

Maria Antonina Obojska*
‘Ikke snakke norsk?’ – Transnational adolescents and negotiations of family language policy explored through family interview

<https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2018-0058>

Abstract: Multilingual families and their language policies have attracted considerable attention in recent sociolinguistic work. Adding to this line of research, this article focuses on a case study of a transnational Polish family living in Norway and investigates the role adolescent children may play in the formation of family language policies. To this end the article analyses stances towards language practices at home taken in an interaction between the father and one of the adolescent daughters of the family. The article argues that the perspectives of adolescent children may be of crucial importance for the establishment of family language policies and thus deserve scholarly attention. Methodologically, the article draws attention to family interviews as a useful tool in generating socio-linguistic data for studies of Family Language Policies and advocates an interactional approach to interview data.

Keywords: family language policy, transnational families, adolescents

1 Introduction

Multilingualism in family contexts attracted attention from researchers already in the first half of the twentieth century (Grammont 1902; Ronjat 1913; Leopold 1939–1949). This interest persisted over the following decades with varying intensity, regaining impetus after 1980 with studies investigating children’s bilingualism from sociolinguistic perspectives (Döpke 1992; Fantini 1985; Lanza 1992, 1997/2004; Svendsen 2004). In an effort to consolidate the growing sociolinguistic body of research investigating multilingualism in families, King et al. (2008), delineated the field of Family Language Policy and thus marked its symbolic establishment. Since then studies on language practices, language ideologies and language management in transnational families have abounded (see e.g.

*Corresponding author: **Maria Antonina Obojska**, Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing), Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, Universitetet i Oslo Det humanistiske fakultet, Oslo, Norway, E-mail: m.a.obojska@iln.uio.no

Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza 2018; Fogle 2012; King and Lanza 2017; Lanza & Wei, 2016; Schwartz and Verschik 2013; Smith-Christmas 2015). The field draws on interdisciplinary perspectives and is grounded in previous research on family bilingualism, combining insights from sociolinguistic, anthropological and language socialization work. Traditionally the field of FLP has been interested in parental perspectives (Curdt-Christiansen 2009; King and Fogle 2006; Kirsch 2012), however, more recently sociolinguists interested in FLP identified the need for more research focusing on children's agency, ideologies and perceptions regarding the language policies at home (e.g. Fogle 2013; Smith-Christmas 2017). In response to this call, basing on a case study of a Polish transnational family living in Norway, this article analyses the stance of a Polish adolescent girl towards a family language policy proposed by her parents, as constructed in an interaction with her father. As noted by Kamada (2009), in comparison to younger children, adolescents tend to have a better grasp of language as a means of articulating and expressing themselves, as well as of achieving various discursive means. They may also be generally more capable of expressing and elaborating on motifs for their language preferences and thus their accounts are of particular interest to researchers interested in metalinguistic talk.

The recent socio-political changes in central and Eastern Europe, including the EU expansions, resulted in an intensification of both short and long-term migration from the countries previously associated with the Eastern block, among them Poland. Many Eastern European transnationals choose Norway as the country of destination due to its geographical proximity and favourable working conditions. In particular, Norway has observed a rise in the numbers of migrants from Lithuania and Poland in recent years. In fact, since 2008 the Poles have been the biggest minority in the country and, according to recent statistics, there are around 100 000 Polish transnationals currently living in Norway (SSB, 2017). Poland has also been reported to be the top country for family-reunifications in Norway since 2008. In fact, Polish transnationals constitute significant minorities in many Western-European countries, e.g. Ireland, the UK, Iceland, the Netherlands and Germany. Studying the experiences of Polish adults and children in Norway may contribute not only to our understanding of the experiences and challenges faced by Polish transnationals in Norway but also elsewhere. Moreover, in the context of increased transnational migration in Europe and the resulting increased numbers of transnational families, studying Polish families in Norway may shed light on the experiences of transnational families in general.

The aim of this article is to elucidate the role of children, and adolescent children in particular, in the processes related to the formation of Family Language Policies of transnational families. To this end, the article analyses

stances towards family language practices taken in a discussion between an adolescent Polish girl and her parents which occurred in an interview situation. The article argues that the perspectives of adolescent children may significantly influence language practices at home and thus should be taken into consideration by scholars interested in Family Language Policy. Methodologically, the article draws attention to family interviews as privileged sites for studying discursive (re)constructions of Family Language Policy and advocates an interactional approach to interview data.

2 Children, family language policy and stance in interviews

Initially, Family Language Policy was defined as explicit (Shohamy 2006) and overt (Schiffman 1996) planning in relation to language use within the home among family members' (King et al. 2008). Later on, in line with the developments in the larger Language Policy field, this definition was expanded to include also "implicit" and "covert" language planning endeavours in the family (Curdts-Christiansen 2009, 2012; King and Fogle 2017). As noted by Curdts-Christiansen and Lanza (2018), encouragement or disapproval of certain language use can serve as implicit language planning strategies [125] and thus implicit and subconscious decisions may be made through language-mediated socialisation routines.

As noted above, early work in the field of Family Language Policy focused on parental perspectives, ideologies, practices and language management strategies in looking at family's language use (Curdts-Christiansen 2009; King et al. 2008; King and Fogle 2006). Subsequent research has drawn attention to the importance of children's agency, language ideologies and practices in shaping family language policies. For example (Gafaranga 2010) showed how children's medium requests in parent-child interactions contribute to the language shift in Kinyarwanda families living in Belgium. Palviainen and Boyd (2013) demonstrated how children act as "language police" at home modifying parental language practices. Fogle and King (2013) documented how older children in three different transnational families impacted parental policy making efforts and resisted the use of majority language at home. More recently, Crump (2017) showed that even pre-school children are active agents in FLP and maintain their stances towards languages across different contexts.

