Talking multilingual families into being: language practices and ideologies of a Brazilian-Norwegian family in Norway

Rafael Lomeu Gomes

Published online: 12 Jul 2020.

Submit your article to this journal ↗

Article views: 535

View related articles ↗

View Crossmark data ↗

Citing articles: 1 View citing articles ↗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Talking multilingual families into being: language practices and ideologies of a Brazilian-Norwegian family in Norway

Rafael Lomeu Gomes

MultiLing – Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

ABSTRACT

This article sets out to explore the relationships between parental language ideologies, and language use and negotiation in parent–child interaction. The primary dataset is composed of around 10 h of audio recordings of everyday interactions of family members (i.e. a Brazilian mother, a Norwegian father, and a 3-year old Norwegian born daughter) during a three-year ethnographically-oriented project undertaken in Norway. A discourse analytical approach with a focus on instances of language negotiation led to the identification of a set of seven parental discourse strategies in the corpus: addressee-bound, code-bound, code rebuttal, filling gaps, rephrase, say 'x', and 'what is–' frame. Results indicate that, contrary to what parents might expect, drawing on discourse strategies that make explicit references to language names might hinder the active use of the child's full linguistic repertoire. Conversely, discourse strategies that only implicitly serve as requests to use a given language can foster continuous multilingual language use. Finally, I suggest that strategies that make explicit references to named languages could be linked to a one-person-one-language-one-nation ideology, and I demonstrate how these strategies help us understand the ways family members navigate their complex national affiliations and talk their multilingual selves into being.

Introduction

In the evening of 02 February 2018, the following interaction took place between a Norwegian father (Håkon, 45), a Brazilian mother (Adriana, 37), and their Norwegian-born daughter (Emma, 3) in their home in Oslo, Norway, just as Adriana prepared dinner. Håkon picks up a drinking glass (Figure 1) and, addressing Emma, says 'Se pappa er brasileiro' (Look daddy is Brazilian). Emma promptly replies 'neeei det er ikke din' (nooo that is not yours), and Håkon repeats 'brasileiro'. Trying to elicit Portuguese from her daughter, Adriana intervenes – 'fala é meu copo' (say it's my glass) – but Emma screams 'não' (no). As a closure to this 10-second event, Adriana says 'du– du liker å provosere Emma' (you– you like to provoke Emma).

This short excerpt shows how Håkon mobilises the multimodal affordances of the glass as he draws on linguistic and semiotic resources to achieve interactional goals. Perhaps more than claiming Brazilianess, Håkon's act could be interpreted as teasing, as noted in Adriana's closing comment. Interestingly, Håkon must have known picking up that specific glass and saying those specific words could have somehow startled Emma. Also interesting to note is Adriana's attempt to elicit Portuguese from Emma (i.e. 'fala é meu copo').

Figure 1. Glass with Brazilian flag.

Despite its brevity, this excerpt taps into a number of interrelated issues that are worth further investigating, namely, the role of language in the construction of national identity, the forging of familial roles, and negotiations of language choice. Framing these issues within current debates in family language policy (FLP) (Curdt-Christiansen 2018; King 2016) and language socialisation (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Ochs and Schieffelin 2008) allows us to ask questions such as: how do members of transnational families navigate their complex national affiliations as they go about mundane tasks in the home? What discourse strategies may encourage or hamper the use of their multilingual language repertoire? What language ideologies inform these language practices?

In this article, I explore possible answers to these questions. Moreover, by anchoring the analysis of the interconnections between language practices and ideologies on debates about recent conceptualisations of language, I aim to expand the theoretical scope of current research on family multilingualism.

Multilingual family making

A steady growth in the number of publications going under the umbrella term 'family language policy' has been noted in the past decade (Lanza and Lomeu Gomes 2020). Longitudinal ethnographic studies have become more common (e.g. Gallo and Hornberger 2019; Smith-Christmas 2016), the language practices and ideologies of diverse family constellations have been investigated (e.g. Coetzee 2018; da Costa Cabral 2018; Hua and Wei 2016; Kendrick and Namazzi 2017), and child agency has been foregrounded (e.g. Fogle 2012; Said and Hua 2019; Smith-Christmas 2018; Wilson 2019). In fact, the central position of child agency in recent studies has a longer tradition in different disciplines (e.g. Kuczynski 2002; Luykx 2003) and echoes a foundational assumption in language socialisation studies, namely that 'the child or the novice (in the case of older individuals) is not a passive recipient of sociocultural knowledge but rather an active contributor to the meaning and outcome of interactions with other members of a social group' (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986, 165).

Apart from following previous studies in the employment of an ethnographic approach and in the emphasis on child agency in language socialisation processes, this study draws on interactional socio-linguistic and discursive analytic approaches to analysing parent–child interactions. Specifically, it assumes family members' identities are interactionally constructed and negotiated through talk as families go about their daily routines and exigencies (Gordon 2009; Tannen, Kendall, and Gordon 2007).

Lanza (1997) pointed to some of these issues in her seminal sociolinguistic study, which provided new insights concerning the roles of language input and context on early bilingualism. Building on the assumption that context and language are co-constitutive of one another, Lanza (1997, 1998) examined the influence of discourse strategies (Gumperz 1982) employed by parents in the nego-tiation of contexts that supported or discouraged bilingual language use (see also Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal 2001).

While I share Lanza's (1992, 1997, 1998) interest in exploring the dialectical relationship between language and context, I draw on translanguaging literature (García and Wei 2018; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2018; Wei 2018) for it can be a useful approach in trying to understand how language use and national affiliations are discursively negotiated in multilingual interactions in the home.

However, it is worth noting that the terms *Portuguese* and *Norwegian* are used to describe the participants' language practices because, as I will show, they are made relevant from an emic perspec-tive. Likewise, the term *multilingual* used to describe the families in my article is not to be con-founded with an understanding of language as an abstract entity that can be separated, labelled and counted. Building on debates stemming from recent conceptualisations of language, I am inter-ested in how the employment of a 'translingual lens' can shed new light on the entanglements between monoglossic language ideologies (García and Torres-Guevara 2009) and multilingual language practices in the home.

A few studies have started to move precisely in this direction. To propose the somewhat overlap-ping notions of 'multilingual familylect' and 'multilingual family language repertoire', Van Mensel (2018) draws on an understanding that family language policies emerge through practice and, as such, are dynamic and contextually bound. Analysing interactional data from two multilingual families in Belgium, Van Mensel discussed the role of shared language practices (e.g. use of certain linguistic features such as lexical items or pronunciation, as well as language alternation practices) in forging family ties.

Similarly, Hiratsuka and Pennycook (2019) conducted a longitudinal ethnographic study inves-tigating the language practices of an English, Japanese, and Spanish speaking three-generation family in Australia. The notion 'translingual family repertoire' is introduced to capture how the language practices in the home serve both to promote the construction of familial bonds and to express the dynamism that characterises tasks in which family members are engaged in their daily lives.

In sum, the lines of inquiry laid out above instantiate a broader shift in current sociolinguistic approaches to family multilingualism, namely, from the hitherto prevailing focus on the relationship between language input and language output to how family members deploy linguistic and semiotic resources available to them as they make sense of their multilingual, transnational selves in their daily lives (King 2016).

This shift has also yielded the foregrounding of agency, identity, and ideology in the agenda of researchers investigating the complex, multi-layered entanglements between language practices and ideologies of multilingual, transnational families (King and Lanza 2019). Feeding into this debate, this article unpacks the connections between the multilingual language practices of family members as they go about their daily lives and language ideologies that may inform these practices.

Context of the study

In the past fifty years, transnational population flows have had a considerable effect on the demo-graphic makeup of Norway. A ninetyfold increase in the number of Norwegian-born to immigrant

parents, from 2 000 in 1970 to nearly 180 000 in 2019 has been recently reported (Statistics Norway 2019). The category 'Norwegian-born to immigrant parents' can be problematic because, having an essentialist undertone, it risks obfuscating the complexities involved in self-identified national affiliations. Yet, the shifting ethnoscape (Appadurai 1996) in Norway has motivated investigations in fields such as education, social anthropology, and sociolinguistics (e.g. Aarset 2016; Beiler 2019; Bubikova-Moan 2017; Opsahl and Røyneland 2016; Svendsen 2018).

