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Abstract


This is a survey study of language maintenance and shift among first and second generation Iranians in Sweden and is based on existing theoretical frameworks. It examines whether Iranians in Sweden are maintaining their Persian or shifting to Swedish. This is explored by examining factors at both the minority-group and individual levels, which according to many previous studies have a potential impact on the matter. The subjects are 188 Persian–Swedish bilinguals between the ages of 6 and 53. They are divided into two groups: one comprising 100 pupils, and the other 88 adults many of whom are the parents of students in the first group. The elicitation instruments are two questionnaires which explore the subjects’ language background, socioeconomic status, linguistic environment in Sweden, patterns of language use in different domains, extent of exposure to Swedish and Persian, competence in both languages, and attitudes towards their languages and countries.

The results confirm many findings of the previous studies. The demographic data reveals that exogamy is increasing, especially among the younger generation. The socioeconomic results show that Iranians in western countries make a strong effort to attain the same living standard they had before migration. They believe that the key to social and economic success is knowledge of the majority language. The language socialization results demonstrate that the second generation is being socialized to a much greater extent in their second language and culture. They are also much more competent in Swedish than in Persian. The first generation not only has full-fledged Persian, but also advanced Swedish, which may be taken as evidence of their intention to integrate. It is also shown that Persian is the main instrument of communication in the families; however some Swedish is also used, especially by the younger children. Furthermore, mothers use Swedish more than fathers, because they are much more involved in their children’s education, a responsibility that demands greater second language skills, and which in turn has a direct effect on their social mobility, not only within the family but also within society as a whole.
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This book is a study of language maintenance and shift among first and second generation Iranians in Sweden. It is a survey analysis and is based on existing theoretical frameworks. The present study does not attempt to provide an exhaustive description of the many approaches that scholars have adopted in studying language maintenance and shift, rather it provides an overview of the literature that has been written on the subject in recent decades. The literature review begins by examining studies investigating the maintenance and shift situation of different minority languages around the world. It then presents the studies which account for the Swedish situation for different minority groups, specifically the group under investigation in this particular study.

What makes this study different from many other investigations of language maintenance and shift is that six different themes are used to shed light on the research issue, namely whether Iranians in Sweden are maintaining their mother tongue or if they are shifting to the majority language. It provides information on different factors at the minority group level and at the individual level that have potential impact on the issue. It presents information about sociocultural and socioeconomic changes that are taking place among Iranians. It also investigates the extent to which Iranian children are being socialized in each language and culture, not only in their home domain, e.g. via the mass media, but also outside the home domain in settings such as childcare centers, during preschool, in school and during after-school hours, in family gatherings, and at traditional festivals, as well as in residential areas through network structures and the like. This study gives some ideas about the extent of the language competence of the first and second generation Iranians, both in the mother tongue and in the second language. The language that is chosen by the participants in different situations, both inside and outside the home domain, and the attitudes that might play a role in their language choices and language development, are also explored.

The results from this study confirm many findings of the previous studies in this field. For example, the demographic data of Iranians in Sweden reveals that some sociocultural changes such as increasing exogamy (inter-ethnic marriage), especially among the younger generation, are taking place. The socioeconomic results show that Iranians in western countries who generally belonged to the upper-middle class in Iran make a strong effort to attain the same socioeconomic standard they had before migration. They
seem to be very aware of the fact that knowledge of the mother tongue does not pay off in the linguistic market of the host country, while knowledge of the majority language brings them social and economic enhancement. The language socialization results demonstrate that the second generation is being socialized to a much greater extent in their second language and culture. The results for language competence reveal that the second generation is much more competent in the second language than the first. The first generation, on the other hand, has not only a full-fledged first language, but also an advanced second language which may be taken as evidence of their integration intention. The results on language-use patterns show that Persian is the main instrument of communication between the parents and children. However, some Swedish is also used, especially by the younger children. Mothers also use Swedish more than fathers because they are much more involved in their children’s education, a responsibility that demands greater second language skills, which in turn has a direct social mobility effect for them, not only within their families but also within society as a whole.

Based on the findings, the present study contends that it seems Iranians have chosen to move towards the dominant group in order to decrease their social distance from the majority country. At the same time, it appears that they have chosen to diverge from their own group in order not to be associated with its negative characteristics.

This study defines the term language shift as referring to the process in language-contact situations where minority individuals gradually abandon the regular use of their mother tongue and develop a regular use of the majority language and in so doing are socially, economically, and psychologically motivated. This study also emphasizes that the language maintenance and shift of every particular group must be investigated using a combination of several factors in order to give a more compelling picture of that particular group. It is not enough to describe merely one factor such as the group’s patterns of language use or the like, as has been the case in many studies. Social, economic, and psychological factors must be taken into account.
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1.1 The goals of the study

The phenomena of language maintenance and language shift have been studied from various perspectives by many researchers. Different processes leading to these phenomena have been investigated to explain a host of factors which may cause minority languages either to gradually disappear or to show resistance to disappearing. These factors may be linguistic, social, political, and economic in nature. One of the outcomes of studies in the field of language maintenance and shift is that most of the factors identified are ambiguous, meaning that they may lead to the maintenance of a language in one situation, while in another to its shift.

Another problematic issue is that these factors interact in very sophisticated ways, to the extent that it is almost impossible to determine the effects of every individual factor or the degree of its role in the maintenance or shift of a language. This is due partly to the dynamic nature of these contextual factors and partly to the specific characteristics of the particular settings which are in force. This means that while many of these factors more or less describe the causes and processes of language shift, they are far from exhaustive or universal (see e.g. Tosi 1999). It also means that every case of language contact is a unique example of language maintenance and shift with some shared and some specific factors. Therefore, every description of a language-contact situation based on the identified factors will no doubt add to a better understanding of the related phenomena. The present study is an effort in this direction. Its contribution will hopefully be that, by studying the language situation of an immigrant group (Iranians in Sweden), which very few studies have previously focused upon, it will broaden our understanding and knowledge of language maintenance and shift phenomena specific for this minority group\(^1\) in Sweden.

\(^1\) In this study the expression minority group refers to both immigrant groups in majority countries and indigenous minority groups. It is important to mention that the main concern here is the language maintenance and shift issues of the immigrant groups in the majority countries and not the indigenous minority groups, and also that since this study does not seek to establish similarities/dissimilarities between these two groups in the process of language maintenance and shift, they are not treated separately.
This study uses the existing frameworks in the field of language maintenance and shift and is not aiming to present a theoretical model for this research area. A general theory of language maintenance and shift that can be applied to every language-contact situation, and is able to predict whether or not a minority language will be maintained, has not been put forward (de Bot & Huebner 1992; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004). This may be due to the aforementioned problems, such as the language-influencing factors affecting each other multidirectionally, and their neither being exhaustive nor universal (see also King 2001). However, some frameworks have been put forward in studies describing unique cases of language maintenance and shift. These are a part of the theoretical structure of the present study.

This study has a sociolinguistic perspective. It concentrates on a few factors that concern the Iranian minority group in Sweden as a whole and also factors regarding individuals. It is less concerned with the dynamics of political and ideological factors at the societal level. It also explores a process by which Persian is partially or totally replaced by Swedish to the extent that Persian does not function in one or more of its former domains. This study investigates one main research question:

Research question Are Iranians in Sweden maintaining their mother tongue\(^2\) or are they shifting to the majority language?

The present study has chosen the following five sub-questions in order to answer the above research question:

1. Are any sociocultural changes taking place among Iranians in Sweden?
2. To what extent are Iranian children being socialized in Persian and in Swedish?
3. To what extent are Iranians in Sweden competent in their languages?
4. What language(s) do Iranians in Sweden choose to speak with whom and where?

The group that has more power, the dominant group, is called the majority group, as opposed to the dominated minority group which usually has less social power. These two concepts may refer not only to the number of speakers in each group, but also to the power relationship between the groups. This means that the dominating group need not outnumber the dominated group to be in a majority position. Paulston (1997:187f) maintains that using the term “minority” is rather unfortunate, because the issue is not really the number, but the group’s secondary and subordinate position in society. It is the exploitation of other people who speak another language which is the real issue, and, no doubt, taking advantage of small minority groups is easier. In this context, it is the language of the dominated group which usually gives way to the language of the dominating group and is, therefore, in danger of disappearing.

\(^2\) In this study the terms mother tongue, home language, and first language (L1) are treated synonymously as referring to the language(s) a child acquires first.
5. What are the attitudes of Iranians toward their home country and
country of residence, their mother tongue and Swedish?

Based on the above sub-questions six hypotheses are formed. Research sub-
question 1 leads to hypotheses A and B:

*Hypothesis A*  The demographic data of Iranians in Sweden points to
their intention to integrate in the host country.

*Hypothesis B*  The socioeconomic changes that are taking place
among Iranians in Sweden have a negative impact on
their mother tongue maintenance.

Research sub-question 2 leads to hypothesis C:

*Hypothesis C*  The extent of socialization of Iranian children in Per-
sian is much less than in Swedish, which in turn limits
their chances of maintaining their first language.

Research sub-question 3 leads to hypothesis D:

*Hypothesis D*  First generation\(^3\) Iranians are more competent in their
first language than their second,\(^4\) whereas second gen-
eration\(^5\) Iranians are more competent in their second
language than their first.

Research sub-question 4 leads to hypothesis E:

*Hypothesis E*  Persian is the only means of communication in the
home domain, while Swedish holds that position out-
side the home domain.

Research sub-question 5 leads to hypothesis F:

---

\(^3\) In this study the expression first generation refers to foreign-born adult immigrants who may
be citizens of either their country of origin or the majority country. Modarresi (2001:100)
defines first- and second generation in his study of Iranians in the U.S. as:

The first generation Iranian are those who ‘personally’ decided or chose to leave their
own country and immigrated to the U.S.; the children of these people, who were
brought to or born in this country and did not have any major role in choosing the
country they want to live in, are called second generation.

\(^4\) In this study the term second language (L2) refers to the language acquired/learned after the
first language.

\(^5\) In this study the expression second generation refers to those who may have immigrated to
the majority country during their childhood or may have been born in the majority country.
They may also be citizens of either or both countries.
Hypothesis F

The majority of Iranians in Sweden have positive feelings toward their home country and country of residence, and about their mother tongue and Swedish.

The subjects of this study are divided into two groups. The first includes 100 Persian–Swedish bilingual students and the second consists of 88 Iranian adults who are the parents of the students in the first group.

The students are divided into five sub-groups including children in the final year of preschool (called Grade 0), students in Swedish comprehensive school\(^6\) in Grades 3, 6, and 9, and finally, a group of students in the upper-secondary school\(^7\) (called Grades 10–12 in the present study). Henceforth Grade 0 is included in the discussion of the comprehensive school for convenience. Their age range is between 6 and 22 years.

The parent group includes 66 mothers and 22 fathers. The majority came to Sweden in the middle of the 1980s at the peak of Iran–Iraq war. They are between 29 and 53 years old. A large proportion of the mothers are in their thirties, while most of the fathers are in their forties.

The main elicitation instruments used for data collection are two questionnaires designed for bilingual subjects and their parents (see Appendices 1 and 2). There is also demographic data on Iranians in Sweden which is collected from the official statistical documents in Sweden and also other studies about this minority group in Sweden and other countries in the world.

1.2 The organization of this book

This book consists of 12 chapters. The present chapter introduces the goals and structure of the book. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical frameworks upon which this study is based. It describes Tajfel’s (1974, 1981) theory of social identity and intergroup relations. It also presents the Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson 1987; Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991) which is based on the Speech Accommodation Theory, first put forward by Giles (1973) and further developed by Giles, Bourhis & Taylor (1977). Furthermore, it discusses Accommodation Theory’s application in terms of language maintenance and shift.

Chapter 3 presents some basic conceptual definitions of language maintenance and shift and describes the assimilation process and the time needed for minority language shift to take place. It puts forward a taxonomic

\(^6\) The Swedish comprehensive school is 9 years (Grades 1–9). In comparison to the American education system it includes the elementary school (6 years) and the junior high school (3 years).

\(^7\) The upper-secondary school in Sweden (called gymnasium) includes Grades 10–12 and is equivalent to senior high school in the American education system.
framework of determinants for minority language maintenance and shift. This framework, which is a part of the theoretical framework of the present study, tries to capture and summarize the major factors that are identified as influencing language maintenance and shift, with an overview of the studies focusing on these factors at societal, group, and individual levels.

Chapter 4 discusses the research methods for the study. It includes a general introduction to the research methods used for investigating minority language maintenance and shift, along with a more specific description of the methodology used in this particular study. Research questions and hypotheses are introduced, along with a discussion of why these particular questions have been chosen. The chapter then moves on to describing the subjects of the present study in detail, with a discussion on sampling procedures. Then, the elicitation instruments are accounted for in detail. Finally, the administration procedures for data collection are described.

Chapter 5 presents the strategies used for analyzing the data. It explains different techniques such as crosstabulations, frequencies, and means that are used to give a general description of the language maintenance and shift factors. A system is also adopted to account for the socioeconomic status of the participants. Inferential strategies such as chi-square tests are used as well, to make some generalization about the results.

Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 report the results of this study. Chapter 6 describes the results on first research sub-question; i.e., whether or not there are sociocultural changes taking place among Iranians in Sweden. It presents the findings on data analyses on the demography of this minority group in general, and then more specifically on the subjects of the present study. The demography of Iranians in Sweden includes their numbers, immigration/emigration patterns, birth rates, patterns of endogamy/exogamy (intra- and inter-ethnic marriage), and also their residential patterns. The demographic factors of the subjects and their socioeconomic status in terms of education levels and occupations are also reported.

Chapter 7 presents the results for research sub-question 2, namely the extent to which Iranian children in Sweden are being socialized in their first and second languages. The results for data analyses of the patterns of language socialization; i.e., how language is transferred from one generation to the next, are reported. It explains the primary socialization of the participants in the home domain and the secondary socialization outside the home domain in different settings such as daycare centers, preschools, schools, and after-school recreation centers.

Chapter 8 presents the results for research sub-question 3, i.e., the extent of competence of Iranians in their L1 and L2. It describes features of three language dimensions including language repertoire, language dominance, and language proficiency. The language proficiency dimension is concerned with four types of skills in each language; namely understanding, speaking, reading, and writing. The three language dimensions jointly describe the
language competence of the participants, or the degree of their bilingualism, as perceived by themselves, and in the case of the students, also as perceived by their parents.

Chapter 9 presents the findings on research sub-question 4; i.e., the language(s) that Iranians in Sweden choose in different domains. It describes language-use patterns in the home domain in different interactions such as parent–child (the expression child here refers to the student participant in this study), child–parent, child–younger sibling, and child–older sibling. It also presents the language-use patterns outside the home domain in settings such as inside and outside the school domain. These patterns are determined in interactions such as student–Iranian peers and student–Persian teacher (inside school domain), student–Iranian friends, and via family gatherings and traditional festivals (outside the school domain).

Chapter 10 presents the results on research sub-question 5; i.e., the way Iranians feel toward their home country and country of residence, their mother tongue and Swedish. It describes whether or not participants think that it is useful to learn Persian and Swedish, and if so, what the reasons are. It also reports the levels of proficiency in Persian and Swedish that the parents desire for their children to attain. The chapter then explains the language preferences of the students and the situations in which they may avoid using their mother tongue. The students’ attitudes towards their mother tongue are also accounted for. The chapter also provides some information about whether or not life in Sweden and Iran (in the case of travel) is enjoyable and why, and if there is a desire to stay in Sweden and why, or to go back to Iran and live there instead and why.

Chapter 11 summarizes and discusses all the results of the present study. It provides some answers to each research sub-question in order to shed some light on the main research question.

Chapter 12 presents some general conclusions based on the study’s major findings. There is a discussion on strengths and limitations of the study, and finally, some suggestions for future studies are given.

A bibliography and two appendices are at the end of the book. The appendices include the original versions of the student and the parent questionnaires.
Chapter 2
Theoretical Frameworks

Chapter 2 presents some core concepts and theoretical frameworks upon which this study is based. It describes Tajfel’s (1974, 1981) theory of social identity and intergroup relations. It also presents the Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles et al. 1987; Giles et al. 1991) which is based on the Speech Accommodation Theory, first put forward by Giles (1973) and further developed by Giles et al. (1977). Then it discusses Accommodation Theory’s application in terms of language maintenance and shift.

2.1 The theory of social identity and intergroup relations

What determines the way in which minority groups interact with majority groups may be understood by Tajfel’s theory of intergroup relationships (1974, 1978a, b, c, d, e and 1981; Tajfel & Turner 1986; Oakes 2001, 2002; Irwin 2007). This theory deals with the concept of social identity referring to people’s membership in different social categories and the positive or negative value they attach to that membership. Those who are members of a high-prestige group usually attach positive value to their membership and do not desire to change their group relation. On the contrary, members of a dominated group who have negative associations towards their own group may want or even feel obliged to change their social affiliations for the better, until they feel satisfied with their situation and group identity.

A necessary condition for members of a subordinate group to change their social identity is awareness of the situation. This in turn depends on how they perceive the stability/instability of the relationship between their own group and the dominant group, and also how legitimate/illegitimate (or just/unjust) they see this relationship to be (Tajfel 1974: 78ff; Genesee 1987: 156). If these conditions are met, the members of the dominated group may solve their problems of social identity adopting one or a combination of the following strategies:

1. Assimilation into the dominant group
2. Redefinition of old negatively valued group characteristics
3. Creation of new group characteristics
4. Direct competition with the majority group
1. **Assimilation** means abandoning often stigmatized norms, values, and characteristics of the minority group and adopting the norms, values, and characteristics of the majority group which are highly valued. Assimilation is to become more like the dominating group. An important factor in this respect is discussed by Ogbu (1997) and Ogbu & Simons (1998) who compared different minority groups in various communities in the United States and found that those groups who had voluntarily migrated to the U.S. were more keen to rapidly change and become members of the new society, while groups that had migrated involuntarily tried harder to maintain their language and culture, specifically by making a joint effort to resist assimilation.

According to Tajfel (1974: 83), cultural, social, and psychological assimilation may be tried first in agreeable conditions. He maintains that the process of assimilation begins by removing obstacles that stand in the way of the group achieving better conditions and equality with the majority group. When this is obtained, one of two psychological processes can take place:

- a. if the minority group stays separate from the majority group, it enters into a process of redefining its old characteristics to new positively valued ones, or
- b. both groups enter into a process of breaking down the psychological hindrances to “passing,” which is defined as being permitted entrance to the new society.

The first case may lead to group integration. The second solution may gradually lead to the group totally disappearing as it blends with the dominating society. Assimilation, however, does not automatically make the minority group equal to or accepted by the majority group.

2. **Redefinition of old negatively valued characteristics** means that minority groups redefine their previously negatively valued characteristics in order to associate and be associated with more positive values. These are usually characteristics that are unique and obvious (e.g. language, dialect, skin color, hairstyle, etc.). The black American slogan of the 1960s “Black Is Beautiful” is such an example. Their more recent self-designation is African American, giving Africa a more positive connotation.

3. **Creation of new group characteristics** means that members of the minority group selectively adopt some of the majority group’s characteristics which they positively value, in contrast to the total assimilation situation in which the whole package of majority group characteristics is accepted and adopted. Although they choose to adopt some dominant characteristics, they retain many of their own group norms and values. According to Ogbu & Matute-Bianchi (1986), those dominant characteristics, norms, and values that will be accepted and adopted by the minority group are very much de-
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termined by their folk theory of “getting ahead” (cited in Genesee 1987: 158). For example, if they believe that getting ahead in the new country depends on better education, they may accept and adopt some of the majority school traditions which may contribute to better achievement in school, even though these traditions may differ very much from their own. Retaining some of their own characteristics gives the minority group the possibility to maintain its distinctiveness as an ethnic group, while taking up certain majority values provides positive associations for the group. This allows the minority group to experience a positive social identity.

4. Direct competition with the majority group means that minority groups may pursue their own positive social identity by competing directly with the majority group. This strategy is likely to be adopted by those minority groups who have high ethnic awareness and ethnolinguistic vitality. According to Giles et al. (1977), redefinition of old features and creation of new ones may lead the minority group to become more ethnic, vigilant, and able to compete with the majority group. The competition between Francophone Québec and Anglophone Federal authorities in various matters is an example of this strategy. If the group sees its inferior social position as illegitimate, unjust, and/or unstable, it will enter into direct competition with the dominant group in order to raise its social status. The competition is usually over social power and scarce resources and can cause serious conflicts between the dominating and the dominated groups. An example of this situation is the struggle of Kurds in Turkey who have maintained their ethnic identity and are struggling for self-determination (see also Landry & Allard 1991; Landry 1992, 1994a, 1994b for other examples).

According to Tajfel (1974, 1981), the intergroup relations are dynamic. Oakes (2001: 42, 2002: 373) maintains that the dominant groups usually harden their boundaries when they feel that their positive identity is in danger. In this situation the majority group will not remain passive and submissive while the minority group challenges its authority and superiority (see also Tajfel & Turner 1986; Oakes 2001, 2002). This, for example, can be seen in strategies taken by the colonial powers in Africa and India.

The above-mentioned strategies involve minority groups moving towards or away from majority groups. One way of conceptualizing these strategies is Communication Accommodation Theory which is accounted for below.

2.2 Communication Accommodation Theory

The basis for this theory was first put forward by Giles (1973) as the Interpersonal Speech Accommodation Theory, according to which speakers adjust their speech style to each other, moving towards or away from their interlocutor (see also Sheppard, Giles & Le Poire 2001; Sachdev & Bourhis 2001).
The tendency to shift toward and adopt the speech style of the interlocutor is called *convergence*, whereas moving away and highlighting the differences is called *divergence*. The function of the former strategy may be to decrease the distance between the interlocutors, while the latter type of interaction may serve to increase the distance between them.

Speakers may be differently motivated for shifting towards or away from each other. For example, they may have positive or negative feelings and attitudes towards their interlocutor or they may be socially motivated; i.e., convergence and divergence tendencies are usually psychosocially motivated (see e.g. Giles & Powesland 1975; Giles *et al.* 1977; Giles *et al.* 1987; Niedzielski & Giles 1996 for an overview of the studies). Giles *et al.* (1977) maintain that “the extent to which individuals shift their speech style towards, or away from the speech style of their interlocutors is a mechanism by which social approval or disapproval is communicated” (P. 322). They contend that “accommodation theory suggests that people are continually modifying their speech with others so as to reduce or accentuate the linguistic (and hence social) differences between them depending on their perceptions of the interactive situation” (ibid.: 324).

Speech accommodation may include adjusting to nonverbal and verbal patterns such as accents, speech rates, pause durations, length of utterances, or the whole language. This means that Speech Accommodation Theory can also explicate intergroup relationships. Accordingly, language maintenance would be characterized as a divergent strategy adopted by a minority group moving away from the majority group, whereas language shift would be categorized as a convergent movement leading the minority group towards the majority group (see Giles *et al.* 1991 for further elaboration). Convergence may have “upward” or “downward” orientation. For example, if a person shifts towards a higher status language variety compared to his/her own, the convergence has an upward direction, while moving towards a lower status language is a downward convergence.

Speech Accommodation Theory has been applied to broader domains of communication, both in first and second language acquisition (see e.g. Long 1983, 1985; Lightbown & Spada 1999 for the theory of Interactionism and adapted strategies and modified input8 in Motherese (or caretaker talk) and foreigner talk. This has led to the theory being renamed *Communication Accommodation Theory* (see e.g. Niedzielski & Giles 1996). According to this theory, it is not only the interlocutor that has a salient role in the interaction. The speaker, the setting, and the topic of the conversation are also crucial features. Giles *et al.* (1991) maintain that Communication Accommoda-

---

8 Modified input refers to adapted speech which adults use when they talk to children in order to make the input comprehensible for them. The same strategy is used by native speakers addressing language learners (see e.g. Lightbown & Spada 1999).
tion Theory may be “able to attend to (1) social consequences (attitudinal, attributional, behavioral, and communicative), (2) ideological and macro-societal factors, (3) intergroup variables and processes, (4) discursive practices in naturalistic settings, and (5) individual life span and group-language shift” (p. 4).

According to Communication Accommodation Theory, strategies that a single speaker adopts in his/her daily life in communication with others can be applied to a group of speakers (see e.g. Trudgill 1974, 1982, 1986). Giles et al. (1991) maintain that “the mechanics of everyday interpersonal convergences in important social networks provide the breeding ground for longer-term shifts in individual as well as group-level language use” (p. 20).

Communication Accommodation Theory, together with Social Identity Theory, have also been employed to explain the language planning policies of the European Union (EU) countries (see e.g. Ager 2001; Oakes 2001, 2002). Oakes (2002) observes that in the EU setting, where there are no dominant groups, the concept of convergence should be interpreted as the confluence of the economies of the member states. He contends that “as an identity strategy, convergence in the EU context may be thought of as an engagement in European integration, a commitment to European ideals and principles, such as the EU’s policy of integral multilingualism” (ibid: 373). In this context, the member states use the divergence strategy to accentuate their cultural and linguistic identities in relation to the other member states. Although the multilingualism policy can be thought of as a convergence strategy of the whole EU, it can also be seen as a divergence policy vis-à-vis the hegemony of English and the English-only movement.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, Tajfel’s theory of social identity and intergroup relations (1974, 1981) and the Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles et al. 1987) based on Speech Accommodation Theory (Giles 1973; Giles et al. 1977) were accounted for. It was explained that all groups in societies, both the dominant and the dominated, try to retain their group identity and distinctiveness. In this attempt the dominant group with its positive associations towards its own group characteristics strives to sustain its supremacy, and in this effort hardens its boundaries if it feels threatened by other groups. The subordinate group, on the contrary, depending on the positive or negative qualities it associates with its own group, chooses a strategy or a combination of strategies in order to gain greater social and economic opportunities. These strategies may include submission to the dominant group and assimilation into it; redefinition and creation of group characteristics to associate and be associated with positive features; and finally, competition with the majority group to gain control of and retain scarce resources.
The above-mentioned strategies involve ethnic groups moving towards or away from each other. One way of conceptualizing these strategies is through Communication Accommodation Theory (see also Giles et al. 1987, 1991), according to which speakers tend to converge or move towards each other in their speech style in order to decrease their social distance to their interlocutors. However, speakers may desire to diverge from each other and accentuate their differences, and increase their social distances.