In the same vein, Smith-Christmas (2017), delineating new directions in the field of FLP, acknowledges the importance of children's perspectives and

stances towards language practices and management at home and calls for the use of methodological approaches eliciting children perspectives on language. In response to this call, this article proposes family interviews as a method useful in accessing language ideologies and metalinguistic awareness of both parents and adolescent children. Previously in sociolinguistic work interested in FLP, interviews with members of more than one generation were used by (Bernal Lorenzo 2017; Doyle 2013), however, the data provided by the parents and their children were treated as separate accounts. In this article, I argue for a more interactional approach to interview data, especially the ones produced in a family setting. As will be illustrated by the data in Section 4, interviewing family members of different generations together creates a rich interactional environment in which the current, past and future language practices of the family can be discussed. This particular format encourages exchange of (opposing) views on the family's language policies and thus can facilitate the researcher's access to perspectives and language ideologies constructed by individual family members in relation to the different linguistic resources used by the family.

Exchanging opinions necessarily involves expressing evaluations and it is precisely here, where the framework of *stance* comes in as a tool for approaching interview data. *Stance* has recently gained considerable attention in the literature (Biber and Finegan 2009; Du Bois 2007; Englebretson 2007; Jaffe 2009) and is a concept that accounts for the ways people relate to the object of the talk, the talk itself and their interlocutors in interaction. Perhaps one of the most influential definitions of stance was provided by Du Bois (2007: 163) in his 'stance triangle' model, which describes stance as:

a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gesture, or other symbolic forms), through which social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field

(2007: 163)

Traditionally, stances have been divided into *epistemic* and *affective* ones (see e.g. Jaffe 2009; Ochs 1990, Ochs 1996), the former referring to the knowledge, beliefs and certainty and commitment to a proposition and the latter to the attitudinal, dispositional and attitudinal dimension of an evaluation. The advantage of Du Bois's model lies in uniting all these aspects of stance instead of seeking to distinguish between different types of stances. In his model, stances are, namely, three-dimensional acts in which the interactants express evaluations of *stance objects* and by doing so, on the one hand, take up certain affective and epistemic positions, which simultaneously influence the positions

of their interlocutors, and, on the other hand, display different degrees of alignment with what has been said (and done) before.

Du Bois's stance model may prove especially helpful in the analysis of sociolinguistic interview data (Morgan 2017; Nylund 2017), in particular (but not only) in case of interviews involving more than one interviewee at a time, such as family interviews. Its usefulness here lies primarily in its focus on *evaluation* and *dialogism*. Family interviews with members of more than one generation are namely likely to involve features of conflict talk, i.e. exchange of differing views. As noted by Hua (2008), intergenerational talk in general is often marked by differences of views, as speakers having different life-experiences tend also to hold divergent opinions on the matters of mutual concern. This may be particularly relevant for transnational families where life experiences of the different generations may vary greatly due to migration, which in turn may result in opposing beliefs and opinions (*ibidem*). These differences may surface in the interview situation in form of different evaluations of stance objects, such as for example experiences of migrations and languages.

The dialogic dimension of the stance framework is particularly suited to account for the interactional character of interviews and allows the analyst to approach the situation as a communicative event in its own right. As pointed out by e.g. (De Fina and Perrino 2011) and (Block 2000), such an understanding of interviews involves seeing the resulting data not as 'true' representations of events, stories and situations reported on by the interviewees but rather as co-constructed and situationally-occasioned representations thereof. This is precisely where stance comes in as a useful analytical tool. Analysing interview data through the lens of stance results, namely, in diverging the focus of the analysis from decontextualized contributions of the interviewees and, by considering interactional development of alignment and positioning patterns leads instead to a more nuanced understanding of data as context-dependent and produced jointly by all interactants.

3 Participants, methods and data

The data for this study were generated as part of a larger study on multilingualism in the lives of transnational Poles in Norway. The whole data set consists of interviews with 26 Poles living in and around Oslo: 14 adults aged 35–50 and 12 adolescents aged 13–19. Very often conflicting schedules of family members prevented the families from being interviewed together, which resulted in

obtaining large amounts of data from one-on-one conversations between the researcher and either a parent or a teenager. The present article focuses on data generated during a joint semi-structured interview with parents and two adolescent daughters of Family X. As will be illustrated by the data excerpts, this particular format created a richer interactional environment than individual interviews and offered space for spontaneous conversations and discussions between the family members.

Family X followed quite a typical migration route to Norway. The father of the family, Marek (49), was offered a job in Norway and moved out from Poland already in 2013. His wife, Aga (46) and their two daughters, Kasia (18) and Maja (15), joined him one year later using the family reunification program. Marek is an engineer by education and works in his profession in a private company in Norway. Aga has a degree in biotechnology but at the time of the interview she was working as a kindergarten assistant. Both daughters attend Norwegian secondary schools in the town where the family resides. Maja is interested in drawing and painting and would like to study art in the future. Kasia's interests include languages, literature and philosophy and she would like to further engage with humanities after she is done with secondary education. The contact to the family was provided by another participant in the study. The atmosphere at the interview was relaxed, the participants spoke freely and were eager to share their experiences of migration and multilingualism.

The shared Polish background, my age (late twenties), gender (female), as well as the fact that I recently arrived in Norway myself may have facilitated the establishment of rapport with the participants and inspired them to openly discuss their experiences. On the other hand, all these factors have also necessarily influenced the generated data, as participants position themselves and engage in stancetaking in an interview situation in response to the positions and stances adopted by the researcher and also according to their own perceptions of the interview context and interviewer's expectations. Therefore, for example, knowing that the interviewer is a linguist researching multilingualism, the participants might have chosen to present themselves as interested in learning new languages and keeping the ones they already know.