Little is known, however, about the language practices and ideologies of Brazilian parents and their children in Norway (but see Lindquist and Garmann 2019). Relatedly, the language practices and ideologies of parents engaged in migration trajectories from the Global South to the Global North as they attempt to raise their children multilingually still require further elucidation (Lomeu Gomes 2018; Smith-Christmas 2017). This study takes a step towards addressing these areas.

Circulating language ideologies in Brazil and in Norway

As noted by Cavalcanti and Maher (2017), a circulating hegemonic ideology characterises Brazil as a markedly monolingual country. This ideology is the result of concerted efforts initiated in colonial times. For instance, it was not until 1988, with the promulgation of the current Constitution of Brazil, that indigenous languages were officially recognised. Previous policies served as grounds for the decimation of indigenous cultures and languages by way of promoting the 'assimilation and conversion to Christianity of indigenous minorities' (de Souza 2017, 190). Results of these policies conceal the *de facto* linguistic diversity that has been part of Brazilian history from before the invasion of the Portuguese in the 1500s. Moreover, these processes are integral to the circulation and sedimentation of the one-language-one-nation ideology that has informed contemporary language practices in various ways.

In urban centres in Norway such as Oslo, recent sociolinguistic research has focused on the linguistic diversity accompanying transnational flows of people that have taken place in the past decades (e.g. Svendsen and Røyneland 2008). Moreover, current language ideologies across different contexts in Norway have been infused by normative assimilationist discourses (e.g. Connor 2019; Lane 2010; Røyneland 2018; Sollid 2013).

One important similarity between Norway and Brazil is that the linguistic diversity of both countries is oftentimes overridden by discourses of homogeneity sustained by, and feeding into, a monoglossic language ideology. While understanding language practices as resultant of only choice may overlook other important factors, language practices are not only about language ideologies either. Thus, proposing an alternative to these competing views, the notion of OPOLON (one-per-son-one-language-one-nation) as *ideology* introduced in this study can be an initial step in the direction of shedding new light on investigations of the possible interconnections between parental language ideologies and language practices (see also Palviainen and Boyd 2013).

Participants and methods

In the past three years, I have followed three Brazilian-Norwegian families raising their children multilingually in Norway to better understand the connections between their language practices and language ideologies. The methods of data generation used in this project included an online questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, participant observations and field notes, and audio recordings made by the participants themselves. Participants were initially recruited via online posts of social media groups and in events catering for the Brazilian and Portuguese speaking communities in Norway. A fuller account with details of each step of data collection are reported elsewhere (Lomeu Gomes 2019). In what follows, I provide more details about the methods used to generate data analysed in this article, namely, self-recordings and semi-structured interview.

Following previous studies that have successfully employed self-recordings as a method of data generation, I instructed participants to record interactions during meals, play time, or other daily

routines (Blum-Kulka 1997; Smith-Christmas 2016; Tannen, Kendall, and Gordon 2007). I also asked them to make, whenever possible, recordings longer than 20 min.

The semi-structured interview guide included four main themes: participants' transnational practices (e.g. migration trajectories, experiences of living in Norway, plans for the future), language practices (e.g. language(s) used in the home, language(s) used with different family members, language(s) used in different media and literacy practices), language ideologies (e.g. advantages/disadvantages of knowing different languages, reasons to use certain languages in the home, conceptions about language acquisition), and life in Brazil before migrating to Norway (e.g. learning languages, educational background, work experience).

Combining the different methods allowed me to gain a more in-depth, multifaceted understanding of how parents make sense of themselves and their practices in raising their children multilingually.

In this article, I focus on the language practices and ideologies of one particular family because, as I will argue, it is a telling case of how a child as young as three years of age (Emma) negotiates language use in the home in interactions with her mother (Adriana) and father (Håkon) in response to discourse strategies used by her mother that make explicit references to named languages and national identities.

Adriana was born in Brazil, where she worked as a school teacher, and lived there until she moved to Luxembourg in the mid-2000s. Since 2013, Adriana has been living in Norway with her partner Håkon, a state-agency employee. They have a daughter, Emma, who was born in Norway and turned 3 years and one month old (3;1) before the audio recordings started. Adriana reported being able to speak Norwegian, English, French, and Luxembourgish, and Håkon reported speaking English and Norwegian. Håkon enrolled in Portuguese classes early in 2017, but he stopped attending the classes after a few months. The self-recordings, made by Adriana between October 2017 and May 2018, amounted to nearly 10 h of interactional data that were partly transcribed using ELAN 4.9.4.[1]

As noted, one of the goals of this study is to better understand the extent to which certain discourse strategies supported the use of multilingual language repertoires. Therefore, the passages that were transcribed were those where language negotiation and elicitation between family members took place. Furthermore, the longitudinal design of the research allowed me to ask the participants, in follow-up visits, about contextual information that the audio recordings failed to capture (for example, objects participants were using in certain interactions). To illustrate the longitudinal character of the engagement with Adriana's family, our first contact took place in June 2017, when Adriana filled out the online questionnaire. In August 2019, I visited them to ask questions about certain passages of the recording and took the photo in Figure 1. A more in-depth analysis of Adriana's reported language practices is presented elsewhere (Lomeu Gomes, in press) and adds layers of complexity to the claims put forth here regarding the extent to which circulating language ideologies might influence language practices in the home.

In the following two sections, I discuss the roles of discourse strategies employed in parent–child interactions in hindering or promoting multilingual practices and the ways in which a monoglossic language ideology, namely OPOLON (one-person-one-language-one-nation), is both enacted and resisted in interactions.

Talking a multilingual family into being

In this section, I explore how the participants draw on their multilingual language repertoires to talk their multilingual selves into being as they go about mundane tasks in their everyday lives. To do so, I took three iterative analytical steps. First, I identified the parental discourse strategies (PDSs) in the corpus. Then, I examined the pragmatic functions of the PDSs and compared these PDSs with those reported in previous literature. Finally, I analysed the role the PDSs had in encouraging or hindering Emma's multilingual language use. Attending to the reflexivity of qualitative data analysis, the iterative aspect of the analysis allowed me to move back and forth between the three distinct, yet

interrelated, analytical steps in a non-sequential way (Srivastava and Hopwood 2009; Wortham and Reyes 2015). In the following subsections, I unpack each stage of this three-step analysis.

Parental discourse strategies: definitions and examples

Following Lanza's (1997) notion of parental discourse strategies, I focused initially on the identification of discourse strategies employed by parents in child–parent interactions to negotiate language choice. Listening to the recordings multiple times, making notes, and preliminarily coding allowed me to identify a set of seven PDSs that were used in interactions between Adriana, Emma, and Håkon to negotiate language choice.

This set of strategies is not conceived of as a normative array of strategies employed universally in parent–child interactions across time and space. On the contrary, the underlying assumption is that these strategies are locally and temporally situated. As such, it is possible that other strategies are employed in interactions in this family, but the recordings failed to capture them. Relatedly, even though Adriana was instructed to make recordings of at least 20 min, we cannot rule out the possibility that the frequency of use of certain discourse strategies by the participants was influenced by the participants being aware of the recorder. Still, the PDSs discussed here are relevant for explicating certain multilingual aspects of family-making in the case of this family and can shed light on specific aspects of theories of multilingual language practices and language ideologies.

In Table 1, I present each of the seven PDSs (i.e. addressee-bound, code-bound, code rebuttal, filling gaps, rephrase, say 'x', and what is– frame), their respective definitions, and examples to illustrate how they appeared in the corpus.

In order to better understand the role of the PDSs in language negotiation in parent–child interactions, I examined what the PDSs accomplished interactionally.

Pragmatic functions of parental discourse strategies

The focus of this analytical step was on what the PDSs accomplished in interaction. This allowed me to identify the different pragmatic functions of each PDS in my corpus, described in Table 2:

Some of these PDSs have been reported in previous literature. For example, in Lanza's (1997) 'repetition', the adult repeats what the child said using the other language. The *rephrase* identified in my corpus encompasses the repetition of words uttered previously in Norwegian and in Portuguese (see also Abreu Fernandes 2019 and Norrick 1991 for a similar strategy used with a corrective purpose).

