore believe how individuals in bilingual marriages conceptualize their linguistic identities is dependent on which language is perceived to bring the most social and financial gain.

11.3 What my Research says about Participants' Identity and Relations within the Family

What emerged from this study is that while most factors of identity are perceived as fluid, nationality is most often viewed as unchanging. Most British participants, no matter how long they have been living in Turkey, appear to obtain security in continuing to label themselves in line with their nation of birth, resisting changes in their national identity even if they have become naturalised Turkish citizens; although, it emerges from Shirley's narrative, that while she chooses not to assimilate into her host community she is aware she has the agency to do so. Maintaining one's original national identity may therefore be seen to be an agentive action.

A number of factors emerged from the data which may explain why participants wish to hold on to their original national identity. These factors may include the feeling that one has limited sociolinguistic competence in one's host community (Holmes, 1990) or finding oneself being positioned as foreign 'before even uttering a word' due to one's appearance (Piller,

2001). While participants' conceptualizations conflate with Hall's (2002) definition whereby national identity is derived from where a person is born, these individuals' conceptualizations do not conflate with current poststructural thinkers, such as Block (2006) who consider nationality to be fluid, not fixed at birth, but an ongoing project recreated on a daily basis. Only two participants described a change in their perceived national identity in line with Block's (ibid) conceptualisation. Alya described an 'English side' to her identity as well as her Turkish identity. However, as described in the previous section, assimilation into British norms provides Alya with financial and symbolic advantages, both in England and Turkey which may be why she is willing to take a more fluid approach to her identity while British participants are less likely to do the same. The second participant to describe a more poststructural conceptualization of her national identity is Leyla who describes thinking and feeling in Turkish, drawing on meanings in Turkish that she cannot find in either English or Farsi to express what she is feeling or observing in Turkish.

While certainties over nationality are displayed by the majority of the participants in this study, these are not reflected in how participants conceptualise their children's identity or participants' perceptions of how their children conceptualise their own identities. Complex conceptualizations of how parents perceived their children's national identity emerged, with the theme of 'two identities' or 'two personalities' arising a number of times, especially when with different people or in different environments which may be indicative of Hong *et al's* (2003) theory that individuals culturally frame-switch between two cultural meaning systems in response to cultural clues from the surrounding environment. Wang (2008) suggests that speakers knowing more than one language may possess different representations of self that are organized around those respective languages. There is evidence that participants have similar conceptualisations to Wang. Lynn describes how her daughter's conceptualisation of self when she was younger was more Turkish as she was being raised in a Turkish environment; she indicates this is what may have contributed to her daughter's linguistic selves, with her English only improving when she took an interest in her 'English side'. Observations of different representations of self in their children were also described by participant, Maureen, and Katy (Research Diary) whereby they perceive their children show different characteristics depending on whether they are speaking English or Turkish. These different representations often correlate with a change in environment, such as travelling to England. Finally, Sayed (Research Diary) describes how his own personality shifts depending on the language he is speaking. There is evidence, therefore, that individuals who are in possession of more than one language may embody and perform different representations of themselves; representations which are organized around their respective languages.

Interestingly, it emerged that even if siblings are raised in the same environment, they may conceptualize their nationality as different from one another, which may mean they are drawing on different factors in their self constructs. It also emerged that conceptualizations of one's nationality may not even be based on having citizenship in that country, but on an individual's claim to citizenship (Holliday, 2011). In addition, it was revealed that an individual may identify with one of their countries of heritage even though he has never lived there which may lead to a site of struggle within the individual. Furthermore, it emerged that in adulthood, individuals born into families with two languages and two nationalities may start to migrate towards the less used identity as they start to fully explore all aspects of their identity. It seems how participants' children wish to be seen, therefore, is a complex business that may defy physical, cultural, linguistic and national description. The markers on which they choose to build their identities may be very much of their own making whereby they choose and claim nationalities to suit how they see themselves and 'absorb whatever environmental reality is encountered' (Holliday, 2011: 54); this may allow them to move between plural worlds. However, these claims may not always align with the perceptions of others and they may find portraying the nationality they have chosen for themselves a site of struggle with others. I believe this indicates that an individual's identity is more complex than can be labelled with a single, national identity. While it may be difficult to counter this struggle as individuals are labelled through their citizenship to certain nations, Holliday (2011) and Kumaravadivelu (2007) believe as individuals we can counter this by avoiding seeing nation and culture as linked; instead, they recommend that we should view them as separate entities and 'go beyond the traditional approach to culture that narrowly associates cultural identity with national identity' (Kumaravadivelu, 2007: 5).

I therefore believe the conceptualization of national identity for individuals born into families from two linguistic and national background involves greater complexity than the conceptualization of individuals born into one language and one country and it is this complexity that leads to more fluidity in their identity construct. However, individuals born into one language and nationality seem to tend towards a uni-dimensional labelling of self, even if they move in and out of different communities and have naturalized citizenship in their host country.

I would therefore say that the relationship between nationality and cultural identity, therefore, cannot be seen as a simple dichotomy or a static situation; instead it is part of a complexity involving community and individuals that Kumaravadivelu describes as a 'multicultural mosaic' (2007: 5). I conclude, therefore, that nationality and ownership of

citizenship may exist as a political demarcation; however, the sense of identifying with one's nation or nations seems to be profoundly personal and may be rooted in the need for security in one's identity construct.

Another area that emerged regarding how individuals conceptualise their national identities would seem to indicate a possible superiority construct in British participants and a possible inferiority construct in Turkish participants regarding their views of British values and cultural norms over Turkish values and cultural norms; views that may reveal 'cultural agendas' (Holliday, 2011: 135). I believe agendas were revealed when British participants' gave their opinions about British and Turkish values. Equal rights, rationality, free-thinking, understanding of truth, creativity and autonomy were presented as being British values that were lacking in the Turkish value system, with only respect and sense of community being presented as positive Turkish values. Following Holliday (2011), I believe the values participants associated with their own culture, such as 'free-thinking', 'truth', 'rationality' and 'creativity' may be indicative of 'the ideal with which they wish to be associated' (Holliday, 2011: 135) as opposed to being a characteristic of themselves or of British culture. Holliday describes these types of statements as 'cultural acts', artefacts of the speaker's culture and indicative of 'cultural agendas'. Thus, through using these value-laden labels, participants may have been maintaining their positive self image of identity by contrasting British culture with Turkish culture, and in doing so 'emphasizing and reifying respective proficient and deficient values, artefacts and behaviours', and 'manipulating selected cultural resources' in order to portray themselves as 'we the pure' against 'they the impure' (Holliday, 2011: 69-70). By doing this, participants can create a picture of their Britain and British life which they may use as a protective device. I therefore believe their narratives may show Othering, possibly with roots based in the false consciousness of Orientalist thought (Holliday, 2011) as they voice which values or behaviours they believe are 'correct' in their own culture, thereby conferring superiority to British cultural values over Turkish values.

There was also a noticeable difference regarding how participants perceived family practices from England and Turkey. British parents were described as encouraging autonomy, discipline and laying strict boundaries for behavioural expectations whereas Turkish parents were described as being both permissive and overprotective leading to children being spoilt. The two Turkish mothers interviewed also took this stance which I believe may have been indicative of self-Othering based on the belief in the superiority of the British perception on raising children, or related to their seeing the symbolic and financial advantages associated

186

with English language and practices in which English may be seen as a class marker. The notion that Turkish family practices could be valid and useful did not appear to be considered in the narratives in this study. There is the possibility the Turkish participants were answering in such a way as to please the British researcher, although as the issues in child-rearing they discussed were ongoing patterns of behaviour, I doubt this was the case.

While I have presented participants' perceptions involving Othering which may be unconsciously based in Orientalist ideology into which all of the participants, the researcher included, have been socialised, there is another alternative. There is always the issue of difference as actually existing; as having a reality rather than being entirely discoursal. I am aware that in analyzing the discourse of my participants through an Orientalist/Othering lens, there is the danger of oversimplifying matters, especially in today's society where the discourse of political correctness is ever present and encouraged. Therefore, putting aside my perceptions of the role of Othering and self-Othering in relation to macro-level factors of discourse, I also put forward the idea that perhaps there are real differences in family practices between British and Turkish culture such that individuals have the agency to make value judgments about their preferences and this is what is revealed in their narratives. These preferences, therefore, may not be influenced by some false-consciousness of Self and Other rooted in Orientalism, but may be a rational choice made on quite clear grounds. While the majority of participants, whether Turkish or British, express a preference for British family practices, there are examples of participants expressing their preference for Turkish practices, such as showing respect for elders, having a strong community spirit, and trusting one's children to be safe in the presence of strangers. As these show a preference for Turkish practices, I therefore believe what emerged from the narratives may be value judgments rather than examples of Othering, self-Othering or showing any sign of an inferiority complex, as if Othering were taking place, these positive preferences for Turkish practices may not have arisen. This leads me to postulate that maybe post-modernism is about selecting cultural practices from a wider range of choice than just the home culture.

As well as the discourse of Othering and value judgments, there is also the possibility of class being a factor in why participants tended towards British family practices and language use within the family. Skeggs (2005) believes cultural practices are at the centre of the formation of modern class, with culture being used as an economic resource and key factor in how we conceptualise class in our society. I believe perceptions of class superiority came through in many of the participants' utterances in the form of positive words to describe British parenting and judgemental words to describe Turkish parenting. Irrelevant of their

nationality, many participants painted British child-rearing practices as encouraging independence and discipline, while Turkish practices were described as producing spoilt children. There is the possibility that Turkish participants tend towards British family practices as they view these as part of a British class system that they see as desirable and which define their class identity as more advanced than practices in the local community, which in turn may increase their status and therefore their cultural and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1982).