The interview took place on a Friday evening at the participants' house with the whole family present and was conducted in Polish. The interview topics included participants' experiences related to migration and multilingualism. The interview guide was used flexibly so as to accommodate the flow of conversations. The Language Portrait method (Busch 2016, Busch 2017) was used as the starting point of the interview in order to elicit participants' perspectives on their linguistic repertoires. The excerpts analysed in this paper were not directly

inspired by the language portrait activity and occurred only later in the interview when all present were discussing the family's language choices. The framework of stance was applied to account for the interactional processes of evaluation, alignment and positioning (cf. Du Bois 2007) that occurred during the participants' discussion on language practices at home.

4 Family language policy as a conflict

All family members reported to be multilingual. The father, Marek, learnt Russian in the past but currently uses Polish in his free time and English at work, as this is the working language of his company. In the future, if time allows, he would like to learn Norwegian. The mother, Aga, speaks Norwegian at work and Polish with family and friends. She also reported to have spoken competence in English, as well as some basic skills in Russian and Italian. Kasia uses Polish, English and Norwegian daily and was assessed by the other family members as 'the best' speaker of Norwegian in the family. The younger daughter, Maja, understands Norwegian well but does not feel confident speaking it yet. Thus, she negotiated with her teachers to use English in classes until her Norwegian improves. Depending on her interlocutors' skills, she uses English and Polish in communication with her friends and classmates.

When asked about the language practices at home, the participants reported to use solely Polish within the family. The parents stated, however, that at some point they considered introducing the practice of speaking either English or Norwegian on a chosen day of the week in order to create the opportunities to learn and practice the foreign languages. This idea, however, was strongly opposed by both of the daughters. Maja reported to have ignored her mother's attempts to speak English with her and to have pretended not to hear when the latter addressed her in a language other than Polish. The older daughter, Kasia, did not welcome the idea either and when the subject of speaking Norwegian at home surfaced in the interview, she engaged in an animated discussion with her father, as illustrated by the excerpts below.

Excerpt 1

1 Marek: *ja bym chciał to {mówienie po norwesku} wprowadzić, ale nikt mnie nie słucha*

I would like to introduce this {speaking Norwegian} but nobody listens to me

2 Kasia: *nie: z wami się nie da <takich rzeczy>*

No: with you {plural} it is not possible to do <such things>

- 3 Marek: <nie nie nie z wami sie> (.) *ale dlaczego nie ustalic, no?*
<no no no with you> (.) but why can't we agree on this, huh?
- 4 Kasia: *poza tym kurde no!* (.)
apart from that what the *heck!* (.)
- 5 *no dobra, no to załóźmy że będę teraz do Ciebie mówić po norwesku i co zrobisz?*
very well then, let's say I will speak Norwegian to you now and **what** are you going to do?
- 6 Marek: *no* (.) *nagram sie @*
well (.) I will record myself @
- 7 Aga, Researcher: <@@@>
- 8 Kasia: <*no wlasnie*>(.) *to jest po pierwsze bez sensu, <po drugie>*
<right> (.) firstly it makes no sense, <secondly>
- 9 Marek: <*ale nie!*> (.) *chodzi o proste sprawy, proste tematy typu 'podaj mi herbatę'*
<But no!> (.) it is about simple stuff, simple topics like 'pass me the tea'

The excerpt above starts with an explicit act of stancetaking by Marek. In line 1, he evaluates the idea of practicing Norwegian in the family as desirable by using the conjunctive mood of the verb *chcieć* ('want') and at the same time positions himself as open to multilingualism at home. In the same turn he projects his family's divergent alignment with his wish stating that 'nobody listens' to him and thus casting himself in a powerless position as well as positioning the family as reluctant towards multilingual practices at home. In line 2, Kasia indeed aligns divergently with Marek's assessment of the use of Norwegian and explicitly evaluates such practices within the family as impossible using the phrase *nie da się* ('it is not possible'). In an overlapping turn in line 3, Marek mockingly repeats Kasia's words, thus suggesting divergent alignment and after a brief pause challenges the girl's evaluation through the interrogative *ale dlaczego nie ustalić, no* ('but why can't we agree on this, huh'). In line 4, Kasia continues constructing her divergent alignment using the emotionally laden exclamative phrase *kurde no* ('what the heck') expressing frustration and irritation. After a pause, in line 5 Kasia invites her father to imagine she would start speaking Norwegian to him, thus positioning herself as a competent user of the language. The emphasis on the interrogative pronoun *co* ('what') in her question in line 5 suggests she does not believe the father would be able to converse in Norwegian, thus her turn also serves

the purpose of positioning the father as an incompetent speaker of Norwegian. In his response in line 6, Marek disaligns with Kasia by not engaging with the object of the talk, i.e. speaking Norwegian at home, and instead humorously alluding to the interview situation and the presence of the recording device. As noted by (Kiesling 2015), alignment between the interlocutors can be constructed not only on the level of *evaluation* but also it can have to do with the involvement with the discourse itself. Here, by making the humorous remark Marek rejects Kasia's argument and also claims a position of an entertainer in the interaction (since the beginning of the interview, Marek was making jokes and prompted several instances of laughter throughout the whole conversation). The attempt at humor results in Aga and the researcher laughing in line 7. (Glenn 2003) shows that shared laughter often begins with one interactant laughing first and thereby inviting the others to laugh along. Uptake of such an invitation, i.e. laughing along, creates affiliation between the interlocutors. In the excerpt above, Marek initiates the laughter at his own remark by closing his turn in line 6 with an instance of laughter and thus invites the others to laugh *with* him. Thus, the uptake of laughter by Aga and the researcher in line 7 shows alignment with Marek and ratifies his position of the entertainer in the conversation. In an overlapping turn in line 8 Kasia reinforces her negative evaluation of the stance object using the phrase *bez sensu* (lit. 'without sense'). After a brief pause, Kasia starts to further develop her argument but is promptly interrupted by her father, who disaligns with her on the level of evaluation showing explicit disagreement ('but no!') in his overlapping turn in line 9 and further specifying the kind of practices that would involve speaking Norwegian at home.