Additionally, the *say 'x'* strategy has received ample coverage in the language socialisation literature (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Ochs (1986, 5) claims this 'prompting routine' is usually (but not

Table 1. Parental discourse strategies: definitions and examples.

Parental Discourse Strategy	Definition	Example
Addressee-bound	Speaker refers to self or other as a determiner of code.	How do you speak with mummy?
Code-bound	Speaker refers to code eliciting production in referred code.	How do you say it in Portuguese?
Code rebuttal	Speaker explicitly rebuts production of their interlocutor in a given code.	Enough. It's not *nok*, it's enough.
Filling gaps	Speaker leaves utterances incomplete expecting interlocutor to complete them.	Little shells of my lo–
Rephrase	Speaker rephrases what their interlocutor uttered.	Emma: jeg er ikke baby (I'm no baby) Adriana: não, não é bebê, é criança (no, [you] are not baby, [you] are a child)
Say 'x'	Speaker gives explicit directions as to what their interlocutor should say.	Say 'Bye, see you later'.
What is– frame	Speaker asks open-ended questions.	What is this figure?

Table 2. Pragmatic functions of parental discourse strategies.

Parental Discourse Strategy	Pragmatic Functions
Addressee-bound	explicit requests to speak Portuguese (and not Norwegian).
Code-bound	explicit requests to speak Portuguese (and not Norwegian).
Code rebuttal	explicit requests to speak Portuguese (and not Norwegian).
Filling gaps	teach and elicit polite forms ('plea–', 'than–'), prayer, and songs; also to elicit lexical items ranging from animals ('dragon-fl–'), demonym ('Brazi–'), and terms of address ('my lo–').
Rephrase	expand, correct, or introduce terms in Portuguese of what was said just before in Norwegian or in Portuguese; also to demonstrate agreement or understanding.
Say 'x'	elicit production of specific words, phrases, or full sentences in Portuguese.
What is– frame	initiate, change (e.g. 'Emma what are you going to do tomorrow?'), or elaborate on topics ('Why are you doing like this, my love?').

necessarily) characterised by the presence of an imperative verb form initiating the utterance. In my corpus, instances where the imperative verb form was in sentence-final position were also found (i.e. excerpt 4, line 10).

What is– frame resembles Lanza's (1997, 262) 'minimal grasp' in which 'the parent relies primarily on the child to resay the repairable utterance'. In the corpus analysed here, however, the use of the *what is– frame* was not intended to encourage the child to resay something, but it was used oftentimes to initiate a conversation (see also 'leading questions' in Ochs 1986).

Notably, the PDSs addressee-bound, code-bound, and code rebuttal shared the same interactional goal, namely, to have the interlocutor switch to Portuguese. Gafaranga (2010, 256) referred to the strategies used by participants to request that a certain language is used as 'other-initiated medium repair'. However, though present in some of the excerpts analysed by Gafaranga (2010), explicit references to named languages (i.e. Kinyarwanda) were not particularly relevant in the analysis. In contrast, I suggest references to named languages are crucial to better understand negotiation of language choice in parent–child interactions. Particularly, I show in detail below that explicit requests to use Portuguese might not reach the intended goal (i.e. excerpts 2, 3, and 4), whilst implicit forms of language elicitation allow Emma to draw more freely on her linguistic repertoire, which includes Portuguese (i.e. excerpt 1).

PDSs promoting or hindering multilingual language use

Here I explore the extent to which the use of certain PDSs allowed Emma to draw more freely on her linguistic repertoire or hindered the (intended) use of Portuguese. Furthermore, the analysis below points to the complexity of parent–child multilingual interactions as sites where family members go about their daily activities while simultaneously accomplishing multiple interrelated social actions such as the employment of discourse strategies to sanction or promote the use of certain languages, the ongoing construction of parent–child ties, and the negotiation of national identities.

In excerpt 1, below, Emma had just wet part of her clothes so Adriana was going to change them.

(1) *eu sou criancinha feliz*
16.02.2018 (00:08:50 – 00:09:57)

01 Emma:	**esse aqui não–**
	this here is not–
02 Adriana:	**vem cá vem • vem cá**
	come here come • come here
03 E:	**não é minha • mamãe não é minha**
	it's not mine • mummy it's not mine
04 A:	**não é da mamãe**
	no it's mummy's
05 E:	**esse aqui** fra **mamãe**
	this here from mummy
06 E:	hva står det mamma?
	what does it say?

07 A:	Adriana
08 E:	Adriana
09 A:	mhmm
10 E:	det er ikke buksa min
	these are not my trousers
11 A:	**não**
	no
12 E:	det er ikke min
	these are not mine
13 A:	**não não é Emma [não**
	no it's not Emma no
14 E:	[jeg har ingen som denne som like deg
	I have no one like this like you
15 A:	mm
16 E:	jeg har ikke like som deg
	I don't have like you
17 A:	**não sabe por quê? porque você é criança • mamãe é grande**
	no [you] know why? because you're child • mummy's big
18 E:	[((starts crying))
19 A:	**[Emma quem é criança?**
	Emma who's child?
20 E:	((continues crying))
21 A:	**quem é criança da mamãe?** hm?
	who's mummy's child?
22 E:	jeg er ikke baby
	I'm no baby
23 A:	**não • não é bebê é criança**
	no • [it/you] is/are not baby is/are child
24 E:	**eu sou bebê não**
	I'm baby not
25 A:	**não é criancinha [feliz**
	no [you] are happy little child
26 E:	**[eu sou– eu sou criancinha feliz**
	I'm– I-m happy little child
27 A:	[/ja/
	/yes/
28 E:	[fra mamma
	from mummy
29 A:	**criancinha feliz da mamãe**
	mummy's happy little child

Excerpt 1 illustrates how Emma drew on lexical items belonging to different named languages. Communication with Adriana was not hampered by explicit language negotiation strategies. Put differently, none of the PDSs used – i.e. rephrase (lines 13, 23, and 29) and what is– frame (lines 19 and 21) – make explicit references to any named language; yet, Emma produces utterances fully in Portuguese (lines 03, 24, and 26).

The first 17 lines revolve around Emma's realisation that she does not have clothes like her mother's. In line 17, working with contrastive categories to teach about intergenerational differences, Adriana explains this is the case because Emma is a child and Adriana is an adult. Emma then starts crying for, based on how the conversation unfolds, she understands 'child' to mean 'baby' (lines 21–24), a categorisation she refuses.

From line 25 onwards, perhaps attempting to raise her daughter spirits, Adriana positions Emma as mummy's happy little child (*criancinha feliz da mamãe*). This position is taken up by Emma, who draws on her emerging multilingual repertoire to say 'eu sou criancinha feliz–' (line 26) 'fra mamma' (line 28). This is finally rephrased once again by Adriana in the end of the excerpt (line 29).

In contrast to excerpt 1, in the following excerpt (2) the use of PDSs that made explicit references to languages (i.e. code-bound and code rebuttal) did not actually encourage Emma to draw on her full linguistic repertoire and speak Portuguese, as Adriana intended her to.

(2) *Emma é Norueguesa?*
23.10.2017 (00:06:16 – 00:06:50)

01 Emma:	kan jeg hjelpe deg?
	can I help you?
02 Adriana:	nei kan du ikke ikke hjelpe meg
	no you can't can't help me
03 A:	**não precisa não**
	there's no need
04 E:	jeg vil
	I want
05 A:	**como é que fala em português?**
	how do you say it in Portuguese?
06 A:	**como é que fala em português?**
	how do you say it in Portuguese?
07 E:	kan jeg hjelpe deg?
	can I help you?
08 A:	**não não é aí é norueguês • Emma é norueguesa?**
	no no it's not then it's Norwegian is Emma Norwegian?
09 E:	**não Emma é brasile–**
	no Emma is Brazili–
10 A:	**então fala mamãe posso te ajudar?**
	then say mummy can I help you?
11 E:	fordi jeg va– kan jeg knappen– fordi– trykke tre
	because I wa– can I the button – because– push three
12 A:	**trê– aí no meio aqui pode só nesse**
	thre– there in the middle here [you] can just in this
13 E:	**esse aqui**
	this here
14 A:	ja
	yes
15 A:	ah
16 E:	jaaaa
	yeeees
17 A:	**ah muito bem Emma**
	ah well done Emma
18 E:	nå trykker vi [/tre/?
	now we push /three/?
19 A:	[**não é só um**
	no it's just one
20 E:	**não**
	no
21 A:	**e a comida agora? vamos bora soprar? vamos soprar?**
	and the food now? come let's blow? let's blow?