Communication Accommodation Theory can also explain intergroup relationships in terms of language-use patterns. Accordingly, maintaining the mother tongue would be characterized as a divergent strategy adopted by a minority group moving away from the majority group, whereas shifting to the majority language would be categorized as a convergent movement leading the minority group towards the majority group.
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Chapter 3 presents some basic conceptual definitions of language maintenance and shift and describes the assimilation process and the time needed for minority language shift to take place. It puts forward a taxonomic framework of determinants for minority language maintenance and shift. This framework tries to capture and summarize the major factors that are identified as influencing language maintenance and shift with an overview of the studies focusing on these factors at societal, group, and individual levels.

3.1 Definitions of language maintenance and shift

Language maintenance and language shift, as a specific field of inquiry, has been under investigation since the second half of the 19th century. These two concepts may be used in speech communities if, on the one hand, a language-contact situation exists between two or more languages or varieties and, on the other, there is a difference in power relations between different groups in the society, e.g. in social, political, economic, or educational aspects (Hyltenstam & Stroud 1996: 568).

The term language shift was defined by Weinreich in 1953 as “the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another” (1968: 68). Language shift refers to language-contact situations where a minority group gradually abandons the regular use of its own language and develops a regular use of another language. Gal (1979) defines language shift as “a socially motivated redistribution of synchronic variants to different speakers and different social environments” (p. 17). This indicates that in language shift situations, one of the two synchronic variants loses its speakers while the other one gains more. Furthermore, the language that is gaining more speakers is also winning more ground (see also Dorian 1981; Fishman 1991; Fa-sold 1992; Romaine 1995; Slavik 2001; Kamwangamalu 2003). Fishman (1991) uses this term to refer to “speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their intergenerational continuity is proceeding

---

9 See also Chapter 1, footnote 1 for the definition of minority and majority groups.
negatively, with fewer and fewer users (speakers, readers, writers, and even understanders) or uses every generation” (ibid: 1). Hornberger & Coronel-Molina (2004) define language shift as “the gradual loss of a language within a community, which can ultimately lead to language death” (ibid: 13). Romaine (1995) maintains that “language shift involves bilingualism (often with diglossia) as a stage on the way to monolingualism in a new language. Bilingualism of course needn’t imply that one of the languages is going to be lost” (ibid: 40). She also contends that there is a global trend that many smaller languages are dying out in support of the spread of a few languages, e.g. English in the world. According to Grosjean (1982: 4), 11 languages are spoken by 70% of the world’s population. Crystal (2000) contends that 96% of the world’s population use only 4% of the world’s languages.

Language maintenance refers to language-contact situations where a minority group continues to use its language even under conditions that might support a language shift. According to Hornberger & Coronel-Molina (2004), language maintenance “refers to relative stability in domains of use, and number, distribution, and proficiency of speakers in a speech community” (ibid: 13). Hoffmann (1991) defines this term as follows:

[It] refers to a situation where members of a community try to keep the language(s) they have always used, i.e. to retain the same patterns of language choice. Language maintenance can thus be said to reflect collective volition. In a multilingual community this may find expression in a group’s conscious effort to protect its language and ensure its continued use. Such measures reflect the group’s self-consciousness and also some degree of political independence, which allows it to determine its own language policies. (Hoffmann 1991: 185)

Minority groups in language-contact situations may move across a continuum ranging from language maintenance to language loss. Accordingly, the concepts of language maintenance, language shift, and language loss are interrelated phenomena. A minority group loses its language when it gradu-

10 The term diglossia was defined by Ferguson as:

[A] relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation. (Ferguson 1959:336, see also Ferguson 1964, 2000)

Fishman revised and expanded Ferguson’s definition of diglossia. According to this author, diglossia “refers to the distribution of more than one language variety to serve different communicational tasks in a society” (Fishman 1967:30, 2000a:81ff). Kaye (2001) maintains that it is useful to take into consideration the notion of the diglossic continuum, referring to triglossia, tetragnosia, multiglossia, or polyglossia in defining the term diglossia. Diglossia can also be connected to bidialectalism and bilingualism, depending on the situation.
ally shifts toward another language and finally adopts it totally. According to Hoffmann (1991: 186), the total shift from Cornish to English in Cornwall is an example of a complete language shift. An instance of incomplete shift has taken place in Wales, where everybody speaks English but about one-fifth of the population also speaks Welsh (ibid.). The Welsh situation has changed for the better with an ethnic revival as shown by Martin-Jones & Saxena (2001, 2003) and Musk (2006). The successful revitalization of the case of the Welsh language as a consequence of globalization is also shown by the study conducted by Coupland, Bishop, Evans, and Garrett (2006).

Jaspaert & Kroon (1993) see language use as “the more fundamental element in the gradual disappearance of a language” (p. 298). They maintain that limited language proficiency is a result of limited language use and not vice versa. The authors contend that changes in language use indicate that there is a language shift taking place, while changes in language proficiency show that there is language loss in progress. At the same time, lack of proficiency in the mother tongue may lead to limited functionality of that language in different domains (Jaspaert & Kroon 1991: 77f). Insufficient proficiency in the mother tongue may result in the use of the other language in these contexts and environments. The retention of language use as well as language proficiency indicates language maintenance (Fase, Jaspaert, & Kroon 1992: 4; Hoffmann 1991: 186).

Tandefelt (1988, 1992), studying the Finland Swedish minority in Finland, makes a distinction between language shift on macro and micro levels. The former refers to language shift as a societal phenomenon and the latter as an individual phenomenon developed across generations. She also states that language shift is related to both language competence and language function (Tandefelt 1992: 151). A decrease in language functions means that the minority language has given way to the majority language, which is now used in domains that once belonged to the minority language. A decrease in competence means that the minority language does not function as a first language any longer. She argues that even though there is a relationship between language shift as a result of loss of competence and as a result of a decrease in language functions, the two processes need not develop in parallel (Tandefelt 1988: 19). In fact, one can be competent in a language without having any use for it. Having designated language competence and language function as two important components of language shift, Tandefelt also differentiates between total and partial language shift in both language function and language competence. Partial shift refers to situations where language shift is in progress, whereas total shift refers to situations where the process of shift has reached the point of no return. Tandefelt (1988: 39) also adds a time aspect to the language maintenance and shift factors, suggesting that the relative influence of each factor may change over time.

The rate of language shift depends on the nature of the relationship between the majority and the minority group. The more intensive their rela-
tionship, the shorter the process of language shift. When both groups choose integration over segregation, the minority group will gradually shift to the majority language; i.e., will move along the continuum away from language maintenance towards language shift (Jaspaert & Kroon 1993: 300).

It is believed that language shift among immigrant minorities usually takes three to four generations. The language shift process among different generations may be described as (1) monolingualism in L1 among the first generation, (2) bilingualism among the second generation and (3) monolingualism in L2 among the third generation. This process can be longer among some groups, e.g. Romani speakers in Sweden, or shorter, e.g. among immigrant groups who are isolated from their home country and/or those groups who desire and act upon their wishes to be integrated in and become part of the majority country. According to Tandefelt (1988: 17f), language shift can even happen within one and the same generation. This refers to situations where the whole process of language shift is experienced by one and the same individual, for example in cases of minority children born in the majority country or who immigrated at a very early age and who are socialized in the majority language and culture. The process of language shift can be described according to the model shown in Figure 3.1. This model was advanced by Haugen in 1953 (1972: 334) and is based on minority members’ proficiency level in their first and second language. Language shift as an ongoing process begins with monolingualism in the minority language (A) and ends with monolingualism in the majority language (B) with unbalanced (Ab & aB) and balanced (AB) bilingualism in between.

\[
\text{A} \rightarrow \text{Ab} \rightarrow \text{AB} \rightarrow \text{aB} \rightarrow \text{B}
\]

Figure 3.1. A language shift model (based on Haugen 1953)

Key: A = First language B = Second language
Ab + aB = Unbalanced bilingualism AB = Balanced bilingualism

This model also shows that bilingualism is not a stable situation and can change, based on the demands of the environment and on the proficiency level of the minority group members in their languages. According to Romaine (1995), many bilingual situations do not last more than three generations, e.g. the Aboriginal languages in Australia or Celtic languages of the British Isles (see also Mühlhäusler 1987). This is also the case for many speakers of South Asian languages, such as Bengali and Gujarati in Britain. However, Fishman

---

11 In this study the expression third generation refers to the children of the second generation, who were born in the majority country. See also Chapter 1, footnotes 3 and 5 for the definitions of the terms first and second generation, respectively.
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(1972a: 137) contends that bilingualism need not be an unstable situation. Minority members can in fact maintain both of their languages if there is a separation of domains between the languages, e.g. speaking the L1 at home and the L2 outside. In Paraguay, Spanish is used in the areas of religion, government, and high culture and Guarani is traditionally used in oral communication (Corvalán 1988: 369). The separation of domains between the two languages also exists in the area of education in Paraguay. According to Corvalán (1988: 366ff), Guarani is used in the primary schools of rural areas and lower class urban areas to help the students to understand the content. Another example is the case of French and English in Montreal, Canada (Fishman 1972a: 9). In Montreal, French is used at home, in the neighborhood, and in the church, and English in the advanced levels of school and work domains. McConwell (1985), however, argues that bilingualism can continue in a setting even without separation of domains between the languages, as for example is the case for French and Flemish in Belgium (cited in Hyltenstam & Stroud 1996: 574).

Languages may show different degrees of stability in contact situations. Some languages may fully maintain their functional stability in different domains, and are widely spoken as the mother tongue by different generations within the minority group and there is not much change in their structure in contact with the dominant language. Dorian (1981: 106ff) maintains that languages that show less functional and structural stability can also be classified as maintained. This means, according to Hyltenstam & Stroud (1996: 568), that “a language can be said to be maintained in declining degrees along a continuum during the entire span of language shift.”

3.2 Studies of language maintenance and shift factors

Work within the study of the factors influencing language maintenance and shift differ greatly. Some concentrate on a few factors; others give a more encompassing picture of the situation. There is a host of literature going back six decades investigating factors that affect language maintenance and shift. These investigations show that there are many social, linguistic, economic, historical, and psychological factors which significantly affect the minority group’s opportunities for language maintenance. They also describe the situation in the majority country in which minority language maintenance and shift take place. The present study uses a framework, shown in Figure 3.2 that is based on a model that was put forward by Hyltenstam and Stroud (1991) to describe the language maintenance and shift situation of the Saami minority group in Sweden. This framework is a part of the present study’s theoretical structure.12

12 See also other frameworks put forward by Giles et al. (1977) and Tandefelt (1988). Compare also with Fishman’s dislocation model (1991:55ff) which includes physical/demographic
Figure 3.2 shows the influencing factors that operate at the level of society as a whole, at the minority group level, and at the level of minority individuals. The majority of the societal factors deal with the power relationship between the majority and the minority group, e.g., the majority country’s political-legal status, its ideologies and economic status, its institutions and its attitudes towards minority languages and cultures. Group factors include the group’s demography, its status (social, economic, sociohistorical, and linguistic), and its institutions, such as the mass media, religion, and culture. Language attitudes at this level may lead the group to converge or diverge from the majority. Intergroup relations between the two groups may lead the minority group to assimilate, create new characteristics, redefine old characteristics, or compete directly with the majority group. Factors at the individual level characterize the conditions faced by the minority speakers when it comes to maintaining their language or shifting to the majority language. Influential factors at this level are language socialization, language competence, language choice, and language attitudes.

Factors at each level interact in very sophisticated, multidirectional ways. For example, the power relationship between majority and minority is strongly influenced by the political ideologies of the majority country. The dominant group’s political ideologies govern the educational system, which in turn regulates minority children’s education to be in their L1, L2 or both.

It is important to bear in mind that even the factors within each level influence each other. For example, the individual speakers’ attitudes towards their own language may influence their degree of competence in the first language. Lack of proficiency in the mother tongue may push speakers to converge to the majority language and culture, which may gradually result in cultural assimilation and language shift. This means that even if language maintenance and shift factors are separated from one another on each level, in reality they are not isolated from each other, and a change in one factor may result in a change of the whole situation.

Another salient factor in this discussion is the time aspect. The minority language situation of today may differ from that of the past or the future. For example, a minority group that is in the process of shift may increase its language awareness and attempt to reverse the language shift process if it is not too late. This endeavor may change the future situation of the group. The following sections include a literature review on factors at each level.

dislocation (referring to any type of in/voluntary population transfer and out-migration), social dislocation (referring to the subordinate status of minority groups which leads to their social, economic, and political disadvantages in the majority countries), and cultural dislocation (referring to interruption of traditional cultural practices).
Figure 3.2. A taxonomic framework of determinants for minority language maintenance and shift (based on Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991: 112)
3.3 Factors at the societal level

As mentioned earlier, factors at the societal level include the majority country’s political-legal status, its ideologies and economic status, its institutions, and its attitudes towards minority languages and cultures. The following is a brief discussion of the first three major factors. Institutional factors are presented jointly with factors at the group level, and attitudinal factors are discussed with factors at the individual level.

3.3.1 Political-legal status

The political-legal status of the majority society plays an influential role in allowing or impeding the survival of minority languages which exist within its boundaries. Political and legislative power and resources are usually in the hands of the dominant group, which has the possibility to pass laws or make provisions which may favor/disfavor the minority group’s situation when it comes to maintaining language and pursuing and preserving its ethnic identity (see e.g. Willemyns 1997; Stevens 1999; Winsa 1999; Kritiansen 2003; Jørgensen 2003; Morita 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004). This is an effective political pattern of legal domination which is called the center–periphery pattern (Esman 1975: 393f). The center–periphery pattern means that the dominating group takes over the heart of the political and legislative power with all its administrative and executive machinery and its economic resources, and controls other groups which are at the periphery of this system. For example, the center–periphery relationship has been recognized twice in the history of the political context of Scotland, once before the Act of Union (1707) and once after (Dorian 1981). The Highlands were at the periphery of the Lowland before the Union, and the whole of Scotland was at the periphery of the English system after the Union. The consequence of this relationship has been the spread of a dominant language and culture, English, throughout the Celtic land to the extent that the indigenous languages of these areas are on the verge of extinction (p. 37ff).

The center–periphery relationship can also describe the situation of the Saami minority group or the Finnish-speaking Tornedalians in Sweden. According to Hyltenstam, Stroud & Svonni (1999: 52ff), the Saami indigenous minority group have had very limited opportunities to determine their own destiny due to not being allowed to participate in the legislation of laws and regulations which significantly affect their own situation and life. However, this condition has changed for the better, especially after the establishment of a district court (Sametinget) in 1993. This municipal authority can decide on allocating the governmental subsidies to different organizations in order to pursue and preserve Saami language and culture. However, the laws
passed after the establishment of Sametinget (referring to the law passed in 1994 which allowed hunting in Saami regions in spite of their massive demonstrations) proves that the Swedish government still dominates the central political power and the Saami minority group is at the periphery of this system.

According to Hyltenstam & Stroud (1991, 1996), this power imbalance between the majority and minority groups may act in the same way in countries with democratic systems as in those with dictatorships (1991: 77). In countries such as Sweden, France, Turkey, and Iran, all with different political systems, minorities have lived under oppression throughout different periods of their history. The overall effect of the language policies of these countries on minority languages has been the same; i.e., there has been a strong tendency to shift to the majority language.

3.3.2 Ideology

Ideology has been discussed and defined in many ways. According to Friedrich (1989), ideology is associated with a tangle of commonsense and semi-technical meanings. It is “the basic notions or ideas that the members of a society hold about a fairly definite, if not bounded set or area such as honor, matrilineal affiliation, or the division of labor, and the interrelations and implications of such sets of notion” (p. 300f). Woolard (1998: 5) states that ideology in this sense is more conceptual and refers to mental phenomena. Ideology is also, according to Friedrich (1989), a system of ideas and strategies that are used to promote, preserve, and change “a social and cultural order; in brief, it is political ideas in action” (p. 301). In this sense, ideology is directly linked to political, social, and economic power and practices to gain or sustain the positions of power (see also Gal 1993; Oakes 2001; Papademetre & Routoulas 2001; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Haglund 2005a, 2005b; Milani 2007, 2008).

Ideology is reflected in the majority country’s laws and regulations and in its official documents. It is mirrored in the overall policies of the majority society towards minority groups, and reflects the attitudes of the dominant group toward the languages and cultures of the dominated groups. One of the instances governed and regulated by the majority country’s ideologies is the educational system, which constrains minority children’s formal education (see e.g. Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Rahman 1997; Morita 2003).

The ideology of the majority country with regard to its minorities can be found somewhere along a scale with two extreme poles: assimilatist on the one side and pluralistic on the other. Assimilationists may have negative attitudes toward any kind of linguistic variation. They may regard minority languages and cultures as inferior to their own and therefore unworthy of being considered cultural resources of the majority country. Minority languages are considered underdeveloped and therefore unsuitable for use in
educating minority children. Assimilationists may react negatively towards any kind of visible use of minority languages or practice of minority cultural traditions. In these situations, minority languages and cultural practices are limited to the home domain, and they are not allowed to be seen or heard in public (see e.g. Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Wingstedt 1998).

Pluralists, on the other hand, may have very positive attitudes towards the language and culture of minorities, and may show a great deal of tolerance because minority languages and cultures are regarded as resources and not as burdens or problems for the majority society. In pluralistic societies, minority languages and cultures may enjoy the same status as the majority language and culture. Pluralists may promote the use of minority languages in the education of minority children. They may even encourage and contribute to the development of these languages by allocating financial support so that they can be standardized and modernized, and appear in the mass media, in literature, and so on (Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Wingstedt 1998).

There are, of course, many constellations of assimilationist–pluralistic characteristics which are positioned between these two extreme poles. The consequences of these ideologies on language maintenance and shift are very clear and obvious. In assimilationist societies there is a strong tendency to shift. Here the goal is assimilation of the minorities into the majority society, whereas in pluralistic societies the goal is maintaining and preserving these languages and cultures. According to Hyltenstam et al. (1999: 54ff), the assimilationist ideology was the dominating policy in Sweden until the 1950s. During the 1960s and the 1970s pluralistic ideologies toward indigenous and immigrant minority groups took form. According to the general guidelines of these pluralistic policies, the minority group members are equal to the majority group members and they should have opportunities to preserve, pursue, and develop their languages and cultures. The Swedish government approved a policy in 1997 to integrate immigrant minority members into Swedish society. Multiculturalism is upheld within the new integration policy in order to provide freedom of choice and equality for the minority group members (see also Wingstedt 1996, 1998 for an overview of the Swedish language policies towards Saami and Tornedalian minority groups).

Several researchers, however, have criticized the Swedish pluralistic policy towards immigrant and indigenous minority groups (see e.g. Municio 1987; Paulston 1992; Boyd 1993). According to these authors, the Swedish immigrant policy is generous on paper, but is not sufficiently implemented to guarantee the maintenance of the minority languages and cultures. In this regard Lainio (1999: 188ff) observes that it is the language, instead of ethnic–social characteristics, that is used for stigmatizing purposes in Sweden today. Language is used as a distinctive ethnic feature to differentiate the Swedes from immigrants. Learning Swedish and becoming monolingual in Swedish is the heart of the assimilation policy in the present Swedish context. Minority languages and their speakers are openly discriminated against
in everyday life. Lainio further maintains that these circumstances have made it very difficult to argue for bilingualism as a genuine objective, because bilingualism is placed against the Swedish language, although the latter is included in the former.

3.3.3 Economic status

The economic status of the majority society is one of the most important determinants of language maintenance and shift. Language shift can happen when minority speakers seek economic advancement to improve their living standard (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981, 1982; Conklin & Lourie 1983; Eastman 1984; Boyd 1985; Edwards 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Kulick 1990; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Shameem 1994; Vaillancourt 1996; Bloom & Grenier 1996; Grenier 1997; Paulston 1992, 1997; Grin 1999; Arua & Magocha 2002; Behtoui 2004; Söylemez 2004). If the minority group’s own economic status is low, and the group is in need of financial support to maintain its language and pursue its ethnic identity, it automatically ends up in a disadvantageous position, especially in a majority society with few economic resources. This imbalance in economic resources makes it very difficult for minorities to maintain their languages. A reason is often that they must learn the majority language in order to make a living and develop economically. According to Dorian (1982), “language loyalty persists as long as the economic and social circumstances are conductive to it, but if some other language proves to have greater value, a shift to that other language begins” (p. 47).

Edwards (1985: 92f) argues that linguistic matters cannot be treated as isolated from other sociopolitical factors and are best understood as pragmatic adaptation of minority group members to the new situation. There is no doubt that economic factors are very important, but there are cases, however rare, of language maintenance or shift, that cannot be explained by minority speakers gaining economic advantages/disadvantages by maintaining their language or shifting to the majority language. Paulston (1992), in a discussion about language maintenance in Catalan, also holds that economic motives are necessary but not sufficient conditions for language maintenance. She argues that “the set of behavior, attitudes and perceptions which we associate with nationalism provides that sufficient conditions” (p. 60).

According to Hyltenstam & Stroud (1991: 84f), the economic situation in the majority country influences the living conditions of minority groups in an indirect way. It affects the labor market. Minority members who have low proficiency in the majority language do not usually have a great chance of being absorbed by the labor market. This is a reason why unemployment rates are generally higher among minority group members than majority ones. The labor market may even force minority members to move from their concentrated residential areas to places which are usually dominated by
majority group members. Many young male members of minority groups have the option of moving with the labor market (see also Söylemez 2004). Moving out has negative effects on minority language maintenance, partly because the concentrated residential areas lose some of their gender heterogeneity (more women are left behind than men), and partly because those who move to majority residential areas lose opportunities to use their own language. They often have to use the majority language in their daily lives. Thus a decrease in the size and density of the close-knit structures of the group causes use of the minority language to decrease both qualitatively and quantitatively. Intergroup marriages may also occur more often among the outward-migrating workers. Needless to say, none of these conditions favor minority language maintenance.

Jaakkola (1973: 139), in a study of the language situation in Tornedalen, Sweden, maintains that one of the influential factors in language maintenance and shift is the depopulation of Tornedalen, which has both positive and negative effects. She observed that one depopulation effect was that schools were closed down and the opening of new schools with a bilingual education program to promote language maintenance did not seem realistic. Population decline was a threat to the future of the Finnish language. However, Tornedalen’s depopulation also had maintenance effects for the Finnish language, because those who moved out were mostly Swedish speakers. The majority of those left behind were speakers of Finnish with large families which gave hope that Finnish will be conveyed to the next generation. The negative effects of out-migration are also seen in other studies (see e.g. David & Nambiar 2002).

3.4 Factors at the group level

Factors influencing language maintenance and shift at the group level refer to the group’s demography, its social, economic, sociohistorical, and linguistic status, its institutions, and its attitudes toward its own language and culture and those of the majority country. The following sections describe these factors.

3.4.1 Demographic factors

Demographic factors such as the number of minority group members, their birth rates, patterns of exogamy/endogamy (inter-ethnic/intra-ethnic marriages), patterns of immigration/emigration, and patterns of residential concentrations have been found to strongly affect the maintenance of the mother tongue or its shift to the majority language.

It is maintained in the literature that the number of minority group members can affect the group’s language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Jaakkola
When a large number of individuals who share the same language, cultural traditions, social norms, and values live in isolation from the majority culture, they have opportunities to preserve their language, cultural norms, and values, which in turn leads them to maintain their cultural identity. They thwart assimilation by living in separated areas (see e.g. Kloss 1966; Fishman 1972a; Andersson-Brolin 1984; Tandefelt 1988).

The number of minority group members may vary from time to time depending on their patterns of immigration/emigration and their living conditions in both the majority and the home country. For example, when the living conditions in Iran became harsher during the 1980s, many Iranians migrated to other countries. In Tornedalen, as it was explained earlier, Swedish speakers moved to other places in Sweden, where more work opportunities could be found (Jaakkola 1973: 139; see also David & Nambiar 2002 for effects of exogamous marriages and out-migration of Catholic Malayalees in Malaysia on their language shift).

The minority group’s patterns of residential concentrations may be a result of their cultural distance from the majority cultural traditions. Residential concentration provides network structures which accommodate frequent interpersonal communication between the speakers. The resulting broader use of the language with greater variation among the speakers favors minority language maintenance (see e.g. Gal 1979; Milroy 1987; Pütz 1991; Prabhakaran 1998; Govindasamy & Nambiar 2003). Li Wei (1982: 113ff) studied Chinese–Americans living in Chinatown and found that their third generation shifted to English much less often than the same generation of Chinese–Americans residing in other places in the U.S. (see also McGregor & Li Wei 1991). One aspect in Gal’s study (1979) of peasants’ language shift from Hungarian to German in Oberwart, Austria, was the social network that her informants were engaged in. She found that it is not only the number of occasions when the speakers interact with each other that is important in language maintenance, but also the nature and goals of their relationship. She found that language shift was in its more advanced stages in “non-peasant networks” and among the younger generations compared to the older “peasant networks” because they sought social and economic advancement through German.

A number of studies show that the minority group’s marriage patterns affect the maintenance and shift of the mother tongue (see e.g. Jaakkola 1973; Gal 1979; Clyne 1982; Pauwels 1986; Penfield 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Pütz 1991; Aikio 1992; Lainio 1996; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Winsa 1999; David & Naji 2000; Al-Khatib 2001; David & Nambiar 2002; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003). Normally, mixed or inter–ethnic marriages (exogamy) accelerate the process of language shift because in these marriages the most prestigious language
will usually be chosen as the communication instrument. In this context the high status language is usually the majority language, which will become the first language of the children born to these families. In Clyne’s study (1982) of language maintenance among immigrants in Australia, the effects of Anglo–ethnic marriages are studied. The data shows that the second generation children in Anglo–ethnic marriages shift very quickly to English. For example, second generation Anglo–Maltese, Anglo–German, and Anglo–Dutch children shifted almost completely to English, whereas the rate of language shift among Anglo–Greek and Anglo–Italian second generation children was slower, especially in those families where the father was Italian or Greek. Clyne, therefore, considers the inter-ethnic marriage variable as one of the crucial factors determining language maintenance or shift (1982: 55). Pütz’s study (1991) of language maintenance and shift among German–Australian immigrants in Canberra also demonstrates the role of mixed marriages in language shift among this group. He found that the majority of respondents whose German had changed very much were either those who were married to people with other ethnic backgrounds or those for whom preserving German was not considered very important. According to Pütz, exogamy is a decisive factor in language shift among German immigrants in Australia (1991: 482). The influence of exogamy on language shift was also confirmed in another study by Clyne & Kipp (1997). The results from their study indicate that the second generation shift is much lower among the children of intra-ethnic marriages, especially among those groups that have low language shift in the first generation (Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan), and those with low exogamy rates (Turkey and Lebanon). Similar results were found regarding the effects of endogamy/exogamy on language maintenance and shift in a study of Maltese in Canada by Slavik (2001) and among Turkish immigrant groups in France in a study by Yagmur & Akinci (2003).