In the above exchange, the father and the daughter take very different stances towards the object of the talk, i.e. the practice of speaking Norwegian at home. They do so by expressing conflicting evaluations of the stance object and openly engaging in acts of divergent alignment. By doing so they also start crafting specific subject positions for themselves: Marek casts himself as a person welcoming speaking Norwegian at home, while Kasia positions herself, on the one hand, as an opponent of this practice and, on the other hand, implicitly casts herself as a competent user of the language. Kasia's reluctance towards adopting Norwegian for communication at home resonates with findings provided by other researchers investigating FLP in families with adolescent children. Fogle and King (2013) showed, for example, that adolescent girls of Russian and Hispanic origins opposed the use of majority language at home. Similarly, adolescents in (Doyle 2013) study on multilingual families in Estonia were found to take responsibility for their continued acquisition and development of the non-majority language.

The next excerpt stems from the same conversation and occurred about one minute after the first one finished. In the meantime, Kasia explained that she did not want to speak Norwegian with her family, as she already had to make an effort to use it daily at school and wanted to keep the home as a Polish-only space. The following excerpt starts with Kasia further explaining her reasons for not wanting to speak Norwegian at home.

Excerpt 2

- 1 Kasia: *poza tym poza tym jak będę mówić po norwesku to tata mnie w ogóle nie zrozumie*
 apart from that if I do speak Norwegian then dad won't understand me at all
- 2 Marek: *no powiedz coś*
 say something then
- 3 Kasia: *no: jeg skal ikke snakke norsk fordi jeg har ikke lyst på det. je:g jeg syns at det er ikke <så:>*
 we:ll I am not going to speak Norwegian because I don't feel like it. i: think that it is not <so:>
- 4 Marek: *<ja nie mówię> ja nie mówię(.)*
<I don't speak> I don't speak (.)
- 5 Kasia: *@ no no no?@*
@ yeah yeah yeah?@
- 6 Marek: *ja nie mówię ja mówię coś po norwesku i i i nie coś tam (.) no*
 I don't speak I speak something in Norwegian and and and not something (.) well
- 7 Aga, Maja, Maria: *@@@*
- 8 Kasia: *no właśnie*
 exactly
- 9 Marek: *ale dobrze no już coś wychyciłem*
 but fine I already grasped something
- 10 Kasia: *to nie jest wcale (.) nic nie wychwyciłeś, powiedziałam, że nie chcę rozmawiać po norwesku*
 this is not at all (.) you didn't grasp anything, I said I didn't want to speak Norwegian
- 11 *bo nie mam na to ochoty < i:>*
 because I didn't feel like it <and>
- 12 Marek: *<ikke> snakke norsk?*
<not> speak Norwegian?

- 13 Kasia: *tak* (.)
yes (.)
- 14 Marek: *no widzisz, już powtórzyłem po Tobie*
You see, I already repeated after you
- 15 Kasia: *Świetnie! Så flink du er!*
Great! You are so clever!
- 16 Marek: (...)
- 17 Aga, Maria, Kasia, Maja: @<@<@<@>
- 18 Marek: <co?!>
<what?!>
- 19 Aga: *że jesteś **bystry** @*
that you are clever@
- 20 Marek: *no to wiem od urodzenia @*
well this I have known since the day I was born @
- 21 Kasia: *a ty w ogóle mówisz po norwesku?*
and do you speak Norwegian at all?
- 22 Researcher: (.) *y: ja mówię po szwedzku*
(.) u:m i speak Swedish

Kasia starts her turn by showing divergent alignment with Marek. She negatively evaluates her father's competence in Norwegian by stating explicitly that he would not be able to understand her if she spoke the language and positions him as lacking in language skills. Her divergent alignment is also signaled on the level of discourse (Kiesling 2015) by referring to Marek in third person singular: *tata nie zrozumie* ('dad won't understand') and addressing the other participants of the conversation. In his response in line 2, Marek challenges Kasia to say something in Norwegian and thus implicitly disagrees with the girl regarding the evaluation of his Norwegian skills. Kasia aligns with Marek's request and produces a sentence in Norwegian in line 3. In her utterance speaking Norwegian (at home) is once more evaluated as undesirable through the non-idiomatic phrase *jeg har ikke lyst på det* ('I don't feel like it', lit. 'I don't fancy it'), at the same time using Norwegian the girl positions herself as a legitimate speaker of the language. The development of Kasia's argument is interrupted by Marek trying to prove his understanding of Norwegian through providing a Polish translation of Kasia's turn.

In line 5 Kasia laughs at Marek's efforts and mockingly invites further contributions from him. According to Glenn (2003: 113), *laughing at*, i.e. 'disaffiliative' laugh, is frequently marked by one interactant nominating another one as a butt of the joke. Very often, this nomination is followed by the first laugh by the

perpetrator. This is exactly the case here – Kasia initiates the disaffiliative laughter and nominates her father as the object of it. Her turn signals both an implicit negative evaluation of her father's competence in Norwegian and her divergent alignment. At the same time, through this implicit negative evaluation of Marek's performance, she claims a position of language authority for herself. In line 6 Marek attempts again to translate Kasia's utterance, thus further exposing his limited competence and causing Aga, Maja and the researcher to laugh in line 7. Here the laughter is directed at Marek's effort and can be read as a reinforcement of and response to Kasia's initial laugh in line 5 and, thus, an instance of convergent alignment with the girl and divergent alignment with her father. Kasia sums up the situation by an ironic *no właśnie* ('exactly'), which on the one hand reinforces her previous negative evaluation of Marek's skills and her divergent alignment with him regarding the use of Norwegian at home, and on the other hand strengthens her positioning as a language expert and a person controlling the interaction.