This discourse of value judgements, described previously, may also have been evident in participants' stories of how extended family reacted to their bilingual marriages. Participants reported more negative reactions from British parents and officials, especially during the 1960s, than described by the Turkish participants. I believe this may mean that in the eyes of Turkish parents and officials, marrying a British spouse may be seen as a gain to the community through the capital and higher symbolic value attached to Britain and the English language. These reactions described by Elizabeth and Tim regarding consulate officials and family may have sprung from individuals positioning themselves as unelected custodians of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982). However, I also believe there may be undertones of Othering (Holliday, 2001) evidenced by the negative undertones reflected in the data regarding British attitudes to marriage with Turkish partners. As Bourdieu theorised, in many societies the decision of matrimonial partners is the business of the whole group, not just the individuals involved, as through marriage the identity, boundaries and definition of the group may be changed, redefined or adulterated (Bourdieu, 1982). I believe there is evidence of this emerging from the participants' stories. While examples of group protection are likely to happen in any group as members protect their identity from incomers, there is the possibility that as these examples tend to be from British individuals attempting to block the entry of Turkish individuals to the group that this may be indicative of Othering against the Turkish spouse. However, narratives were not without counter-discourse as it emerged that in Elizabeth's family, her husband's Turkish family Othered her own British background which may have been driven by class-based chauvinism – seeing Elizabeth's family as having less social standing than their own. This contradictory discourse, therefore, may once again be indicative of individuals using their agency in making value judgements about their child's future spouse as opposed to being rooted in Orientalism or Othering.

In the earlier discussion regarding the discourse of nationalism, it emerged that my thinking sways towards Fairclough's dichotomised model of discourse which observes the macro-discourse of the dominating class as overpowering the discourse of the subordinated class. As described in my reflections above, it is tempting, when finding possible examples of

Othering in British participants and self-Othering in the narratives of Turkish participants, to make generalisations about the power of British discourse while not also rigorously attempting to investigate examples of counter-discourse in the narratives. This line of theorising may also have been swayed by the current discourse of political correctness which implores us to repair past wrongs. It is all too easy to find examples of what one believes is going on, and not pay the same attention to details that may not fit the researcher's developing patterns of thought; something that may lead to self-fulfilling prophesies. I am aware that in this investigation, I may have tended towards an oversimplified picture of patterns of discourse, when in fact the complex patterns that our linguistic and social lives follow may defy simplified descriptions of how discourse is at work. There are many ways in which our social networks function and there are many ways in which we may analyse the forces that drive these networks; something that I believe is reflected in Foucault's (1978, 1979) theorising which sees discourse as having multiple authors, each of whom have the agency to produce counter discourses.

11.4 Summary of Key Ideas and Themes

From these understandings, I believe the complexities involved in being an individual in a bilingual family are as follows.

It would seem that the interaction between spouses may be affected by both micro- and macro-discourses. On a micro-level, individuals show agency in constructing and protecting their sense of self-identity including aspects such as their patterns of language use. These micro-level agentive actions also take place within the dominant discourses of identity at a macro-level, and it may be these macro-level discourses that provide the guiding framework for relationships between spouses and their extended families. For some participants, they find themselves in an environment where the dominant discourse of their home language provides them with a social power they would not have to the same extent in their home country. This dominant discourse may also be accepted as superior by partners, exemplifying Foucault's theory that discourse itself is the vehicle for power.

In particular, my findings suggest that what is considered right or wrong, good practice or poor practice, may be seen to be co-constructed and negotiated between partners. However, these negotiations take place within a macro-framework of social power. It is possible that the dominant discourse of the British partner's culture influences both partners into seeing British practices and values as superior, with English potentially acting as a class indicator and therefore something that is desirable in the local community. However, it is also

possible that individuals are using their agency to make their own value judgements. I therefore believe it is necessary to acknowledge the contributions that macro-level discourse makes to these micro-level processes which may mean partners are not negotiating their shared values from a position of parity. However, I believe it is also important to acknowledge the possibility that each individual has agency with which they can make their own choices.

Current poststructural approaches ask us to avoid essentialist practices such as categorising people or peoples by national, linguistic or cultural labels. However, I believe when it comes to how individuals label their identity, this approach may need reassessing. As emerged from the data, the majority of participants tend to see their national, cultural and linguistic identity in a definitive light despite viewing other aspects of their identity, such as class or gendered performance, as more fluid. I believe, therefore, that the practice of using definitive nominalisation provides individuals with the security they may desire in how they construct their images of self. One of the outcomes of this study, therefore, may be that the whole concept of what identity is and what it means to each individual needs rethinking. This may be uncomfortable for those who prefer postmodern, fluid expressions of identity, those who may object to the nominalisation of national labels that they believe tend towards essentialism. However, I believe what arises from this study are individuals' deep-felt need for a clear identity and it is this that drives them towards taking an innate, national binary-labelling approach to identity, even if they have the option to claim plural identities. This does not, however, mean that they do not move between two different languages and worlds in their daily lives.

While there are no definitive answers as to what is taking place in these bilingual families, in the diagram below, I attempt to make sense of what is coming out of the data and present some of the main themes (Table 6). I do this to clarify my ideas and guide the reader through the upcoming discussion. It should be noted that although these terms were not used directly by the participants, I believe they represent the concepts and patterns of behaviour that emerged from their narratives.

TABLE 6: REPRESENTATION OF THE COMPLEXITIES ON A MACRO- AND MICRO-LEVEL AFFECTING INDIVIDUALS IN BILINGUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Superiority construct may be seen – but independent agency to make value judgements exists

English language and discourse may dominate relationships

Self-Othering may take place - but independent agency to make value judgements exists

Tendency towards a strong, national identity

English Partner

Turkish Partner

Likelihood of fluidity in national identity

Symbolic and economic gain from English

English is a class-based indicator in the local community

Symbolic and economic gain from English

English is a class-based indicator in the local community

Issues of cultural chauvinism may reveal themselves on a micro-level in families

These families are living in the urban, cosmopolitan city of Istanbul. The time period for the study was 2006-2012.

While I have tried to present some of the main themes that emerged from the investigation in this diagram, I am aware that this is a simplistic attempt at representation of the complex issues that take place within bilingual relationships. These issues are so complex that I believe it is hard to generalise. Therefore the only way to understand these issues better may be at the local level. Despite this, I do feel there are some broader implications that can be drawn from these findings.

11.5 The Broader Implications: How Bilingual Families are Changing Identities within Societies

The factors that lead to how we construct, view and perform our identities are all around us on both micro- and macro-levels. We construct ourselves based on our friends, spouses, extended family, communities of practice, institutions and governments and are increasingly influenced by electronic media. However, as globalisation moves forward leading to a more mobilised population, and as increasing numbers of people marry outside their nation, language, community and religion of birth, old certainties of identity start to change which may lead to insecurity or uncertainty about who we are and indeed of who others are. As individuals migrate, relocate, intermarry and have children they may feel unsettled when they find they no longer have a clear set of unquestionable standards for values and cultural norms. They may struggle to accept that concepts that they had believed to be universal and irrefutable are viewed differently by others leading to further confusion and uncertainty. However, I believe approaching these uncertainties with openness, flexibility, equality and curiosity may give individuals the opportunity to expand their cultural repertoires, increase their tolerance and release themselves from the all too easy act of dichotomising cultures, practices, peoples and languages. Giddens (1991) believes this situation that many individuals currently find themselves in will ultimately lead to many positive consequences as they will find themselves needing to think about other cultures and locate themselves in a much wider setting. Thus, I believe the boundaries that were once drawn by and drawn upon by individuals, families, communities and governments are no longer as distinct as they used to be; a situation that creates both uncertainty and opportunity.

Individuals who move to a new country and perceive they come from a more powerful nation may show some inflexibility in how they construct and perform their identities. However, children born into these families are perceived to be less likely to dichotomise, categorise and label, although how much they embrace all aspects of their mixed heritages may depend on how these were presented by those around them during their socialisation.

Migration alone, therefore, may not lead to flexibility in identity perception and performance. Individuals in such situations may still perceive traditional identity boundaries to exist, and perpetuate these boundaries through their daily practices, despite having the agency to cross these notional boundaries if so desired.

I therefore believe that changes occurring due to globalisation have implications on a macro-level for society in terms of tensions surrounding the lack of certainty about identity; tensions which are also felt on a micro-level in families that incorporate members from more than one national or linguistic background. However, I believe these families have the potential to create nurturing environments in which openness and fluidity towards one's identity construction and an 'equal but different' approach to values and norms can be encouraged and celebrated. As individuals born into such families increase in number, their voices, attitudes and approaches may start to have more of an impact on dialogue at a macro-level as traditional concepts of identity continue to be challenged and more fluid concepts of identity come into being.