Endogamy/exogamy can affect language maintenance and shift differently in various cultural contexts and different minority groups. Grin (1996: 37), referring to a study of immigrants in Canada and the U.S. by Chiswick & Miller (1992), maintains that in the case of immigrants to Canada from East and Southern Europe the “married abroad” variable had a negative and statistically significant effect on their acquiring English proficiency, whereas it had a non-significant and sometimes positive effect in the cases of Asian, African, and Latin American immigrants. The figures for immigrants in the U.S. showed that this variable had a negative and significant effect only in the cases of European, Mexican, and Cuban immigrants. These results suggest that the influence of women on language maintenance and shift differ with ethnic and cultural origin in accordance with the women’s position in the family in each cultural context.

Exogamy can also slow down the rate of the language shift. This was the situation in Tornedalen, Sweden, where Swedish men married Finnish wom-
en from Finland, that is women from the villages on the other side of the border (see e.g. Winsa 1999). According to Jaakkola (1973: 140f), in those Tornedalian villages where the number of people with Finnish as their strongest language was less than in other villages, and the spread of Swedish had gone far, these mixed marriages caused a delay in the process of language shift from Finnish to Swedish. Winsa (1999: 383f) maintains that the inter-marriages (up to 40% of all marriages have one spouse from Finland) has had a major effect on maintaining bilingualism in those regions (see also Aikio 1992; Al-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001 for the role of women in language maintenance and shift).

3.4.2 Status factors

Status factors include social, economic, sociohistorical, and language factors. These are briefly discussed here.

3.4.2.1 Social status

Social status, which has a strong impact on the language maintenance and shift of minority groups, affects the group’s self-esteem and ethnic awareness. It can have a maintenance effect on minority languages. However, it can also have a negative influence by causing language shift (see e.g. Fishman 1972a: 98; Tandefelt 1988: 49). Boyd (1985), studying language maintenance and shift among second generation immigrant students (14–16 years old) in Sweden, maintains that if minority groups are largely made up of individuals who belong to the middle or upper classes with higher education, language shift sometimes takes place rapidly. This was the case for European scientists who emigrated to America during and after World War II (ibid.: 12f). However, it can also result in language maintenance because people with higher social status may have more means to make efforts to save the language. The educated elite among Spanish speakers in California and German immigrants in America and Israel are a few examples of immigrants with higher social status who promote the maintenance of their languages. Boyd (1985: 13) further states that the literature on language maintenance and shift rarely discusses the people who make up the minority group constellation. She argues that if there are religious, cultural, or political leaders among the group, the potential to maintain the group’s language is broader than in situations where the group consists of individuals with low levels of education and economic status.

The social status of a group is closely linked to its economic status. In a study of language and socioeconomic status of the English and French speakers in Quebec, Vaillancourt (1996), based on two survey studies, found that the differences in earnings between Anglophones and Francophones had changed, and that the socioeconomic status of Francophones had improved from 1960 to 1990. There was a higher payoff on the labor market in know-
ing French than in knowing English (p. 87). These results may explain the impact of major changes in the economic and legal status of the two languages, English and French, in Quebec since 1960 (p. 69).

3.4.2.2 Economic status

Economic status, a factor closely connected to social status, is recognized by many studies to strongly affect language maintenance and shift among minority groups. However, there are some controversies over the results. Some of the studies show that minorities with low economic status tend to maintain their language better than those with other economic backgrounds (see e.g. Fishman, Nahiry, Hofman, Hayden, Warshauser, Kloss, Lemaire, Chester, Christian & Glazer 1966; Gal 1979; Conklin & Lourie 1983). One reason may be that minorities with low economic status may never gain enough fluency in the L2 to develop economically. This was the case for the poor, older Hungarian peasants in Oberwart in Gal’s study (1979). The older peasants maintained their language as a symbol of identity, while they viewed German as a language for earning some income which could only supplement their income from agriculture but not replace it.

Other studies show that minorities who have poor economic backgrounds, for example, Mexican American, Chinese American, or immigrant workers in Western Europe, shift to the majority language in their search for a higher economic standard (Giles et al. 1977; Fishman 1985; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Hakuta & D’andrea 1992). A reason for the shift may be that the minority language is strongly associated with poorly educated people with low economic status, and the majority language is connected to better economic and educational opportunities, as is the case for many Spanish speakers in the U.S. In these situations, immigrant children are encouraged by their parents to attain high levels of proficiency in the L2 in order to increase their economic and social opportunities in the majority country (see e.g. Appel & Muysken 1987; Shameem 1994; Arua & Magocha 2002). Bloom & Grenier (1996) studied the differences in employment and earnings between English and Spanish speakers in the United States from 1970 to 1990. They found that Spanish speakers, both men and women, are not performing as well as English speakers in the labor market. Unemployment among the members of this minority group is high and there is a large income gap between the two groups. It is argued that Spanish speakers do not possess the labor market qualifications, for example, education, the value of which has increased dramatically since the 1980s in the USA. Another reason put forward by the researchers is that the Spanish speakers’ English language skills are not sufficient to meet the demands of the labor market (p. 45).

Grin (1996), referring to several studies on second language acquisition and the socioeconomic status of immigrants in the United States (see for example Grenier 1982 cited in Grin 1996; Jasso & Rosenzweig 1989, 1990), maintains that empirical work shows that education increases the immi-
grants’ opportunities to learn English. Their chances of learning English increase further if they are young at the time of immigration, spend a longer period in the U.S., and do not live in the immigrant residential areas (p. 21). Grenier (1997) also studied the linguistic and economic situations of French speaking minorities in Ontario and New Brunswick between 1981 and 1991. He found an inverse relationship between maintaining language and economic success; i.e., he found that French speakers in New Brunswick have better maintained their language but have not done as well economically, whereas the Ontario group’s assimilation to English is high and increasing. They also show greater economic success (see also Grin 1999; Behtoui 2004 for similar results and discussions). However, monolingualism in the majority language does not always result in socioeconomic improvement, and multiculturalism does not have a causal relationship with poverty (see e.g. Grenier 1982; Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas 1995: 4).

3.4.2.3 Sociohistorical status
Sociohistorical status refers to the minority group’s ethnon linguistic history (Giles et al. 1977; Appel & Muysken 1987). There are sometimes historical junctures in which a minority group has to struggle against the domination of another group within its territorial borderlines in order to defend its identity as an ethnic group. These past struggles may be associated with the group’s self-esteem, loyalty, and ethnic awareness. Historical events of this kind may stimulate and motivate minority groups to continue their struggle to defend their ethnic identity and maintain their language in the majority country even in the future. In such cases the language is a core value and is associated with the minority groups’ ethnic identity (see e.g. Smolicz 1981, 1992, 1995; Smolicz, Hudson & Secombe 1998; Smolicz, Secombe & Hudson 2001; Jansson 2003). An example of this is the struggle of the people in Persia (637–945 AD) against the Arab invasion and their fight against the spread of the Arabic language, which resulted in Persian being maintained as a core value (Khanlari 1991: 307ff).

3.4.2.4 Language status
Language status is also one of the important factors in language maintenance and shift (Fishman et al. 1966; Clyne 1985; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Holmes 1992). Language and social status are very closely connected, and as such social status affects language status and vice versa (Appel & Muysken 1987). Low-status minority languages which have to compete with other languages, and often with the majority language itself, have a very insecure position. They cannot usually survive in the majority country because of their low prestige and their association with the speakers’ low social status.

13 See Section 3.4.3.3 below for some explanations.
On the other hand, high-status languages may enjoy a safer position in the majority country. The higher position of the language may safeguard its continuous use in the majority society. However, the use of high-status language may also be constrained by other factors. Boyd, Jørgensen & Latomaa (1994) studied the language-use patterns among immigrant groups in Nordic countries. One immigrant group under investigation was North Americans in Copenhagen, Helsinki, and Gothenburg. One of the research questions was to find out whether or not the English status variable influenced the language choice that Americans made. The authors found that the American group in Helsinki used significantly more English than their counterparts in Copenhagen and Gothenburg; i.e., they tried to maintain their mother tongue. It was claimed that this difference may firstly be due to the difficulty for English speaking to learn the Finnish language. Secondly, since Helsinki is a bilingual city, maintaining the mother tongue is highly encouraged and valued. It was further argued that the total picture of the immigrant Americans in these countries is that they are well integrated into these societies and it seems that they integrate willingly, and do not meet any obstacles in doing so. It was also argued that English may well be a high status language in the world, but in language-contact situations people’s language choice in everyday life is based on their motives and also the local linguistic norms and values.

Another issue to be discussed here is that if the minority language is the official language of the group’s homeland, it has a better chance of survival (Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991: 92). Non-official dialects or minority languages have limited opportunities for maintenance. For example, Baluchi, one of the minority languages in Iran, has a smaller chance of survival in Sweden compared to Persian which is the official language of Iran. It is further argued that a standardized and modernized language has better chances of being used in education of the immigrant group in the majority country, and that it may be used to publish schoolbooks or other sorts of printed material, which may result in increased opportunities for maintenance (ibid.: 93). This is the situation again for Baluchi in Sweden. Negative attitudes towards one’s own language and culture are especially strong in cases where languages are not standardized and/or modernized. These languages may be considered as “only dialects,” and therefore not suitable to be used in education.

Another aspect of minority language status discussed in the literature is the status of the written language compared to the spoken language, as well as the distance between the two varieties. In some cases, the written language has a very high status among the speakers because it is associated with e.g. religion. Written Arabic, associated with the language of the Koran, is an example of this. The high status of this written variety among Muslim Arabic speakers in many different countries unites them in efforts to maintain the language (Appel & Muysken 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991). On the other hand, the distance between written and spoken varieties may cause some maintenance problems. It may be difficult for children to learn both of
the language varieties (spoken and written) in a majority country, especially if they differ greatly in lexicon, grammar, and phonology.

3.4.3 Institutions

Institutional factors refer to the extent to which a minority language is both formally and informally represented in different institutions in the majority country. Informal support refers to the degree to which the minority group itself supports and protects its own ethnolinguistic interests in different institutions such as the mass media, education, various governmental institutions, businesses and industries, and so on. Formal support refers to the degree to which the majority country gives the minority group resources for their protection and access to representation at different decision-making levels of governmental institutions, industry, mass media, education, and so on (Kristiansen et al. 1991: 423).

Due to the fact that institutional factors refer to both formal and informal support, they can be regarded as factors belonging to both societal and group levels. Minority groups that are strongly represented in key positions, within both state and private institutions, have a better chance of maintaining their language. Kristiansen et al. (1991) also mention the decisive role of leaders from among the minority group membership who can represent the ethnic group both formally and informally in order to mobilize the group to work towards ethnic survival in the majority country (see also Fishman 1972b; Edwards 1985; Boyd 1985).

Hyltenstam & Stroud (1991: 101) maintain that minorities who have strong unity and solidarity among themselves are more likely to establish institutions that have language maintenance aims (such as the Chicanos in the USA). However, the existence of these institutions depends very much on the economic and ideological support of the majority government (see also Atkinson 2000; Hornberger & King 2001).

In the following sections, some of the institutions (mass media, religion, culture, administrative services, and education) that can strongly affect language maintenance and shift are discussed. The discussion is mostly about the ways these institutions (both at the societal and group levels) provide for the minority language speakers, the means to promote and preserve their language and culture.

3.4.3.1 Mass media

The mass media form one of the institutions that can strongly affect the minority language maintenance and shift. Broadcasting radio and television programs as well as publishing newspapers, periodicals, and books in minority languages can raise the status of these languages by demonstrating their suitability for use in public domains. Mass media in all its forms can help minority individuals to promote and refine their languages and increase their
competence (Appel & Muysken 1987; Clyne 1991; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991). On the other hand, mass media in majority languages facilitate the penetration of the majority language into many minority language domains such as the home. This was the case for Nahuatl (also known as Mexicano or Aztec) communities in Central Mexico. Hill & Hill (1977) studied the language shift towards Spanish of rural Nahuatl speakers in these areas. One of the reasons for the language shift found by the authors was the introduction of electricity and radios with programs broadcast in Spanish in the early 1940s (ibid.: 99ff).

According to Hyltenstam & Stroud (1991: 103), mass media in minority languages has to compete with mass media in the language of the majority country. Economic resources, both those of the minority group and those allocated to them by the government, are usually limited and do not allow for competition on an equal basis. Because of the limited broadcasting time, limited economic opportunities, and irregular broadcasting and publishing, the news may become old and therefore unattractive. The time limitation and/or lack of quality may mean that the programs offered do not provide broad coverage, and that therefore some of the public will automatically be left out or will lose interest. On the other hand, mass media has potential as an instrument for strengthening the minority group’s ethnic unity by making the minority language publicly visible and promoting its prestige and status.

Another important aspect is the language variety used in the mass media. If the difference between the written and spoken language is not great, the dialects do not differ vastly, and the language of the mass media is understood by most of the minority group members, then it can be used as an effective and powerful instrument to boost and promote the minority language. On the contrary, if the differences are great, many individuals in the minority group, amongst them children, will be left out because of their low comprehension level (see e.g. Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991: 103). For example, the language of the Persian mass media in Sweden is difficult for the children to understand since it is very close to the written Persian variety which children are not very familiar with. The written Persian variety is usually learned and developed in school in Iran. The mother tongue learning program in Swedish schools provides some opportunities for the children to learn this variety, however it is not enough for understanding the broadcast language.

The amount of exposure to the minority language through the mass media can increase enormously if the speakers have the opportunity to use more advanced technologies in this field, for example the Internet, parabolic antenna, and satellite channels. Advanced technology may provide for the minority speakers the means to push back the majority language from some domains, like the home domain, and to compete with the mass media in the majority language on a more equal ground. However, when the amount of exposure to the first language increases in this way, there is a risk of decreas-
ing input in the second language, and as a result minority speakers may lose some of their opportunities to learn their second language.

Renz (1987) studied the effects of broadcasting in Portuguese in Northern California on linguistic and cultural maintenance. He found that broadcasting was perceived as a significant institution in maintaining Portuguese language and culture. Several explanatory factors were suggested. For example, it was mentioned that radio can play the role of an information network, bringing the members of the community closer together, and broadcasting in the minority language may also promote the prestige of that language in the eyes of both community and non-community members. It was suggested that broadcasting in the minority language may provide means of upgrading the members’ language skill, and by regularly introducing successful role models into the community, may also provide an opportunity for positive identification, and promote the community members’ pride (ibid.: 31ff).

There are some other countries that show positive attitudes to linguistic diversity in the mass media, for example, Spain (Catalan media in Catalonia and Euskara media in País Vasco) and Great Britain (Welsh and Irish). In Africa some 175 indigenous languages can be heard on the radio (Boyd-Barrett 1996). There are regular radio broadcasting programs in the three largest cities in Sweden (Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö) in minority languages such as Albanian, Arabic, Assyrian/Syrian, English, Finnish, Greek, Persian, Polish, Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian, Spanish, and Turkish. The broadcasting time for each language varies from 40 minutes to 2 hours per week. These programs are transmitted by the state radio (Sveriges Radio P6 1999). Also, some language minority groups broadcast programs on the local radio stations. These programs are basically financed by the minority groups themselves (for example through advertising revenues) and therefore, the broadcasting time is longer compared to the state radio.

Swedish TV has a policy to mirror the country’s multiculturalism. This task is accomplished in different ways. For example, there is an immigrant editorial section within the Swedish TV which provides programs by and about the minority language members. There are also other multicultural programs, which reflect the life of different groups of people, for example those who live in Sweden or in many other countries. There is a strong concentration on English speaking countries, but a large number of other countries are also represented. For example, in 1998 there were 49 countries represented in different programs. 40% of the multicultural programs were about countries outside Europe, and one fourth of the European programs represented the Nordic countries (SVT 1998; see also Winsa 1999). In 2004, 78% of the broadcasting time for fiction and feature movies was allocated to productions from countries outside Sweden. Productions from countries outside Europe made up about half of this time. Among them, feature movies from the U.S. dominated, but movies from other countries such as Iran, Morocco, and Cuba were also represented (SVT 2004). The radio and TV
broadcasting time for programs in different minority languages is stable and fluctuates marginally.

The local television service in Stockholm (called Open Channel) broadcasts programs in different languages such as Amharic, Arabic, English, Greek, Kurdish, Persian, Somali, Spanish, Swedish, and Tigrinya. These minority language groups pay an annual fee to financially support the local broadcasts. Accordingly, the broadcasting time for each minority language varies from 1 to 3.5 hours per week. Parabolic antenna are also common in some immigrant residential areas in Sweden. This technology is used by some minority groups such as the Arabic, Turkish, and Persian people.

3.4.3.2 Religion

Religious institutions have a positive effect on maintaining the mother tongue, especially if the minority language is also the language of religion and is used in the religious services held in religious institutions. This view is held by many scholars (Kloss 1966; Giles et al. 1977; Smolicz 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Winsa 1999). Kloss (1966: 206), investigating German immigrants in the U.S., names religious and social isolation of the minority group and also use of the home language in religious settings as important factors that promote language maintenance. According to Paulston (1997: 189), a strong motive of Amish people in Pennsylvania and Hassidic group in New York for maintaining their languages (German and Yiddish respectively) is religion.

According to Hyltenstam & Stroud (1991: 96), if religion unites individuals in a minority group and promotes their solidarity, it can positively affect language maintenance. This is because there are shared religious beliefs and an in-group unity regarding a philosophy of life. This homogeneity can be a source of inspiration which leads individuals in the minority group to struggle to maintain their language and ethnic identity. Religious heterogeneity, however, can negatively affect language maintenance if there is disintegration and lack of conformity among the group members.

The Assyrian/Syrian group in Sweden, with a very strong religious background, is neither linguistically nor religiously a homogenous group. They immigrated to Sweden in the latter half of the 1960s from different countries, especially from Turkey, Lebanon, and Syria. Cultural oppression has been the main reason for their migration. Most of them speak Arabic, but Kurdish, Turkish, and Aramaic are also represented. They are Christians belonging to different churches. Most of them belong to the Orthodox Syrian Church, but there are also followers of the Assyrian Church (Nestorians) and the Catholic Syrian Church, among others (Persson 1977: 7). One of the languages that is most often used for the church services is Syrian, a Semitic language and one of the three Aramaic languages (Nelhans 1977: 18ff).

The church has an extremely important place in Assyrian/Syrian life and is highly respected. It is an authoritative institution and its rulings are usually
obeyed. It penetrates into the lives of Assyrians/Syrians and regulates many aspects of their social lives. The church is not only a place for religious practices and ceremonies, but also a place for families and relatives to gather for social purposes (familjepedagogerna för assyrier och syrianer 1979: 8ff). According to Sabri (1993), the key word in Assyrian/Syrian culture is collectivism. Family and relatives are placed at the center, and responsibility and loyalty are highly emphasized, encouraged, and valued. These characteristics have had a very strong maintenance influence on many aspects of Assyrian/Syrian culture (ibid.: 35ff). It seems that the factors significant to the survival of this ethnic group over time and in different places have been the religious and linguistic values which helped the group in their cultural preservation efforts (see also Smolicz et al. 2001 for similar results in the context of Australia among four ethnic groups of Greek–, Latvian–, Italian–, and Chinese–Australians). However, living in Sweden for more than 30 years as an immigrant group has had its cultural consequences. Some researchers (see e.g. Augustsson, Björk & Sjölund 1977: 24) maintain that those Assyrians/Syrians who have lived longer in Sweden are slowly undergoing acclimatization and are adopting some of the Swedish norms and traditions. Overall, the religious function of Arabic among different Arabic speaking groups in Sweden has had a strong language maintenance effect (see also Winsa 1999: 402).

3.4.3.3 Culture

Culture is another factor discussed in the literature as influencing language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Clyne 1982; Appel & Muysken 1987; Fishman 1994; Smolicz 1981, 1992, 1995; Smolicz et al. 1998; Smolicz et al. 2001; Jongenburger & Aarssen 2001). According to Fishman (1994: 86), language is (part of) culture in the sense that many of the cultural characteristics of a group (e.g. songs, music, fables, folktales, religion, arts and crafts, family structure, food, etc.) have a linguistic character which constructs a strong association between language and culture. Language is also associated with ethnic identity. Cultural norms, values, and traditions are transferred to the next generation through language from early childhood. In short, language symbolizes people and their ethnocultural identity.

Smolicz (1992, 1995), in his studies of language maintenance and shift in Australia, found that the theory of minority language as a core value of ethnic cultures facilitates understanding how these languages are maintained, shifted, and lost in multiethnic societies. He maintains (1992: 278ff) that some of the ethnocultural characteristics of a group are of fundamental significance for the survival of the group in contact situations, while others are not. The latter values may be modified or dropped completely without damaging the stability or integrity of the ethnic group. Those factors significant for the group’s survival are known as core values. It is by core values that an ethnic group is identified, both by its own members and by those outside the
A minority group ceases to exist as a distinctive ethnic group if it loses its core values whether voluntarily or by force (see also Jansson 2003). This finding is also confirmed in Pauwels’s study (1986) of language maintenance and shift among German and Dutch speakers living in Australia. Pauwels observes that very few speakers of Dutch consider their language to be a core value. The study shows that the rate of language maintenance among the speakers of Dutch is lower than among German speakers who attach greater importance to their language (ibid.: 114). Smolicz (1995: 239) maintains that the language preservation among the Greeks in Australia may depend on the sociohistorical status of the language. Their struggle in past centuries against the Ottoman Empire has prepared them with the necessary experience to save their language and culture. Another factor which applies to both the Greek and Italian groups is their collectivism. There is a close family structure in both groups. Religion is also a factor in both cases, however, it is a much stronger factor in the Greek case.

Clyne (1982) maintains that the closer the similarity between minority and majority cultures, the greater the tendency to shift. In his studies of language maintenance in Australia, he found that one of the most influential factors is the extent to which language is perceived to be a cultural core value. For example, he found that Southern Europeans tend to maintain their languages better than Northern Europeans, and Eastern Europeans better than Western Europeans. His studies show that there is a high degree of language maintenance among Greeks, Italians, and Yugoslavs, while language maintenance among Germans and Poles is moderate, and among Dutch and Maltese there is a strong language shift. Clyne maintains that the most crucial factors in determining the language maintenance and shift rates seems to be whether or not the minority language has a cultural core value within the group, and/or the extent of cultural similarity/dissimilarity to the majority group’s culture. The speakers of Dutch and Maltese in Clyne’s study seem to attach less importance to their language (see also Demos 1988).

Conklin & Lourie (1983) identified several cultural affiliations as important in minority language maintenance. Among them they mention cultural and religious ceremonies held in the mother tongue, ethnic identity and emotional attachment to the minority language, mother tongue as the national language of the home country, socialization of children in the mother tongue, and cultural norms which are dissimilar to majority cultural traditions. Factors that strongly disfavor language maintenance are socialization of children in the majority language and also minority members’ low self-esteem (e.g. if minority groups consider their language and culture unsuitable for public use). They state that if there is a high degree of similarity between minority and majority culture and religion, there is a greater danger of assimilation of minority groups.

In some countries, the importance of cultural diversity has been recognized and awareness has increased regarding the role of music education in
maintaining non-Western music cultures which can otherwise be in danger of disappearing because of the popularity and availability of Western music. For example, Australia and Britain have been attempting to include non-Western music in multicultural education (Murphy 1991a, 1991b). The purpose of introducing music of different cultures in primary and secondary schools has been firstly, to maintain them, and secondly, to develop them. In Britain the promotion of non-Western music has concentrated especially on Indian, Latin American, and Chinese music, and in Australia on Australian Aboriginal music. The approach has been to study non-Western music from the viewpoint of the country where the music is made, because this may lead to more understanding of the music’s functions, encourage tolerance and open-mindedness, and help promote integration (1991b: 390f).

3.4.3.4 Administrative institutions

Administrative institutions are regarded as important for maintaining the mother tongue. Administrative services provided in minority languages in the majority country institutions stimulate the use of these languages in different domains, which in turn increases the opportunities for language maintenance over a longer period. This maintenance effort also raises the status of minority languages among both minority and majority members. In Finland, for example, since 1922 both Finnish and Swedish speakers have the legal right to use their languages in governmental institutions. Based on the same law, a district is considered bilingual when 8% of the population is bilingual or when there are 3,000 bilingual speakers in the area. The bilingual districts must provide the children with bilingual education. Institutional services are given in both languages by bilingual personnel. Official documents, statements and proclamations are also available in both languages (Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991: 81).

Language planning is one of the activities performed by the government. One aspect of language planning in multilingual contexts is whether to include minority languages in the educational system and/or in the administrative services provided by the governmental institutions, or to exclude them partially or totally. Language planning may be based on three language perspectives including language as a problem, language as a right, and language as a resource (Baker 1993: 247ff). All three perspectives relate the language strongly to politics, economics, and ideologies, and to society as a whole. Language planners’ decisions about bilingual education are not only based on pedagogical and educational aspects, they are also influenced by the political and ideological beliefs of the decision makers.

In the perspective of language being a problem there have been many discussions about different problems, such as the personality and social problems that bilinguals supposedly have. The minority language is seen as a barrier, and is often blamed for the economic, educational, and social problems that minority members may have. According to this view, bilingualism
may also cause political problems, such as national disunity. To solve all of these “problems” the followers of this perspective suggest that minority children be assimilated into the majority language and culture as soon as possible (Baker 1993: 248).

The other aspect considers the right to one’s language as a basic human right. It is a personal, legal, and constitutional right of the individual and is based on the individual’s freedom of expression. The rights of minority groups to preserve their languages and cultures are recognized and recommended by international organizations such as the UN, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the EU. These organizations have recommended their members to provide for the minority children to be educated in their mother tongue and to preserve their culture. However, these recommendations have been disregarded by many of the member countries (Baker 1993: 249f).