At this point Marek is not ready to give up and in his next turn in line 9 he evaluates the preceding conversation and his own efforts positively claiming that he already learnt something, thus disaligning with the negative evaluations of his performance by the other interactants and the use of Norwegian at home in general. At the same time, he positions himself as an eager and quick language learner. In line 10 Kasia abruptly disaligns with Marek by explicitly discrediting his attempts and providing the correct translation of the utterance, thus displaying knowledge and maintaining the language expert positioning. In response in line 12, Marek attempts a back-translation of Kasia's words into Norwegian. On the one hand, Marek's turn is an act of divergent alignment, as it seeks to prove Kasia wrong by demonstrating Marek's potential to acquire Norwegian, on the other hand, however, it takes an interrogative form and seeks confirmation from Kasia, thus acknowledging the girl's positioning as a language expert. Kasia's affirmative response in line 13 stresses her powerful position in the conversation. In line 14 Marek uses the girl's confirmation as a springboard to another act of divergent alignment and an opportunity to reinforce his positive evaluation of using Norwegian at home. In this turn Marek again tries to prove that his language skills had already benefited from the short conversation and maintains the position of a quick learner.

On the surface, Kasia's response in Polish and Norwegian: *świetnie! są flink du er!* ('Great! You are so clever!') is a praise and a typical way of giving encouraging positive feedback in Norwegian, however, the context of the previous turns and the emphatic intonation flag the turn in line 15 as ironic. Mocking the father subverts the traditional hierarchies within the family and shifts power relations in the family exchanges. It is no longer 'Father knows

best' dynamic described by Ochs & Taylor (1995). Contrary to this model, in the above conversation it is the father whose behavior (here, linguistic performance) becomes problematized and judged by the daughter. The mock-praise serves the purpose of negative evaluation of both Marek's language skills and the practice of using Norwegian at home, although at the same time it shows convergent alignment with his wish to practice Norwegian in the family. The use of both Polish and Norwegian in the utterance also implies Kasia's competence and ease in using the languages and thus solidifies the girl's language-expert position.

Marek's long pause following Kasia's remark exposes his lack of understanding and again provokes laughter from all the other interactants. Marek's exclamative interrogative *co?! ('what?!)* in line 18 provides evidence of his limited comprehension of Norwegian and contributes to positioning him as an incompetent user of the language. In response Aga provides a Polish translation of Kasia's remark in line 19. The laughter at the end of her turn, as well as the emphasis on the adjective *bystry ('smart')* suggests that Aga takes up Kasia's ironic stance and thus shows convergent alignment with the daughter and divergent one with the husband. Aga's behaviour also diverges strongly from 'Father knows best' model (Ochs & Taylor, 1995), as, unlike the women in Ochs & Taylor's studies, she does not support and facilitate the construction of Father's powerful and knowledgeable position in the family but instead joins in laughing at his expense. By showing the ability to translate between Norwegian and Polish Aga also positions herself as a skilled user of both languages.

In his final turn in line 20 Marek seemingly takes Kasia and Aga's ironic stance at face value agreeing that he had always been aware of his own cleverness, however, the exaggeration expressed by the adverbial of time *od urodzenia ('since I was born')* as well as the laughter at the end of the turn might be read as Marek's attempt to save his face (Goffman 1967) through an attempt to go along with the teasing and laugh with the others at himself. In the following turn (line 21), Kasia maintains her empowered position and takes over the control of the conversation by breaking the interview convention and asking the researcher a question regarding her Norwegian skills. As marked by the unnatural pause and a prolonged hedge at the beginning of the researcher's response in line 22, the sudden change of interviewer-interviewee roles takes the researcher by surprise.

In the above excerpt we observe a further development of the stances initiated by the participants in Excerpt 1. Marek further elaborates his positive affective stance towards the use of Norwegian at home and at the same time constructs himself as an eager learner. Kasia, on the other hand, develops her negative affective stance towards the language practices proposed by her father

and positions herself as a language authority. This positioning contributes later on into her taking over control of the conversation and finally stepping into the ‘interviewer’ role. Taking stance necessarily involves also positioning of others. In the excerpt above Marek plays along with Kasia’s own positioning as a language-expert through for example seeking her confirmation of the correctness of his translations. Kasia, on the other hand, rejects Marek’s positioning as an eager and quick learner and dismisses all his efforts through the negative evaluations of his language competence and positioning him as an incompetent user of Norwegian.

The other participants of the interview act as an audience in the two interview excerpts and contribute to the development of stances and positions through acts of convergent and divergent alignment with the two main interactants. The interviewer’s contributions in both data extracts are minimal and limited to instances of laughter. Nevertheless, the presence of the interviewer could have influenced the participants’ accounts in several ways. Firstly, it was the interview situation and the discussed topics (multilingualism and migration) that sparked the discussion between Kasia and Marek, which otherwise might have not occurred at all or might not have been pursued at length and with the same level of engagement. Secondly, the gendered and professional identity of the researcher might have inspired the participants to bring to the fore certain aspects of their own identities at the expense of downplaying others. For example, my status as a female linguist employed by a university might have encouraged Kasia, an aspiring humanist interested in languages, to present herself as knowledgeable about and skilled in languages. Similarly, it might have inspired Marek to position himself as an ‘eager language learner’. Thirdly, our shared Polish background and recent history of migration to Norway may have caused the participants to feel at ease and freely express their thoughts and emotions, resulting in the discussion between Kasia and Marek.