11.6 Concluding Remarks

From the key themes and ideas that have emerged from this investigation, I have drawn the conclusion that an individual's concept of identity is established by drawing on their language, heritage, people and influences at a micro-level from their personal life. However, each individual may also be affected by macro-level forces which may include elements of cultural chauvinism of which the individual is unaware or has a false-consciousness, although I believe the agency for choice exists within this structure. In this chapter, against a backdrop of changing identities in a globalised world, I have discussed the key themes and ideas that emerged from this investigation regarding what individuals in bilingual families say about language use in their families and how this affects how they construct and perform their identities and family practices.

In the final chapter, I outline my thoughts as a participant researcher regarding my reaction to the findings and how my expectations have been met and challenged before presenting my closing thoughts.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT RESEARCHER

12.1 My Reaction to the Findings and how my Expectations have been Met and Challenged

Richards (2003: 9) says one of the profound strengths of qualitative inquiry is 'its transformative potential for the researcher'. I certainly agree with Richards' comments. I feel this research has had a powerful impact on me in a number of different ways. Through embracing the role of qualitative researcher and embracing the concept of constant change, I have been able to link discoveries and findings back to my personal and professional life in many dimensions and this process has changed my view of my own identity, and my understanding of my beliefs, and my practices.

In this section, I reflect upon what I have learnt as a researcher, including an awareness of personal change, developed academic understandings and a realisation of agendas inherent in research. I also reflect on what I have learnt as a professional, mother, wife, daughter and daughter-in-law in my own bilingual family.

Increased Academic Awareness as a Researcher

Through this investigation, I have become more aware that research is politically charged and paradigms are constantly shifting, blurring or emerging, entwined with social and political change. Due to this, I have become aware that my findings may only be considered relevant to the time and setting in which my investigation takes place. This is a humbling notion, knowing my research may only be relevant in the here and now and that the paradigms and perspectives I have located myself in may fall out of favour. However, this is natural in the evolutionary process of research and paradigmatic thinking. As I saw in chapter two of the literature review, each research project into language acquisition was working in line with current thinking and research traditions at the time and while some methods, motivations and outcomes may now be considered questionable, the body of research has grown and developed from each study and helped current researchers to locate changing paradigms, perspectives and traditions.

As a result of this research, I now feel I understand the political nature inherent in becoming a researcher. I now realise everything we do and say, whether consciously or unconsciously or with false consciousness is motivated by our race, gender, class, nation and

place in history. I also realise I have a moral responsibility to raise awareness of the agendas I uncover and use this awareness to push for social change. One of the positive outcomes of this inquiry is that it has brought me into contact with other qualitative researchers, in particular, narrative researchers at universities in Istanbul who have used this medium to give a voice to the marginalised groups of street-involved children and their service providers. Through this project, that developed directly from a narrative inquiry research project, these researchers have shown me how the power of people's stories can capture the attention of communities, institutions and state and create social change. I am proud to have joined this group of researchers and to be a part of their project. Therefore, through this research and my association with other qualitative researchers in Istanbul, I now appreciate what an excellent approach qualitative research can be in prompting social change and the creation of shifted linguistic, social, or cultural narratives.

From this research, I have learnt that labels are useful tools when descriptive of distinct entities, but when labelling complex concepts such as language use and identity, most do not provide clarity of understanding and may even provide negative connotation. I have also learnt that people give themselves labels drawing on multiple factors, or are given labels by others, but in reality each individual is in a unique situation that defies clear cut nominalisation.

While attempting to write about the participants, I came to understand that nominalisation is critical. When starting to write, I found it hard not to label participants along the lines of existing categories. This is something I wished to avoid as by giving a label to someone the next easy step is to start seeing that individual and their behaviours in line with expectations for that label; what one sees becomes an essentialist, self-fulfilling prophesy. Gaining an awareness of the underlying ideology inherent in discourse compounded my desire to avoid nominalisation, especially with terms such as bilingual, bicultural, and cross-national. However, to my surprise, I even struggled with labels such as Turkish or British as most participants defied clear-cut categorisation, resisting association with one of their nationalities, or laying claim to a nationality not recognised through citizenship. Despite these difficulties, I found I had a need for labels on which to hang ideas to provide the tools for writing and sharing my thoughts. However, I understand that labels I have given in this thesis are solely heuristic devices, and I leave the meanings derived from those labels to be constructed by the participants and readers.

Regarding broader issues of nominalisation, I believe as we see changing patterns of understanding in society, clear cut definitions of identity, especially those based on nationality, national language and ethnicity will increasingly be challenged and will need to be debated.

Increased Professional Awareness as an Educator

On a professional level, working as an educator in national and international schools and working as a teacher trainer who trains new English language teachers, this research has raised my awareness of how English may be a double-edged sword for those involved in the acquisition of English. For individuals acquiring English, it brings them opportunity for travel, higher education and increased employment opportunity, all of which can be converted into symbolic and economic capital, but it seems this may come at a price. The acquisition of English is a process not unlike joining a prestigious club of English speakers. However, while this may increase an individual's academic and employment opportunities, this may also involve individuals taking on the beliefs and behaviours of the English club they have joined; or, using Bourdieu's terms, they may start to embody the 'habitus' of that linguistic club (1986). In the case of English, this means individuals may take ownership of the beliefs, values, and norms all of which may contain the underlying cultural chauvinism attached to English and Centre-West languages. Individuals may find themselves taking on this rhetoric, even if it is chauvinistic towards their own heritage; in other words, they may start to self-Other. I believe as individuals partake in this self-Othering or reification of Centre-West norms, the English-embedded-Centre-West rhetoric is not only perpetuated but also remains unchallenged. I therefore believe as well as tackling this issue at the level of families, we also need to raise awareness of this rhetoric in educational institutions that teach English or through English.

Increased Personal Awareness

This process of inquiry has involved me in reflecting upon my own language use, how much I am investing in learning Turkish, and in which ways I gain through having English as a mother-tongue.

For many years I have chastised myself for only having reached a certain level of proficiency in Turkish despite many years of living in the country. It is all too easy to reach for essential stereotypes that the British are lazy, not good at learning languages, or not interested in learning the language of others and apply those labels to myself. However, when I analyse

when and where I use Turkish in my everyday interactions and what kind of interactions these are, I can see I may have reached the boundaries of my current communicative need. I have built relationships and can chat to my Turkish family and neighbours, I can get my needs attended to, read and write emails for work and participate in meetings. Beyond this scope, I have limited need to acquire more Turkish as my professional role is based around my use of English. I have therefore come to the realisation that it is these boundaries that may be limiting my need to learn more proficient Turkish, not some innate laziness or lack of interest in the language or country.

I have also become more aware of the role my British background and native English play in my life. In Turkey, these factors are considered attributes and particularly desired in the educational market; this means I can always find employment and negotiate salary and benefits on my own terms and conditions. I therefore have a lot to invest in my professional, British identity in Istanbul. If I were working in England, it is likely I would have neither the bargaining power nor the status I currently hold. Likewise, my husband would find himself in a less beneficial position; he would not be the prestigious, English speaker, the asset to his company that he is currently seen to be in Istanbul. Instead, his English would be considered deficient to the local norm leading to him being disadvantaged in the employment market. For these reasons, it is not surprising we continue to live in Istanbul where our languages bring us more power than they would in England and more symbolic and economic capital. I believe this is also why the language of our relationship started and has continued in English as it is the language that brings us both the greatest gain.

Through the process of undertaking this investigation, I have put the choices that my husband and I have made (often unconscious, unspoken choices) under scrutiny, realising that there are reasons for our choices we may not previously have been aware of. In particular, I became aware of changes in identity that my husband and I go through with our families, both having learnt when, where and how to be flexible with our constructed identities to create harmony when with our extended families. My husband appreciates it when I perform the more traditional, female-gendered role that suits the particular social demographic in which his family is situated. This involves helping in the kitchen, preparing meals and tidying up around the males in the family, not expecting my husband to assist as he does in our own home as this would emasculate him in his father's expectations for the roles of husband and wife. I don't see this shift as being untrue to my own concept of self-identity, but a natural identity compromise that I make in order to strengthen my relationship with my husband and his family. The same is true for the linguistic change I go through, tending more towards

Turkish when speaking to my husband and children so that his family does not feel linguistically excluded and so I show respect for their language. I too appreciate the changes my husband makes in his behaviour when spending time with my family, tending towards the more informal relationship that has become the norm in the section of today's Britain that my family inhabits. I believe my husband and I have reached this equilibrium as we have always been open to discussing differing expectations, especially after inadvertent *faux pas* with family members when we have broken expected local norms.

As well as becoming more aware of how and why I construct and perform my identities, through this investigation I have also become more aware of which cultural and social factors influence my prejudices and beliefs, my value system and conceptualisation of cultural norms and how this affects decisions made in my family. As a parent, I have described how my underlying chauvinism may affect how I view my husband's heritage; however, I am aware it is this same global chauvinism that gives me my position in society in Istanbul. I am also aware that I have been party to many conversations with other British parents in Turkish-English marriages in looking down upon or rejecting certain Turkish family practices as unnecessary or incorrect. In putting these opinions forward to my husband, I know I have been forceful in getting us to follow practices from my own heritage which I believe are correct, drawing on British norms and beliefs, unconsciously taking for granted that they must be superior to Turkish beliefs. However, while I now understand where my convictions and superiority constructs are derived from, I still find it challenging to suspend belief in my convictions and approach practices from both cultures in an equal light. It is not surprising that this is not easy to do as these decisions potentially affect the health of our children and their development. I know I have found myself in a situation where advice given from Britain's National Health Service in order to avoid cot death was in direct conflict with recommended Turkish practice, leaving my husband and I needing to choose one course of action over another. Therefore, as a researcher, while I recommend approaching both sets of practices with parity, as a parent I understand how difficult it is to suspend belief in one's ingrained cultural practices and suspend trust in the bodies and institutions that espouse these views; these are what we have grown up with and this collective belief provides us with a feeling of security and conviction in our practices.