In this passage, possibly trying to emulate actions that Adriana and Håkon do, Emma wanted to get things done (i.e. set the table – line 01 – and push buttons of a certain electronic device – lines 11 and 18). On the other hand, Adriana kept the (rather unsuccessful) language negotiation going for the first 10 lines. Emma did not draw on Portuguese to reformulate the question as Adriana wanted, despite the use of explicit references to language (PDS code-bound in lines 05 and 06, and PDS code rebuttal in line 08).

Also relevant in this excerpt is Emma's national identity being explicitly referred to as an implicit request to use Portuguese. When asked by Adriana if she is Norwegian (line 08), Emma, born in Norway to a Norwegian father and a Brazilian mother, answers negatively and adds 'Emma is Brazili–' (line 09).

While it could be argued that Emma's few utterances in Portuguese from line 09 were triggered by Adriana's insistent negotiation, Emma did not ask to help her mother in Portuguese, which seemed to be Adriana's goal in the first place. In response to Emma's utterance in line 13 (but also in line 02), Adriana used a Norwegian word (line 14), breaking the rigid rule Brazilians must speak Portuguese.

In sum, in a context where parents speak more than one named language, excerpt 2 points to the difficulties involved in strictly adhering to what has been termed OPOL (one-parent-one-language or one-person-one-language) to describe a strategy of bilingual acquisition in childhood in which

parents 'each speak their own language to the child from birth' (Romaine 1995, 184). Excerpt 3, below, is another case in point where not only does Adriana not follow an OPOL strategy, but also has little success in eliciting from Emma the formulaic polite phrase she expected.

(3) *tusen takk for maten min*
30.10.2017 (00:03:46 – 00:04:30)

01 Emma:	tusen takk for maten min
	thank you for my food
02 Adriana:	tusen takk for maten min? **e como é que fala em português? o–**
	thank you for my food? and how do you say it in Portuguese? th–
03 E:	**bigada, mamãe**
	ank you, mummy
04 A:	**pela comi–**
	for the foo–
05 E:	**comi**
	foo
06 A:	**comida fala • obrigada pela comida, mamãe**
	food say • thank you for the food, mummy
07 E:	mamma
	mummy
	(3.31)
08 A:	**fala obrigada pela comida**
	say thank you for the food
09 E:	jeg tror jeg våt der
	I think I wet there
10 A:	**que que você tá desenhando Emma?**
	what are you drawing Emma?
11 E:	jeg t– vet ikke
	I d– don't know
12 A:	vet ikke? **fala eu não sei • que isso? é um monstro?**
	don't know? say I don't know • what's this? a monster?
13 E:	se
	look

In the passage above, Emma and Adriana were drawing. Emma had just finished having a snack and put away an empty bottle with milk that she had drunk while drawing. In the beginning of the excerpt, Emma thanks for the food she had just had using a formulaic phrase (i.e. 'takk for maten', thank you for the food), common in certain contexts of shared meals in Norway.

Using a combination of PDSs code bound and filling gaps (line 02), Adriana attempts to elicit the production of the same phrase in Portuguese, which is only partially successful, as Emma fills in the gap with 'bigada mamãe' (as in, 'obrigada mamãe'). Adriana tries to expand the production by adding another filling gap (line 04), and Emma simply repeats the incomplete word 'comi' (instead of 'comida'). The PDS say x is then used two times by Adriana (lines 06 and 08), which are not taken up by Emma.

A more pressing issue might be at stake for Emma seems to have noticed that she wet her clothes (probably when she put her bottle of milk away) and tries to draw Adriana's attention to this (lines 07 and 09). Adriana does not notice it (or does not respond to it immediately) as she asks questions about Emma's drawings (lines 10 and 12). Then Emma tells her mother to look at her clothes (line 13) and after the end of this excerpt Adriana asks if Emma wants to change her clothes.

To summarise, excerpt 3 is an example of how dealing with daily tasks (i.e. changing wet clothes) takes precedence over attempts at negotiating language, even when discourse strategies that make the request explicit are employed. This is another example showing the simultaneous and interrelated social actions taking place in a fast-paced interactional event such as those involving parent–child multilingual conversations. Such conditions, which are not atypical in households with young children, can contribute to the difficulty of maintaining a strategy such as OPOL. In fact, I argue OPOL might be a better notion to describe an *ideology* rather than a *strategy*. Before elaborating on this point in the following section, I present one final excerpt (4) of interactional data.

Excerpt 4 is a telling example of the bidirectionality of language socialisation, that is, children are socialised to use language and through the use of language (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). At the same time, their agency has important consequences in interactions with peers, caregivers and/or parents.

(4) *du må leke Norge på papa*
25.02.2018 (00:01:37 – 00:02:30)

01 Adriana:	# sove litt	
	# sleep a little	
02 Emma:	**mamãe**	
	mummy	
03 A:	nei • hvorfor ikke?	
	no why not?	
04 Håkon:	nei jeg skal ikke sove nå [jeg er ikke trøtt	
	no I'm not going to sleep now I'm not tired	
05 A:	[# slappe av	
	# relax	
06 H:	ja	
	yes	
07 H:	det går bra	
	it's fine	
08 E:	mamma	
	mummy	
09 E:	Håkon • gå å slapp av	
	Håkon • go relax	
10 A:	**vai dormir fala**	
	go to sleep say	
11 E:	sove	
	sleep	
12 E:	hu heter ikke Brasil mamma • hu heter Norge du må leke Norge på [pappa	
	she isn't called Brazil mummy she's called Norway you must play Norway with daddy	
13 A:	[**mamãe tem que falar norueguês com o papai?**	
	mummy has to speak Norwegian with daddy?	
14 E:	**sim**	
	yes	
15 A:	**ok**	
16 E:	pappa	
	daddy	
17 A:	du må sove	
	you must sleep	
18 E:	du må sove du må slappe ave	
	you must sleep you must relax	
19 A:	ja pappa **vai** slappe av pappa • **tá [cansado**	
	yes daddy go relax daddy [he] is tired	
20 E:	hu vil ikke • hun vil ikke	
	she doesn't want to• she doesn't want to	
21 A:	**ele não quer?**	
	he doesn't want to?	
22 E:	da leker vi • mamma [leker vi	
	then we play mummy we play	
23 A:	[**agora mamãe não** heter **norueguês, não mamãe fala português**	
	now mummy isn't called Norwegian, no mummy speaks Portuguese	
24 E:	mamma– hvis– mamma –	
	mummy– if– mummy–	
25 A:	**que língua você fala com a mamãe?**	
	what language you speak with mummy?	
26 E:	**mamãe • brinca** med **eu**	
	mummy play with me	
27 A:	mmm	

In the passage above (excerpt 4), Adriana and Emma were playing with Emma's toys. Adriana is usually the one who attempts to negotiate language use (oftentimes unsuccessfully) by making explicit references to language based on purportedly fixed connections between person-nation-language. In this excerpt, however, Emma is the one who reproduces what Adriana says as she tries to regulate which language should be used in addressing Håkon. Moreover, it was not only language that was being negotiated in this excerpt, the activity was also at stake. So perhaps Emma conceded to her

mother's explicit request to use Portuguese in order to persuade Adriana to continue playing with her. It is worth unpacking this excerpt in detail.

From line 01–07, a conversation unfolds between Adriana and Håkon, who was elsewhere but walked into the room where Adriana and Emma were playing. During this exchange, Emma tries to get Adriana's attention by calling her in Portuguese (line 02) and in Norwegian (line 08). Not being successful, Emma tells Håkon to relax (line 09). Adriana uses the PDS 'Say x' (line 10), but Emma gives another directive (i.e. sleep, line 11).