5 Discussion and conclusions

In this article I have presented two examples of conflict talk around language practices in the family that occurred in an interview with members of two generations of a Polish family recently arrived in Norway. As exemplified by the data a family’s language policy can spark opposing views and differing opinions among the family members. In the presented interview excerpts the main interactants, Kasia and Marek, engaged in constructing opposing stances towards the practice of using Norwegian at home. This was achieved through

expressing contrasting evaluations of the stance object, as well as through acts of divergent alignment and self and other positioning. Marek evaluated the use of Norwegian at home positively and constructed it as an opportunity to improve the family members' language skills. Kasia, on the other hand, evaluated the use of Norwegian at home negatively and saw it as a pointless exercise in light of her father's limited competence in Norwegian. The differing evaluations of the stance object were reflected in the patterns of diverging alignments between Kasia and Marek observed throughout the two interview excerpts. The divergent alignment was not always limited to contrasting evaluations and sometimes manifested itself also on the level of discourse, e.g. when participants did not engage with the object of the talk or directed their utterances at other people present instead of at their immediate interlocutor.

In terms of positioning, it is possible to dissect three different levels in the above interactions. Firstly, there is the affective positioning of the self (Du Bois 2007), which is reflected in, respectively, positive and negative evaluations expressed by Marek and Kasia with regard to the stance object. Secondly, there is the epistemic level (*ibidem*), which manifests itself in the participants' constructions of their own and other's knowledge of Norwegian. Throughout the excerpts, Kasia consistently positions herself as a competent user of the language through: 1) demonstrating own practical knowledge and speaking skills in Norwegian and 2) claiming the authority to evaluate her father's language competence as insufficient (thus simultaneously positioning him as an incompetent speaker of Norwegian and altering traditional hierarchical roles in the family). To a certain degree Marek accepts being positioned as lacking in language skills but at the same time tries to recast himself as an eager and enthusiastic learner of Norwegian throughout the interaction, a positioning attempt that is dismissed both by Kasia through proving Marek's limited competence and other interactants who align with Kasia through laughing at Marek's failed efforts. Importantly, he accepts Kasia's self-positioning as a language expert and contributes to its reification in the interview through seeking the daughter's approval of his translations.

Assuming and ascribing positions of competent or incompetent speakers of Norwegian in the above interactions has consequences for the third level of positioning which has to do with power, dominance and control over the interaction. As noted by Watts (1991), all verbal interactions reflect the distribution of power between the participants. In case of the above interview excerpts, the construction of Kasia's competence in Norwegian allows the girl to first dominate the floor and finally also to take over the control of the conversation resulting in a reversal of traditional interviewer and interviewee roles. Kasia's powerful position was jointly constructed by all interactants throughout the

whole meeting – it started with the parents informing the interviewer that the girl was the most competent speaker of Norwegian in the whole family, later on Kasia's competence was claimed by herself, as illustrated in the quoted interview excerpts, through explicit displays of Norwegian competence and commentary on her father's skills, and finally it was also accepted by the other interactants through expressions of convergent alignment (such as laughing *with* Kasia *at* Marek or Marek's uptake of Kasia's expert position). Having said that, it is important to note that Marek did not 'surrender' the control of the discussion without a fight. His overlapping turns as well as the attempts to make the other interactants laugh may be read as attempts to take over the floor, save face (Goffman 1967/2005) and (re)claim a more powerful position.

The discussion between Kasia and her father illustrates how the migration situation may change the balance of power within a family. Sociolinguistic studies show that in transnational contexts the traditional intrafamilial power relations may shift due to the children's quicker acquisition of dominant social, cultural and linguistic skills (Revis 2016), which may result, much like in Kasia's case, in children's achieving a more knowledgeable and authoritative position in the family and often also becoming language brokers for their parents (Antonini 2016; Morales and Hanson 2005). As illustrated in the interview excerpts, the powerful positioning is locally and situationally constructed in interactions, here – in the concrete interview encounter. However, with repetition over time it may potentially develop into more or less reified positions of power. In turn, achieving positions of power opens up opportunities for agency, i.e. the "socio-culturally mediated capacity to act" (Ahearn 2001), and thus enables the children to directly affect Family Language Policies. As indicated in Section 2, research in different places has shown that children frequently take on an agentive role in the formation of FLP's, often leading the family to a linguistic change (cf. Fogle and King 2013; Gafaranga 2010; Gyogi 2015; Tuominen 1999). In case of younger children, the resistance towards parental language management may be implicit and achieved through specific discourse strategies and metalinguistic commentary; older children, however, may engage in elaborate and explicit discussions of FLP's and become the decision makers in matters of language practices at home themselves, as the data presented in this article seem to suggest.