The third perspective considers language a personal and a national resource. In this perspective, it is believed that linguistically diverse groups can live together side by side and have national unity. Diversity and national unity need not be incompatible. The societal and educational aim in this perspective is to promote pluralism and to deepen the understanding of language and culture between groups (Baker 1993: 252ff).

### 3.4.3.5 Education

Education is considered to be one of the most salient institutions which influences the minority language maintenance and shift. If minority children learn to read and write in their mother tongue in school, their language will survive longer in contact with the majority language (Appel & Muysken 1987). On the contrary, if the language socialization of minority children is limited only to the home or only to the school domain, there is a risk of language shift (see also Landry & Allard 1991; Hornberger & King 1996).

Fishman (1989: 419) views education as a formal institution responsible for minority children’s language and their ethnic socialization (see also Papademetre & Routoulas 2001). Ekstrand (1983: 157f) maintains that it is the responsibility of the schools to prepare children for society and to socialize them in the language and culture of the country that they live in. It is the duty and goal of the educational system to give children equal opportunities. Therefore, it is the duty of the schools to socialize bilingual and bicultural children both in their languages and their cultures. He further states that the socialization of bilingual and bicultural children should not be left to the families only (see also Smolicz et al. 1998; Tacelosky 2001 for similar thoughts on the vital role of the school in fostering cultural pluralism). However, some studies show that the development and promotion of the minority

---

14 See, however, Rahman (1997) who argues against the use of mother tongue in primary school education of the minority children.
languages among children is often possible only by the effort of the minority group itself as a supplementary education outside the curriculum, such as Sunday schools and the like (see e.g. Glenn & De Jong 1996; Martin 2007; György-Ullholm 2004).

The negative and positive effects of the education system on the maintenance of the minority languages in the majority countries have been studied by many scholars (see e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1983; Baker 1993; Garcia 1997). According to Paulston (1980: 76), the educational system of a country is part of a whole system and is subject to the ideologies and political system of that particular country. The government, with all the political power in its possession, may pass laws that are not in the interest of the minority groups who live within its borders. Paulston contends that:

Contrary to expectation, choice of medium of instruction in the schools, especially for minority groups, has very little predictive power in the final language choice of the ethnic group. The major point to understand about language as group behavior is that language is very rarely a causal factor that makes things happen; rather, language mirrors social conditions and human relationships. The … point is that bilingual education … is in itself not a causal factor. Schools and schooling can facilitate existing social trends, but they cannot successfully counter social, economic, and political forces. (Paulston 1997: 191f)

As mentioned earlier, the political system in a majority society may be assimilationist or pluralistic. Either one of these political ideologies has a powerful impact on the educational system, which in turn influences the maintenance or shift of minority languages. An assimilationist political system does not allow immigrants to use their languages in public. Minority languages are forced to be used only at home. They are not “good enough” to be used in the educational system. These negative attitudes towards minority languages in the majority society gradually spread among minority group members as well. In such a situation there is not much hope for the maintenance of minority languages (see e.g. Morita 2003). In a pluralistic system, on the other hand, the use of the mother tongue in education and the mass media are promoted, and resources are allocated to maintaining and developing the minority languages that exist in the country. These languages are considered resources of the country, which should be cared for and developed (see also Christian & Genesee 2001).

Different political systems and ideologies provide different kinds of education for minority children. Skutnabb-Kangas (1983) gives an overview of the types of bilingual education in different countries. She identifies 7 types of bilingual education based on the relationship between methods and aims of these programs (see Skutnabb-Kangas 1983: 127 for an overview). Another typology of bilingual education that bears some similarities to that of Skutnabb-Kangas is presented by Baker (1993: 153). It consists of two
forms: one weak and one strong. This typology is based on the type of program, the typical participant, the language of instruction, the societal and educational aim, and lastly the language outcome. Baker’s typology has, however, been criticized because some of the programs listed should not be called bilingual education programs because they aim at monolingualism either in the majority or minority language. The weak form of the bilingual education programs in Baker’s typology includes:

a. Submersion education  
b. Submersion with withdrawal classes  
c. Segregationist education  
d. Transitional bilingual education  
e. Mainstream education with foreign language teaching  
f. Separatist education

The strong form of the bilingual education programs includes:

g. Immersion bilingual education  
h. Maintenance and heritage language bilingual education  
i. Two-way/dual language bilingual education  
j. Mainstream bilingual education

In what follows, these 10 forms of bilingual education will be briefly introduced (based on Baker 1993: 154ff; see also Romaine 1995; Thomas & Collier 1997, 1999, 2000, 2001).

3.4.3.5.1 Weak forms of bilingual education

a. **Submersion education.** This is a program for minority children. The language of instruction in this program is the majority language. Its societal and educational aim is the assimilation of the minority children. The ultimate goal of the program is to replace the minority language with the majority language. This program is the most prevalent type of bilingual education in the U.S., where it is also called *Structured immersion.* Minority children in this program are placed in the mainstream education. The schools become melting pots where the aim is to create political, social, and economic unity. Students with different language skills, ranging from fluent speakers to those with very limited language knowledge in their L2, are placed in the same classroom. This heterogeneity causes problems in teaching and class management for the teachers, and social and emotional problems for the minority children (Baker 1993: 154f).

b. **Submersion with withdrawal classes.** This is also a program for minority children in mainstream schools. It can be found in the U.S. and England. The educational and societal aim for the minority children in this program is
assimilation and for them to become monolinguals in the majority language. The language of the classroom is the majority language with “pull-out” L2 lessons. Minority students are “pulled out” for compensatory lessons in their L2 in order for them to be prepared for the mainstream schooling. As a result, they may fall behind on the content that is taught to the mainstream children. Another drawback of this program is that it may create some emotional disturbances for the withdrawal child who may be harassed by peers as a student with limited knowledge in the L2 (Baker 1993: 155f).

c. Segregationist education. This, too, is a program for minority children who are forcibly instructed in their mother tongue. The societal and educational aim is to keep the minority group separated from the dominating ruling elite, and to create apartheid. This type of program has been found in Africa. Minority children become monolinguals in their mother tongue and do not have the opportunity to learn the language of the dominating power well enough to be able to make social transitions (Baker 1993: 156).

d. Transitional bilingual education. This is a program which provides for the minority children to gradually shift from their mother tongue to the majority language. In this program the immigrant children’s mother tongue is used as an instructional language during the first school years (while proficiency in the L2 is low) in order to facilitate acquiring knowledge in different school subjects. In this program the amount of exposure to the second language is gradually increased as mother tongue use is decreased. The societal aim of transitional programs is assimilation of the minority children. The motivation for learning L2 pursued by the majority society is that minority children need to use the majority language to get by in the society. Without proficiency in the L2, their academic performance and achievements will be lower than their native majority language peers and they will not enjoy equal employment and other opportunities in the majority society. In other words, it is “for their own good” that they be assimilated as soon as possible. This has been the predominant bilingual program throughout the world, especially from the end of the 19th century up to the 1960s (Baker 1993: 156f; see also Gupta’s [1997] reasoning against primary education in the mother tongue).

e. Mainstream education with foreign language teaching. This program is a bilingual program for the majority children. It can be found in the U.S., Canada, Europe, and Australia. The language of instruction is the majority language, while other languages are taught as foreign or second languages. Children receive half an hour of foreign (second) language teaching per day between the ages of 5 and 12 years. The language outcome of this program is limited bilingualism, and the societal and educational goal is to familiarize
the mainstream children with other languages and cultures to a limited extent (Baker 1993: 157).

**f. Separatist education.** This is a program in which minority children are taught through their own language and the societal goal is separation and autonomy from the majority society. This program is to protect the minority language and culture from being assimilated into the majority language and culture (Baker 1993: 157f).

**3.4.3.5.2 Strong forms of bilingual education**

**g. Immersion bilingual education.** This program began in Montreal, Canada in 1965 with the aim of making English speaking children bilingual and bicultural in both of the official languages, English and French. Since then this program has rapidly spread throughout Canada and has influenced bilingual education in the U.S., Europe, and other parts of the world. There are different types of immersion programs depending on the age of the children being exposed to a second language (early, middle, and late immersion), and the amount of exposure (total and partial immersion). The language of instruction is initially the children’s second language. Depending on the type of program, the use of the first language in the classroom increases until a balance in the amount of exposure to both languages is reached in order to achieve the goals of the program which are bilingualism and biliteracy. The societal aim is pluralism, to allow the children to deepen their knowledge about other languages and cultures (Baker 1993: 158ff).

**h. Maintenance and heritage language bilingual education.** This is a program which provides for and facilitates the maintenance and development of the mother tongue while minority students are socialized into their second language and encouraged and prepared to acquire it. The societal aim is pluralism, to give minority children opportunities to become bilingual, with literacy skills in both languages. In this program, minority children continue to acquire knowledge through their L1, and are not impeded in this effort by lack of proficiency in the L2. Through their first language, they develop the ability to be successful in the context-reduced and cognitively demanding school subjects. These skills are later transferred to the L2. When minority children acquire literacy skills in their L1, they are developing reading and writing skills not only in their mother tongue, but also in their second language. In the maintenance program, the minority language is usually used as a medium of instruction for half of the curriculum time, but in some cases (such as in Wales) up to 80% to 100%. Other examples of maintenance programs can be found in the U.S. (Navaho and Spanish), in Canada (Ukrainian), in Sweden (Finnish), and in Spain (Catalan) (Baker 1993: 162ff).
i. Two-way/dual language bilingual education. This program is for both minority and majority students (50% from each group) who participate together and build up a whole class. Both the minority and majority languages are languages of instruction. Each language is used equally and alternately. With pluralism as the societal goal, this program attempts to provide opportunities for the children to achieve bilingualism and biliteracy. It can be found in the U.S. at the elementary school level, for example to integrate Spanish and English speaking students (Baker 1993: 164f).

j. Mainstream bilingual education. This program is for the majority students and can be found in countries like Taiwan, India, or Japan, where it is desired that the children learn an international language alongside their own native language. Both languages are used as the medium of instruction. The societal aim is pluralism and multiculturalism. Students deepen their knowledge about both of the languages and cultures to become bilingual and bicultural, with reading and writing skills in both languages. An example of this program in Europe can be seen in Luxembourg where children’s first language is Luxembourger. They become trilingual, adding French and German through education (Baker 1993: 165ff).

3.4.3.5.3 Immigrant children’s education in Sweden – A historical perspective

The education of immigrant children in Sweden began to take form during the 1960s. In 1962, immigrant children’s right to preserve and develop their language was recognized for the first time (Hyltenstam & Arnberg 1988: 487; Paulston 1988). In 1966, the municipalities received financial support from the government to arrange a Tutorial Program (called stödundervisning in Swedish) for immigrant and stateless children, as well as for Swedish children who had studied in foreign schools. The Tutorial Program consisted of two parts: instruction in Swedish as a foreign language, which later was changed to Swedish as a second language, and instruction in school subjects through the medium of the mother tongue (called studiehandledning in Swedish). Until 1977, the municipalities were not obliged by law to arrange home language instruction for immigrant children. It came in the form of a recommendation from the government to the municipalities. In practice, however, all immigrant children were given the opportunity to study their mother tongue from as early as 1968 (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 44f).

In 1977 the Swedish government decided that children who had a mother tongue other than Swedish were to be instructed in their home language. This decision bound the municipalities by law to arrange home language instruction for those students who desired it. This resolution, called the Home Language Reform, covered immigrant children in both comprehensive and upper-secondary schools, students in the adult educational system, and those in special schools (for children with special needs). The condition for
minority children to be eligible for this program was that the home language should be a living feature in their home. This definition meant that students who participated in mother tongue instruction could have very varying amounts of knowledge of their mother tongues (see also Municio 1987; Hyltenstam & Arnborg 1988; Paulston 1980, 1983, 1988, 1992; Boyd 1993; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996).

The Home Language Reform was based on three objectives: 1) equality between immigrants and Swedish people, 2) cultural freedom of choice for immigrants, and 3) cooperation and solidarity between Swedes and ethnic minorities. The first objective, equality, means that immigrants should have equal opportunities in society, for example in terms of work and education. It also means that immigrants, like Swedes, should have the means to preserve their cultural identity. The second objective, freedom of choice, facilitates for the immigrants to preserve their own language and culture or to adopt the Swedish language and culture to the extent they choose themselves. The third objective, cooperation and solidarity, emphasizes the development of tolerance and understanding between ethnic minorities and Swedes. These objectives were to provide the immigrants with positive support to maintain their mother tongues and cultures. They were to strengthen the immigrants’ ethnic identity and to guarantee a natural linguistic, social, emotional, and intellectual development of the immigrant children (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 29ff).

The municipalities’ responsibility to arrange a Tutorial Program was emphasized in the Home Language Reform. It included instruction in Swedish as a second language, and instruction in school subjects through the medium of the mother tongue. Participation in both of these areas of instruction was (and still is) obligatory for those immigrant students who were in need of such instruction (Skolverket 2002b: 22). Attending home language instruction was not (and still is not) compulsory for immigrant students (Municio 1987: 40ff; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 29ff).

The goals and organization of Swedish as a second language will not be discussed here (for an overview see e.g. Tingbjörn 1988, 1991; Hammarberg 1991; Viberg 1993a, 1993b, 1996; Lainio & Wande 1996). The literature review here is about mother tongue teaching. Educational goals for immigrant children were described in a comprehensive school education curriculum (Lgr 80) in force between 1980 and 1993 (Skolverstyrelsen 1980). The following goals, among others, were emphasized:

The goal of teaching the mother tongue is to maintain and develop knowledge in the language that the child uses in his/her daily milieu. In this way the child’s emotional, linguistic, and intellectual development will be promoted. The child also has an opportunity to experience and feel affiliated with the cultural background of parents/guardians.

Further, the goal is for students to later develop bilingualism in order for them to belong to two cultures. They shall receive support and encourage-
ment to develop their listening, understanding, speaking, reading, and writing abilities. The goal is for students to wish, be able and dare to use their mother tongue in different situations (free translation by the author from Lgr 80: 56f).

Mother tongue was described for the first time as a subject matter in the immigrant education curriculum. Its goals, among others, were:

The aim of home language instruction is for the students to develop their language in such a way that it becomes a means for them to develop into individuals with strong self-esteem and a clear understanding about themselves, their group affiliation, and their situation in life.

Home language instruction shall contribute to students maintaining contact with their family and their language group. In this way their prerequisites for developing their language increase. Home language teaching shall provide the foundation for the students to develop towards active bilingualism (free translation by the author from Lgr 80: 145).

In 1985 the definition of which immigrant students were eligible for mother tongue instruction was changed. According to the new definition, only those students with at least one parent/guardian with a mother tongue other than Swedish could participate in mother tongue instruction. The mother tongue should also be used daily in interactions between parents and children. Sámi children, students from Tornedalen with Tornedalen Finnish, speakers of Romani, and adopted children were exempted, and were not required to use their mother tongue actively and daily to qualify for mother tongue instruction (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 46; Skolverket 2002b: 22).

In 1991 it was decided that municipalities were obliged by law to arrange mother tongue instruction for immigrant students only if classes were made up of at least 5 students. Sámi, Tornedalen Finnish, and speakers of Romani were again exempted from this decision. They could receive mother tongue instruction individually. In 1991, the responsibility of the municipalities for schools was increased so that they were given more freedom to allocate the government subsidies as they saw fit and according to their priorities. In 1991 and 1992 the municipalities received government subsidies jointly for instruction in both mother tongue and Swedish as a second language. Since 1993, the municipalities receive financial support from the government which is not earmarked for specific purposes. The municipalities themselves decide how much of the budget should be spent on the mother tongue instruction (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 47; Skolverket 2002b: 22).

In 1994 a new curriculum for comprehensive school education (Lpo 94) and for upper-secondary schools (Lpf 94) was approved (Skolverket 1994a, 1994b). Many of the above-mentioned rules and regulation are the same in the 1994 curriculum, for example, the responsibility of the municipalities to arrange mother tongue instruction, the definition of the mother tongue student, and the rights of the students who need instruction in subject matter
through the medium of the mother tongue. However, a change was made in relation to the number of years immigrant students could receive instruction in their mother tongue, the so called 7-year-rule. Accordingly, students who receive instruction in their mother tongue after school hours can receive such instruction for only 7 years. The language groups exempted from this rule are Saami children, students from Tornedalen with Tornedalen Finnish, Romani speakers, Finnish students, and students from the Nordic countries. Other immigrant children can also be exempted from this rule only if there are some special reasons and needs. These new rules and regulations for comprehensive school have been in force since the 1995/96 school year and for upper-secondary school since 1994/95, and they are in force to date (Skolverket 2008a: 13f, 2011; Utbildningsdepartementet 2010b: 39).

Another discussion during this period was about changing the term “home language.” The expression refers to the language that immigrant children actually use in their home milieu, one of the eligibility conditions to receive mother tongue instruction. These children’s home language does not need to be their mother tongue (Municio 1987: 42f). However, this term was misused, as it gradually came to refer to the language that could only be used at home in informal situations. Consequently, it was strongly criticized for a long time (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 10). Therefore, it was suggested that this subject matter be called “mother tongue.” The National Board of Education (Skolverket) maintains that it is appropriate to change the term from home language to mother tongue, because it is in line with the strong position that this subject matter has received in both comprehensive (Lpo 94) and upper-secondary school (Lpf 94) curricula. The change may even reinforce the students in their mother tongue instruction and increase the subject’s importance (Skolverket 1996a: 7f). Finally this became a reality in July 1997 (Skolverket 2002b: 23).

A change in the goals of mother tongue teaching is the omission of active bilingualism. The goals according to Lpo 94 are:

The mother tongue is of fundamental importance for the individual’s linguistic, personality, and intellectual development. It is an instrument for communication, for development of one’s identity and ability to learn, and also the key to the cultural heritage and cultural literature.

Instruction in this subject matter aims to enable students with a home language other than Swedish to develop their language so that they can have strong self-esteem and a clear understanding about themselves and their situation in life. Home language teaching shall promote the students’ development into bilinguals with bicultural identity (free translation by the author from Skolverket 1996b: 37).

However, it is written in the upper-secondary education curriculum (Lpf 94) that active bilingualism is the general aim for mother tongue and Swedish as
a second language during the immigrant students’ entire time in school (Skolverket 1997: 100).

Another subject to be discussed here is the number of students participating in home language instruction. Since the enactment of the Home Language Reform, the percentage of students participating in home language instruction in comprehensive schools steadily increased up to 1986. In 1978 the total of the eligible immigrant students who participated in mother tongue instruction rose to 54%, and in 1986 to 68% (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 53). However, since 1986 there has been a decrease in the ratio of the participating students in mother tongue instruction. This may mainly be due to the change of the definition of the mother tongue student in 1985. The participation ratio dropped to 54.9% in 1995/96 and to 52.5% in the 1998/99 school year (Namei 1997: 11; Skolverket 1999: 84). The participating ratio was about 60% in larger metropolitan areas and about 20% in smaller cities in 2001/2002 (Skolverket 2002b: 35). The participating ratio in the 2009/2010 school year was about 53% (Skolverket 2010: 52). This proportion has been fluctuating between 51% and 56% from 1999 to 2009 (Skolverket 2010: 53).

The education of the immigrant students in Sweden has been evaluated in many studies and many problems are identified. These are not going to be presented and discussed here (see e.g. Municio 1987; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996; Namei 1997). Instead, the following sections present the organization of education for immigrant children in preschool, comprehensive, and upper-secondary school.

3.4.3.5.4 The organization of immigrant children’s education in Sweden

Preschool. The Home Language Reform for preschoolers originally included only 6-year-old children. In 1978 it also covered five-year-old children. The condition for program eligibility was that the home language should be a living element in the home. It was in 1989 that the Swedish government decided to give municipalities financial support for home language training which included all immigrant children (ages 0–6) in daycare centers and preschools (Arnberg 1996: 189f).

The mother tongue training in preschools included mother tongue groups in which children could receive lessons in Swedish, combined groups which included 50% immigrant children with one and the same language and 50% Swedish peers, and regular Swedish groups with at least 4 hours of home language training per week (Hyltenstam & Arnberg 1988: 489).

In 1991, the rules and regulations for governmental subsidies were changed. Accordingly, the municipalities could receive financial support from the government only in proportion to the number of immigrant children who were enrolled in the child care system, compared to the past when they received governmental support for those children for whom they had actually arranged home language training. Further, the received subsidies could be
used for home language training and other programs that immigrant children in preschool might need (Arnberg 1996: 190).

Another change came in 1993, and since then the governmental financial support to the municipalities for immigrant children and refugees is no longer earmarked. It is integrated into the budget of the municipalities that is received from the government. This has led some municipalities to decide to support other needs of immigrant children and to omit the home language training from their agenda. In some others, only children with special needs receive training in their mother tongue (Arnberg 1996: 190ff). In 1990, 179 (out of 260) municipalities (69%) organized mother tongue training for preschool children, compared to 17% (52 out of 289 municipalities) in 2001 (Skolverket 2002b: 29).

In 1997 a proposition for the Swedish preschool curriculum was made (ages 1–5) for the first time (SOU 1997: 157). It was subsequently approved and has been in force since August 1998 (Skolverket 1998). This was to gather the preschool, the comprehensive, and the upper-secondary schools under one umbrella and link them together in order to have a shared view of knowledge, development, and learning (Lpfö 98: 3). About mother tongue training it is written in the preschool curriculum that:

The preschool shall contribute to the children with a language other than Swedish developing both Swedish and the mother tongue (free translation by the author from Lpfö 98: 10; Utbildningsdepartmentet 2010b: 31).

Participation in mother tongue training in preschool has decreased from 64% in 1980 to 31% in 1992 (Arnberg 1996: 191), and to 20% in 1994 (Skolverket 2002b: 29) and it has been fluctuating between 13% and 20% from 1999 to 2009 (Skolverket 2010: 15). In the 1998/99 school year 14.7% of the children in ages 0–5 participated in mother tongue training (Skolverket 1999: 31), compared to 36.3% for the children in Grade 0 (6–7 years old) for the same school year (Skolverket 1999: 62), and 44% for 2009/2010 (Skolverket 2010: 40). The participation decline for children in ages 0–5 may mostly be due to the budget cutbacks, and the fact that the remaining budget is no longer earmarked for home language training (for an overview of the identified problems see e.g. Nauclér 1983; Municio 1983; Arnberg 1991; Arnberg & Viberg 1991; Viberg 1991; Lindholm 1992; Johansson & Åstedt 1993; Arnberg 1996; Nauclér & Boyd 1997).

Comprehensive school. The Home Language Reform gave the municipalities the opportunity to arrange bilingual education in different ways according to the characteristics of the minority groups. It was recommended that each municipality cooperate and co-plan with local minority organizations and with immigrant students and their parents to organize a suitable education program. Four types of program were included in the immigrant child-
ren’s education in the comprehensive school, and were practiced until 1994 when a new curriculum was approved (Hyltenstam & Arnberg 1988: 48ff; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 47ff):

1. Home language class
2. Integrated class
3. Swedish class
4. Preparatory class

In the *Home language class* program, all of the students had one and the same non-Swedish mother tongue. Instruction was given in both Swedish and the mother tongue. This program was organized for Grades 1 to 6, but in a few municipalities was even available for Finnish students in Grades 7 to 9. During the early years of comprehensive school, most of the school subjects were taught in the students’ mother tongue. At the intermediate level, the amount of the time allocated to Swedish increased until it equaled the time spent on the first language. According to Boyd (1993: 278), the minority students attending this program made up about 9% of all eligible immigrant students. According to Winsa (1999: 401), it is estimated that the participation rate in this program has decreased to 5% (see also Löfgren & Eriksson 1982).

In the *Integrated class* program, half of the students in the class were Swedish and the other half were immigrant children with one and the same mother tongue, for example, Spanish. This program was available for Grades 1 to 3 and later in some cases to Grade 6. In the beginning, minority students were taught in their L1 except for some subjects, for example, music, art, woodshop, physical education, and so on, where they were instructed in Swedish together with their Swedish classmates. Bilingual children in this program also studied Swedish as a second language. The amount of time for Swedish language instruction was gradually increased until all of the students could be instructed together in Swedish. According to Boyd (1993: 278), the minority students attending this program made up about 2% of all eligible immigrant students.

The *Swedish class* program was the most common program for immigrant children. About 89% of the immigrant students attended this program (Boyd 1993: 278). The students attended regular Swedish classes where the language of instruction was Swedish. They could also be instructed in Swedish as a second language if needed. In this case they were “pulled out” from their regular classes. The immigrant students in the Swedish class program were also offered mother tongue instruction for about 2 hours per week; however, they had to be “pulled out” from their classes again in order to participate in mother tongue instruction.

Minority students in the Swedish class program also had the opportunity to study other school subjects through the medium of their mother tongue.
The home language teachers were the subject instructors, and the purpose of the program was to help minority students understand the content of the school subjects in order to continue acquiring knowledge in different school subjects and not be impeded by their lack of second language proficiency. The number of hours allocated per week for this purpose was determined on the basis of the minority student’s needs.

In the Preparatory class program (usually 1 to 2 years) immigrant students belonging to different age groups and backgrounds were instructed in Swedish as a second language. This program was available at all school levels and its goal was to prepare the students to participate in the regular Swedish classes. Immigrant students in the Preparatory class were not isolated from their Swedish classmates in the regular program, but joined them to socialize a few hours per week. For example, they were together during sports and music classes, or other classes which did not require advanced language skills and which had a friendlier atmosphere so that students had a chance to get to know each other on informal terms.

Upper-secondary school. Immigrant students in the upper-secondary school could receive instruction in their mother tongue instead of second and third foreign languages (formerly called B- and C-languages) or another subject. Further, instruction in school subjects through the medium of the mother tongue was also provided for those students who needed such instruction (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 49). The preparatory program in upper-secondary school was called the Introductory class with the same objectives and types of students mentioned for the Preparatory class in the comprehensive school.

The education of immigrant students in comprehensive and upper-secondary schools in Sweden is still organized as described above (Skolverket 2008a: 13f). However, due to the budget cutbacks, among other possible reasons, today fewer Home language classes and Integrated classes (called Bilingual education) are held. This bilingual education is arranged for Grades 1–6 and for Finnish speaking students all the way through comprehensive school. In this program, about half of the instruction should be held in the students’ mother tongue, and the extent of using Swedish as an instruction language should increase successively (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 58; UFB 2 1998/99: 251f; Skolverket 2002b: 22). In the following sections the organization of the mother tongue instruction is described based on the new curricula for the comprehensive (Lpo 94) and the upper-secondary school (Lpf 94).