As an individual who is capitalising on English-as-a-native-language in Istanbul, I also find myself in a position of ambivalence, caught between guilt and gain. I am aware that many factors including a history of colonialism, the dominance of English as a global language, and the ongoing politically-oriented Orientalist rhetoric have led to my current positioning and the

linguistic and symbolic capital I embody. I realise it is all too easy to make the next step which involves seeing those from a different background and with a different language as somehow inferior, even if the individual concerned is one's own spouse. I have seen this superiority construct manifest itself in the majority of British participants in this study, especially regarding how they view Turkish values and norms, and am aware that this construct also lies within me, even if I am uncomfortable admitting this. The perpetuation of this superiority construct, however, is not solely down to me, but also perpetuated by my husband. I regularly observe my husband proudly introducing me as his British wife, and see the added kudos he is afforded by his interlocutors when they realise the language of our marriage is English. In their eyes it seems our marriage gives him a greater layer of complexity and more fully legitimises him as an English speaker and accepted member of the English-speaking group. He too, therefore, is capitalising on the language and heritage of English.

I now feel I better understand where the gains come from in my life; a situation that leaves me feeling uncomfortable as these gains do not come from nations or languages being treated with parity. However, despite this realisation, I know my husband and I will continue to use our English language and connections to Britain to bring symbolic and economic gain; it is our livelihood and also an important part of our professional identity constructs. However, outside our professional lives and inside our family lives, I believe increasing our understanding of these underlying forces will aid us in viewing both of our heritages and languages with equal respect and valuing each other's perceived cultural values and norms with more parity and inclusiveness, not with binary constructs of superiority and inferiority. By taking this course of action, I believe we can create a proud, healthy, cultural environment in which to raise our children with both languages and heritages.

12.2 Closing Thoughts

To conclude the main story in this thesis, I believe we are now at the stage where we are seeing the forces of globalisation leading to more migration and bilingual families, the process of which is changing traditional certainties regarding identity. This may have led to a feeling of uncertainty in individuals, communities and nations regarding how they identify themselves and others and may also lead individuals to emphatically hold on to traditional concepts of national identity. Along with this uncertainty over identity may come uncertainty over concepts that were previously considered absolute, concepts such as truth. How individuals and groups react to these uncertainties may take a number of paths, from a fluid construction of identity leading to more plurality, to a backlash against changing identities

leading to communities, movements and governments attempting to bring definitions of identity and absolutes back along traditional lines.

Paradoxically, at the same time that we are seeing a tendency back towards nationalism and traditional concepts of group identity, we are also seeing the steady growth of English around the globe as more individuals strive to acquire ownership of this linguistic capital and become part of the elite, English-speaking class. It may be the case that as each individual acquires English, they may also assimilate the Centre-West English discourse and rhetoric that is so intrinsically embedded within it; a situation that may lead them to Other their own background. This is a possibility for any individual moving up the social hierarchy, gradually distancing themselves from the beliefs and norms that they may now perceive as lesser than the standard they have acquired. It is human nature to seek social advancement. It seems at the current point in history, acquisition of English is one of the indicators or conduits to this ideal. I believe it may be this global race to join the English linguistic class that is one of the catalysts to the current identity crisis that Eriksen (1999) describes as prompting a return to traditional identity constructs. I believe countries and movements are aware that the spread of English is not happening with neutrality. They may perceive that ideologies are inherent *within* English and are being spread *through* English which may leave their local practices being viewed as less desirable or prestigious by those within them.

While this crisis of identity may be encouraging individuals to pull back towards traditional identity constructs and to view new identities with suspicion, I believe individuals in today's bilingual families are sitting in an ideal position to provide tangible examples of the fluid, changing nature of identity and how this can be inclusive and adaptive instead of dichotomised. Through this, these individuals are living proof of how identity can mean more than is able to be encompassed by one definition. I believe it is through the positive examples provided by these bilingual families that fear of change may be abated within communities as families with plural identities become normalised in our midst. These families, therefore, through their actions and how they perform their family identities, if done with parity and openness, and by challenging the essentialist ideologies they find within themselves and their own cultural discourses, may provide a positive force for the acceptance of plural identities in societies faced with today's rapidly shifting, globalising world. They may also provide examples of how we can attempt to 'escape from the constraints of our histories and the scripts of our class, gender and ethnicity by learning to challenge and change aspects of both our inner and outer worlds' (Merrill & West, 2009: 188).

<p style="text-align:center;">BIBLIOGRAPHY</p>

Agar, M. (1996) The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography. Academic Press. American Heritage Dictionary. 2000. Houghton Mifflin.

Ahmad, A. & Donnan, H. (1994) Islam in the age of postmodernity. In Ahmad, A. & Donnan, H. (eds) *Islam, Globalisation and Postmodernity:* London, Routledge, pp 1-20.

Althusser, L. (1971) Lenin and philosophy, and other essays. London: New Left Books.

Anastasi, A., & Cordova, F. (1953) *Some effects of bilingualism upon the intelligence test performance of Puerto Rican children in New York.* Journal of Educational Psychology, 44, pp 1-19.

Anderson, J. (1976) Language, Memory and Thought. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987) Language Contact and Bilingualism: Edward Arnold, London.

Atkinson, P. (1990) The Ethnographic Imagination. London, Routledge.

Auer, P. (ed.) (1998) Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity. London: Routledge.

August, D. & Hakuta, K. (eds.) (1997) *Improving schooling for language-minority children - A Research agenda.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Ausubel, D. (1963) The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Baker, C. (2000) A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2011) Foundations of Bilingual Education: Fifth Edition. Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2007) A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism, Third Edition. Multilingual Matters.

Bamberg, M. (1997) Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History,* 7, pp 335-342.

Bateson, M. (1989) Composing a Life. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Baumann, G. (1996) Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beardsmore, B. (ed) (1986) Bilingualism: Basic Principles: Second Edition. Multilingual Matters Ltd., England.

Beck, U. (2000) The Brave New World of Work. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Beck, U. & Sznaider, N. (2006) 'Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: a research agenda.' *The British Journal of Sociology* 57/1, pp 1-23.

Bell, A. (1984) Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13 (2), pp 145-204.

Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F. & Morris, M. (2002) Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame-switching in biculturals with 'oppositional' vs. 'compatible' cultural identities: *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, pp 492-516.

Berger, P. & Luckman, T. (1966) The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bhahba, H. (1984) The Location of Culture. London: New York: Routledge.

Bialystok, E. (1991) *Language Processing in Bilingual Children.* Cambridge University Press.

Bialystok, E. (2007) Cognitive effects of bilingualism. How linguistic experience leads to cognitive change. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 10*, pp 210-223.

Block, D. (1996) Not so fast!: Some thoughts on theory culling, relativism, accepted findings and the heart and soul of SLA. *Applied Linguistics,* 17, pp 65-83.

Block, D. (2006) Multilingual identities in a global city: London stories. London: Palgrave.

Block, D. (2007) The Rise of Identity in SLA Research Post Firth and Wagner 1997. *The Modern Language Journal, 91,* Focus Issue, pp 863-876.

Bond, M., Zegarac, V. & Spencer-Oatey (2000) Culture as an explanatory variable: problems and possibilities: pp 52-53. In Spencer-Oatey, H. (ed) (2000) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures.* London: Continuum, pp 272-288.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information, 16*, pp 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. (1977a) Algérie soixante, English Edition.

Bourdieu, P. (1977b) The forms of capital. In Halsey, A., Lauder, H., Brown, P. & Wells, A. (eds) *Education, Culture, Economy, and Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 46-58.

Bourdieu, P. (1978) The Linguistic Market; a talk given at the University of Geneva in December 1978. In Bourdieu, P. (English Translation) (1993) Sociology in Question. Sage, pp 79-86.

Bourdieu, P. (1982) Les rites d'institution, Actes de la recherché en sciences Sociales, 43: 50-63. From Richardson, J. (ed) *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education* (Greenword Press, 1986), pp 241-258. Translated by Richard Nice.

Bourdieu, B. (1984) Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) The Forms of Capital. In Richardson, J. (ed), *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education.* Translated by Richard Nice. Greenwood Press, pp 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) Language and Symbolic Power. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992) Rites as acts of institution. In Honor and Grace in Anthropology, Peristiany, J. & Pitt-Rivers, J. (eds) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 79-89.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) La Domination Masculine, English Edition 2001, Masculine Domination, translated by Richard Nice. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CT.

Bourdieu, P. & Lacquant, L. (1992) An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology. University of Chicago Press.

Breger, R. & Hill, R. (eds) *Cross-Cultural Marriage: Identity and Choice.* Oxford: Berg.

Bremer, K., Grahams, C., Vasseur, M., Simonot, M. & Broeder, P. (1996) Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters. London: Longman.

Brislin, R. (1993) Understanding culture's influence on behavior. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Brown, H. (1980) Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, R. (1973) A First Language: The Early Stages. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983) Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language. Oxford University Press.

Buchanan, D. & Bryman, A. (2009) The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods. Sage Publications Ltd.