Emma's utterance in line 12 needs clarification. *Hu* (also *hun* in some dialects in Norway) is a third-person singular feminine pronoun. It could be that Emma was referring to one of her toys. Another plausible interpretation, especially considering Emma's age and how she addresses Håkon in lines 09 and 16, is that Emma might have used the feminine form, rather than the masculine, to refer to Håkon. Adriana herself seems to have understood it this way, for Adriana asks (line 13) if she must address Håkon in Norwegian. In fact, when I played this back to Adriana in a subsequent visit, she confirmed Emma was addressing Håkon and that *heter* (is called) in this context meant *kommer fra* (comes from). Emma confirms she wanted Adriana to speak Norwegian to Håkon (line 14) and manages to have Adriana tell Håkon, in Norwegian, he should sleep (line 17).

Emma repeats what Adriana said, adding that Håkon should relax (line 18). In line 19, Adriana reaffirms her compliance to the terms laid out by Emma and continues using Norwegian, though drawing on Portuguese too (i.e. 'vai' and 'tá cansado'). In line 20, Emma says Håkon doesn't want to rest, perhaps subtly indicating they should focus on something else now. Adriana uses the PDS rephrase (line 21), and Emma proposes a resolution: since Håkon does not want to rest, Emma and Adriana should carry on playing (line 22). In line 23, Adriana craftily retrieves Emma's terms of language negotiation (line 12) to say she is not Norwegian and, thus, she speaks Portuguese (yet, drawing on Norwegian i.e. *heter*). Emma does not seem to abide by this rule for she continues to address her mother in Norwegian in line 24. Adriana then, in line 25, uses the PDS addressee-bound and finally manages to elicit some Portuguese from Emma (line 26).

Excerpts 1–4 tell us a few interesting things about the role of PDSs in promoting the use of Portuguese (or not), and showing how participants draw on their multilingual repertoires in forging familial bonds as they go about their daily lives.

The first excerpt contained no explicit requests for Emma to use Portuguese, and Emma drew more freely on her emerging linguistic repertoire, producing utterances fully in Portuguese. Conversely, excerpts 2, 3 and 4 illustrated how the use certain PDSs (i.e. the addressee-bound, code-bound, and code rebuttal) employed by Adriana did not necessarily lead to the intended use of Portuguese by Emma.

Interestingly, demonstrating contextual sensitivity to the languages used by her parents (cf. Lanza 1992), Emma incorporates Adriana's discourse strategies into her own language practices (i.e. excerpt 4). In doing so, Emma regulates the languages her parents should use according to their respective nationalities. The picture is more complex than this, however, because when Emma suggests Håkon should be addressed in Norwegian because he is Norwegian, she implicitly concedes it is acceptable that Adriana, admittedly Brazilian, speaks Norwegian. Rather than purposefully drawing on abstractions such as people, nation and language, what Emma seems to be doing is safeguarding Portuguese as a label to describe the language as a practice (Pennycook 2010) in and through which intimate, affective daughter-mother ties between her and Adriana are constructed.

Another possible interpretation draws on Little's (2017) study of heritage language learners in the United Kingdom. Combining questionnaire and interview data, Little (2017) proposes that, unlike their parents, young children may struggle to identify with pragmatic (e.g. future job prospects) or emotional reasons to use the heritage language in the home. Similarly, Revis (2016) investigation of the family language policies of Ethiopian and Colombian families with refugee background in New Zealand taps into metalinguistic commentaries that express connections between national identity and language use. Particularly relevant for this study is the case of Lydia, a six-year-old daughter

of an Ethiopian family. In interactions with her mother, Lydia reportedly preferred English to Amharic because 'she was 'kiwi' and therefore did not need to speak Amharic' (Revis 2016, 183).

Building on findings of Little (2017) and Revis (2016), excerpt 4 provides an example of how national identity becomes relevant in negotiations of language use between a parent and a child as young as 3 years of age. Noticeably, while drawing on her mother's strategy of regulating language use based on national affiliation, Emma finds it acceptable for her Brazilian mother to speak Norwegian to Håkon. This suggests that children may have a different understanding of and approach to bilingual interaction than parents (Wilson 2019). Furthermore, being socialised into a language regime in which language and nationality are closely connected, Emma might find that this strategy is an acceptable way of bypassing a potential lack of knowledge in Portuguese while moving forward in the conversation. That is, perhaps not being able to reformulate in Portuguese what she had spoken in Norwegian, Emma is granted 'permission' to speak Norwegian if she justifies her language choice based on her interlocutor's national identity.

Likewise, Gafaranga's (2010) study of the language practices of Rwandans in Belgium highlighted the crucial role of children in processes of language shift. Drawing on Fishman's (1991) call for investigations of face-to-face interactions in studies of language shift, Gafaranga (2010) demonstrated how a community-level process of shift from Kinyarwanda to French was taking place in interactions between children and adults, in other words, how language shift was talked into being.

Reflected in the title of this section, Gafaranga's (2010) work is a clear inspiration for this study. Yet, drawing on and feeding into contemporary sociolinguistic discussions about the ontological status of language, negotiation of identities, and practice-based understandings of language policy (García, Flores, and Spotti 2017; Tollefson and Pérez-Milans 2018), I move away from a Fishmanian language maintenance and shift paradigm, and I aim to take studies of family multilingualism in the direction of exploring how family members negotiate language use to make sense of their transnational selves (Little 2017; Revis 2016).

The overarching goal of this article is not exactly to understand whether the language practices of Adriana, Emma, and Håkon could be representative of a broader process of maintenance of Portuguese (or shift to Norwegian) in future generations of a supposedly homogeneous Brazilian diaspora. Rather, the aim of the analysis is to show how family members draw on their multilingual language repertoires to forge family ties and navigate complex national affiliations as they negotiate language choice and go about daily tasks. Put differently, in this article I illustrate how members of this family talk their multilingual selves into being. In order to better understand this process, it is crucial to investigate the language ideologies that may find expressions in the language practices observed in the home, a discussion I now turn to.

One-person-one-language-one-nation ideology

Emma telling who should speak what language to whom seems to be a recurring situation which Adriana demonstrated being aware of, as the interview data illustrates. In the excerpt below from an interview (5), Adriana gives examples of what Emma says to regulate language use in the home:

(5) Interview with Adriana (30.08.2017)

Mas ela, ela não deixa ele falar português. Aí se ele fala 'obrigado', 'obrigado, mamãe'. E ele não– 'Pappa er Norge' ela é bem clara nisso 'Pappa er Norge. Mamma, Emma brasileira', 'Emma brasileira', 'Emma, você é norge?', 'nei er ikke norge'@@@ (@@@). Aí eu falo com ela 'Nós falamos– nós falamos português'.

But she, she doesn't let him speak Portuguese. Then if he says 'thank you', 'thank you, mummy'. And he no– 'Daddy is Norway' she is very clear in it 'Daddy is Norway. Mamma, Emma Brazilian', 'Emma Brazilian', 'Emma are you Norway?','No [I] am not Norway' @@@ (@@@) Then I say to her 'We speak– we speak Portuguese'.

Moreover, in the following excerpt (6), I asked Adriana if she had established rules of language use in the home. Adriana said there are no rules, but she acknowledged telling Emma that they are Brazilian

and, as such, they speak Portuguese, which suggests Adriana is the originator of this negotiating move. Also, Adriana seems to be aware of certain PDSs reported here, such as addressee-bound ('Emma, how do you speak with mummy?'), and rephrase ('So what she doesn't know I repeat'.).