3.4.3.5.5 Mother tongue instruction in comprehensive school
As mentioned before, the organization of education for immigrant students in comprehensive schools was changed in the 1995/96 school year after the approval of the new curriculum (Lpo 94). A very important change was the
arrangement of mother tongue teaching for those students who participate in Swedish class and Preparatory class programs, mainly due to the fact that the “pulling out” system was strongly criticized. Accordingly, instruction in mother tongue in comprehensive schools was organized for 2 hours per week and is still in operation using the following four alternatives (UFB 2 1998/99: 252f; Skolverket 2002b: 24, 2008a: 13f; Utbildningsdepartmentet 2010b: 5, 2011: 5):

1. Language choice
2. Student’s choice
3. Extracurricular activity
4. School choice

1. Language choice. During comprehensive school, students are offered 320 hours of instruction in at least two of the three B-languages. A B-language is a second foreign language after English, which is the first foreign language. The B-languages are French, Spanish, and German. Municipalities have the responsibility to offer instruction in a B-language if there are at least 5 enrolled students and the students are assessed to be able to continue their studies in that language at the upper-secondary school level. Besides the above-mentioned B-languages, Finnish and Saami are also offered as B-languages. If students choose these two languages, instruction shall be arranged even if the number of the registered students is less than 5. Other languages may also be offered as B-languages, only if students are considered to be able to continue their studies in that language at the upper-secondary school level. Each school decides when the instruction in B-language should begin. However, it usually begins in Grade 6. According to the curriculum for comprehensive school education, students can choose to study their mother tongue as a B-language. This right is reserved for those immigrant students who are eligible to receive instruction in their mother tongue (UFB 2 1998/99: 254; Skolverket 2010: 50ff).

2. Student’s choice. During comprehensive school, students are offered 470 hours of instruction in one or more subjects of their choosing. The goal is to deepen the students’ knowledge in the chosen subject. The content of the instruction should be in line with the goals specified in the curriculum for that particular subject. Students can also choose a third foreign language, a so called C-language, as one of their elective subjects. Instruction in a C-language should be arranged if there are at least 5 enrolled students who are able to continue their studies at the upper-secondary school level. Immigrant students can choose to study their mother tongue as one of their elective subjects. Other subjects available to choose from are art, computers, woodshop, or the like (UFB 2 1998/99: 254f).
3. Extracurricular activity. The third way of studying one’s mother tongue is to study it as an extracurricular activity during the comprehensive school years. Students enrolled in this program study their home languages after school hours. As mentioned before, these students have the right to such instruction for only 7 years (Utbildningsdepartementet 2011: 5). Saami children, students with Tornedalen Finnish, Romani children, Finnish students, and students from the Nordic countries are exempted from the 7-year-rule. If there are some special reasons and needs, other immigrant children can also receive instruction in their mother tongue for more than 7 years. This means that the school must keep a record of each student who receives mother tongue instruction (Skolverket 2002b: 24). Implementing the 7-year-rule has caused some problems, and it has been strongly criticized. The practical difficulties have led to some changes at the local level. For example, larger cities such as Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Malmö decided not to put the 7-year-rule into practice. Instead they offer 470 hours of mother tongue instruction under the whole comprehensive school time (Stockholms skolor–Invandrarenheten 1995).

4. School choice. Finally, students can study their mother tongue in a program called school choice. Every school can choose to offer instruction in subjects like mother tongue, music, computers, or the like as special subjects which reflect the school’s profile (UFB 2 1998/99: 255).

Although eligible immigrant students can be offered mother tongue instruction according to the aforementioned four alternatives, in practice however, it is the third alternative, mother tongue instruction as an extracurricular activity, which is the most common alternative (60% according to Skolverket 2010a: 53). Within the language choice alternative, mother tongue must compete with languages such as French, German, Spanish, Swedish as a second language, sign language, English, and Swedish as a mother tongue. This makes the competition for the mother tongue subject more difficult. The competition is even harder when students have to choose between their mother tongue and other more popular subjects (within the student’s choice alternative) such as computers, music, or sports. Also, very few schools choose a language of an immigrant group to reflect their profile. Another issue is that it is the school’s headmaster who decides whether or not home language should be among the alternatives within language choice, student’s choice, or school choice (for an overview of the identified problems see e.g. Ekstöm 1982; Enström 1982; Källström 1982; Tingbjörn 1984; Namei 1993; Garefalakis 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996; Nygren-Junkin 1997; Skolverket 2008a).

It should be mentioned that since 1991 a different type of school, called the Independent school (Fristående skolor), has been established in Sweden with a concentration on minority language and ethnicity. These schools can
be considered attempts by various language minority groups to better assist their members in preserving their language and culture through education. The most active minority group with the highest number of Independent schools (established in many cities) is the Sweden Finnish group. The languages of instruction in Sweden Finnish Independent schools are both Finnish and Swedish (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 59). Since 1997 the Independent schools are obliged to arrange mother tongue instruction for their students in the same manner as public schools (Skolverket 2002b: 23). In the school year 2009/2010, 70% of the eligible students participated in mother tongue instruction in the Independent schools, compared to 51% in public schools (Skolverket 2010: 53).

A few Independent schools have also been established for Muslim children. There has been a comprehensive school for Jewish children in Stockholm since 1955, and there are also schools for English, French, and German speaking children in Stockholm and Gothenburg (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 59f).

Several immigrant groups have Saturday and Sunday schools where children of different age groups participate in mother tongue instruction. Other subjects like art, music, dance, sports, and so on may also be offered to promote the interest of the children to attend these schools at weekends, and to raise their cultural competence.

3.4.3.5.6 Mother tongue instruction in upper-secondary school
Since 1994/95 instruction in mother tongue has been provided in upper-secondary school for about 2 hours per week based on the following three alternatives (UFB 2 1998/99: 288ff; Skolverket 2002b: 24; Utbildningsdepartementet 2010a: 8):

1. Individual choice
2. Extended program
3. Replacing languages other than Swedish, Swedish as a second language, and English

1. Individual choice. Upper-secondary students are offered the chance to deepen their knowledge through their elective subject/s. They can choose practically any subject that is offered in the national program for upper-secondary school. For example, immigrant students can choose their mother tongue or Swedish as a second language.

2. Extended program. Mother tongue can also be studied as one of the subjects that students can choose to study after their regular program. It is offered to those students who can cope successfully with both the national and the extended programs. This decision is made by the school’s headmaster.
3. Replacing languages other than Swedish, Swedish as a second language, and English. The third alternative for mother tongue instruction offered in upper-secondary school is that it can replace other languages that students can study as long as these are not Swedish, Swedish as a second language, or English. These languages are second and third foreign languages included in the upper-secondary school program, formerly called B- and C-languages, referring to advanced and elementary level, respectively (Utbildningsdepartementet 2010a: 8). The proportion of the students who choose to study their mother tongue at upper-secondary school is very low. According to the Swedish National Agency for Education, the proportion of the students who received credit for courses in mother tongue in their final grades at upper-secondary school in the 2007/2008 school year was very low, only 2 to 3%, compared to those who chose English as C-language, Spanish, German, French, or Italian (Skolverket 2009a: 129).

The percentage of students participating in home language instruction in the upper-secondary school increased constantly from 1978 (19.2%) to 1987 (51.2%) (Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996: 56). However, this has dropped to 36.6% in 1994/95 (Namei 1997: 11; Skolverket 2002b: 30). There are no official statistics for the following years. However, 3,523 students received certificate for studying their mother tongue in 1997/98 (Skolverket 1999: Del 1: 39ff). If one assumes that the number of eligible students was around 20,000 (approximately so since 1988), the ratio of the students participating in mother tongue instruction in upper-secondary school in 1997/98 is 17.6%. This is probably among the lowest participation rates since the enactment of the Home Language Reform in 1977.

Some of the problems with the education of immigrant students at the upper-secondary school are identified and discussed in the literature (see for example Edberg & Holmegaard 1982; Sahaf 1994; Hill, M. 1995; Namei 1997; Winsa 1999 for an overview). One of the most important problems is that there are not enough organizational alternatives to cover students at different proficiency levels. When students choose to study their mother tongue as a C-language (elementary level), based on their perceived language proficiency, they must study it together with more advanced students, with those who study their mother tongue as a B-language (advanced level) in order to deepen their knowledge and broaden their proficiency in that subject. Students with limited proficiency in their mother tongue cannot succeed in reaching the goals of the courses. In other words, mother tongue instruction in the upper-secondary school is actually for advanced students. This has led to many forced dropouts (Namei 1997: 11f).
3.5 Factors at the individual level

Individual factors refer to the speaker’s potential, opportunities, or limitations with regards to maintaining the mother tongue. They include language socialization, language competence, language choice, and language attitudes. These are accounted for below.

3.5.1 Language socialization

One of the factors influencing language maintenance and shift is the pattern of language socialization, that is, how the language is transferred from one generation to the next. The main instrument of socialization is language. Parents, in their interaction with children, reproduce their own ways of being, their ways of thinking, how they comprehend the world, and how they perceive their cultural norms and values. Parents themselves are influenced by other factors, which in turn affects their way of socializing their children (see e.g. Kulick 1990; Remennick 2003; Haglund 2005a, 2005b).

In early childhood, socialization takes place at home via parents, siblings, caretakers, relatives, and others who may come into contact with the child. During the time that the child spends in daycare and preschool, this task is extended to caregivers and teachers. In these places, peers have a very important role in the child’s socialization. When the child begins school, socialization will also be the school’s responsibility. This is a normal picture in western countries, but it is far from universal. Children in distinct cultures or within the same culture belonging to various social classes are socialized differently. In some cultures grandparents and siblings are directly involved in the process of socialization. In others, close relatives play a significant role in the socialization of the younger generation. The primary socialization according to the Iranian culture, where parents, grandparents, caregivers, siblings, relatives, neighbors, and friends are very much involved, does not differ significantly from western countries.

The extent of the use of language in the children’s socialization also varies in different cultures. For example, in Sweden there is a strong emphasis on verbal interaction with the child. This is also true in the Iranian culture. The intensive verbal interaction with the child may be motivated by the mother sharing her experiences with the child who has limited opportunities to experience the world. In some other cultures the child is carried on its mother’s back where it can observe the happenings and hear all kinds of conversations that the mother is engaged in (Aronsson 1991: 26ff). Addressing can also be constrained by culture. For example, in Sweden the child is directly spoken to, whereas in Kaluli, Papua New Guinea, the child is addressed by the mother via the older sibling by a routine called elema “say it” (Schieffelin 1990: 92). Elema is used by caregivers with young children in conducting many interactional functions. It is used in dyadic and triadic con-
versations to help children learn specific speech activities designed for specific interlocutors (Schieffelin 1990: 77).

In language shift situations, the patterns of language socialization may also change a great deal. This was noted by Kulick (1990) when he studied language shift in Gapun, a village in Papua New Guinea. He found that parents did not understand, nor were they even aware of the process of change in their patterns of socialization. They thought that they treated their children as they were once treated by their own parents. What was really happening was that parents did not provide their children with enough language input in Taiap, the local vernacular. They code-switched to Tok Pisin very often in direct interactions with their children and in speaking with one another. This was a result of how they associated important aspects of their life such as modernity, Christianity, and education with Tok Pisin, while they connected backwardness and other negative aspects with Taiap.

Heath (1983) studied children’s socialization in different socioeconomic environments in the Piedmont Carolinas. The families under investigation lived in three different areas: Roadville, a white working class context, Trackton, a black working class environment, and a small middle class and school-oriented city. The townspeople were the mainstreamers. These places are not very far from each other, but Heath finds that their literacy norms deviate enormously from each other. Among other aspects of socialization, she studied and compared the traditions of story-telling in these areas. She describes how stories are constructed and told, and how questions are asked and answered. She describes the oral and literate traditions in each context. She maintains that many stories are told in each context, but differ in form, content, functions, structure, occasions, and patterns of interaction. In Roadville, only factual stories are allowed with only a little exaggeration, whereas in Trackton, reality is interwoven with fiction and fantasy. In Roadville, stories are told to sustain the individual’s relationship with the community. In Trackton, one purpose is to uphold distinctness and personal power (Heath 1983: 184ff). The traditions of story-telling in middle class mainstream families also differ from those in the white and black working class families. For example, mainstream children learn that it is alright to use their imagination when playing and fantasize about make-believe identities and relationships. They soon learn how to ask questions, give answers, analyze, and judge the stories’ quality (Heath 1983: 294ff). The author contends that the differences in traditions and norms in each community gradually lead to the fact that the children develop in very contrasting ways in story-telling and oral traditions. Heath describes the consequences that each story-telling tradition has for the children’s work at mainstream school (Heath 1983: 294ff).

In Sweden, Nauclér & Boyd (1997) also studied story-telling traditions in Turkish and Swedish contexts among preschool children. Based on their findings, the authors assert that the Turkish and Swedish children are socia-
lized differently to participate in story-telling activities. The general picture in Turkish families is that children usually listen to a story told by an adult. They seldom participate actively. Telling a story of this type is called performance. In Swedish families, children do not just listen. They participate in telling the story, ask questions, give answers, and construct the story’s future events. In short, they are encouraged to use their imagination and dare to use it. This is called the co-construction model. The investigators draw parallels between the Swedish and the American contexts described by Heath. The Turkish children’s socialization norms have some corresponding characteristics with the white working class families in Roadville, while the mainstreamers in town socialize their children in almost the same way as the Swedish working class families (Nauclér & Boyd 1997: 140).

One of the interesting results of the study by Nauclér & Boyd is that when preschool Swedish teachers tell a story to Turkish children, they do not encourage them to actively participate. They perform the story. Whereas in interacting with Swedish children they co-construct the story with them. The investigators maintain that using the co-construction model is more difficult when the Turkish children have limited language proficiency and lack narrative skills in Swedish. However, because the teachers are uncertain about how much is understood by the Turkish children, they limit these children’s role in the story-telling activity. Turkish children are not encouraged by their Swedish teachers to share their prior knowledge with the teachers or other children. One possible interpretation is that the teachers adapt to the children’s sociocultural norms. This can be understood as a gesture of cooperation. However, they maintain that it can also be “a reflection of the power relation between majority and minority” (ibid: 143; see also Nauclér 2003).

3.5.2 Language competence

Language competence in both first and second languages (which may also refer to degree of bilingualism) is an important issue in studying changes in patterns of habitual language use. The degree of bilingualism refers to automaticity, proficiency, and code-intactness at the phonetic, lexical, and grammatical levels with respect to language perception, comprehension, and production, as well as with regard to written, read, and spoken language. If literacy in the first language is attained before exposure to the second language, a shift in reading and writing in the second language may be delayed, while if literacy in the L1 is attained after exposure to the second language, the shift in reading and writing may occur more rapidly (Fishman 1972c).

The role of code-switching in language shift and its connection to language competence has been the focus of research in many studies (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Schmidt 1985; Hill, J. 1989; Tandefelt 1992; Jaspaert & Kroon 1992; Eastman 1992; Romaine 1995). However, researchers discuss the results differently and arrive at different conclusions. On the one
hand, code-switching has been taken as a sign of linguistic decay and incompetence in one of the languages involved. Being incompetent in one language affects speakers, in that the dominant language will be chosen in more and more domains, which gradually results in language shift. Researchers like Poplack (1980) and Huffines (1989), however, show otherwise. Poplack, who studied bilingual Puerto Ricans in New York, states that only fully bilingual Puerto Ricans are capable of using both their languages, English and Spanish, in one sentence. She maintains that code-switching is a mode of speech by itself. Huffines (cited in Hyltenstam & Stroud 1996) argues that code-switching gives non-competent speakers an opportunity to participate in interactions that might not have been possible for them because of the level of complexity in the interaction.

Language competence as perceived by minority members may also affect language maintenance and shift. Gal (1979), in her study of peasants’ language shift from Hungarian to German in Oberwart, asked her informants to rank their knowledge of each of their languages on a five-point scale. Only one of her informants indicated perfect knowledge of German and Hungarian. Half of them ranked their knowledge highest in Hungarian, and 21% ranked themselves highest in German. As many as 20% deemed their Hungarian knowledge to be moderate, while 37% had moderate German knowledge. Several of them did not answer this question at all. Judging from the fact that Oberwarters are not usually so shy or reticent about their achievements, Gal stated that the self-ranking results reflected the informants’ “insecurity rather than modesty.”

3.5.3 Language choice

Studies of language choice factors try to explain how people are motivated to change their choice of language in different social contexts by examining individuals’ patterns of language use. In these studies, the social processes that describe the redistribution of different variants among speakers are illustrated (Gal 1979: 1ff; Woolard 1989: 4f). Language choice can be examined from different perspectives: sociological, sociopsychological, and anthropological. These approaches focus on different issues and their methods of investigation vary. For example, investigating language choice from a sociological perspective describes the language behavior of a group of people in relation to different kinds of changes in sociocultural processes. Sociologists have mainly focused on domains of language behavior, often using quantitative research methods such as surveys. Social psychologists are interested in studying individuals’ psychological processes and motivations of language behavior in connection with structures within society. In this type of study, quantitative methods such as surveys and samples are usually used to explain why bilinguals choose between their languages in different domains. They also rely on qualitative methods of investigation. Anthropologists are also
interested in the individuals’ language behavior in regard to the social structure. They study the *values* that groups of people associate with their language and culture, and how these values influence their behavior. Individuals’ choices between different languages may indicate a change in cultural values, and anthropologists try to understand the processes of change in these values. They usually use qualitative methods such as participant observation (Fasold 1984: 187ff).

It is emphasized in the literature that domains, within which the first or second language is used, play a very important role in language maintenance and shift (Fishman 1965, 1972c; Clyne 1982; Boyd 1985; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991). The language domain should be considered an abstraction of an interactional situation in which a cluster of sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and linguistic factors is at work. Fishman defines a domain to be:

> [A] sociocultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community, in such a way that individual behavior and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other. (Fishman 1972e p. 449)

Examples of domains mentioned in the literature are the family, the playground and the street, the school, the church, work, literature, the mass media, the courts, and other administrative institutions. The correct definition and designation of domains requires a deep understanding of the sociocultural dynamics, norms, and values of a particular society at a particular time in its history. This is because the domains of language behavior may vary from context to context in terms of both number and level (Fishman 1972e: 448, 2000b: 89ff).

Weinreich (1968: 107) maintains that it is possible to survey the process of language shift by mapping and outlining those domains in which both languages function. This is referred to as domain analysis of the language use. If the majority language is gradually taking over the functions of the minority language in those specific areas where the L1 was once used, the process of language shift may have started. Ervin-Tripp (1968: 197) presents four major domain factors which cause changes in verbal behavior:

1. Setting
2. Participants
3. Topic
4. Functions of the interaction

Ervin-Tripp contends that each of these factors may account for choosing one language instead of the other, but it is usually a combination of several factors that leads to a choice between languages. There is a dynamic and
complex interaction between the domain factors, which makes studying the extent of their influence on language choice difficult. In the following, each factor is briefly discussed.

1. Setting. This expression should be taken as designating a cluster of factors perceived by interacting speakers. It may be connected to locale (time, place) and situation. According to Ervin-Tripp, setting may be culturally constrained, which determines the appropriate participants, situation, functions, topics, style, and mode of interaction (formal/informal). For example, a formal conversation in one context may be conducted informally in another situation or a particular style may be appropriate in one situation, whereas in another it may not. Any change in the features and norms of the setting may cause some kind of social reaction ranging from rejection to acceptance of the new variation (Ervin-Tripp 1968: 193; Fishman 2000b: 89ff).

In bilingual settings, similar factors may be at work, but because there are two or more languages involved, the situation becomes much more complex (Grosjean 1982: 128). Herman (1968: 492ff) believes that language choice situations are problematic for bilinguals because they usually get caught between different psychological situations and are drawn in various directions by the dynamics of the situation. He maintains that a person may be influenced by his own personal needs when choosing one language rather than another. The speaker’s ethnic group may also expect him/her to choose one or the other language. These two sets of demands may not be in harmony with each other. Another factor that may demand the use of one language rather than the other is the immediate situation of the interaction. Accordingly, the influencing forces can be limited to 1) personal needs, 2) the immediate situation, and 3) the background situation. Herman maintains that the salience of each situation is the decisive factor that leads the speaker to choose between his/her particular languages at a particular moment (see also Fishman 2000b: 90ff).

Fishman (1965: 70) maintains that bilinguals regularly consider one of their languages more dialectal and regional than the others. They regard one of their languages as more appropriate to use in certain situations. For example, one language is more associated with intimacy, informality, equality, and solidarity than the other, whereas the other language is more suitable in status situation such as education, the mass media, and the like. Greenfield (1972) studied language behavior of young Puerto Ricans in New York. The study focused on the choices between Spanish and English in relation to person, place, and topic. Five interlocutors (parent, friend, priest, teacher, and employer), five places (home, beach, church, school, and workplace), and five domains (family, friendship, religion, education, and employment) were chosen. The researcher also used five topics related to each domain, for example, how to play a game in relation to the domain of friendship, or how to be a good Christian in connection to religion, and so on. The results indi-
cated that the extent of the use of Spanish was highest in the domain of family. It decreased in the domains of friendship and religion respectively. It was used least in the education and employment domains. The extent of use of English in these domains was the reverse. Greenfield concluded that Puerto Ricans in New York chose Spanish where intimacy was salient (family & friendship), while English was used in situations where status was more important (religion, education, and employment) (Greenfield 1972: 27f).

Dorian (1981), in her study of Gaelic among fishermen in East Sutherland, writes about the association of a language or dialect with certain spheres of activity “almost to the exclusion of the other variety or varieties” (p. 74). Dorian reported that in the early twentieth century the fishermen used Gaelic in the domains of home, work, and religion, while English was used in national secular institutions, local public life, and the medium of print. In some domains the two languages were completely functionally differentiated. For instance, English was not used at all in the domains of home or religion, and Gaelic was not chosen in national institutions. Another example is Paraguay, where the location determines people’s choice of language to a large extent. In rural regions people use Guarani, whereas most of the activities in urban areas are conducted in Spanish (Corvalán 1988: 66ff).

Cormack (1995) studied the use of Gaelic in the domain of the newspaper industry in Scotland. According to this study, English dominates the language of the political, social, and economic news and discussions in both the local and national newspapers. This policy even regulates the broadcasting of programs on radio and television, although some changes have been seen in the domain of ether media, which indicates an increase in the use of the Gaelic language (Cormack 1995: 279).

2. Participants. Participants’ individual characteristics such as their role relationship, age, sex, language proficiency, socioeconomic background, ethnic background, language history with the interlocutor, power relation, education, occupation, extent of intimacy with the interlocutor, group membership, language preference and language attitudes highly affect their choice of language. Woolard (1989: 69ff) maintains that physical cues over-ride other factors in the choice of language in Catalonia. She contends that the appearance and stylistic characteristics of a person may determine the code selection in an interaction, even if the conversation is taking place at a time and location that may indicate otherwise.

The influence of the participants’ role relationship on language choice has been studied by Gal (1979) in Oberwart. She found that her informants, irrespective of age, chose Hungarian when talking to God (this refers to church services, the language of hymns and prayers), and that everyone, except for the older people, chose German when talking to their doctors. She also found that the use of German was more prevalent among the younger generation, and that young women chose German more often than young
men. This was because Hungarian was associated with peasant life, which was rejected by young women more than by men (Gal 1979: 121; see also Labov 2001 for the role of women in language maintenance and shift).

Dorian (1981: 76) found that the interlocutor factor was a strong predictor of language choice in many situations in East Sutherland. After World War I, parents in many families used Gaelic in interactions with their own parents and siblings, while they used English with their children and expected them to use the same language in return; Gaelic was the language used between grandparents and their grandchildren.

The presence of a monolingual participant usually causes bilinguals to switch to the language of the new person. Dorian (1981) writes “Gaelic–English bilinguals will defer linguistically to a single English monolingual who joins them by switching to his code” (p. 79). In Schmidt’s study (1985) of young people’s choice of language between Dyirbal and English, she found that Jambun bilinguals linguistically submitted to white English monolinguals and switched to the newcomer’s language (Schmidt 1985: 31f). Schmidt also finds that a setting may require one language, while the participants may require another. An example of this situation is when “a young speaker talks to an in-group member (interlocutor requires Dyirbal) in the presence of white people (setting requires English)” (p. 31). She maintains that although the interaction between these factors is complex, it is possible to identify dominant factors. In Jambun, the major factors regulating language choice among young Dyirbal speakers are domain, setting, interlocutor, topic, and the speaker’s confidence and ability in Dyirbal.

In a study of Iranian schoolchildren (ages 11–14) in Sweden, Namei (1993: 48f) found that her subjects used more Swedish when talking to their mothers than their fathers. The results also showed that Persian was extensively used with interlocutors of the older generation such as grandparents, whereas it greatly decreased in interaction with siblings, Persian peers, and friends. This may be due to the limited Swedish skills of the older generation, and also the language history of the participants with their older interlocutors. Using Swedish with the younger generation may be an indication of group membership and language attitudes. In another study of language choice among Assyrian/Syrian school children (age 7) in Sweden, Tuomela (1993: 19) arrived at similar results, as such children used their mother tongue in interaction with their parents and other adults with the same first language, while their use of Swedish increased amongst peers and friends.

Pan (1995) studied patterns of language choice of ten families in Boston with Mandarin as their first language and English as their second. She observed parent–child dyads when they interacted with each other around a wordless book, and also tape-recorded their conversations during an evening meal. The researcher noticed that parents’ use of English is relatively limited in both situations, whereas children used English more depending on the context. The children did not actively interact in Mandarin or English in a
book-reading context, however during the mealtime they were much more active and used English to a larger extent. The patterns of language choice between Mandarin and English in the home domain are explained by the accommodation theory. The researcher maintains that parents use English to accommodate their children who have limited proficiency in Mandarin. Children use Mandarin to adjust to and comply with their parents’ desire to use the home language (Pan 1995: 326).