Burr, V. (2003) Social Constructionism (Second Edition). Hove, Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990) Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (1997) Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In Wodak, R. (ed), *Gender and Discourse.* London, Sage, pp 21-36.

Cameron, D. (2005) Language, gender and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(4), pp 482-502.

Canagrajah, S. (1999) Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carr, D. (1986) Time, narrative and history. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Carroll, J. & Freedle, R. (1972) Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Washington, DC: Winston.

Charmaz, K. (2000) Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds). Sage, pp 509–536.

Chase, S. (2005) Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses, approaches, voices. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (Third Edition).* Sage, pp 651-679.

Clandinin, D. (2006) Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Clandinin, D. & Murphy, S. (2007) Looking ahead: Conversations with Elliot Mishler, Don Polkinghorne, and Amia Lieblich. In Cladinin, D. (ed) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp 632-650.

Clandinin, D. & Rosiek, J. (2007) Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In Clandinin, D. (ed) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage, pp 35-75.

Clements, P. (2001) Autobiographical Research and the Emergence of the Fictive Voice. In Soler, J., Craft, A, & Burgess, H. (eds) *Teacher Development Exploring our Own Practice.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd, pp 160-166.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007) Research Methods in Education (Sixth Edition): New York, Routledge.

Collier, M. (2005) Theorizing cultural identifications: critical updates and continuing evolution. In Gudykunst, B. (ed) (2005) *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication.* Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp 245-256.

Collins, J. (2006) Where's class in second language learning? *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies.*

Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D. (2006) Narrative inquiry. In Green, J., Camilli, G. & Elmore, P. (eds) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research (third edition)* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp 477-487.

Cook, V. (2002) Portraits of the L2 User. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Coupland, N. (2001) Introduction: Sociolinguistic theory and social theory. In Coupland, N., Sarangi, S. & Candlin, C. (eds), *Sociolinguistics and social theory.* London: Longman, pp 1-26.

Craik, F. & Lockhart, R. (1972) Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11, pp 671-684.

Crane, D. (ed) (1994) The Sociology of Culture. Oxford, Blackwell.

Crawford, M. (1995) Talking Difference: On Gender and Language. London: Sage.

Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N. & Martin, P. (2006) Multicultural, Heritage and Learner Identities in Complementary Schools. *Language and Education,* Volume 20: Issue 1, pp 23 - 43.

Cresswell, J. (2003) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches. Sage Publications: London.

Cresswell, J. (2007) Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cresswell, J. & Miller, D. (2000) Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice 39,* pp 124-130.

Cromdal, J. (1999) Childhood bilingualism and metalinguistic skills: Analysis and control in young Swedish-English bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics 20*, pp 1-20.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt R. (1991) Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), pp 469–512.

Crotty, M. (1998) The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and perspective in the research process. London: Sage.

Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2010) Multilinguals are...? Battlebridge Publications, London, UK.

Crystal, D. (1987) The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge.

Cummins, J. (2001) Bilingual Children's Mother Tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum, Number 19,* pp 15-16.

De Houwer, A. (2009) Bilingual First Language Acquisition. Multilingual Matters.

Delanty, G. (2006) The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitan and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology* 57/1, pp 5-47.

Delanty, G. (2008) Dilemmas of secularism: Europe, religion and the problem of pluralism. In Delanty, G., Wodak, R. & Jones, P. (eds) *Identity, Belonging and Migration.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, pp 81-93.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2003) Anti-Oedipus. University of Minnesota.

Denscombe, M. (1998) The Good Research Guide. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2003) Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and* Issues (Second Edition). London, Sage, pp 1-45.

Derrida, J. (1982) Margins of Philosophy. (Translated by Bass, A.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Devine, F. (2005) Middle-class identities in the United States. In Devine, F., Savage, M., Scott, J. & Crompton, R. (eds) *Rethinking Class: Culture, Identities and Lifestyles.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 140-162.

Donato, R. (2000) Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In Lantolf, J. (ed). *Sociocultural theory and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 27-50.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizer, K. & Nemeth, N. (2006) Motivation, Language Attitudes and Globalisation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. (2008) *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duff, P. & Uchida, Y. (1997) The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms, *TESOL Quarterly, 31 (3),* pp 451-486.

Eckert, P. & McConnel-Ginet, S. (1992) Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: pp 461-490.

Edwards, R. (2006) What's in a name? Chinese learners and the practice of adopting 'English' names, *Language, Culture and Curricula,* 19, (4), pp 421-446.

Ehrlich, S. (1997) Gender as social practice: Implications for second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19 (4), pp 421-426.

Erlandson, D., Harris, L., Skipper, B. & Allen, S. (1993) Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Eriksen, T. (1999) Globalisation and the Politics of Identity. UN Chronicle (Autumn 1999).

Erikson, E. (1968) Identity: Youth and Crisis. London, Faber.

Ervin, S. (1964) Language and TAT content in bilinguals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 68, 5, pp 500-507.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1968) An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. In Fishman, J. (ed) Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton, pp 192-211. (Reproduced from: *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964), pp 86-102.)

Eyüboğlu, H. (2006) From the Steeple to the Minaret: Living Under the Shadow of Two Cultures. Çitlembik, Istanbul.

Fairclough, N. (1989) Language and Power. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992) Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis. *Linguistics and Education,* Volume 4, n3-4, pp 269-293.

Fairclough, N. (1993) Discourse and Social Change. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1996) Technologisation of discourse. In Caldas-Coulthard, C. & Coulthard, M. (eds) Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001) Language and Power, Second Edition. London, Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003) Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2006) Language and Globalisation. London: Routledge.

Fanon, F. (1967) Black Skin, White Masks, New York: Grove Press.

Fitzpatrick M. (1990) Models of marital interaction. In Howard, G., Timson, P. & Smith, P. (eds) *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology.* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, pp 433-451.

Fleming, D. & Søborg H. (2004) Human Resource Strategies as a Technology of Governance in Danish Subsidiaries in Southeast Asia. http://geert-hofstede.international-business-center.com/geert_hofstede_contrarian_position.shtml

Foucault, M. (1972) The Discourse on Language. In Foucault, M. The archaeology of knowledge. New York, Pantheon, pp 215-237.

Foucault, M. (1978) The History of Sexuality, Volume One: The Will to Knowledge (translated by Robert, H.) Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1979) Truth and Power: Interview with Fontano and Paquino. In Morris, M. & Patton, P. (eds). *Michel Foucault – Power/Truth/Strategy.* Sydney: Feral Publications, pp 46-101.

Foucault, M. (1980) Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings. 1972-1977. Brighton: Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1988) Technologies of the self. In Martin, L., Gutman, J. & Hutton, P. (eds). Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault. Amherst University of Masachusetts Press, pp 16-49.

Fodor, J., Bever, T. & Garrett, M. (1974) The Psychology of Language. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freeman, M. (2007) Autobiographical understanding and narrative inquiry. In Clandinin, D. (ed) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, pp 120-145.

Gal, S. (1979) Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria. Academic Press: New York.

Gardner, H. (1993) Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice. NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, R. & Lambert, W. (1972) Attitudes and Motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury house.

Gardner, R. (1985) Social psychology and second language learning. The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. (2001) Language Learning Motivation: the Student, the Teacher, and the Researcher. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 6, pp 1–18.

Gee, J. (1999) Discourse Analysis. New York: Routledge.

Gergen, M. (2003) Once upon a time. A narratologist's tale. In Daiute, C. & Lightfoot, A. (eds) *Narrative Analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society.* Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp 267-286.

Giddens, A. (1991) Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age. Cambridge: Polity.

Giles, H. & Byrne, U. (1982) An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3/1, pp 17-41.

Giroux, H. (1988) Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Goetz, P. (2003) The effects of bilingualism on theory of mind development. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 6,* pp 1-15.

Gooderham, P. & Nordhaug, O. (2004) Are cultural differences in Europe on the decline? http://geert-hofstede.international-business-center.com/geert_hofstede_contrarian_position.shtml

Grande, E. (2006) Cosmopolitan political science. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57/1, pp 87-111.

Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with two languages.* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Grosjean, F. (2010) Bilingual: Life and Reality. Harvard University Press.

Gudykunst, W. (1991) Bridging Differences: Effective intergroup communication, Volume Three. Sage.

Gudykunst, W. & Kim, M. (1997) Communicating with Strangers: an approach to intercultural communication: Instructors' Manual – Third Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W., Lee, C., Nishida, T. & Ogawa, N. (2005) An Introduction. In Gudykunst, W. (ed) (2005). *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication:* Thousand Oaks, Sage, pp 3-32.

Guilford, J. (1967) The Nature of Human Intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hakuta, K. (1986) Mirror of Language – The Debate on Bilingualism. Basic Books.

Hakuta, K. & Garcia, E. (1989) Bilingualism and education: *American Psychologist 44*, pp 374-379.

Hall, K. (2002) Teaching and Researching Language and Culture. Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

Hall, S. (1991) The local and the global: globalisation and ethnicity. In King, A. (ed) *Culture, Globalisation and the World-System.* New York: Palgrave, pp 219-40.

Hall, S. (1996) Who needs 'identity'? In Hall, S. & du Gay, P. (eds) *Questions of cultural identity.* London: Sage, pp 1-17.

Halliday, M. (1975) Learning how to mean. London, Edward Arnold.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P (1995) Ethnography: Principles in Practice. London: Routledge.