(6) Interview with Adriana (30.08.2017)

Quando ela fala norueguês eu falo assim 'Emma, como é que fala com a mamãe?' Aí ela vai– ela repete, ela sabe. O que ela não sabe eu falo, porque eu sei que ela não sabe [umhum] ela não sabe tudo. Então, o nível de norueguês dela é muito alto em relação ao nível de português [umhum]. Ela sabe se comunicar muito bem em norueguês. Então o que ela não sabe eu repito. Mas assim não regras (tá) não. Eu deixo mais– mas ela sabe /que/ comigo ela fala português. (umhum) @@@ 'Mamãe não fala norueguês, mamãe er ikke norsk' @@@

When she speaks Norwegian I say: 'Emma, how do you speak with mummy?' Then she goes– she repeats, she knows. What she doesn't know I say, because I know that she doesn't know (umhum) she doesn't know everything. So, her level of Norwegian is very high in relation to the level of Portuguese (umhum). She can communicate very well in Norwegian. So what she doesn't know I repeat. But like not rules (ok) no. I leave more– but she knows /that/ with me she speaks Portuguese. (umhum) @@@ 'Mummy doesn't speak Norwegian, mummy is not Norwegian'. @@@

The interview data suggests that Adriana might use OPOL as a strategy. The interactional data presented here, however, shows that Adriana actually does draw on Norwegian on certain occasions (i.e. excerpts 2 and 4) when addressing Emma. Thus, instead of describing what parents do (cf. Romaine 1995), OPOL seems to be more appropriate to label the strategies that parents *report* using. Contradictions between reported language use and language practices resonate with previous research findings (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen 2016) and motivate the analysis of interactional data undertaken here.

Furthermore, employing a 'translingual lens' to analyse the conflation of parental reported language use with interactional data helps us see that OPOL as *strategy* carries in itself the assumption about the separateness of languages. From a 'translingual lens', rather than a *strategy*, it is more helpful to think of OPOL (or OPOLON) as a multilayered *ideology* carried on by parents. At an interactional level, it substantiates an understanding that in order to successfully raise children bilingually, parents should avoid drawing on their multilingual language repertoire and should, instead, only use one language (but see De Houwer 2007). At a societal level, it speaks to the political dimension of the interconnections between the formation of modern nation-states, the invention of traditional understandings of language, and imagination of peoples as homogenous groups, all of which have been amply scrutinised and criticised (e.g. Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Piller 2016; Wright 2016).

Adriana's requests to use Portuguese based on her and Emma's national identity as Brazilian can be interpreted as reminiscent of ideological workings that tie together a people to a language and a nation. That is, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Adriana's strategy to elicit use of Portuguese is informed by her own beliefs about the interconnections between people, language, and nation. This argument is strengthened by the examination of other parts of the interview, for example, when I asked Adriana what it would mean to her for Emma to know Portuguese (excerpt 7):

(7) Interview with Adriana (30.08.2017)

Comunicar … com eles lá. É– gostar do Brasil? Talvez ter um interesse, porque se você não ensina, né, /mais tarde/ eles não vão ter interesse nem no país, não vai querer ir nem no país, nem na língua, nem em nada. Então eu quero que ela tenha interesse no Brasil. Nós somos brasileiras.

To communicate … with them there. Er … to like Brazil? Maybe to have an interest, because if you don't teach, right, later on they won't even be interested in the country, won't even want to go to the country, not even in the language, in anything. So I want her to be interested in Brazil. We're Brazilian.

Finally, the employment of a 'translingual lens' argued for here is far from being considered a panacea. Orthodox views that leave no room for ontological and epistemological diversity have been rightly called into question (Dewaele 2019). Another relevant point typically raised in this debate concerns policies aiming at the recognition and preservation of the rights of minorities such as

indigenous populations. Entering the intricacies of this debate is beyond the scope of this article. However, it should be noted that developing frameworks that challenge understandings of language as abstract systems that can be separated and labelled and attending to the needs of minority populations are not two mutually exclusive enterprises (Pennycook and Makoni 2020). With this in in mind, employing a 'translingual lens' to analyse the language practices taking place in the home of multilingual families can be useful for the following reason.

Highlighting the social and political dimensions of the epistemological development a positivist understanding of language as an abstract entity that can be separated, counted and labelled, a 'translingual lens' offers theoretical grounding for attempts to understand how language use is negotiated in the home. Specifically, it helps us to understand the role of a notion of language that binds together a people to a nation in negotiations of language use in the home. As I have argued, contrary to the parents' intentions, it could be that employing parental discourse strategies that make explicit references to named languages and national affiliations does not always lead to the outcome expected by the parent. In the next subsection, I further elaborate on the notions of explicit and implicit in FLP.

Rethinking the notions of explicit and implicit in FLP

In her recent definition of FLP, Curdt-Christiansen mentions 'explicit and overt' as well as 'implicit and covert' to characterise the language planning of family members in the home. In her words: 'Explicit and overt FLP refers to the deliberate and observable efforts made by adults and their conscious involvement and investment in providing linguistic conditions and context for language learning and literacy development. Implicit and covert FLP refers to the default language practices in a family as a consequence of ideological beliefs'. (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 420).

The analysis of interview data combined with the analysis of the interactional data suggests the distinction between explicit and implicit proposed by Curdt-Christiansen (2018) is insufficient to account for the language practices of Emma, Adriana and Håkon. It can be helpful to work with the notions of explicit and implicit, nonetheless, when examining the PDSs employed to negotiate language use, as shown in Table 3:

Limiting the notions of explicit and implicit to distinguish discourse strategies, I propose that family multilingual practices can be regimented by discourse strategies that make explicit references to named languages or addressees, and discourse strategies that may serve as implicit requests for a certain named language to be used. Whether implicit or explicit, this is a categorical interactional property whose value can be empirically identified and described. Put differently, whether participants make implicit requests to elicit language or explicit references to named languages (or people who are expected to use those languages) is something that can be verified empirically through

Table 3. PDSs as explicit references or implicit requests.

Parental Discourse Strategy	Type
Addressee-bound	Explicit references
How do you speak with mummy?	
Code-bound	
How do you say it in Portuguese?	
Code rebuttal	
Enough. It's not nok, it's enough.	
Filling gaps	Implicit requests
Little shells of my lo–	
Rephrase	
Emma: *jeg er ikke baby*	
Adriana: *não, não é bebê, é criança*	
Say 'x'	
Say 'Bye, see you later'.	
What is– frame	
What is this figure?	

analysis of interactional data. Additionally, interviews can be a productive way of examining if parents are aware of the discourse strategies employed by them, as I have shown.

Yet, discussing with parents the interactional consequences of the use of certain PDSs is something that was not covered in this study, but could generate insightful analyses. Similarly, the relevance of multimodal resources in multilingual interactions, noted in the drinking glass event (Figure 1), can be more aptly addressed if video recordings are employed. Finally, as noted in the analysis section, the arguments advanced here should be interpreted taking in consideration that they were based on data from one single case only. Therefore, there is no assumed normativity or universality in the set of PDSs identified in the corpus or the outcomes of their employment. They have been helpful here, however, as heuristic devices that were useful in an attempt to better understand the recorded language practices of Adriana's family.

Conclusion

The analysis put forward here taps into two analytical levels. The first level concerns the interactional consequences, with an emphasis on language negotiation, of the parental discourse strategies employed in parent–child interactions. After identifying a set of seven PDSs used by members of this family (Table 1), I described the pragmatic functions these strategies accomplished in interaction (Table 2). Moreover, I suggested that while the use of certain PDSs might contribute to the flow of communication by allowing Emma to draw more freely on features belonging to her emerging linguistic repertoire, PDSs that make explicit references to the language or to the addressee as a way to request use of Portuguese does not necessarily lead to the actual use of Portuguese by Emma. I further argued that a close analysis of the interactional data led to rethinking the notions explicit and implicit, much used, but undertheorised, in FLP literature. I suggested these notions can be employed in the context of analysing language practices to distinguish PDSs that make explicit references to named languages and addressees with the intention to negotiate language from PDSs that can be thought of as implicit ways of eliciting language (Table 3).

The second level of analysis relates to the role played by PDSs in the ways family members make sense of their transnational, multilingual selves. Combining analysis of interactional data with interview data allowed me to identify a language regime (Kroskrity 2000) where language practices, some of which arguably informed by an OPOLON ideology, serve as metapragmatic indicators of who should speak what language to whom. This ideology resonates with a programmatic construction of a nationalist ethos that binds together a people to a language and a nation (Piller 2016; Wright 2016).

To be sure, my point is not to interpret the attempts by Emma, a three-year-old child, to regulate what languages should be used by/to whom as the result of ideological workings. However, in discussing how master narratives enter minor ones in reference to the role of monolingual state ideologies, Busch (2012, 13) reminds us that 'constructs of national identity are internalized in the course of socialization'. In this article, I suggested that circulating monoglossic language ideologies can inform localised language practices and influence parent–child interactions and the ways they make sense of their transnational, multilingual selves and socialise their children.