Gupta & Yeok (1995) studied language choices between Cantonese, Mandarin, and English in a Singaporean Chinese family with 15 members divided into three generations. They used a combination of anthropological methods (participant observation) and sociological (interview) methods. This gave them the opportunity to compare the results for both approaches, which in itself can be considered to be part of their results. Data was gathered over the course of 14 weeks by participant observation. The data gathering was complemented by interviews after the observation period. This study examines the changes in attitudes and pressure that society imposes on minority members in different situations, which has led to a very rapid language shift in this context. The results are in line with the general patterns of language shift among Chinese in Singapore, from Chinese varieties other than Mandarin towards the languages of education, Mandarin and English. The patterns of language choice in the family under observation show that the communication between the first- and third generation is broken and is conducted via the second generation. This is because the language of the first generation is Cantonese (the grandfather combines Cantonese with Mandarin), a language not quite known by the third generation. The members of the second generation are the real bilinguals (Cantonese and Mandarin). They speak in Cantonese with their parents and in Mandarin with their children. The third generation is bilingual in English and Mandarin using mostly Mandarin with their parents and mostly English with the members of their own generation. According to the authors, in many families in Singapore, Mandarin is used as a lingua franca to link the oldest and youngest generations together (Gupta & Yeok 1995: 307f).

The above study shows that the members of the third generation have a very negative attitude towards Cantonese and do not voluntarily accommodate their grandparents. All the accommodation attempts are initiated by the older generation towards the younger one. The children actually avoid the company of their grandparents and show it by physically moving away from them. This has had some negative implications for the relationship between these two generations. The second generation also accommodates the third generation and occasionally excludes the first generation totally by using English with their children.

The results on observations from the study are non-congruent with the interview results. The results from the interview showed that members of both the first and the third generation believed that they did not have any commu-
nication problems. They either denied that they had any communication problem at all or gave some excuse for it. According to the authors, the older generations’ willingness to accommodate the youngest generation is in fact one of the language shift factors in that context. It has led to an expectation from the youngest generation that they are the ones who should receive all the help they can get to conduct an intelligible conversation with the older generation. They themselves need not make any effort. The second generation wishes for their children to be able to communicate with their grandparents but makes no considerable effort to speak Cantonese to the children. The authors concluded that the limited use of Cantonese has led to difficulties in communication between generations, which in turn has led to limited opportunities for socialization of the children in this language. Another reason for this rapid language shift is the promotion of Mandarin over the other varieties of Chinese (Mandarin and English are the languages of education). This has influenced the speakers’ attitudes. They do not see any practical use for the other Chinese varieties, especially when these varieties are considered low prestige dialects, both by the government and their speakers.

3. Topic. Another language choice factor is topic. It may be the case that certain topics of conversation are better dealt with in one language than in others in particular situations. Individuals who usually speak in one language may switch to another when discussing a particular topic. This switch may be caused by the speaker’s limited competence in the subject matter and lack of specialized terms needed for a satisfying discussion. It may also be conditioned by the language, in that it lacks the exact terms required for an adequate discussion on the topic. Blom & Gumperz (1972) studied a group of young people who had grown up in Hemnesberget, Norway, but had gone to university in Oslo. When these young people returned to their hometown, they spoke their dialect (Ranamål) with each other if the subject was happenings in Hemnesberget. Ranamål was the language of local activities, and it indicated identification with the local people. However, the students switched to Bokmål, a standard language in Norway, when they spoke about more general Norwegian topics. The standard language is associated with non-local activities, education, power, and events on the national stage (Blom & Gumperz 1972: 433).

In Schmidt’s study (1985: 33) topic is a less prominent factor in language choice than interlocutor. The young speakers associate Dyirbal with traditional lifestyle and legends, while English is associated with white society institutions like education and the church. Dorian (1981) also reported that the topic factor was a less-salient factor in language choice. She writes that some topics do associate with Gaelic, for example technical fishing matters, but this association is not very strong, because the subject can certainly be discussed in English as well, though some borrowed Gaelic words would be found in the discussion. On the other hand, Dorian states, “no topic requires
English, no matter how remote from East Sutherland life or how ‘modern’ and technological” (p. 79f). Gaelic speakers easily use English loanwords but they modify them to Gaelic morphology, morphophonology, and phonology. Adopting this strategy has helped them to discuss any topic in Gaelic, just as they would speak about local happenings in that language.

4. Functions of the interaction. Another determinant of language choice is functions of the interaction. Scholars have tried to develop models of language choice which illustrate interaction functions. Some of these models, such as decision trees and flow charts (see e.g. Rubin 1968; Sankoff 1980), cannot precisely and accurately reflect changes of an individual’s language choice over a period of time. This is because patterns of language choice are considered to be static by these models. To give an example, decision tree models do not usually take into account participants’ important characteristics such as sex and age. For instance, the language choice patterns of the first generation usually differ from those of the second, just as women differ from men in choosing between their languages (see e.g. Gal 1979: 99 and Labov 2001 for a discussion).

As was mentioned before in relation to the Interpersonal Speech Accommodation Theory (Giles 1973; Giles et al. 1977), in order to explain bilinguals’ language choices one must go beyond the situation factors. It is important to consider interpersonal relationships as well. If the speaker is motivated and willing to reduce the distance between her/himself and the interlocutor or include her/him in the interaction, i.e., to converge, s/he chooses the language of her/his interlocutor. On the other hand, the speaker may choose to diverge, i.e., to increase the distance or exclude the interlocutor from the interaction when s/he uses her/his own language (see also social identity theory by Tajfel 1974, 1981). According to Bell (1984: 161ff), speakers may converge with their addressee in order to win approval. The greater the need and desire the speaker feels for the audience’s approval, the greater would be the degree of convergence. This can be done at different levels. They may adjust and harmonize their speech rate, their speech content, accent, and even pausing to their interlocutor.

Bilinguals usually reserve one or more language for certain functions. Dorian (1981) reported that in East Sutherland some functions of interaction are reserved for Gaelic. For example, people discuss their purchases in Gaelic, because they want to keep the affair as private as possible when dealing with English monolingual shopkeepers. Schmidt (1985) reports that young Dyirbal speakers may resist switching to English in situations where a monolingual is present but does not actively participate in the conversation. Here Dyirbal “serves as an important solidarity function, expressing the social bond of the Dyirbal speakers against the backdrop of white society” (p. 32).
3.5.4 Language attitudes

This section presents a review of some studies about the influence of attitudinal factors on language maintenance and shift. Attitudinal factors can be viewed at the societal, group, and individual levels.

The attitudes of the majority group towards minority groups, their languages, and cultures is significant for minority groups’ language maintenance and shift, as are the minority groups’ own feelings (Tollefson 1991; Bijvoet 1998, 2003; Hellner & Martin-Jones 2001; Dörnyei & Skehan 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Haglund 2005a, 2005b; Milani 2007, ). If majority group members have negative attitudes toward the minority language, believing for example that it is underdeveloped, imperfect, or inappropriate, then there is a danger that the minority language will not survive in that society (see e.g. Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004). In this situation, the minority language is not usually used as an instrument of communication or instruction in school. It is not generally allowed in public, and its use is by and large limited to the home domain only. Under these circumstances the domains of the minority language will be tremendously reduced, while the majority language gains ground. The negative attitudes of the majority group will slowly spread among speakers of the minority language, until they too will consider their language unqualified for use in different domains. This is a situation that endangers the life of a minority language and puts it at risk of becoming obsolete in the majority country (see e.g. Milroy 1987; Yagmur, de Bot, & Korzilius 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Kristiansen 2003; Yagmur 2004).

Attitudes of the minority group towards its own language and culture affect language maintenance and shift in different ways. On the one hand, language maintenance may be strengthened by positive attitudes and associations among minority group members who are individuals belonging to the middle or upper social classes and who have higher education. The same is true of groups which have religious, cultural, and/or political leaders among them (Fishman et al. 1966; Boyd 1985; Hart-Gonzalez & Feingold 1990). Self-esteem, loyalty, and ethnic awareness may be found among those groups who have struggled in the past to preserve their language and culture in threatening situations such as the invasion or domination of their home country by other ethnic groups. Their positive attitudes may reinforce and encourage individuals to pursue their struggle to defend their ethnic identity and maintain their language even in the majority country (Giles et al. 1977; Archer 1999). Schmidt (1990: 21), in her investigation of the languages of the Aborigines in Australia, emphasizes the role of language pride and awareness and the use of language as a core symbol of identity, among other significant maintenance factors (see also David 2003).

On the other hand, if the minority language is strongly associated with poorly educated people with low economic status, then there can be negative
attitudes towards it among its own speakers, as it was found in Gal’s study (1979) in which Hungarian was associated with the old ways of peasant life and with lower social and economic status, while German was connected to education, employment, and economic success. Hungarian was the language of the old people and of the past. German was seen as the language of the future and the young. The author maintains that the higher prestige of German compared to Hungarian can be seen “by the fact that today the children of a monolingual German speaker and a bilingual German–Hungarian speaker virtually never learn Hungarian regardless of which parent is bilingual” (Gal 1979: 107).

In situations of negative associations, children may be encouraged by their parents to gain a high level of L2 proficiency in order to increase their economic opportunities and their social status in the majority country (Appel & Muysken 1987; Liliequist 1998; Morita 2003). This is the case, for example, for teenagers and the younger Indo-Fijian immigrants in Wellington, New Zealand. Shameem (1994: 399) reports that young Indo-Fijian speakers are shifting from Fiji Hindi\(^{15}\) to English under environmental pressure, particularly from their parents who view English as the language of academic and social advancement and success. The higher proficiency in English of Indo-Fijian primary school children in both urban and rural areas in Fiji is also shown in another study by Shameem (2002). Indo-Fijian children are not only encouraged by their parents to learn English for social upgrading purposes, but also by the transitional education system which stipulates the use of the mother tongue as the language of instruction during the first three school years and the use of English after that. It is shown, however, that the mother tongue is not used in school because teachers are confused about which language has the status of the children’s mother tongue. They prefer instead to use English as the medium of instruction from the beginning. Cases where parents encourage children to learn their second language to a high level are also seen in other settings, for example in Otavalo, Ecuador (see e.g. Carpenter 1983 cited in Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004: 14), in Ayacucho, Peru (see e.g. von Gleich & Wölck 1994 cited in Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004: 14f), in Botswana (see e.g. Arua & Magocha 2002), and in Thailand among Chinese people (see e.g. Morita 2003).

Minority group members may not only have negative or positive feelings about their language and culture, but can also be indifferent towards them. This indifference may be more prevalent than either positive or negative feelings. The lack of or only limited ethnic awareness may put the minority language and culture in danger of disappearing, for example, due to indifferent towards the penetration of the majority language into the minority lan-

\(^{15}\) Fiji Hindi is a pre-literate language resulting from a language-contact situation in Fiji during the period of 1879–1916 when cheap labor was imported from India.
guage domains. Edwards (1985: 140ff) discusses the role that the ethnic-group members play in their assimilation in the majority society and the role that the activists, or as he calls them, “spokesmen,” have within the minority groups in maintaining their language. He argues that in the United States many immigrant groups willingly Americanized themselves in areas where the law did not force them to do so. Most of the group members were assimilationists in their attitudes. They made their choices and most of them considered language as a “dispensable commodity.” The author further maintains that the ordinary members of the groups are not usually romantic activists with an ideal to save their language. The needs and necessities of everyday life are what generally occupy their thoughts. Most of them are pragmatic and “desire to make the act of emigration worthwhile.” This is largely an assimilationist attitude. Among the members of an ethnic group one might find a small group of activists or spokesmen who support and encourage cultural pluralism. However, their viewpoints about saving their language and preserving their cultural traditions may differ from those of the masses. That is to say, there may be a distance between the leaders’ wishes and the grassroots’ desires.

Spolsky (1989) describes how attitudes may affect second language learning (see also Gardner 1985). He maintains that second language learning does not take place in a vacuum. Language is learned in a social context, which includes the home, community, school, and society as a whole. The social context is influenced by political ideologies and language policies towards bilingualism and second language learning. The social context itself influences the L2 learning in two ways; 1) it affects the learner’s attitudes toward both the majority country and his/her own learning situation, and these attitudes in turn influence the person’s motivation to learn, as well as interact with other aspects such as age, personality, capabilities, and previous knowledge; and 2) it influences the possibility of acquiring a second language (both formal and informal). Spolsky (1989) states that “the social context determines the actual nature of possibilities for social intercourse and other communicative transactions” (p. 26). Viberg (1996) also emphasizes the significant role of interactions with majority members of different age groups and in different situations in second language learning. He maintains that some minority children may have good contact and varied interactions with members of the majority country, while others may have very limited contact. The attitudes of the minority group towards the new society and its members, along with the minority group’s own sociocultural patterns, determine the extent to which they establish contact with members of the majority country and the extent to which they engage in different interactions with the majority group members (see also Oliver & Purdie 1998 on the effects of attitudes on the L1 and L2 learning among Asian, European, and Arabic bilingual children in Australia). The important role of attitude and motivation on second language learning has also been demonstrated in many
other studies (e.g. Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret 1997; Masgoret & Gardner 1999).

In an investigation of attitudes towards one’s own language and others’, Andersson (1999) studied four groups of Swedish, English, Finnish, and Persian speakers, all living in Sweden. The general result of the study was that all informants considered English to be a very important and high-status language. It was also found that Persian elicited less positive attitudes and was assigned a lower status, even by its own speakers. The Swedish and English groups ranked their own mother tongues highest, the Finnish group Swedish, and the Iranians English (ibid.: 16ff). The positive attitude of non-English speakers towards English was also shown by other measurements such as that the informants’ strongest wish was to increase their knowledge in English compared to other languages, or by the fact that they considered English to be a more universal language than any other language, and maintained that knowing English was very important and brought about economic well-being and high status.¹⁶

The attitudes of interacting speakers towards each other can be understood using Giles’s accommodation theory (1973; Giles et al. 1977; Giles et al. 1987). Positive associations with one’s own language may lead the minority group members to diverge from the majority language and culture, whereas negative language attitudes may direct them towards the majority society. This convergence or divergence may not only happen between individuals or ethnic groups as a whole, but also within these groups, for example, between the younger and the older generations or between genders.

3.6 Summary

Many studies in the past six decades have investigated factors that affect language maintenance and shift. These investigations show that there are many social, linguistic, economic, historical, and psychological factors which significantly affect the minority group’s opportunities for language maintenance or shift in different majority countries. These influencing factors operate at the level of society as a whole, at the minority group level, and at the level of minority individuals. The majority of the societal factors deal with the power relationship between the majority and minority groups. Among the societal factors are the majority country’s political-legal status, its ideologies and economic status, its institutions, and its attitudes towards

¹⁶ See also Lee (2004) for results of a survey of language ability, language use, and language attitudes of young Aborigines in Taiwan and the discussion on the reasons for the tendency for the younger generation to look up to Mandarin and to look down on Southern Min languages (Chinese languages).
minority languages and cultures. Group factors describe the minority group itself, for example, its demography, its status (social, economic, socio-historical, and linguistic), and its institutions. Language attitudes at this level may lead the group to converge or diverge from the majority. Intergroup relations between the two groups may lead the minority group to assimilate, create new characteristics, redefine old characteristics, or compete directly with the majority group. At the individual level, influential factors are language socialization, language competence, language choice, and language attitudes; i.e., social and psychological factors that influence whether minority speakers maintain their mother tongue or shift to the majority language.

Factors at each level interact in multidirectional ways. For example, the power relationship between majority and minority is strongly influenced by the political ideologies of the majority country. The dominant group’s political ideologies govern the educational system, which in turn regulates whether minority children’s education will be organized in their first or second language or both. Studies also show that even the factors within each level influence each other. For example, the individual’s attitudes towards his/her own language may influence the speaker’s degree of competence in the first language. Lack of proficiency in the mother tongue may push the speaker to converge with the majority language and culture, which may gradually result in cultural assimilation and language shift. This means that even if language maintenance and shift factors are separated from one another on each level, in reality they are not isolated from each other, and a change in one factor may result in a change of the whole situation. Another salient factor in the discussion of language maintenance and shift is the time aspect. A minority group that is in the process of shift may increase its language awareness and attempt to reverse the language shift process.
Chapter 4
Method

Chapter 4 discusses the research methods by presenting a general discussion on methods used for investigating minority language maintenance and shift, along with a more specific description of the methodology used in this particular study. Research questions and hypotheses are introduced and their purposes explained. The participating subjects are then described in detail. Finally, the elicitation instruments and the administration procedures for sampling and data collection are accounted for.

4.1 Introduction

In investigating minority language maintenance and shift, two main methodological approaches have been used. Some investigators have preferred to use more qualitative methods, whereas others have favored the use of more quantitative methods in their studies. A representative qualitative methodology is ethnographic investigation which is especially used in anthropological studies. A typical quantitative method is the survey study, which is usually employed in the fields of sociology or sociolinguistics.

Reichardt & Cook 1979 (cited in Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991: 12) have listed a number of characteristics that are specific to each of these methodological paradigms. For example, in qualitative methods the investigator studies people’s behavior in non-laboratory, natural settings over a period of time to examine behavioral changes. Information gathering is uncontrolled, usually longitudinal, and is done by means of observations. There are usually only a few cases under observation, which results in data which is valid but difficult to draw generalizable conclusions from. The investigator does not usually test hypotheses, but rather observes, discovers, and describes people’s behavior from an insider perspective, using people’s own frames of reference. The researcher concentrates not only on the behavior of the individuals but also on behavioral patterns among groups of people in connection with their sociocultural norms and values. The individual behavioral patterns are then put in a wider perspective and are described in the context of the social structures and systems of the group. To sum up, qualitative methods provide a holistic view of a certain group of people.
In quantitative methods, the investigator seeks explanations of and reasons behind social phenomena and tries to verify his/her hypotheses as an outsider, without recourse to subjectivity in terms of taking the participants’ perspective. The measurements in quantitative methods usually take place at one specific time. The measurement situations are controlled to eliminate undesired variables that can affect the data elicitation process. Research problems are normally few. Quantitative methods usually address large groups of people, making their results more reliable and generalizable. The advantages and disadvantages of these techniques are discussed at great length in the literature (see e.g. Lieberson 1980; Fasold 1984; Gorter 1987; De Bot & Weltens 1991; Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; De Vries 1992; Dörnyei 2003). Some researchers have argued that qualitative and quantitative approaches have complementary effects and should be used together to describe language maintenance and shift situations.

Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991) have found Reichardt & Cook’s separate and rigid characteristics for qualitative and quantitative paradigms inappropriate. They have argued that such attributes should neither be restricted nor exclusive to either paradigm. They have suggested instead that the methods should be arranged on a continuum between two poles, with the qualitative paradigm at one end and the quantitative paradigm at the other. Along this continuum from qualitative to quantitative paradigms, other methods such as introspection, participant observation, non-participant observation, focused description, pre-experimental, quasi-experimental, and experimental are arranged (see Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991: 15ff for a description of each method). What is important, according to these authors, is that the researcher is clear about the goals of the study and tries to achieve them in the best way by choosing the most appropriate methodological approaches.

The present study’s cluster of attributes is more associated with the quantitative paradigm, but it also has some qualitative features such as data collection methods, process-oriented/outcome-oriented, insider/outsider perspective, and reliability of methods. These are accounted for below:

Data collection consisted mainly of questionnaires and structured interviews. Two different questionnaires were used: 1) a student questionnaire (henceforth SQ), and 2) a parent questionnaire (henceforth PQ). Structured interviews with the student group were conducted based on the SQ. However, in order to give a more complete picture of the situation, some supplementary official documents were also gathered. Although there are more quantitative than qualitative attributes, data collection methods for this study cannot exactly be placed under a quantitative paradigm. For example, the gathering of information by means of official documents had more explorative and descriptive characteristics. It provided supplementary information about the Swedish bilingual context. The structured interviews also allowed the researcher to seek more information and clarifications from within participants’ own frames of reference.
As regards to the research perspective, in terms of the study’s research questions and the interpretation of the results, there is an “insider” perspective with a focus on Persian culture, norms, and values due to the fact that the author comes from the same country as the participants.

Although this study can be categorized as an outcome-oriented study because it took place at only one point in time, in some respects it can also be seen as process-oriented. According to Lieberson (1980), one of the limitations of survey studies is that they may not show “change” in language behavior because they are not reporting the language behavior of the same group of subjects at different periods of time. Survey studies which do not measure sequences of events at different points of time, as qualitative approaches do, are called by Lieberson (1980) “one-shot affairs rather than ongoing surveys which repeatedly study a population over the years” (p. 12). One way of getting around this problem, as suggested by Lieberson, is to study the language behavior of subjects who belong to different age groups within the same community. Other elementary steps are to compare the language behavior of groups who belong to different generations, or to use retrospective questions, i.e., to ask the subjects what they did five or ten years ago, and what they may do in the future in comparison with their behavior at the time of the study (see also De Vries 1992). Using retrospective questions is, of course, problematic too, because self-reports cannot be verified. This investigation is admittedly a “one-shot” study. It is mostly concerned with describing the language situation of the participants at the time of investigation, but in order to show “change” in terms of language behavior, participants belonging to different age groups and generations are studied.

In terms of reliability, one of the strengths of using questionnaires is that they provide a vast amount of data which can be gathered from a large group of people in many different linguistic situations. Advanced statistical techniques make comparing the variables possible and advantageous. It is also easier to handle and manage the collected data. One of the disadvantages of this method is its heavy reliance on self-reports which makes it difficult to control the reliability of the supplied information, as opposed to observed language behavior which may be more reliable. This difficulty stems from the fact that the researcher does not know whether the reported data is based on reality or the informant’s wishes or beliefs. One way of resolving this problem is to use both quantitative and qualitative approaches together. One could also use supplementary documentation to be able to examine the survey material from different angles or, as Gorter (1987) puts it, to have “built-in consistency checks” during the interviews, i.e., the same questions put in different ways. Many questions were answered by both students and their parents in order to address the reliability issue. This method may provide opportunities to obtain more reliable information, at least to some extent, compared to self-reported data.
4.2 Research question

This study seeks answers to the following question:

**Research question** Are Iranians in Sweden maintaining their mother tongue or are they shifting to the majority language?

The present study has chosen the following five sub-questions in order to find some answers to the above research question:

1. Are any sociocultural changes taking place among Iranians in Sweden?
2. To what extent are Iranian children being socialized in Persian and in Swedish?
3. To what extent are Iranians in Sweden competent in their languages?
4. What language(s) do Iranians in Sweden choose to speak with whom and where?
5. What are the attitudes of Iranians toward their home country and country of residence, their mother tongue and Swedish?

The aims and the related hypotheses of each sub-question are described here:

**Sub-question 1** Are any sociocultural changes taking place among Iranians in Sweden?

The purpose of this question is twofold. Firstly, it describes Iranians’ residential patterns, birth rates, immigration/emigration, and marriage patterns in order to give an overall demographic picture of this minority group in Sweden to make it possible to examine if any social changes are taking place. This is because social status affects the group’s language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Li Wei 1982; Andersson-Brolin 1984; Ramirez 1985; Milroy 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Pütz 1991; Kristiansen et al. 1991; Pittam et al. 1991; Aikio 1992; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Prabhakaran 1998; Winsa 1999; Atkinson 2000; Al-Khatib 2001; David & Nambiar 2002; Govindasamy & Nambiar 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003). Secondly, it investigates whether or not there are economic changes taking place in the Iranian minority group in Sweden, as economic status has a strong impact on the language maintenance and shift of minority groups (see e.g. Fishman et al. 1966; Fishman 1972a, 1985; Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Conklin & Lourie 1983; Boyd 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Shameem 1994; Bloom & Grenier 1996; Grin 1996, 1999; Grenier 1997; Arua & Magocha 2002; Behtoui 2004). Research sub-question 1 leads to the following two hypotheses:
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Hypothesis A  The demographic data of Iranians in Sweden points to their intention to integrate in the host country.

Hypothesis B  The socioeconomic changes that are taking place among Iranians in Sweden have a negative impact on their mother tongue maintenance.

Sub-question 2  To what extent are Iranian children being socialized in Persian and in Swedish?

It was discussed in the literature review that patterns of language socialization are one of the important factors influencing language maintenance and shift. Parents convey their cultural norms and values in interactions with their children (see e.g. Heath 1983; Schieffelin 1990; Kulick 1990; Aronsson 1991; Nauclér & Boyd 1997; Nauclér 2003; Remennick 2003).

Socialization takes place for different people based on factors such as age, sex, culture, and so on. The primary socialization at home is mainly done by parents and other members of the family, but even by relatives or other people who come in contact with the child. The secondary socialization takes place during the time that the child spends in the daycare center and preschool, and eventually school. Other social institutions such as mass media are also involved in children’s socialization. This study investigates both the primary and secondary socialization of Iranian children in Sweden.

Another factor is planning to stay in the host country or return to the country of origin (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). Minority groups who maintain close contact with their home countries are able to delay the process of language shift. In this way the prerequisites for development of their language increase. This process can be shorter among isolated groups (Tandefelt 1988). Research sub-question 2 leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis C  The extent of socialization of Iranian children in Persian is much less than in Swedish, which in turn limits their chances of maintaining their first language.

Sub-question 3  To what extent are Iranians in Sweden competent in their languages?

This question deals with language repertoire, language dominance, and language proficiency, including understanding, speaking, reading, and writing abilities, as perceived by the students and their parents. These three language dimensions together will provide a language competence indicator for Iranians in Sweden. It was mentioned that language competence as perceived by the minority members may affect language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Fishman 1972c; Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Schmidt 1985; Tandefelt 1988,
Fishman (1972c) maintains that if literacy in the L1 is attained before exposure to the L2, a shift in reading and writing to the L2 may be prolonged, while if literacy in the L1 is attained after exposure to the L2, the shift in these skills may occur more rapidly. Limited language proficiency is a result of limited language use. Lack of proficiency in the L1 may lead to limited functionality of that language in different domains (see e.g. Tandefelt 1988; Jaspaert & Kroon 1991, 1993; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). Insufficient proficiency in the L1 may result in the use of the other language in these contexts and environments.

Language competence of minority groups often has to do with their attitudes towards their own and the majority language and culture, which may in turn affect speakers’ language-use patterns. A speaker who does not feel secure or proficient in his/her mother tongue usually tries to avoid its use. This avoidance may also be strengthened by negative associations or affiliations attached to the minority language and culture (see e.g. Gal 1979; Clyne 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Hart-Gonzalez & Feingold 1990; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Holmes 1992; Andersson 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004). Research sub-question 3 leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis D**

First generation Iranians are more competent in their first language than their second, whereas second generation Iranians are more competent in their second language than their first.