Hannerz, U. (1991) Scenarios of peripheral cultures. In King, A. (ed) *Culture, Globalisation and the World-System.* New York, Palgrave, pp 107-128.

Harding, E. & Riley, P. (1986) *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents.* New York, Melbourne. Cambridge University Press.

Hatch, E. (1983). Pyscholinguistics: A Second Language Perspective. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Haugen, E. (1953) The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. Second Printing, revised 1969. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas:* Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Hayes, J. (1970) Cognition and the Development of Language. New York: Wiley.

Heller, M. (1995) Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society* 24, pp 373-405.

Helman, C. (2001) Culture, health and illness (Fourth Edition): New York, Oxford University Press.

Higgins, E., & Kruglanski, A. (eds), Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles. New York.

Hoffman, C. (1991) *An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Longman, London.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences: comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organizations across cultures.* London: Sage.

Holliday, A. (2002) Doing and Writing Qualitative Research. London, Sage.

Holliday, A. (2005) The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2007a) Doing and Writing Qualitative Research (Second Edition). Sage.

Holliday, A. (2007b) The persistence of constructions of superiority and inferiority in cultural description, *Canterbury Christ Church University (unpublished paper).*

Holliday, A. (2011) Intercultural Communication and Ideology. Sage.

Holmes, J. (1990) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Longman, London and New York.

Holmes, J. & Meyerhoff, M. (1999) The Community of Practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research: *Language in Society* 28, 2, pp 173-183.

Holmes, J. & Meyerhoff, M. (eds) (2003) The handbook of language and gender. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hong, Y., Benet-Martı´nez, V., Chiu, C. & Morris, M. (2003) Boundaries of Cultural Influence: Construct activation as a mechanism for cultural differences in social perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* pp 453–464.

Huber, M., Clandinin, D. & Huber, J. (2006) Relational responsibilities as narrative inquirers: *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue,* 8(1 & 2), pp 209-223.

Huber, J. & Whelan, K. (1999) A marginal story as a place of possibility: Negotiating self on the professional knowledge landscape. Teaching and Teacher Education, 15, pp 301-396.

Hudson, G. (2000) *Essential introductory linguistics*. Blackwell Publishers.

Huerta, A. (1977) *The acquisition of bilingualism: A code-switching approach.* Sociolinguistic Working Paper No. 39, pp 1-33.

Jaeger, J. (1998) Brain and Language: Does sex make a difference? In Wertheim, S., Bailey, A. & Corston-George, M. (eds) *Engendering Communication: Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, pp 221-233.

Jandt, F. (2004) An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a global community (Fourth Edition). London, Sage.

Janesick, V. (2000) The choreography of qualitative research design: minuets, improvisations and crystallization. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Second edition) Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Jenkins, J. (2007) English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity. Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, B. (2008) Discourse Analysis (Second Edition). Blackwell Publishing.

Kidd, W. (2002) Culture and Identity. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrove.

Kolb. D. & Fry, R. (1975) Toward an applied theory of experiential learning. In Cooper, C. (ed) *Theories of Group Process,* London: John Wiley, pp 33-57.

Kornakov, P. (2000). Bilingualism in Children: Classifications, Questions and Problems. Bilinguals and Bilingual Interpreters. *Hermeneus* 3 (2001), pp 155-192. (St. Petersburg State University, Russia/University of Bradford, West Yorkshire, UK).

Kovács, A. (2008) Early bilingualism enhances mechanisms of false-belief reasoning: *Developmental Science.* (Online) Available at DOI:10:1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00742.X)

Kramsch, C. (2000) 'Linguistic identities at the boundaries' Paper presented as the annual convention of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada, 12-14th March.

Krashen, S. (1981) Second Language Acquisition and Learning. London: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982) Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kress, G. (1990) Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2003) Comments on Jennifer Jenkins's 'Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity', *TESOL Quarterly,* 40 (3), pp 604-613.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2007) Cultural Globalisation and Language Education. Yale: Yale University Press.

Kvale, S. (1996) Interviews. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Labov, W. (1972) Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (1981) Speech actions and reactions in personal narrative. In Tannen, D. (ed) *Analysing Discourse Text and Talk. Georgetown University Round Table.* Washington D.C. Georgetown University Press, pp 217-247.

Lam, W. (2004) Second Language Socialization in a bilingual chatroom. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*, pp 44-65.

Lambert-Sen, M. (2011) The Privilege of Speaking English. *British Community Newsletter,* June 2011, pp 3-4.

Lantolf, J. (1996) SLA theory building: Letting all the flowers bloom! *Language Learning*, 46, pp 713-749.

Lantolf, J. & Pavlenko, A. (2001) (S)econd (L)anguage (A)ctivity theory: Understanding second language learners as people. In Breen, M. (ed) *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited: pp 141-158.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

Leopold, W. (1939-1949) Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: A Linguist's Record (Four volumes). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL.

Le Page, R. & Tabouret-Keller (1985) Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Ethnicity and Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liang, X. (2006) Identity and language functions: High school Chinese immigrant students' code-switching dilemmas in ESL classes. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,* 5 (2), pp 143-167.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R. & Zilber, T. (1998) Narrative Research: Reading, Analysis and Interpretation. London, Sage.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA. Sage.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (2000) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Second Edition) Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage, pp 163-188.

Li Wei (ed) (2000) The Bilingualism Reader. London: Routledge.

Lustig, M. & Koester, J. (1999) Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures. Third Edition. New York: Longman.

Mackey, W. (1962) The description of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 7. In Harding, E. & Riley, P. (1986) *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents.* New York, Melbourne. Cambridge University Press, pp 51-58.

Mackey, W. (1970) The description of bilingualism. In Fishman, J. (ed) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague, Mouton, pp 554-584.

Mackintosh, M. & Mooney, G. (2004) Identity, inequality and social class. In Woodward, K. (ed) *Questioning Identity: Gender, Class, Nation (Second Edition).* London: Routledge, pp 79-114.

MacLean, L., Mechthild, M. & Alma, E. (2004) Improving Accuracy of Transcripts in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research* 14(1), pp 113–123.

Mango, A. (2004) *The Turks Today:* John Murray Publishers.

Mathews, G. (2000) Global Culture/individual identity: Searching for a home in the cultural supermarket. London: Routledge.

Maxwell, J. (1996) Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. London, Sage.

McKay, S. & Wong, S. (1996) Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescence immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review, 66* (3), pp 557-608.

McSweeney, B. (2002) Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: a triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations* 55/1, pp 89-118.

Mercer, K. (1990) Welcome to the jungle. In Rutherford, J. (ed) *Identity: community, culture, difference.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp 43-71.

Merriam, S. (1988) Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merrill, B. & West, L. (2009) Using Biographical Methods in Social Research. Sage.

Merton, R. (1996) On social structure and science. University of Chicago Press.

Miller, J. (2003) Audible Difference: ESL and Social Identity in Schools. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mills, S. (1997) Discourse. London, Routledge.

Milroy, L. (1987) Observing and Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (2004) Second Language Learning Theories (Second Edition). London, Arnold.

Montgomery, M. (2007) An Introduction to Language and Society (Second Edition). Routledge.

Moore, C. (2009) The Discursive Workings of Identity and Power in Intercultural Encounters: Mexican and North American Talk as 'Cultural Brokerage'. PhD Thesis, Canterbury Christ Church University.

Morita, N. (2004) Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities, *TESOL Quarterly,* 38 (4), pp 573-603.

Nash, C. (1990) Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in Sciences, Philosophy and Literature. London, Routledge.

Navarro, Z. (2006) In Search of Cultural Intepretation of Power: *IDS Bulletin* 37(6).

Neuman, W. (2000) Social Research Methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (Fourth Edition). Burton: Allyn & Bacon.

Nguyen, A. & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007) Biculturalism Unpacked: Components, Measurement, Individual Differences, and Outcomes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass 1*, pp 101-114.

Noddings, N. (1986) Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review,* 56(4), pp 496-510.

Norton, B. (1995) Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 29, No. 1.* Spring 1995, pp 13-18.

Norton, B. (2000a) Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Norton, B. (2000b) Identity and Language Learning. London, Longman.

Norton, B. (2001) Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom In Breen, M. (ed) *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research.* Harlow, Longman, pp 159-171.

Norton Pierce, B. (1995) Social identity, investment, and language learning, *TESOL Quarterly,* 29 (1), pp 9-31.

Norton, B. & Pavlenko, A. (2004) Gender and English language learners: Challenges and possibilities. In Norton, B. & Pavlenko, A. (eds) *Gender and English Language Learners.* Virginia: TESOL Inc, pp 1-11.

Ochs, E. (1992) Indexing Gender. In Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (eds) Rethinking context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp 335-358.

Ochs, E. (1996) Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In Gumperz, J. & Levinson, S. (eds) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp 407-437.

O'Malley, J. & Chamot, A. (1990) Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omoniyi, T. (2006) Hierarchy of identities. In Omoniyi, T, & White, G. (eds) The Sociolinguistics of Identity. London: Continuum, pp 11-33.

Omoniyi, T. & White, G. (eds) (2006) The Sociolinguistics of Identity. London, Continuum.

Oxford, R., Hollaway, M. & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992) Language learning styles: research and practical considerations for teaching the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. System, 20 (4), pp 439–456.

Paivio, A. (1971) Imagery and Verbal Processes. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Paivio, A. (1986) Mental Representations. New York: Oxford University Press.