In attending to the perspectives of participants, this exploratory study sought to understand how the localised language practices of this Brazilian-Norwegian family can be thought of as, at the same time, unique and structured (Blommaert 2007). As such, rather than proposing that the arguments advanced here will find resonances in multilingual families in general, or suggesting which PDS are more successful for the purposes of minority language maintenance, this study can offer insights into how notions such as Brazilian, Norwegian, and Portuguese are drawn upon in parent–child multilingual interactions as family members go about their daily lives.

In line with the need to analyse, on the one hand, the language strategies employed by parents as a reflex of language ideology and, on the other, how these strategies are interactionally enacted (Palviainen and Boyd 2013), this study can shed new light on debates concerning the discursive

construction of family ties, and the construction, negotiation, and of national affiliations as observed in multilingual language practices in the home of transnational families.

Furthermore, in the description of the language practices participants engage in, it is analytically useful to employ the terms *Portuguese* and *Norwegian*. Using these terms, however, is not divorced from an understanding of languages as social practices embedded in political and historical contexts. Put differently, while serving the purposes of description in this article, the employment of these terms does not subscribe to an understanding of languages as entities that rest, ontologically, as systems that can be neatly separated, labelled and counted. Yet, future endeavours in the direction of developing novel ways of describing language practices are surely welcome.

Finally, for over one century (cf. Ronjat 1913) studies have shown that parents can be very diligent in their planning of raising multilingual child. However, excerpts 1–4 showed that multiple social actions happen simultaneously in multilingual households, negotiating language choice being one of them. All these actions require different levels of engagement of parents or caregivers. In certain occasions, negotiating language choice might, quite understandably, not be prioritised over attending to more urgent needs. This would not sound as any novelty to people who have raised, taken care of, taught, observed, or interacted with children in another capacity.

Linking this discussion to an axiomatic assumption of a framework of language policy pervasively employed in FLP (i.e. Spolsky 2009; 2012) leads to the following question: is language policy all about choices? Considering the points I made above, my answer is: maybe not (see also Pennycook 2017). Conversely, parental choices are not only about ideology either. Perhaps the question that is really worth asking, then, is: what are the consequences of employing epistemological models that aim at universality to analysing localised language practices of multilingual families? Trying to answer this question is beyond the scope of this article. However, exploring alternatives to universal models through critical, ethnographic approaches to multilingualism has proven to be a constructive endeavour (e.g. García, Flores, and Spotti 2017; Heller and McElhinny 2017; Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Martin-Jones and Martin 2017; Tollefson and Pérez-Milans 2018). Thus, drawing on such approaches could advance family multilingualism research in directions worth exploring.

Transcription Conventions

Roman type	Used for Norwegian
Bold type	Used for Portuguese
Italics type	Used for English
—	Em dash indicates self-interruption
?	Question mark indicates rising intonation
•	Dot indicates pauses
( )	Parentheses enclose backchannels
(( ))	Double parentheses enclose researcher annotation
[	Left square bracket indicates onset of overlap at word level
[ ]	Square brackets enclose insertions
" "	Quotation marks enclose reported speech
@	Laughter
/ /	Slashes enclose uncertain transcription
#	Number sign indicates incomprehensible speech

Note

1. I thank research assistant Ingeborg Anna Bakken for transcribing parts of the audio recordings.

Acknowledgements

References

Aarset, Monica Five. 2016. "Transnational Practices and Local Lives. Quran Courses via Skype in Norwegian-Pakistani Families." *Identities* 23 (4): 438–453.

Abreu Fernandes, Olga. 2019. "Language Workout in Bilingual Mother-Child Interaction: A Case Study of Heritage Language Practices in Russian-Swedish Family Talk." *Journal of Pragmatics* 140: 88–99.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Beiler, Ingrid Miriam Rodrick. 2019. "Negotiating Multilingual Resources in English Writing Instruction for Recent Immigrants to Norway." *TESOL Quarterly*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1002/tesq.535.

Blommaert, Jan. 2007. "Commentaries. On Scope and Depth in Linguistic Ethnography." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (5): 682–688.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Bubikova-Moan, Jarmila. 2017. "Constructing the Multilingual Child: The Case of Language Education Policy in Norway." *Critical Discourse Studies* 14 (1): 56–72. doi:10.1080/17405904.2016.1190389.

Busch, Brigitta. 2012. "The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited." *Applied Linguistics* 33 (5): 1–22.

Cavalcanti, Marilda C., and Terezinha M. Maher, eds. 2017. *Multilingual Brazil: Language Resources, Identities and Ideologies in a Globalized World*. New York: Routledge.

Coetzee, Frieda. 2018. "Hy Leer die nie Hier nie ('He Doesn't Learn It Here'): Talking About Children's Swearing in Extended Families in Multilingual South Africa." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 15 (3): 291–305. doi:10. 1080/ 14790718.2018.1477291.

Connor, Janet E. 2019. "Regimes of Hearing: Norwegian Qualia of Quiet and Noise as Heard Through a Migrant Classroom." *Language & Communication* 66: 55–66. doi:10.1016/j.langcom.2018.10.003.

Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2016. "Conflicting Language Ideologies and Contradictory Language Practices in Singaporean Multilingual Families." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (7): 694–709.

Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2018. "Family Language Policy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, edited by James Tollefson, and Miguel Perez-Milans, 420–441. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

da Costa Cabral, Ildegrada. 2018. "From Dili to Dungannon: An Ethnographic Study of Two Multilingual Migrant Families from Timor-Leste." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 15 (3): 276–290.

De Houwer, Annick. 2007. "Parental Language Input Patterns and Children's Bilingual Use." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28 (3): 411–424.

de Souza, Lynn Mario T. Menezes. 2017. "Epistemic Diversity, Lazy Reason, and Ethical Translation in Postcolonial Contexts: The Case of Indigenous Educational Policy in Brazil." In *Entangled Discourses: South-North Orders of Visibility*, edited by Caroline Kerfoot, and Kenneth Hyltenstam, 189–208. New York and London: Routledge.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc. 2019. "The Vital Need for Ontological, Epistemological and Methodological Diversity in Applied Linguistics." In *Voices and Practices in Applied Linguistics: Diversifying a Discipline*, edited by Clare Wright, Lou Harvey, and James Simpson, 71–88. Sheffield, York: White Rose University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctvs09r4p.7.

Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fogle, Lyn Wright. 2012. *Second Language Socialization and Learner Agency: Adoptive Family Talk*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gafaranga, Joseph. 2010. "Medium Request: Talking Language Shift into Being." *Language in Society* 39 (2): 241–270.

Gallo, Sarah, and Nancy H. Hornberger. 2019. "Immigration Policy as Family Language Policy: Mexican Immigrant Children and Families in Search of Biliteracy." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 23 (3): 757–770. doi:10.1177/1367006916684908.

García, Ofelia, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti, eds. 2017. *Handbook of Language and Society*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

García, Ofelia, and Rosario Torres-Guevara. 2009. "Monoglossic Ideologies and Language Policies in the Education of US Latinas/os." In *Handbook of Latinos and Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by Enrique Murillo, Sofía Villenas, Ruth Trinidad Galván, Juan Sánchez Muñoz, Corinne Martínez, and Margarita Machado-Casas, 182–193. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. 2018. "Translanguaging." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by Carol A. Chapelle. John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1488.

Garrett, Paul B., and Patricia Baquedano-López. 2002. "Language Socialization: Reproduction and Continuity, Transformation and Change." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 339–361. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085352.

Gordon, Cynthia. 2009. *Making Meanings, Creating Family: Intertextuality and Framing in Family Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica, and Bonnie McElhinny. 2017. *Language, Capitalism, Colonialism: Toward a Critical History*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Hiratsuka, Akiko, and Alastair Pennycook. 2019. "Translingual Family Repertoires: 'No, Morci is Itaiitai Panzita, Amor'." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/01434632.2019.1645145.

Hua, Zhu, and Li Wei. 2016. "Transnational Experience, Aspiration and Family Language Policy." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (7): 655–666. doi:10.1080/01434632.2015.1127928.