**Sub-question 4**

What language(s) do Iranians in Sweden choose to speak with whom and where?

This sub-question attempts to map patterns of language use inside and outside the home domain. Some studies found that the particular domains within which the first or the second language is used play a very important role in language maintenance and shift (see Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Penfield 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Aikio 1992; Namei 1993; Tuomela 1993; Cormack 1995; Sohrabi 1997; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003; Jahan 2004). According to Weinreich (1964), it is possible to survey the process of language shift by mapping domains in which both languages function (see also Gal 1979; Woolard 1989). Examples of domains mentioned in the literature are the family, the playground and the street, the school, the church, work, literature, the mass media, the courts, and the administration. Research sub-question 4 leads to the following hypothesis:
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Hypothesis E  
Persian is the only means of communication in the home domain, while Swedish holds that position outside the home domain.

Sub-question 5  
What are the attitudes of Iranians toward their home country and country of residence, their mother tongue and Swedish?

This question tries to investigate how Iranians feel about both of their countries and languages. Language maintenance may be strengthened by positive attitudes and associations among minority members belonging to the middle or upper social classes and with higher education. The same is true of groups which have religious, cultural, and/or political leaders among them (Fishman et al. 1966; Boyd 1985; Hart-Gonzalez & Feingold 1990). However, if the minority language is strongly associated with poorly educated people of low economic status, then there can be negative attitudes towards it among its own speakers (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Clyne 1985; Boyd 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Holmes 1992; Shameem 1994; Romaine 1995; Andersson 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004; Lee 2004). Minority group members may not only have negative or positive feelings about their language and culture, but can also be indifferent towards them. This indifference may be more prevalent than positive or negative feelings. Being indifferent towards the penetration of the majority language into minority language domains may put the minority language and culture in danger (see e.g. Edwards 1985). Research sub-question 5 leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis F  
The majority of Iranians in Sweden have positive feelings toward their home country and country of residence, and about their mother tongue and Swedish.

4.3 Subjects

This section describes the subjects of the present study. They are divided into two groups. The first group includes 100 Persian–Swedish bilingual students and the second group consists of 88 Iranian adults who are the parents of the majority of the bilingual students in the first group.

4.3.1 The student group

The distribution of the students in terms of grade, age, and sex is summarized in Table 4.1.
There were 52 boys and 48 girls between the ages of 6 and 22. They were divided into five sub-groups of 20 students each attending Grades 0, 3, 6,
and 9 in comprehensive schools, and 10–12 at upper-secondary school. They were recruited from different schools in Stockholm.

The participating students differed by place of birth. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of their places of birth (PoB) by grade. It can be seen that 66% of them were born in Iran. This is especially the case for those in the upper levels, while the majority of the younger students were born in Sweden.

Students were first exposed to Swedish at different ages. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of the bilingual subjects by grade and age of onset (AO), i.e., age of first exposure to Swedish. It can be seen that 33% of them had been exposed to Swedish from birth. These are mostly the younger subjects (Grades 0 and 3), while subjects in the upper levels had been exposed later. For example, the majority of the students in upper-secondary school had been exposed to Swedish after the age of 9. Most of these students were born to young families who immigrated to Sweden in the middle of the 1980s at the peak of Iran–Iraq war.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.4.** Students’ length of residence in Sweden

The participating students’ length of residence (LOR) in Sweden ranged from 3 to 13 years, as seen in Table 4.4. It is important to note that students born in Sweden are also included in this calculation. Their age simply served as their length of residence in Sweden. Table 4.4 also demonstrates that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>LOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.5.** Students’ mean age, length of residence, and age of onset by grade
students at the upper levels show a wider range in LOR, and most of the subjects in the lower levels have lived in Sweden all their lives. The students’ mean age, length of residence, and age of onset are shown in Table 4.5. As seen, taking into account the mean age, upper-secondary school students have the shortest LOR and the latest AO.

Table 4.6. Parents’ gender, age, and mean age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>39.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Parents’ place of birth in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth place</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran-Tehran</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran-Others</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 The parent group

The parent group included 88 people consisting of 22 fathers and 66 mothers who responded to the PQ. The distribution of the parent group at the time of data collection in terms of their age and sex is summarized in Table 4.6, which also shows the mean age of the parents. It can be seen that fathers
were between 31 and 52 years old, while mothers were between 29 and 53. Their average age was about 41 years.

**Table 4.8.** Parents’ age of first exposure to Swedish in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.9.** Parents’ length of residence in Sweden – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parents (66%) were born in Tehran, while about 34% were born in other cities in Iran. This is shown in Table 4.7. The majority of them (76%) were first exposed to Swedish between the ages of 21 and 40, as seen in Table 4.8. There were also 10% with an age of onset under 20, and 14% were exposed to Swedish after the age of 41.

The parents’ length of residence (LOR) in Sweden was between 2 and 23 years and their mean LOR is 9.88 years. This is shown in Table 4.9. The majority of them (74%) have lived in Sweden between 7 and 12 years.
4.4 Research instruments

The present study is a part of a larger study which included these parts:

1. Three questionnaires (designed for the students, their parents, and their Persian teachers).
2. Association test 1 (free single-response association based on the Kent-Rosanoff [1910] list which included 100 words.) The list was translated into Swedish and Persian and was used to test the bilingual students.
3. Association test 2 (the Kent-Rosanoff list in which each word was clustered with 8 other words). Some of the words in clusters were syntagmatically\(^{17}\) and paradigmatically\(^{18}\) related, while others were not. This test was designed by the researcher in both languages based on a testing format proposed by Read (1993, 1997). The subjects’ task was to choose the related words.
4. Association test 3 (free single-response associations to 100 words of different word class types). This test was also designed by the researcher in both Persian and Swedish.
5. A picture-naming test including 20 pictures, each of which contained 24 concrete nouns belonging to different semantic fields. There were also 54 pictures referring to properties, states, acts, and processes for a total of 534 words tested in each language. The subjects’ task was to match each picture to its name.

The results of association test 1 were published (see Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b). Some preliminary results from association test 2 and the picture-naming study have also been published (see Namei 1999). The results for the questionnaires have been presented orally for different audiences. The present study introduces the findings on the questionnaires in more detail. The results of the home language teacher questionnaire will not be presented here for the reason that most of the items included in that questionnaire addressed the situation of the home language teaching in Sweden, its aims and purposes, its organization, and its implementation as understood by the teachers. This part of the study needs to be complemented by a more detailed questionnaire and qualitative research methodologies in order to give a better

\(^{17}\) Syntagmatic relations usually, but not necessarily, appear between members of different grammatical categories which can co-occur in grammatically well-formed expressions (Lyons 1995:124f). A syntagmatic association is a response which along with the stimulus word completes a syntagm, for example, white-table or nice-weather (Richards, Platt & Weber 1985; Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b).

\(^{18}\) Paradigmatic relations hold between the same grammatical categories, for example, white-red or nice-fine (Lyons 1995:124f). This means that paradigmatic words are interchangeable in a sentence (see e.g. Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b).
understanding of the situation of mother tongue teaching in Sweden. The following sections describe the student and parent questionnaires.

4.4.1 The questionnaires

The present study used two questionnaires: one for students and one for parents. These are accounted for below:

4.4.1.1 The student questionnaire

The student questionnaire (SQ) consisted of 60 items. It was developed by the researcher specifically for this study and was written in Swedish\(^{19}\) (see Appendix 1).\(^{20}\) Some of the items were adapted from similar studies (see e.g. Hyltenstam & Svonni 1990; Namei 1993; Tuomela 1993). On the upper left side of the front page of the SQ there was a space with a code number which referred to each subject to safeguard his/her identity.

A preliminary version of this questionnaire was modified after a pre-test. The pre-test was carried out with three bilingual Persian–Swedish children, two Persian adults, and three Swedish adults. The children were in grades 5, 8, and 9. The adults all were university educated. The reason adults were chosen for the pre-test was because the test was going to be carried out not only in comprehensive schools but also in upper-secondary schools. Conducting the pre-test resulted in the questionnaire going through several developmental stages before reaching its final form.

The general aims of the SQ were to explore the students’ language background, their linguistic environment in Sweden, and their patterns of language use in different domains. The questionnaire also tried to explore the extent to which students were exposed to Swedish or Persian input in their daily interactions. It also attempted to find out how they perceived their competence in both of their languages, along with their attitudes towards their languages, their country of origin, and the country of residence.

4.4.1.2 The parent questionnaire

The parent questionnaire (PQ) consisted of 66 items and was also developed by the researcher specifically for the present study. Again, on the upper left side of the front page of the PQ there was a space with a code number which referred to each subject to safeguard his/her identity. The code number corresponded to the participating child in the student group to make family

---

\(^{19}\) The English version of the items of the student questionnaire is presented in this chapter with respect to the themes of the questionnaire.

Language Maintenance and Shift among Iranians in Sweden

member identification possible. The PQ was written in Persian\(^{21}\) (see Appendix 2) and was pre-tested on six male and female Persian adults both with and without college educations. The questionnaire went through several developmental changes after being pre-tested.

The PQ’s general aim was to find out if there were language shift tendencies across the two generations. As discussed in the literature review, it usually takes three to four generations for the language shift to take place among immigrant minorities. The process leads from monolingualism in the L1 among the first generation, to bilingualism among the second generation, to monolingualism in the L2 among the third generation (see e.g. Haugen 1953, 1972; Fishman 1972a; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991). This process can be shorter among immigrant groups who are isolated from their home country and/or those groups who wish to be integrated in and become part of the majority country (see e.g. Tandefelt 1988).

The PQ also contained many of the items that were included in the SQ in order to raise the reliability of the students’ self-reported answers (see e.g. Gorter 1987). These questions dealt with the students’ linguistic background and proficiency in Persian, their patterns of language use within the home and outside the home domain, the extent of their exposure to Persian and Swedish at home, and finally, their attitudes towards their languages and environment. This questionnaire also studied other variables dealing directly with the parents’ situation. For instance, it investigated their background and socioeconomic status, their level of Persian and Swedish proficiency, their language-use patterns when speaking with their children at home, and their thoughts and opinions about different aspects of their life in Sweden.

### 4.4.2 Response alternatives

Subjects of the present study carried out a single task which could be classified as a controlled task. They were asked to provide the researcher with information based on the questionnaires. After each question, a space was provided for responses. Most of the items in both the PQ and the SQ had fixed response alternatives often arranged on ordinal five-point scales measuring a degree of choices in a symmetrical way on a continuum with a neutral point in the middle (see e.g. Dörnyei 2003). The ordinal scale format was chosen in order to make complicated statistical procedures at the ordinal level possible (see e.g. Ejlertsson 1996: 79f). For instance, the response alternatives on the scale for measuring literacy skills of the participants are very poorly, poorly, average, well, and very well, which are translated into arithmetic values from 1 to 5 representing both direction and strength be-

\(^{21}\) The English version of the items of the parent questionnaire is presented in this chapter with respect to the themes of the questionnaire.
between the alternatives. There are also ordinal scales with three and six response alternatives depending on the potential frequency of occurrence of the activities. For example, the response alternatives on the scale determining the length of summer vacation in Iran are *less than one month*, *1–3 months*, and *more than three months*, or on the newspaper reading scale are *never, sometimes, at least once a month, at least once a week, a few times a week*, and *every day*.

Both questionnaires also contain nominal or categorical scales such as gender, with the value of “1” designated to the “male” category and “2” to the “female”. These values are completely arbitrary and do not indicate any differences in size or salience (see e.g. Dörnyei 2003). There are a couple of rank order items in both questionnaires asking the respondents to order the items according to their preferences. These are very few in number due to the fact that responding to them is very demanding (see e.g. Wilson & McClean 1994; Dörnyei 2003).

Some of the questions are expanded with open-ended questions in order to obtain more information about each response alternative. They call for the respondents’ opinions about the themes in question (see e.g. Ejlertsson 1996: 64f). Some of the answers to these questions are classified under a few statistically feasible categories. In other cases where categorizing is not practicable, the answers are presented as statements.

4.4.3 Themes of the questionnaires

The themes of the questionnaires are based on language maintenance and shift factors and are specifically chosen from among the factors at the group and individual levels. Among those at the group level, themes such as *demography* and *socioeconomic status* are chosen, while at the individual level the selected themes are *language socialization*, *language competence*, *language choice*, and *language attitudes*. In what follows, the items on the questionnaires will be presented, commented on, and justified in terms of their validity to provide data for the research questions. It should be mentioned that the order of presentation of the items is based on the themes of the questionnaires and not on the order they appeared in the questionnaires.

4.4.3.1 Demography and background variables

The demographic and background variables are as follows:

**SQ:**

01. Date of birth?

02. Place of birth?

03. When did you come to Sweden?
04. How old were you when you came to Sweden?

06. Do you live with your mother? □ No □ Yes

07. Do you live with your father? □ No □ Yes

08. Do you have siblings? □ No □ Yes If no, go directly to question No. 11.

09. How many?

10. How old are they?

11. Does anyone else live with you? □ No □ Yes Who?

PQ:

01. Date of birth?

02. Place of birth?

03. Gender? □ Male □ Female

04. When did you come to Sweden?

09. Your family members:
□ Husband □ Wife □ Children: Number and their dates of birth? □ Others

10. Your spouse’s place of birth?

From the first item on the questionnaires the variable of age was calculated for each participant and the second item provided information about the participants’ place of birth. The SQ did not include any question to establish their gender, as opposed to the PQ (item 03), because their gender was already known to the researcher at the time of the data collection. Items 03 and 04 in the SQ and PQ respectively gave information regarding the participants’ immigration year to establish their age of first exposure to Swedish and their length of residence in Sweden. Both questionnaires contained items about their family members (items 06–11 and item 09 in the SQ and PQ respectively) in order to establish the structure of each family, the birth rate, and the age distribution within each family. The PQ also included an item (10), about the birthplace of the spouse, to determine the marriage pattern of the first generation; i.e., if both parents are Iranians or whether mixed marriages can also be found among the families in this study. The place of residence was already known to the researcher.

The above-mentioned variables provide demographic and background information which has been found to affect the maintenance of the mother tongue or its shift to the majority language (see e.g. Jaakkola 1973; Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Li Wei 1982; Andersson-Brolin 1984; Ramirez 1985; Milroy 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Pütz 1991; Kristiansen et al. 1991; Pittam et al. 1991; Aikio 1992; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Prabhakaran 1998; Winsa 1999;

4.4.3.2 Socioeconomic status variables
The SQ obviously did not contain any socioeconomic variables because the respondents had not yet finished their education nor had they entered the labor market.

PQ:
06. Please mark the alternative(s) that describe(s) your situation:
☒ I work ☐ I study ☐ I am unemployed ☐ Others

07. Please state your occupation.

08. Please state your education level.

The aim of variable 06 was to determine the employment status of the parents. They had the opportunity to mark all the applicable alternatives describing their situation. Also, in case of lack of suitable alternative(s) they could write their own. The aims of variables 07 and 08 were to determine the type of occupation each parent had and also their education level in order to compare the acquired information with classification system used by the Central Bureau of Statistics (SCB) for determining the socioeconomic status of the participants (see Chapter 5 for more details on this system, and also Statistical Yearbook of Sweden 1992: 177, 1998: 182; Population and Housing Census 1985, part 7: 285). As mentioned in the literature review, the social status of a group is closely connected to its economic status, both of which are recognized by many studies as strongly affecting language maintenance and shift among minority groups (see e.g. Fishman et al. 1966; Fishman 1972a, 1985; Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Conklin & Lourie 1983; Fishman 1985; Boyd 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Shameem 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Bloom & Grenier 1996; Grin 1996, 1999; Grenier 1997; Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9; Arua & Magocha 2002; Behtoui 2004).

4.4.3.3 Language socialization variables
The language socialization items in each questionnaire are as follows:

SQ:
12. Do you have Persian friends? ☐ No ☐ Yes
13. Do you have Swedish friends? ☐ No ☐ Yes
15. Which language did you acquire first?
16. In which language did you learn to read and write?
32. Do you use Persian in school apart from during mother tongue instruction?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

33. How many Persian classmates do you have?  
☐ None ☐ 1–3 ☐ 6–10 ☐ More than 10

34. How often do you speak Persian with Iranian adults outside school?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

35. How often do you speak Swedish with Swedish adults outside school?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

36. How often do you speak Swedish with Swedish friends outside school?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

37. How often do you speak Persian with Iranian friends outside school?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

40. How often do you watch Persian programs on TV/video?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

41. How often do you listen to Persian programs on the radio?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

42. How often do you listen to Persian music?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

43. How often do you see Persian films at a movie theater?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

44. How often do you watch Swedish programs on TV/video?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

45. How often do you listen to Swedish programs on the radio?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

46. How often do you listen to Swedish music?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

47. How often do you see Swedish films at a movie theater?  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

48. How often do you read Persian books? (Other than your Persian schoolbooks)  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

49. How often do you read Swedish books? (Other than your Swedish schoolbooks)  
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

50. How often do you read Persian newspapers?
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☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

51. How often do you read Swedish newspapers?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

52. How often do you write to your Persian friends and relatives?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

53. How often do you write in Swedish? (Other than your homework)
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ At least once a month ☐ At least once a week ☐ A few times a week ☐ Every day

54. Do you participate in family gatherings and traditional festivals? ☐ No ☐ Yes

56. How often do you travel to Iran?
☐ Never (If never, go directly to question No. 59) ☐ Sometimes ☐ Once a year ☐ Two or more times a year

57. How long do you usually stay there?
☐ Less than one month ☐ 1–3 months ☐ More than 3 months

PQ:

18. Do you have Iranian friends?
☐ Yes ☐ No If your answer is negative, go to question No. 21.

19. How often do you meet your Iranian friends?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

20. How often do you take your child (in this study) with you to Iranian friends’ gatherings?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

21. Do you have Swedish friends?
☐ Yes ☐ No If your answer is negative, go to question No. 24.

22. How often do you meet your Swedish friends?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

23. How often do you take your child with you to Swedish friends’ gatherings?
☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Fairly often ☐ Often ☐ Very often ☐ Every day

24. Did your child go to preschool in Sweden?
☐ Yes ☐ No If no, please state the type of childcare.

25. Please state how long s/he attended childcare (or other types of childcare centers).

26. Please state the language of communication of the childcare center.
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- Only Persian
- Mostly Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- Mostly Swedish
- Only Swedish

27. Where does your child spend his/her time after school?
- At home
- At the childcare center
- With Iranian friends
- With Swedish friends
- With a sports club
- Others

41. How often does your child speak Persian with Iranian adults outside school?
- Never
- Sometimes
- Fairly often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

42. How often does your child speak Swedish with Swedish adults outside school?
- Never
- Sometimes
- Fairly often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

43. How often does your child speak Persian with his/her Iranian friends outside school?
- Never
- Sometimes
- Fairly often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

44. How often does your child speak Swedish with his/her Swedish friends outside school?
- Never
- Sometimes
- Fairly often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

52. How often does your child watch Persian programs on TV/video?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

53. How often does your child listen to Persian programs on the radio?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

54. How often does your child listen to Persian music?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

55. How often does your child see Persian films at a movie theater?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

56. How often does your child participate in activities in Persian?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

57. How often does your child watch Swedish programs on TV/video?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

58. How often does your child listen to Swedish programs on the radio?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

59. How often does your child listen to Swedish music?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

60. How often does your child see Swedish films at a movie theater?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

61. How often does your child participate in activities in Swedish?
- Never
- Sometimes
- At least once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

62. How often does your child meet with his/her Iranian friends?
4. Method

63. How often does your child meet with his/her Swedish friends?
- Never
- Sometimes
- Fairly often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

64. Do you travel to Iran?
- Yes
- No
If the answer is no, you do not need to answer the following questions.
- Never
- Sometimes
- Once a year
- Two or more times a year

65. How long do you usually stay there?
- Less than one month
- 1–3 months
- More than 3 months

66. Does your child travel with you?
- Yes
- No

The socialization items follow the participants in various settings to investigate the extent of their socialization in each language so as to give a more encompassing picture of the socialization situation. The selected settings are the home domain, daycare centers, preschools, schools, after-school recreation centers, and individual activities after school hours. The items also illuminate to some extent the socialization of the students through contact with different people belonging to different age groups or via other means of socialization in the aforementioned settings. These items also take into consideration the fact that children learn their languages and cultural norms and values via other institutions such as the mass media, which can help minority individuals to promote and refine their languages and increase their competence. Mass media in majority languages, however, facilitate penetration of the majority language into many minority language domains such as the home. The items also examine the participants’ potential opportunities and their extent of socialization in Persian in the home country milieu based on the results from studies which show that minority groups that maintain close contact with their home countries are able to prolong the process of language shift. In this way the prerequisites for developing their language increase.

The overall reasoning behind all the language socialization questions is that many studies have shown that socialization is one of the most important factors influencing minority language maintenance and shift in the majority countries (see e.g. Hill & Hill 1977; Heath, 1983; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Schieffelin 1990; Kulick 1990; Clyne 1991; Aronsson 1991; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Hornberger & King 1996; Naucler & Boyd 1997; Hyltenstam et al. 1999; Lainio 1999; Naucler 2003; Remennick 2003).

4.4.3.4 Language competence variables

The language competence items in each questionnaire are as follows:

SQ:

14. What languages do you know?
17. How well do you understand each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

18. How well do you speak each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

19. How well do you read in each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

20. How well do you write in each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

38. Which language do you know best?

- Persian
- Swedish

PQ:

11. What languages do you know?

12. Which language did you acquire first?

13. In which language did you learn to read and write?

14. How well do you understand each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

15. How well do you speak each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

**Swedish**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well

16. How well do you read in each language?

**Persian**
- Very poorly
- Poorly
- Average
- Well
- Very well
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Swedish
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

17. How well do you write in each language?

Persian
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

Swedish
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

29. Which language do you know best? Please place the most advanced language first and the least last.

31. How well does your child understand Persian?
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

32. How well does your child speak in Persian?
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

33. How well does your child read in Persian?
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

34. How well does your child write in Persian?
☐ Very poorly ☐ Poorly ☐ Average ☐ Well ☐ Very well

45. Which language do you think your child knows best?
☐ Persian ☐ Swedish

Language competence variables address three language dimensions including language repertoire, language dominance, and language proficiency including understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills. These variables try to establish the participants’ degree of bilingualism.

The language competence items are based on the results from many studies that show that language competence in both the L1 and the L2, or the degree of bilingualism, is one of the issues that helps to establish changes in patterns of habitual language use. According to Fishman (1972c), degree of bilingualism refers to automaticity, proficiency, and code-intactness at the phonetic, lexical, and grammatical levels with respect to language perception, comprehension and production, as well as with regard to written, read, and spoken language. Lack of proficiency in the L1 may lead to limited functionality of that language in different domains (Jaspaert & Kroon 1991, 1993). Insufficient proficiency in the L1 may also result in the use of the L2 in different contexts. The retention of language use as well as language proficiency indicates language maintenance (see e.g. Gal 1979; Schmidt 1985; Tandefelt 1988, 1992; Woolard 1989; Hill, J. 1989; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Jaspaert & Kroon 1991, 1992, 1993; Aikio 1992; Fase et al. 1992; Namei 1993; Tuomela 1993; Pan 1995; Cormack 1995; Sohrabi 1997;

### 4.4.3.5 Language choice variables

The language choice variables in the present study try to distinguish between participants’ patterns of language use both in and outside the home domain.

#### 4.4.3.5.1 Language choice variables in the home domain

Items of patterns of language use in the home domain are as follows:

**SQ:**

21. Which language do you use to speak with your mother?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

22. Which language does your mother use to speak with you?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

23. Which language do you use to speak with your father?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

24. Which language does your father use to speak with you?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

25. Which language do you use to speak with your older siblings?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

26. Which language do you use to speak with your younger siblings?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

**PQ:**

35. Which language do you use to speak with your child?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

36. Which language does your child use to speak with you?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish

38. Which language does your child use to speak with his/her older siblings?
   - Only Persian
   - Mostly Persian
   - Persian and Swedish
   - Mostly Swedish
   - Only Swedish
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39. Which language does your child use to speak with his/her younger siblings?
- Only Persian
- Mostly Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- Mostly Swedish
- Only Swedish

The language choice items explore the patterns of language use in the home domain in different situations. Many studies show the importance of examining the habitual use of both the L1 and the L2 in different domains to establish whether or not a language shift is taking place among the individual members of the minority group. According to Fishman (1972a), minority members can maintain both of their languages if there is a separation of domains between the languages, e.g. speaking the L1 at home and the L2 outside (see Fishman 1965, 1972c; Weinreich, 1968; Clyne 1982; Boyd 1985; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991). The language choice in the home domain is influenced by different factors, such as attitudinal and socioeconomic factors affecting parents’ ways of socializing their children. A great deal of code-switching may occur in parents’ interaction with their children and between parents themselves depending in particular on how they view their languages. For instance, if parents associate their L1 with positive factors they may put a great deal of effort into transferring it to their children, otherwise the L2 will soon penetrate the home domain (see e.g. Greenfield 1972; Dorian 1981; Kulick 1990; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991).

Parents’ understanding of their children’s L1 proficiency also strongly affects their choice of language in interaction with them. The same is true for the children. The use of the L2 leads to limited functionality of the L1 in children, which in turn encourages them to use the L2 at home, a domain that once belonged exclusively to the L1. Parents’ use of the L2 at home also has attitudinal effects and gives a positive signal to the children to use that language more and more. In this situation, the minority language does not have a strong chance of survival (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Clyne 1985; Boyd 1985; Penfield 1987; Romaine 1995; Sohram 1997; Andersson 1999; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004; Jahani 2004; Lee 2004).