Paivio, A. & Begg, I. (1981) The Psychology of Language. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Pallotti, G. (2001) External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations. In Di Luzio, A., Gunther, S. & Orletti, F. (eds) *Culture in Communication.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp 295-334.

Patton, M. (2002) Qualitative research and evaluation methods (third edition). California, Sage.

Pavlenko, A. (2001) Bilingualism, gender and ideology, *The International Journal of Bilingualism,* 5 (2), pp 117-152.

Pavlenko, A. (2002) Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in L2. In Cook, V. (ed) *Portraits of the L2 User.* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp 277-302.

Pavlenko, A (2004) "Stop doing that, ia komu skazala!" Emotions and language choice in bilingual families. Journal of Multicultural Development 25, pp 179-203.

Pavlenko, A. &, Blackledge, A. (eds) (2004) Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. & Lantolf, J. (2000) Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In Lantolf, J. (ed) *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 155-178.

Pavlenko, A. & Piller, I. (2001) New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender. In Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., Piller, I. & Teutsch-Dwyer, M. (eds) *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender.* Berlin, Mouton de Gryter, pp 17-52.

Peal, E. & Lambert, W. (1962) Relation of bilingualism to intelligence: *Psycholingual Monographs, 76, pp 1-23.*

Pellegrino, A. (2005) Study Abroad and Second Language Use: Constructing the Self. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. (1995) English in the world/The world in English. In Tollefson, J. (ed) *Power and Inequality in Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 11-30.

Pennycook, A. (2001) Critical Applied Linguistics. A Critical Introduction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Phillipson, R. (1992) Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Phinney, J. (1999) An intercultural approach in psychology: Cultural contact and identity. Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin.

Piaget, J. (1923) The Language and Thought of the Child (*Le Langage et la pensée chez l'enfant*). London: Routledge (Kegan, P. 1962)

Piller, I. (2001) Linguistic intermarriage: Language choice and negotiation of identity. In Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., Piller, I. & Teutsch-Dwyer, M. (eds*) Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender.* Mouton De Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp 210-217.

Piller, I. (2002) Bilingual couple's talk: the discursive construction of hybridity. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pinker, S. (2007) The stuff of thought. London, Allen Lane.

Pinnegar, S. & Daynes, J. (2006) Locating narrative inquiry historically: Thematics in the turn to narrative. In Clandinin D. (ed) *Handbook of Narrrative Inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter One.

Putnam, R. (2001) Social Capital: Measurement and Consequences. *ISUMA* (Spring), pp 41–51.

Rampton, B. (1995) Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among adolescents. London: Longman.

Raubicheck, L. (1934) Psychology of Multilingualism. *The Volta Review, 36,* pp 17-20.

Reismann, C. & Speedy, J. (2007) Narrative inquiry in the psychotherapy professions: A critical review: In Clandinin, D. (ed) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, pp 426-456.

Richards, K. (2003) Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Richardson, L. (2003) Writing and interpreting qualitative materials. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Second Edition. London: Sage, pp 499-541.

Romaine, S. (1989) Bilingualism (Second edition). London: Blackwell.

Saer, O. (1923) The effects of bilingualism on intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology 14*, pp 25-38.

Said, E. (1978) Orientalism. Random House: New York, Canada.

Sarup, M. (1996) Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World. Edinburgh University Press.

Saunders, G. (1982) *Bilingual Children: Guidance for the Family.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Schieffellin, B. & Ochs, E. (1986) Language socialization, *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 15, pp 163-191.

Schiffrin, D. (1996) Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity, *Language in Society*, 25 (2), pp 167-203.

Schmidt, S. (2007) Histories & Discourses: Rewriting Constructivism. Exeter: Imprint-Academic.

Schofield, J. (2002) Increasing the Generalizability of Qualitative Research. In Huberman, M. & Miles, M. (eds) *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion.* Thousand Oaks, Sage, pp 171-203.

Schudson, M. (1994) Culture and the Integration of National Societies. In Crane, D. (ed) *The Sociology of Culture.* Oxford, Blackwell, pp 21-43.

Schumann, J. (1978) The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In Gringas, R. (ed) *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching.* Washington DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics, pp 27-50.

Schwandt, T. (2001) Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1997) Political, Personal, and Commercial Discourse of National Sovereignty: Hong Kong becomes China. In Lauristin, M. (ed) *Intercultural communication and changing national identities.* Tartu: Tartu University Press, pp 49-71.

Searlemann, A. & Herrmann, D. (1994) Memory from a Broader Perspective. New York: McGraw Hill.

Segalowitz, N. (1977) Psychological perspectives on bilingual education. In Spolsky, B. & Cooper, R. (eds) *Frontiers of Bilingual Education,* Massachusetts: Newbury House, pp 119-158.

Shi, X. (2006) Gender, identity and intercultural transformation in second language socialisation: *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 6 (1), pp 4-7.

Silverman, D. (2005) Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook (Second Edition). London, Sage.

Simon. R. (1992) Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Skeggs, B. (2005) The re-branding of class: Propertising culture. In Devine, F., Savage, M., Scott, J. & Compton, R. (eds) *Rethinking Class: Culture, Identities and Lifestyles.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 46-68.

Skinner, B. (1957) Verbal Behavior. Acton, MA: Copley Publishing Group.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981) Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities. *Multilingual Matters 7.*

Smith, M. (1939) Some light on the problem of bilingualism as found from a study of the progress in mastery of English among pre-school children of non-American ancestry in Hawaii. *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* 21, pp 119-284.

Smith, M. (1949) Measurement of vocabularies of young bilingual children in both of the languages used. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 74,* pp 309.

Søndergaard, M. (2004) '"In my opinion" – on Cultural differences"' (Online) Available at http://geert-hofstede.international-business-center.com/geert_hofstede_contrarian_position.shtml

Stake, R. (1995) The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stephenson, S. (2000) Narrative. In Browning, G. & Hacli, A. & Webster, F (eds) *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present.* London, Sage, pp 112-125.

Sternberg, R. (1977) Intelligence, Information Processing and Analogical Reasoning. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sticht, T. (1975) Applications of the Audread model to reading evaluation and instruction. In Resnick, L. & Weaver, P. (eds), Theory and Practice of Early Reading , Volume 1. Hillsdale , NJ: Erlbaum, pp 209-226.

Sticht, T. (1976) Comprehending reading at work. In Just, M. & Carpenter, P. (eds.), Cognitive Processes in Comprehension. Hillsdale , NJ: Erlbaum.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sumner, W. (1906) Folkways. New York: Ginn.

Swain, M. (1972) Bilingualism as a First Language. Ph.D. thesis: University of California at Irvine.

Swain, M. (1976) Bilingual First Language Acquisition. In Von Raffles-Engel, W. & Lebrun, Y. (eds) *Baby Talk and Infant Speech.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeilinger: pp 277-280.

Tajfel, H. (1974) Social Identity and intergroup behaviour, *Social Science Information,* 13 (2), pp 65-93.

Tannen, D. (1990) You just don't understand: Men and women in conversation. New York: William Morrow.

Tollefson, J. (1995) Power and Inequality in Language Education. Cambridge University Press.

Toohey, K. (2001) Disputes in child L2 learning, *TESOL Quarterly,* 35 (2), pp 257-278.

Triandis, H. (1995) Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. (2004) Foreword. In Landis, D., Bennet, J., and Bennet, M. (eds) *Handbook of Intercultural Training,* Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp ix-xii.

Trudgill, P. (2000) Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society. Penguin.

van Dijk, T. (1986) News as Discourse. New York: Longman.

van Dijk, T. (1999) Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society.* 1999, 10, pp 459–460.

van Dijk, T. (2008) Discourse and Power. Palgrave: Macmillan.

van Lagenhove, L. & Harré, R. (1999) Introducing positioning theory. In Harré, R. & van Lagenhove, L. (eds) *Positioning Theory. Moral contexts of intentional action.* Malden. MA: Blackwell, pp 14-31.

Van Lier, L. (1994) Forks and hope: Pursuing understanding in different ways. *Applied Linguistics,* 15, pp 328-347.

Vygotsky, L. (1962) Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wang, X. (2008) Growing up with Three Languages: Birth to Eleven. Multilingual Matters, Canada.

Wacquant, L. (2005) Habitus. *International Encyclopedia of Economic Sociology.* Becket, J. and Milan, Z. London, Routledge.

Watson-Gegeo, K. & Nielsen, S. (2003) Language socialization in SLA. In Doughty, C. & Long, M. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, Blackwell, pp 155-177.

Webb, J., Schirato, R. & Danaher, G. (2010) Understanding Bourdieu. Sage.

Weedon, C. (1997) Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory. London: Blackwell.

Weinreich, U. (1968) *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Mouton Publishers, The Hague.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987) Learning Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wenger, E. (1998) Communities of practice: Language, Meaning and Identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. (2002) Cultivating Communities of Practice. Harvard Business Press: First edition.

Williams, J. (1915) *Mother-Tongue and Other-Tongue:* A Study in Bilingual Teaching. Bangor: Jarvis and Foster.

Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999) The Discursive Construction of National Identity. Translated by Hirsh, A. & Mitten, R. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) (2001) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Wode, H. (1978) Developmental sequences in naturalistic L2 acquisition. In Hatch, E. (ed) *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings:* Massachusetts, pp 101-117.