Results of studies on children's agency in FLP often show that children may steer the family towards the dominant language and often become mediators socialising parents into the dominant culture (Guo 2014; Revis 2016). The case study presented in this article suggests that children in transnational families may also take on a different role and resist the pressure from the dominant culture and become guardians of the heritage language. Naturally, the conversations discussed in the present article were generated during one particular interview

with one particular family and might not necessarily be reflective of general discussions regarding language practices occurring in transnational families. Stances towards language practices are dynamic and may fluctuate over time, influencing the family's language policies. The particular stances constructed by Kasia and Marek during the interview encounter may have been influenced by many factors (such as social desirability, the presence and personality of the researcher, gender, age and social identities of the interlocutors, etc.), a thorough exploration of which is beyond the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless, placing the current argument in context of other studies may point to some interesting trends regarding adolescents' influence on language practices at home. For example, in the study of three transnational families conducted by Fogle and King (2013), adolescent girls newly arrived in the US resisted parental use of English in family setting. Furthermore, Kasia and Maja's opposition towards any use of Norwegian at home in the current study is also in line with the findings of Obojska (2018), who found that adolescent girls of Polish origin living in Norway care about the maintenance of the Polish language and see it as an important part of their linguistic repertoires, as well as their current and future language practices. The girls' preference for using Polish at home resonates as well with the findings provided by Rogstad (2018), who found that adolescents of Polish background living in Norway use almost exclusively Polish in communication with their parents. More studies on how adolescents' agency may influence language practices at home are necessary but the existing research seems to suggest that teenagers may play an important role not only in the implicit but also in very explicit language planning endeavours at home.

Methodologically, this article shows that family interviews are a useful tool in generating sociolinguistic data for studies of Family Language Policies, particularly in case of families with older children. The group setting creates a more complex interactional environment than the classical one-on-one conversation between the interviewee and the researcher (Hoffman 2013; Mallinson et al. 2013) and allows space for discussion and exchange of opinions. Similarly, to a focus group (Al Ghazali 2014; Barbour 2007), a family interview allows participants to interact not just with the researcher but also with each other and to co-construct their stances towards the discussed topics collaboratively and/or competitively, thus rendering the generated data more polyphonic than in a one-on-one interview. This format allows as well for the expression of conflict and emotions, while letting the interpersonal dynamics to play out to their fullest extent (Frey and Fontana 1993). Therefore, a family interview may prove especially illuminative for the researcher's understanding of the different family member's perspectives on a given phenomenon and may as well bring to the fore the complexities of intrafamilial power relations. In addition, the group

setting may prove empowering for the interviewees and in some instances, like in the case discussed above, may even encourage them to take over control of the interaction altogether.

Understanding children and young people's perspectives on language practices at home has important implications not only for understanding the processes of FLP formation, but also the processes related to language shift and maintenance in transnational families. Data provided in this study suggest that adolescents' language preferences may play a significant role in a family's language policy and can influence decisions regarding language practices at home. Furthermore, the data suggest that adolescents' high metalinguistic awareness paired with their ability to purposefully engage in metalinguistic discussions may lead to shifts in traditional intrafamilial power relations and socialization roles, resulting, potentially, in the children's effectively becoming the decision makers in matters of Family Language Policy.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Family X for sharing their time and thoughts with me. I am also very grateful to Bente Ailin Svendsen, Ana Deumert, Elizabeth Lanza, Piotr Garbacz, Judith Purkarthofer, Kristin Vold Lexander and Rafael Lomeu Gomes for close reading and constructive feedback on earlier versions of this text.

Funding: The writing of this paper was supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding scheme, project number 223265 (MultiLing) and 240725 (MultiFam).

Transcription conventions

(.)	pause
,	brief pause
.	Falling intonation
?	rising intonation
!	exclamation
<...>	overlapping speech
:	elongated sound
@	laughter
Bold	emphasis
<i>Italic</i>	Polish original
<u>Underline</u>	Norwegian

References

- Ahearn, L. M. 2001. Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30(1). 109–137. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109>.
- Al Ghazali, F. 2014. A critical overview of designing and conducting focus group interviews in applied linguistics research. *American Journal of Educational Research* 2(1). 6–12. doi:<https://doi.org/10.12691/education-2-1-2>.
- Antonini, R. 2016. Caught in the middle: Child language brokering as a form of unrecognised language service. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37(7). 710–725. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1127931>.
- Barbour, R. S. 2007. *Doing focus groups*. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from <http://srmosagepub.com/view/doing-focus-groups/SAGE.xml>.
- Bernal Lorenzo, D. 2017. The role of the Zapotec language from Lozoga' in the Californian migrant community. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world*, 96–114. New York: Routledge.
- Biber, D. & E. Finegan. 2009. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 9(1). 93–124. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1989.9.1.93>.
- Block, D. 2000. Problematizing interview data: Voices in the mind's machine. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(4). 757–763. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/3587788>.
- Busch, B. 2016. Methodology in biographical approaches in applied linguistics. Retrieved 25 February 2016. from https://www.academia.edu/20211841/WP187_Busch_2016._Methodology_in_biographical_approaches_in_applied_linguistics.
- Busch, B. 2017. Expanding the notion of the linguistic repertoire: On the concept of *Spracherleben*—The lived experience of language. *Applied Linguistics* 38(3). 340–358. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv030>.
- Crump, A. 2017. “I speak all of the language!”: Engaging in family language policy research with multilingual children in montreal. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world: Opportunities, challenges, and consequences*, 154–174. London: Routledge.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. 2009. Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy* 8(4). 351–375. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9146-7>.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. 2012. Private language management in Singapore: which language to practice and how? In A. S. Yeung, E. L. Brown, & C. Lee (Eds.), *Communication and Language : Surmounting Barriers to Cross-Cultural Understanding* (pp. 55-77). (International Advances in Education, Global Initiatives for Equity and Social Justice). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. & E. Lanza. 2018. Language management in multilingual families: Efforts, measures and challenges. *Multilingua* 37(2). 123–130. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0132>.
- De Fina, A. & S. Perrino. 2011. Introduction: Interviews vs. ‘natural’ contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society* 40(1). 1–11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000849>.
- Döpke, S. 1992. *One parent, one language: An interactional approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