Juan-Garau, Maria, and Carmen Pérez-Vidal. 2001. "Mixing and Pragmatic Parental Strategies in Early Bilingual Acquisition." *Journal of Child Language* 28 (1): 59–86. doi:10.1017/S0305000900004591.

Kendrick, Maureen, and Elizabeth Namazzi. 2017. "Family Language Practices as Emergent Policies in Child-Headed Households in Rural Uganda." In *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World: Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences*, edited by John Macalister, and Seyed Hadi Mirvahedi, 56–73. New York: Routledge.

King, Kendall. 2016. "Language Policy, Multilingual Encounters, and Transnational Families." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (7): 726–733. doi:10.1080/01434632.2015.1127927.

King, Kendall, and Elizabeth Lanza. 2019. "Ideology, Agency, and Imagination in Multilingual Families: An Introduction." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 23 (3): 717–723. doi:10.1177/136700691668490.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kuczynski, Leon. 2002. "Beyond Bidirectionality: Bilateral Conceptual Frameworks for Studying Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations." In *Handbook of Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations*, edited by Leon Kuczynski, 3–24. London: Sage Publications.

Lane, Pia. 2010. ""We Did What We Thought Was Best for Our Children": A Nexus Analysis of Language Shift in a Kven Community." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2010 (202): 63–78. doi:10.1515/ijsl.2010.014.

Lanza, Elizabeth. 1992. "Can Bilingual Two-Year-Olds Code-Switch?" *Journal of Child Language* 19 (3): 633–658. doi:10.1017/S0305000900011600.

Lanza, Elizabeth. 1997. *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lanza, Elizabeth. 1998. "Raising Children Bilingually in Norway." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 133 (1): 73–88. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1998.133.73.

Lanza, Elizabeth, and Rafael Lomeu Gomes. 2020. "Family Language Policy: Foundations, Theoretical Perspectives and Critical Approaches." In *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development: Social and Affective Factors*, edited by Andrea C. Schalley and Susana A. Eisenchlas, 153–173. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lindquist, Hein, and Nina Gram Garmann. 2019. "Toddlers and Their Translingual Practicing Homes." *International Journal of Multilingualism*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/14790718.2019.1604712.

Little, Sabine. 2017. "Whose Heritage? What Inheritance?: Conceptualising Family Language Identities." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23 (2): 198–212. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1348463.

Lomeu Gomes, Rafael. 2018. "Family Language Policy Ten Years On: A Critical Approach to Family Multilingualism." *Multilingual Margins: A journal of multilingualism from the periphery* 5 (2): 51–72. doi:10.14426/mm.v5i2.98.

Lomeu Gomes, Rafael. 2019. "Family Multilingualism: Language Practices and Ideologies of Brazilian-Norwegian Families in Norway." PhD Dissertation, University of Oslo.

Lomeu Gomes, Rafael. In press. "Family Multilingualism from a Southern Perspective: Language Ideologies and Practices of Brazilian Parents in Norway." Manuscript accepted for publication in Multilingua.

Luykx, Aurolyn. 2003. "Weaving Languages Together: Family Language Policy and Gender Socialization in Bilingual Aymara Households." In *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies*, edited by Robert Bayley, and Sandra R. Schecter, 25–43. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Makoni, Sinfree, and Alastair Pennycook, eds. 2007. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Martin-Jones, Marilyn, and Deirdre Martin, eds. 2017. *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Norrick, Neal R. 1991. "On the Organization of Corrective Exchanges in Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 16 (1): 59–83. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(91)90005-I.

Ochs, Elinor. 1986. "Introduction." In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs, 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2008. "Language Socialization: An Historical Overview." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, edited by Nancy H. Hornberger, 03–15. Boston, MA: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_193.

Opsahl, Toril, and Unn Røyneland. 2016. "Reality Rhymes: Recognition of Rap in Multicultural Norway." *Linguistics and Education* 36: 45–54.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García, and Wallis Reid. 2018. "A Translanguaging View of the Linguistic System of Bilinguals." *Applied Linguistics Review* 10: 625–651. Advance online publication. doi:10.1515/applirev-2018-0020.

Palviainen, Åsa, and Sally Boyd. 2013. "Unity in Discourse, Diversity in Practice: The One Person One Language Policy in Bilingual Families." In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz, and Anna Verschik, 223–248. Dordrecht: Springer.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2017. "Language Policy and Local Practices." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*, edited by Ofelia García, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti, 125–140. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pennycook, Alastair, and Sinfree Makoni. 2020. *Innovations and Challenges in Applied Linguistics from the Global South*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Piller, Ingrid. 2016. "Herder: An Explainer for Linguists." *Language on the Move*, March 4. Accessed November 9, 2019. https://www.languageonthemove.com/herder-an-explainer-for-linguists/.

Revis, Melanie. 2016. "A Bourdieusian Perspective on Child Agency in Family Language Policy." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22 (2): 177–191. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1239691.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ronjat, Jules. 1913. *Le Développement du Langage Observé chez un Enfant Bilingue*. Paris: Champion.

Røyneland, Unn. 2018. "Virtually Norwegian: Negotiating Language and Identity on YouTube." In *Multilingual Youth Practices in Computer Mediated Communication*, edited by Unn Røyneland, and Cecilia Cutler, 145–167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Said, Fatma, and Zhu Hua. 2019. ""No, No Maama! Say '*Shaatir ya Ouledee Shaatir* '!" Children's Agency in Language Use and Socialisation." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 23 (3): 771–785. doi:0.1177/1367006916684919.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., and Elinor Ochs. 1986. "Language Socialization." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 163–191. doi:10.1146/annurev.an.15.100186.001115.

Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2016. *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language in the Home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2017. "Family Language Policy: New Directions." In *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World: Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences*, edited by John Macalister, and Seyed Hadi Mirvahedi, 23–39. New York: Routledge.

Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2018. "'One Cas, Two Cas': Exploring the Affective Dimensions of Family Language Policy." *Multilingua* 37 (2): 131–152. doi:10.1515/multi-2017-0018.

Sollid, Hilde. 2013. "Ethnolects in Northern Norway: From National Negligence to Local Linguistic Pride." In *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, Identities, Space, Education*, edited by Peter Siemund, Ingrid Gogolin, Monika Edith Schulz, and Julia Davydova, 63–94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2009. *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2012. "Family Language Policy – The Critical Domain." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33 (1): 3–11. doi:10.1080/01434632.2011.638072.

Srivastava, Prachi, and Nick Hopwood. 2009. "A Practical Iterative Framework for Qualitative Data Analysis." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 8 (1): 76–84. doi:10.1177/160940690900800107.

Statistics Norway. 2019. "Norwegian-Born to Immigrant Parents - Demography, Education, Work and Income." *Report 2019/21*, July 4. Accessed October 18, 2019. https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/norwegian-born-to-immigrant-parents-demography-education-work-and-income.

Svendsen, Bente Ailin. 2018. "The Dynamics of Citizen Sociolinguistics." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 22 (2): 137–160. doi:10.1111/josl.12276.

Svendsen, Bente Ailin, and Unn Røyneland. 2008. "Multiethnolectal Facts and Functions in Oslo, Norway." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12 (1&2): 63–83.

Tannen, Deborah, Shari Kendall, and Cynthia Gordon. 2007. *Family Talk. Discourse and Identity in Four American Families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tollefson, James W., and Miguel Pérez-Milans. 2018. *Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Mensel, Luk. 2018. "'Quiere Koffie?' The Multilingual Familylect of Transcultural Families." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 15 (3): 233–248. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477096.

Wei, Li. 2018. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9–30. doi:10.1093/applin/amx039.

Wilson, Sonia. 2019. "Family Language Policy Through the Eyes of Bilingual Children: the Case of French Heritage Speakers in the UK." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–19. doi:10.1080/01434632.2019.1595633.

Wortham, Stanton, and Angela Reyes. 2015. *Discourse Analysis Beyond the Speech Event*. London: Routledge.

Wright, Sue. 2016. ""Peuple, Langue, Territoire". France, the Monolingual Nation State." *Sociolinguistica* 30 (1): 45–64.