Woodward, K. (1997) The concepts of identity and difference. In Woodward, K. (ed) *Identity and Difference.* London, Sage, pp 7-62.

Woodward, K. (2000) Questions of identity. In Woodward, K. (ed) *Questioning Identity: Gender, Class, Nation.* London: Routledge, pp 5-41.

Yamamoto, M. (2005) What makes who choose what language to whom? Language use in Japanese-Filipino interlingual families in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8 (6),* pp 588-606.

Yoshika, J. (1929) A study in bilingualism. *Journal of Genetic Psychology 36*, pp 477-483.

Zahiri-Farnoody, N. (n.d.) Biculturalism among Iranian American College Students. (Online)

Available at http://www.ashena.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=751

(accessed 29.03.09)

Appendix 1: Example of Labov's Elements of Narrative in an Interview

Type of Clause	Extract

Abstract:
A clause summarizing the story to come. The abstract announces that the narrator has a story to tell and makes a claim to the right to tell it.

→ Elizabeth: I must say, on a serious point, that when we used to go out, I used to have to sit in the corner at a corner table and I had to sit in a chair facing the wall so I was unavailable. And on several occasions he hit people on other tables because... and he always said 'you've done something to make them look at you'. I don't know what I'd done.

Orientation:
Introduces the characters, temporal and physical setting and situation.

→ And once we were on a *dolmuş* (a public minibus, popular in Turkey) there was this child, and he was only about sixteen, and he turned around and looked at me because we were speaking in English, and so my husband turned around and hit the child.

Complicating Action:
Recapitulate a sequence of events leading up to the climax of the story. They create tension and keep auditors listening.

→ And the *dolmuş* driver got out and the child got out, and the *dolmuş* driver just told him 'run'. And the child got out and started running, and my husband got out and started running after him, and he left me in the *dolmuş* with no money to pay the driver.

Evaluation:
Underscoring what is unusual about the story. Often occurs just before the resolution.

→ I mean, how irresponsible. He wasn't really thinking about me.

Result or Resolution:
Releases the tension and tells what finally happened.

→ And then I said to the *dolmuş* driver, you know 'I'm ever so sorry'. So I had to get out and I had to walk home because I had no money, and later on, he sort of came home and apparently he stayed outside the child's flat and he told me that he told the child on the bus 'you looked at my wife' and the child said 'I wouldn't look at that old woman!'

Based on Johnstone (2008: 92-93)

Appendix 2: Declaration of Adherence to Appropriate Ethical Procedures for Research

Canterbury
Christ Church
University

Declaration of adherence to appropriate ethical procedures for research

undertaken with human participants in countries outside the United Kingdom

❑   I declare that I, **Caroline Fell**

have followed all the necessary procedures to ensure that the research involving human participants I have carried out, or intend to carry out, entitled:

LANGUAGE USE WITHIN BILINGUAL FAMILIES:
STORIES FROM ISTANBUL

…between 01.09.2007 and 31.08.2012 as part of my research degree, conforms in full to the ethical requirements of that country.

❑   I have acquired all the necessary permission from all the necessary parties with regard to access, use of research instruments or any other invasive procedures, and confidentiality.

❑   I have made the purpose of my research appropriately clear to all the parties that I am required to, and have behaved appropriately in response to the outcomes of this communication.

❑   I attach a copy of any regulatory or ethical documentation/certificates that I have had to sign or have been awarded by the jurisdiction within which I am operating.

Signed:

Caroline Fell

Date:

AN INVESTIGATION INTO LANGUAGE USE WITHIN BILINGUAL FAMILIES:

STORIES FROM ISTANBUL

Dear (individual names added here),

The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in my doctoral research project. Please feel free to decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time if you so wish. The purpose of this study is to investigate:

Language Use within Bilingual Families

Data will be collected and discussed at three points:

- at the start of the study in the form of an interview recorded onto a Dictaphone;

- in the middle of the study for us to discuss ideas and for me to ask follow up questions either face to face or via email depending on suitability;

- towards the end of the investigation when I will present perceptions, analysis and interpretations based on our interviews for us to discuss, critique, and for you to agree or disagree with how your views and perceptions have been represented.

In the interests of anonymity, if you decide to participate, you will be able to choose a pseudonym for yourself, your partner and your children. Your identity will not be revealed in the thesis or in subsequent articles or presentations and will only be known to the researcher.

The outcome of this research will be presented as a doctoral thesis, as articles in publications such as the British Community Council and international school newsletters, and in presentations at international groups or universities.

Please do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study, either before participating or during the time that you are participating. I will be happy to share my findings with you after the research is completed.

  Please sign your consent with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the procedures.

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   Date

Caroline Fell – Doctoral Research Student: Canterbury Christ Church University

Interview Protocol

'What does it mean to be an individual in a bilingual family in Istanbul?'

Time of Interview: _____ Date:_____ Place:_____

Interviewees: _____

(Briefly describe the project)

Questions (Background):

1. Tell me about what brought you to Turkey (to 'English' participants) and, if relevant, tell me what took you to the UK (to Turkish participants).
2. Tell me about how you met your partner.
3. Tell me about your families' reactions to your marriage.
4. Tell me about other people's reactions to your marriage.
5. Tell me about your employment history.
6. Tell me about your children's schooling.

Questions (Language):

1. Do you describe yourself as bilingual? Why/Why not?
2. Describe the use of languages in your home from when you first got together until today.
3. Have patterns of language use changed over the duration of your marriage?
4. Which other languages occur in your family's lives? Describe.
5. How have your children's languages developed?
6. Do you feel there are advantages or disadvantages to being in a bilingual family?
7. How do you feel your bilingual family status is viewed by others?
8. Does bilingualism play a role in your employment?
9. Do you have any special stories you would like to share about your family's experiences?

(Thank individuals for participating in this interview and assure about the confidentiality of responses and the confidentiality of any further communication).

Appendix 5: Extract from Interview Notes Showing Additional Comments about the Behaviour and Attitudes of Participants and my Reading of the Situation

---

Taken from interview with Graham and Alya

Graham: Yes, when we have Noddy books in English and Turkish, Alya says when she reads them, and perhaps it's the way they translate it, but she says if she reads Noddy in Turkish it's not as interesting, it's boring.

Alya: It's that it doesn't get to the child's level. It's more like it's aimed at the adults.

Graham: I think it's your upbringing as well. Sometimes Alya's language, I mean the way she's been brought up is more stronger and disciplined and more harsh than I talk in some ways because I've been brought up a lot more kind of easy-going. It's a different cultural thing, to do with your upbringing. But I think that your underlying culture comes into your language a lot, because you can't separate yourself from your culture.

Description: Eren starts screaming to get his parents' attention; he's bored with the attention that his parents are giving to me. Graham jumps down onto the carpet and starts playing boats with Eren. As he plays with Eren, he starts joking that he and Alya are expressing views during this interview that they may not have shared with each other before, views that each of them may not have been aware that their partner harboured. Graham jokes that he's going to be in trouble when I leave, and from Alya's expression, I think he may be right. I am acutely reminded of the delicate position of being a researcher and how my interview, even though totally unintended, may have a direct impact on the participants involved. In this case, I am sensing that some of Graham's previously unspoken opinions are irritating, if not angering his wife. It is clear Alya may not have been aware of some of Graham's opinions previously. Alya turns the conversation back to Rob's lack of willingness to learn Turkish.

229

Appendix 6: Starting to Identify Emerging Themes: A Reduced Extract from my Spreadsheet

	Leyla	Elizabeth	Myself	Research Diary
Advantages of Bilingualism	Ease of Learning	Ease of Learning		
Aspects of Bilingualism	Selective Bilingualism	Selective Monolingualism		
Code-switching for the Benefit of Others			Getting Attention	
Code-switching for the Benefit of Others			To Involve those around You	*To exclude those around you - Interviewing the nanny*
Code-switching for the Benefit of Others			When Two Languages are Used in One Conversation	
When Culltural Norms Differ		Norms of Behaviour		*Approaches to medicine*
When Cultural Norms Differ	Culture and Gender	Culture and Gender	Cengiz watching Kubra - add notes to Maureen's interview	
When Culltural Norms Differ		Exam Grades		
The Community		Understanding Social Status		*DP commenting on teachers' choice of husbands*
Concepts of Truth				*Your washing machine will be ready on Wednesday*
Between Languages and Cultures		Speaking in One Language Acting in another Culture		
Feeling or Perceived as Foreign	Feeling like a Foreigner in your own Country	Feeling like a Foreigner in your own Country		
Parental Choice of Names		Parental Choice of Names		*How we chose Yasemin and Onur*
Choice of School	Choice of School			*My choice of school history*
Cultural Acquisition and Television		Cultural Acquisition and Television	Which channels and languages are watched and why	
Bilingualism and the Family	When Languages are Lost or Change over Generations	When Languages are Lost or Change over Generations	When Languages are Lost or Change over Generations	
Bilingualism and the Family		The Effect of Sibling Order		
Bilingualism and the Family			Titles for Family Members	
Acting Like a Native		Causing Offence	See research diary, how I offended Parent Liaison Officer about International School 2	*Example from Marmaris market*
Sounding Like a Native	Learning Turkish (Motivation and Barriers)	Learning Turkish (Motivation and Barriers)	Learning Turkish (Motivation and Barriers)	
Sounding Like a Native	Accents	Accents	Accents	
Becoming a Native?	Citizenship		Citizenship	