- Doyle, C. 2013. To make the root stronger: language policies and experiences of successful multilingual intermarried families with adolescent children in Tallinn. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy*, 145–175. Netherlands: Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8_7.
- Du Bois, J. W. 2007. The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* Vol. 164, 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from <https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.164.07du>.
- Englebretson, R. Ed.. 2007. *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* Vol. 164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164>.
- Fantini, A. E. 1985. *Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective (to age ten)*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L. W. 2012. *Second language socialization and learner agency: Adoptive family talk*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L. W. 2013. Family language policy from the children's point of view: Bilingualism in place and Time. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (eds.), *Successful family language policy*, 177–200. Netherlands: Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8_8.
- Fogle, L. W. & K. A. King. 2013. Child agency and language policy in transnational families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 19(0). 1–25.
- Frey, J. H. & A. Fontana. 1993. The group interview in social research. In D. Morgan, *Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art*, 20–34. SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483349008.n2>.
- Gafaranga, J. 2010. Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society* 39 (2). 241–270. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000047>.
- Glenn, P. 2003. *Laughter in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. 1967/2005. *Interaction ritual: essays in face to face behavior*. New Brunswick: AldineTransaction.
- Grammont, M. 1902. Observations sur le langage des enfants. In D. Barbelenet & P. Boyer (Eds.), *Mélanges offerts à M. Antoine Meillet*, 61–82. Paris: Klincksiek.
- Guo, Z. 2014. *Young children as intercultural mediators: Mandarin-speaking Chinese families in Britain*. Bristol, England & Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Gyogi, E. 2015. Children's agency in language choice: A case study of two Japanese-English bilingual children in London. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18(6). 749–764. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.956043>.
- Hoffman, M. 2013. Sociolinguistic interviews. In J. Holmes & K. Hazen (Eds.), *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hua, Zhu. 2008. Duelling languages, duelling values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(10). 1799–1816. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.02.007>.
- Jaffe, A. 2009. The production and reproduction of language ideologies in practice. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (eds.), *The new sociolinguistics reader*, 390–404. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kamada, L. D. 2009. *Hybrid identities and adolescent girls: Being "Half" in Japan*. Bristol, UK ; Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Kiesling, S. 2015. Stance and stancetaking: Theory and practice in sociolinguistics. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/13000752/Stance_and_Stancetaking_Theory_and_Practice_in_Sociolinguistics.

- King, K. & L. Fogle. 2006. Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9(6). 695–712. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2167/beb362.0>.
- King, K. & E. Lanza Eds.. 2017. Special issue. Ideology, agency, and imagination in multilingual families. OnlineFirst. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 1–7.
- King, K. A., L. Fogle & A. Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5). 907–922. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x>.
- King, K. A. & L. W. Fogle. 2017. Family language policy. In *Language policy and political issues in education*, 315–327. Cham: Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02344-1_25.
- Kirsch, C. 2012. Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: An account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(1). 95–112. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.607229>.
- Lanza, E. 1992. Can bilingual two-year-olds code-switch? *Journal of Child Language* 19(3). 633–658.
- Lanza, E. & Li Wei Eds.. 2016. Special issue. Multilingual encounters in transcultural families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37. 7.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1997/2004. *Language mixing in infant Bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leopold, W. 1939–1949. *Speech development of a bilingual child*. Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series, Nos. 6, 11, 18 and 19, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Mallinson, C., B. Childs & G. V. Herk. 2013. *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Morales, A. & W. E. Hanson. 2005. Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27(4). 471–503. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986305281333>.
- Morgan, C. A. 2017. Post-socialist language ideologies in action: Linking interview context and language ideology through stance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 21(1). 34–63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12225>.
- Nylund, A. 2017. Constructed dialogue, stance, and ideological diversity in metalinguistic discourse. In J. Wegner, A. De Fina & D. Ikizoglu (eds.), *Diversity and Super-Diversity: Sociocultural Linguistic Perspectives*, 133–150. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Obojska, M. 2018. Between duty and neglect: Language ideologies and stancetaking among Polish adolescents in Norway. *Lingua* 208. 82–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2018.03.009>.
- Ochs, E. 1990. Cultural universals in the acquisition of language: Keynote address. In *Papers and reports on child language development*, Stanford University, Vol. 29, 1–19.
- Ochs, E. & C. Taylor. 1995. The father knows best dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: language and the socially constructed self*, 97–120. New York: Routledge.
- Ochs, E. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407–437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palviainen, Å. & S. Boyd. 2013. Unity in discourse, diversity in practice: The one person one language policy in bilingual families. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy*, 223–248. Netherlands: Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8_10.

- Revis, M. 2016. A Bourdieusian perspective on child agency in family language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 0(0). 1–15. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1239691>.
- Rogstad, J. 2018. Preliminary results of CILS-NOR: The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study in Norway. Private Communication.
- Ronjat, J. 1913. *Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris: Champion.
- Schiffman, H. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Schwartz, M. & A. Verschik Eds.. 2013. *Successful family language Policy - Parents, Children and | Mila Schwartz | Springer*. Retrieved from <http://www.springer.com/br/book/9789400777521>.
- Shohamy, E. G. 2006. *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith-Christmas, C. 2015. *Family language policy: Maintaining an endangered language in the home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2017. Family language policy: new directions'. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world opportunities, challenges, and consequences*, 13–29. London: Routledge.
- SSB. 2017. Flest nye bosatte fra Syria. Retrieved October 11th, 2017, from <http://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef/aar/2017-03-02>
- Svendsen, B. A. 2004. *Så lenge vi forstår hverandre: språkvalg, flerspråklige ferdigheter og språklig sosialisering hos norsk-flippinske barn i Oslo*. Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet. Universitetet i Oslo.
- Tuominen, A. 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140(1). 59–76. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1999.140.59>.
- Watts, R. J. 1991. *Power in family discourse*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.