4.4.3.5.2 Language choice variables outside the home domain
Items of patterns of language use outside the home domain are as follows:

SQ:

27. Which language do you use to speak with your Persian friends in school?
- Only Persian
- Mostly Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- Mostly Swedish
- Only Swedish

28. Which language do you use to speak with your Persian friends outside school?
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29. Which language do you use to speak with your Persian teacher?
☐ Only Persian ☐ Mostly Persian ☐ Persian and Swedish ☐ Mostly Swedish ☐ Only Swedish

55. Which language do you use when you meet at family gatherings and traditional festivals?
☐ Only Persian ☐ Mostly Persian ☐ Persian and Swedish ☐ Mostly Swedish ☐ Only Swedish

PQ:

28. Which language does your child use at the after-school recreation center?
☐ Only Persian ☐ Mostly Persian ☐ Persian and Swedish ☐ Mostly Swedish ☐ Only Swedish

40. Which language does your child use to speak with Iranian friends outside school?
☐ Only Persian ☐ Mostly Persian ☐ Persian and Swedish ☐ Mostly Swedish ☐ Only Swedish

These items investigate the students’ patterns of language use outside the home domain in settings such as daycare centers, pre/schools, and after-school recreation centers. These patterns establish through interactions in such settings as between student–Iranian peers and friends, student–mother tongue teacher, student–Iranian friends, and students–Iranian people at family gatherings and traditional festivals. It was previously emphasized that interaction with different people of different age groups in various situations plays a very important role in the acquisition and maintenance of both the first and second language. Interactions in these domains provide opportunities for formal and informal exposure to and production of each language (see e.g. Fishman 1972a; Greenfield 1972; Corvalán 1988; Spolsky 1989; Viberg 1996).

4.4.3.6 Language attitudes variables
The attitudinal variables in each questionnaire are as follows:

SQ:

05. Do you enjoy living in Sweden? ☐ No ☐ Yes

30. Do you think that it is useful to know your mother tongue?
☐ No ☐ Yes Why?

31. Do you think that it is useful to know Swedish? ☐ No ☐ Yes Why?

39. Which language do you prefer to use? ☐ Persian ☐ Swedish
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58. Do you like Iran? ☐ No ☐ Yes Why?
59. Do you want to live in Iran? ☐ No ☐ Yes Why?
60. Do you want to live in Sweden? ☐ No ☐ Yes Why?

PQ:

05. Do you enjoy living in Sweden? ☐ Yes ☐ No
30. Which language do you prefer to use? ☐ Persian ☐ Swedish

37. How does your child react when you talk in Persian with him/her in public?
☐ Very negatively ☐ Negatively ☐ Neither negatively nor positively ☐ Positively
☐ Very positively ☐ I never use Persian in those situations

46. How well do you want your child to learn Persian?
☐ A little ☐ Fairly little ☐ Enough to speak ☐ Well ☐ very well

47. Do you think it is useful for your child to learn Swedish? ☐ Yes ☐ No Why?

48. How well do you want your child to learn Swedish?
☐ A little ☐ Fairly little ☐ Enough to speak ☐ Well ☐ very well

49. Do you think it is useful for your child to learn Persian? ☐ Yes ☐ No Why?

50. Do you think that your child avoids speaking Persian?
☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, in what situations?

51. What attitudes do you think your child has toward mother tongue learning?
☐ Very negative ☐ Negative ☐ Neither negative nor positive ☐ Positive ☐ Very positive

The attitudinal variables in the present study investigate participants’ attitudes towards Persian and Swedish, whether or not participants think that it is useful to learn Persian and Swedish, their language preference, whether or not they avoid speaking Persian, students’ reaction when they are spoken to in Persian publicly, and attitudes towards learning the mother tongue. There are also some items concerning whether or not participants enjoy their life in Sweden and in Iran (if traveling), and if they wish to stay in Sweden or to go back to Iran and live there instead.

The attitudes of the minority group towards its own and the majority language and culture affect language maintenance and shift, as many studies have shown (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Clyne 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Spolsky 1989; Schmidt 1990; Hart-Gonzalez and Feingold 1990; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Holmes 1992; Shameem 1994; Gupta & Yeok 1995; Romaine 1995; Andersson 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004; Lee 2004).
4.5 Administration procedures

4.5.1 Sampling procedures for the student group

Based on the information obtained from the Home Language Department, 879 Iranian students were registered at schools in Stockholm during the 1996/97 school year. The number of registered students included everyone from the final year of preschool through comprehensive and upper-secondary school. Before July 1, 1991, the vast majority of children in Sweden began school at the age of 7 (Grade 1). Since that time, children may begin school at the age of 6 (called Grade 0). Grade 0 students also include 7-year-olds whose parents want them to begin Grade 1 later because they need a little more time to mature. Comprehensive school in Sweden consists of Grades 1 to 9, and is divided into three levels: lower (Grades 1–3), intermediate (Grades 4–6), and upper (Grades 7–9). Upper-secondary school students are in Grades 10–12.

It was decided to choose students from a wide range of grade levels in order to simulate longitudinal language behavior research using one particular group of students. Comprehensive school students were chosen from Grades 3, 6, and 9. The preschooler group (Grade 0) was chosen in order to study their language environment and behavior at the beginning of their schooling; henceforth Grade 0 is included in the discussion of the comprehensive school for convenience. The upper-secondary school students were chosen from all three years. Thus, in the present study there were students from the comprehensive school (Grades 0, 3, 6, 9) and the upper-secondary school (Grades 10–12), the latter being grouped together due to the small number of available students.

Within the aforementioned grades, the sampling was done from among 329 (172 male and 157 female) registered students from the comprehensive schools and 75 (39 male and 36 female) from the upper-secondary schools. The sampling procedures for the bilingual subjects took place during the fall semester of 1996. In order to choose the subjects randomly, the population

---

22 The Home Language Department (Hemspråkenheten at the time of data collection in 1997, now known as Språkcentrum för modersmål och minoritetsspråk or Language Center for Mother Tongues and Minority Languages) is the department which administers mother tongue instruction in the municipality of Stockholm. This department was under the Stockholm Department of Education at the time of data collection. At the time of this writing it is under a division called Arbetsmarknads- och utbildningsförvaltningen (ARUF) or the Labor Market and Education Department.

23 The level system in the Swedish comprehensive school was changed to the ordinary grade system from Grade 1 to 9 in 1994/95. However, the levels are still referred to for convenience. In the present study, all participants are grouped according to the level system. See also Chapter 1, footnote 6.

24 See Chapter 1, footnote 7.
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of available students \((N = 329 + 75 = 404)\) was divided at each school level into two groups according to their sex. Their names were written on pieces of paper which were then folded and selected by hand.

According to Swedish regulations (see e.g. Vetenskapsrådets etikregler för humanistisk–samhällsvetenskaplig forskning [The Swedish Research Council’s ethical guidelines for arts and social science research], 2002, 2005) a research permit is required to use students as research participants. The appropriate permit was obtained in March 1996 permitting the researcher to study the language environment of the bilingual Persian–Swedish students in the comprehensive and upper-secondary schools in Stockholm.

A letter was written in Persian and sent to the parents of all of the selected students, informing them about the study and its aims and inviting them to participate. Attached to the letter was a form that was to be filled out and sent back by those parents who were unwilling to participate in the study. None of the parents refused to participate. Later, a second letter was sent to the parents explaining the data collection procedures and time schedule in detail. They were also notified that in the students’ case the time necessary for the research would be taken from their home language teaching hours at the beginning and later from other subjects, following an agreement with the students’ Swedish teachers.

Persian home language teachers whose students were going to participate in the study were also informed in person by the researcher. The aims and purposes of the research were carefully explained to them. Procedures for carrying out the study were also discussed, and a time schedule for data collection was given to each of them.

The research involved 36 schools in different areas in Stockholm. A letter was sent to the school directors explaining the research plan and how and when it was going to be carried out. It was also explained that a letter had been sent to the parents and that they had given their consent. The research permit was also attached to this letter.

At the beginning of the data collection, the researcher was informed by two subjects (girls in Grades 0 and 3) that they had decided to withdraw. Since their decision came at the time scheduled for data collection, a spontaneous choice of replacements was made from among their peers; this resulted in the addition of two extra boys to these groups. Their parents were contacted in order to obtain their consent, which then allowed the researcher to continue collecting data with the chosen number of students.

4.5.2 Data collection procedures

The researcher conducted structured interviews with the students based on the SQ. The interviews were carried out individually with each student. As mentioned before, the reason for choosing interviews as a technique for collecting data from the students was that there were students who could not yet
read and write, and interviewing them made it possible to use the same procedure for all of the students. It also made it easier to check whether or not questions were understood correctly and answered fully.

The student response rate was 100%. Each interview generally took about half an hour to 45 minutes to complete depending on the age and language skills of the informant. This time was taken from the mother tongue teaching hours. The questionnaires were written in Swedish and were filled out in Swedish by the researcher while conducting the interviews. All of the interviews were carried out in Persian and words not known to the students were explained using both their languages. During the interviews, the students could switch between their languages if they wanted, and as a matter of fact everybody did, including the researcher. This was a conscious strategy to ensure that they correctly understood the questions and could answer them completely without being impeded by possible language difficulties.

The data for the present study were collected from February to March 1997. The interviews with the students were conducted in empty classrooms in the students’ schools, except for the upper-secondary students, with whom activities were carried out in just one school. Meeting the students in their school milieu was more practical and convenient for them than conducting the data collection at the University of Stockholm where the researcher worked at that time. The students seemed very relaxed and “at home” during the interviews, and they were given some refreshments afterwards.

The PQ was sent to the parents by mail. A letter was attached to the questionnaire explaining the aims of the study and encouraging them to participate. The letter also contained the same instructions for filling out the questionnaire that had previously been orally explained to the students. The parents were asked to answer all of the questions as clearly, correctly, and completely as possible. They were also asked to contact the researcher by phone (the number was included in the letter) if further information was needed to understand the questions or the study itself.

The questionnaire was not specifically addressed to the mother or father, but to the parents of the student. As a result, 66 mothers and 22 fathers filled it out. 12 did not send the questionnaire back. The parents who did not answer the questionnaires received a letter of reminder and a phone call. The effort was fruitless, which means that the parent response rate was 88%.
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Analysis

Chapter 5 presents the strategies used for analyzing the data. It explains different techniques such as crosstabulations, frequencies, and mean values that are used to give a general description of the language maintenance and shift factors. A system is also adapted to account for the socioeconomic status of the participants. Inferential strategies such as chi-square tests are used as well to make some generalizations about the results.

The data collected through questionnaires, structured interviews, and other sources of information was prepared, coded, and entered in a PC version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program (SPSS for Windows, version 11.0, 2005) (Norušis 1990; Pallant 2010).

The analytical instruments were chosen to find answers to the research question: whether Iranians in Sweden are maintaining their mother tongue or if they are shifting to the majority language. As discussed in Chapter 4, this study has selected six themes, namely demography, socioeconomic status (belonging to the maintenance and shift factors at the group level), language socialization, language competence, language choice, and language attitudes (belonging to the maintenance and shift factors at the individual level) in order to find some answers to the research question (see Figure 5.1).

5.1 General data analysis strategies

The classification of data that is collected for the above-mentioned six themes of the present investigation is based on frequencies and mean values of different variables. Most of the results are presented in crosstabulation tables to shed more light on the issues in question. The calculations using these techniques were straightforward and caused no difficulties. Analysis techniques such as frequencies of counts and percentages and crosstabulations are recommended strategies in the initial phases of data analyses to give a more general description of the data (see e.g. Baker 1992: 59; Dörnyei 2003: 114).
5.2 Classification of socioeconomic status data

In order to determine the socioeconomic status of the participants in this study, a system was adapted which is presented here. Establishing socioeconomic status is a complicated and sensitive issue. It is usually determined via information about the education levels of the participating people, their occupations, their family income levels, and their housing situations. Due to the sensitivity of these questions, the researcher has used a simpler system. This system is used by the Central Bureau of Statistics (SCB) (see e.g. Population and Housing Census 1985, part 7: 285; Statistical Yearbook of Sweden 1992: 177, 1998: 182) and has also been adopted by other surveys in Sweden (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9). This procedure is mainly based on classifying the participants’ occupation and education level, and comparing the obtained
information with pre-established categories in order to determine the socio-economic status of the participants.

In the SCB system, occupations are divided into three categories, namely manual workers (skilled and unskilled), non-manual employees (low, middle, and high), and self-employed (professional, businesspeople, and, farmers). These are described in Table 5.1, along with their required education levels and some typical examples for each category. As seen, the education level for unskilled manual workers is less than 11 years, while skilled workers need to have at least 11 years of education. The education levels of the three categories under the heading of non-manual employees range from less than 12 years for the category of low, to between 12 and 15 years for the category of middle, and up to at least 15 years for the category of high non-manual employees. Professionals are also required to have at least 15 years of education. However, no education level is indicated for businesspeople and farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational categories</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Less than 2 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Childcare worker, nursing assistant, simple machine operator, waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>At least 2 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Assistant nurse, cook, postal worker, hairdresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Less than 3 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Computer operator, preschool teacher, clerk, telephone operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4–6 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Teacher, nurse, technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>At least 6 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Lawyer, architect, doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>At least 6 years after comprehensive school</td>
<td>Lawyer, architect, doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesspeople</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to adapt SCB’s system for this study, the occupational categories in Table 5.1 were ranked on a six-point scale comprising unskilled manual
worker = 1, skilled manual worker = 2, low non-manual employee = 3, small business owner = 4, middle non-manual employee = 5, and high non-manual employee and professionals = 6. Different education levels were also ranked on a six-point scale consisting of less than 11 years = 1, 11 years = 2, less than 12 years = 3, at least 12 years = 4, less than 16 years = 5, and more than 16 years = 6. This system is shown in Table 5.2. It should be mentioned that the category of small business owner with up to 12 years of education was added to the SCB’s system in order to have a more suitable classification system of socioeconomic status of the participants of the present study.

Table 5.2. Occupational and educational scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Education in years</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual employee: low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual employee: Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual employee: High, professionals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>≥16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine the socioeconomic status of the participants in this study according to the system presented in Table 5.2, occupations and education levels of the participating parents were first crosstabulated (see Chapter 6, Table 6.5). Their occupations were categorized into manual workers (skilled and unskilled) and non-manual employees including low, middle, and high non-manual employees, and also self-employed small business owners. A category of others was also added to include unemployed people, student parents, and also those who were retired (see Chapter 6, Table 6.7).

The different scale points designating types of occupation and education levels shown in Table 5.2 can be translated into the three traditional socioeconomic classes; the working class, the middle class, and the upper class. Those belonging to the first and second categories (unskilled and skilled manual workers) should be considered as working class families, whereas those belonging to the third to fifth categories (low and middle non-manual employees and small business owners) are the middle class families and those belonging to the sixth category (high non-manual employees and professionals) are recognized as families belonging to the upper class (see Chapter 6, Table 6.7). This categorization should, of course, be considered an arbitrary system.

Another type of classification close tied to socioeconomic status was the degree of over- or under-qualification of the parents in the labor market. This was done using the six-point scales of occupation and education level de-
scribed in Table 5.2 above. To establish over- or under-qualification, the following steps were taken.

The first step was to omit the category of “others” from this calculation. The second step was to designate each type of occupation and education level the right number according to the system presented in Table 5.2. Then the points assigned to different categories of jobs were subtracted from the points given for actual education levels that the parents in the labor force had (see Chapter 6, Table 6.8). For example, a person who has less than 4 years of university education (5 points on the education scale) and has an unskilled manual job (1 point on the occupation scale) would get +4 points ($5 - 1 = +4$). Thus this person has an occupation which requires four degrees of education less than the person holds. In other words, this person is highly over-qualified for his/her job. A non-manual employee at the low level (3 points) with an education level of less than 12 years (3 points) would get 0 points ($3 - 3 = 0$); i.e., this person has an occupation which matches his/her education level. A non-manual employee at the middle level (5 points) with an education level of 11 years (2 points) would get -3 point ($2 - 5 = -3$); i.e., this person has an occupation which requires three degrees of education higher than the person holds, making him or her highly under-qualified for her/his job. This system is shown in Table 5.3 (see also Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of over- or under-qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>–6 (highest degree of under-qualification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (neither over nor under qualified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6 (highest degree of over-qualification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Inferential statistics

Inferential statistics are needed if any generalization about the findings of a particular sample of a larger population is to be made. This is done by calculating the statistical significance between different variables such as men vs. women or first generation vs. second generation. A statistically significant
result may indicate a more generalizable phenomenon, whereas a non-significant result may point to a more coincidental result in the sample (see also Dörnyei 2003). In the present study, different types of statistical significance are computed for different purposes, and these are accounted for below.

5.3.1 Chi-square analysis strategies

Chi-square is a type of statistical measurement which is usually used with variables at the nominal level in order to measure associations such as dependency between them. The most usual chi-square value or the Pearson value (named after the statistician Karl Pearson) may only reveal that there is a significant/insignificant dependency relation between two variables and does not say anything about the strength of the relationship. Such tests are recommended when there is a large number of \( x \) and \( y \) values (see e.g. Aronsson 1997). Such was the case here when chi-tests were used.

Chi-square tests were used to compare the parents’ evaluations with those of the students. They were also used for comparing results between the participants’ two languages and also within and between grade levels in the student group, or between different variables under investigation, e.g. the degree of language exposure via TV and radio or the degree of understanding of Persian and Swedish.

In order to calculate the chi-square values, it was necessary to assign dummy variables to categories under each variable being tested. Dummy method can be described as a procedure by which numerical values, such as 0s and 1s, are used to replace the nominal categories of a variable, e.g. male = 1 and female = 2. The purpose of this procedure is to give the researcher opportunities to conduct various statistical calculations (Aronsson 1997).

5.4 Summary

In this chapter the statistical procedures used to analyze the data in the present study were described. These procedures included general data analysis strategies including crosstabulations of different variables, calculation of frequencies of counts and percentages, and mean values in order to present a general description of the data.

Procedures for categorizing participants’ socioeconomic status and their potential under- and over-qualification for their jobs were also described adopting SCB’s classification system. This system was changed somewhat to fit this particular study. Inferential statistics such as chi-square tests were described to make some generalizations about the sample.
Chapter 6
Results: Sociocultural Changes

Chapter 6 describes the results for data analyses based on the first research sub-question: whether or not sociocultural changes are taking place among Iranians in Sweden. It presents the findings on data analyses on the demography of Iranians in Sweden in general from 1970 to 2010, and the participants of the present study in particular. The demography of Iranians in Sweden includes their numbers, immigration/emigration patterns, birth rates, and patterns of endogamy/exogamy, and also their residential patterns. The demographic factors of the participants and their socioeconomic status in terms of education levels and occupations are also reported. These data are based partially on official Swedish statistical documents and partially on the questionnaires, and also on other supplementary sources.

6.1 Demography of Iranians in Sweden – A historical background

Until 1980, there were about 3,000 Iranians in Sweden most of whom were students at different universities (SCB 2002). Two political events in Iran at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s made many Iranians flee their home country to seek asylum in western countries.

The first was the so-called “Islamic Revolution” in 1979 which resulted in the exile of a large number of Iranians. Among them were those who were not Muslims, a large number of political activists, many supporters of the former government, and those who had benefited from former government’s programs, as well as many ordinary people who did not wish to live under Islamic laws. This event also led to the exile of a considerable number of Iranians who were supporters of the modernization programs during the reign of the Pahlavi dynasty (1925–1979). According to Hosseini-Kaladjahi (1997), the modernists were forced to leave the country because the Islamic government aggressively attacked and destroyed everything that had to do with these modernization programs.
The second event was the Iran–Iraq war (1980–1988) which resulted in the flight of 1.5 to 2 million Iranian refugees to Europe, the U.S., Canada,

### Table 6.1. Statistics for Iranians in Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of immigration</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Sweden-born</th>
<th>Iranian citizen</th>
<th>Swedish citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 180</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 097</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 695</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 545</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 218</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 903</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 664</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 189</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 348</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 935</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4 069</td>
<td>4 004</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3 344</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4 561</td>
<td>4 412</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3 661</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>5 143</td>
<td>4 919</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4 092</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>6 754</td>
<td>6 420</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>5 526</td>
<td>1 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>9 921</td>
<td>9 406</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8 342</td>
<td>1 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>15 481</td>
<td>14 655</td>
<td>1 555</td>
<td>13 270</td>
<td>1 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>23 301</td>
<td>22 154</td>
<td>2 030</td>
<td>20 463</td>
<td>2 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>31 870</td>
<td>29 664</td>
<td>2 652</td>
<td>28 420</td>
<td>3 014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>39 262</td>
<td>35 986</td>
<td>3 356</td>
<td>35 144</td>
<td>3 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>44 256</td>
<td>40 084</td>
<td>4 147</td>
<td>38 982</td>
<td>4 948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>48 568</td>
<td>43 616</td>
<td>4 928</td>
<td>40 001</td>
<td>6 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>52 680</td>
<td>46 865</td>
<td>5 788</td>
<td>38 996</td>
<td>11 004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>54 752</td>
<td>48 063</td>
<td>6 658</td>
<td>36 097</td>
<td>15 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>59 246</td>
<td>48 693</td>
<td>10 553</td>
<td>32 670</td>
<td>19 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>60 616</td>
<td>49 040</td>
<td>11 576</td>
<td>29 323</td>
<td>22 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>61 744</td>
<td>49 203</td>
<td>12 571</td>
<td>27 209</td>
<td>24 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63 409</td>
<td>49 818</td>
<td>13 591</td>
<td>26 238</td>
<td>26 812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>65 047</td>
<td>50 264</td>
<td>14 795</td>
<td>19 793</td>
<td>32 859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66 227</td>
<td>50 525</td>
<td>15 702</td>
<td>16 129</td>
<td>36 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>67 864</td>
<td>51 101</td>
<td>16 763</td>
<td>14 324</td>
<td>38 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69 546</td>
<td>51 844</td>
<td>17 702</td>
<td>13 499</td>
<td>40 057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>71 492</td>
<td>52 721</td>
<td>18 771</td>
<td>12 944</td>
<td>41 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>67 249</td>
<td>53 241</td>
<td>14 008</td>
<td>12 464</td>
<td>42 053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>68 669</td>
<td>53 982</td>
<td>14 687</td>
<td>12 443</td>
<td>42 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>69 827</td>
<td>54 470</td>
<td>15 357</td>
<td>11 535</td>
<td>43 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>71 873</td>
<td>55 747</td>
<td>16 126</td>
<td>10 526</td>
<td>45 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>73 352</td>
<td>56 516</td>
<td>16 836</td>
<td>10 204</td>
<td>46 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>75 175</td>
<td>57 663</td>
<td>17 512</td>
<td>10 621</td>
<td>46 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>78 210</td>
<td>59 922</td>
<td>18 288</td>
<td>11 846</td>
<td>47 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>62 120</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13 493</td>
<td>48 533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** SCB, Population statistics 1970–2010

**Grand total** = Foreign-born + Sweden-born Iranians.

The empty spaces in this table are due to the lack of official statistics.

The second event was the Iran–Iraq war (1980–1988) which resulted in the flight of 1.5 to 2 million Iranian refugees to Europe, the U.S., Canada,

The number of Iranian refugees in Sweden increased constantly throughout the 1980s. A mass immigration took place in the mid-1980s when the Iran–Iraq war intensified. The number of Iranians in 1990 was about 12 times (1,197%) larger than in 1980. Table 6.1 shows the number of Iranians living in Sweden between 1970 and 2010. Some of the figures in this table are approximate, and the table should therefore be interpreted with caution. According to the population statistics of SCB (2010b), there were 78,210 Iranians in Sweden at the end of 2009. This number includes both foreign-born (59,922) Iranians and those who were born in Sweden (18,288). Iranians are the fifth largest minority group (after Finns, Yugoslavs, Iraqis, and Bosnians) in Sweden (SCB 2005).

Before the mass immigration, the majority of Iranians in Sweden were male students in their twenties. This picture has changed because many young families (25 to 29 years old) sought asylum in Sweden during the Iran–Iraq war. Apart from the group of children under 18 years, the largest age group of Iranians today is between 40 and 49 years old (15,435 persons). There are more men than women. Among the foreign-born Iranians there are 31,567 men and 28,355 women and among the Sweden-born children there are 9,357 boys and 8,931 girls.

The rate of Iranian migration to western countries has slowed down considerably in the past few years, with about 1,500 persons arriving each year.

Figure 6.1. The growth rate of Iranians in Sweden
Language Maintenance and Shift among Iranians in Sweden

from 2000 to 2009 (SCB 2010b). However, the total number of Iranians has increased every year due to the number of the children born in this country. The number of this age group has increased five times (544%) from 3,356 in 1989 to 18,288 in 2009, which shows a high birth rate (see Figure 6.1).

The majority of Iranians still marry within their own ethnic group, but today exogamy (marriage outside one’s own cultural group) does occur, especially among younger Iranians. Figure 6.2 compares the growth rate of children with one Iranian parent to those with two Iranian parents. The marriage pattern is also changing in another way; until recently only young men married women belonging to other ethnic backgrounds, while today it occurs among young women as well (Figure 6.2). The exogamy marriage pattern among Iranian immigrants is also found in studies of this minority group in other countries (see e.g. Modarresi 2001; Nercissians 2001; Jahani 2004). In his study of Iranian immigrants in the U.S., Modarresi maintains that many Iranians changed their intention from staying temporarily to staying permanently because of intergroup marriages, jobs, and the like (ibid.: 95f). Although Jahani (2004) did not study in detail marriage patterns among Persian speaking people in Sweden, she maintains that exogamy is not unusual. She further states that this is because “[m]any Persians in Sweden are quite secularized and do not mind their children marrying a non-Muslim” (ibid: 109). However, the issue of exogamy among Iranians should be investigated more thoroughly and looked at historically in relation to intergroup marriages that occur between different minority group members in Iran (see also Nercissians 2001).

Figure 6.1. Iranian children born to endogamous and exogamous families

The majority of Iranians still marry within their own ethnic group, but today exogamy (marriage outside one’s own cultural group) does occur, especially among younger Iranians. Figure 6.2 compares the growth rate of children with one Iranian parent to those with two Iranian parents. The marriage pattern is also changing in another way; until recently only young men married women belonging to other ethnic backgrounds, while today it occurs among young women as well (Figure 6.2). The exogamy marriage pattern among Iranian immigrants is also found in studies of this minority group in other countries (see e.g. Modarresi 2001; Nercissians 2001; Jahani 2004). In his study of Iranian immigrants in the U.S., Modarresi maintains that many Iranians changed their intention from staying temporarily to staying permanently because of intergroup marriages, jobs, and the like (ibid.: 95f). Although Jahani (2004) did not study in detail marriage patterns among Persian speaking people in Sweden, she maintains that exogamy is not unusual. She further states that this is because “[m]any Persians in Sweden are quite secularized and do not mind their children marrying a non-Muslim” (ibid: 109). However, the issue of exogamy among Iranians should be investigated more thoroughly and looked at historically in relation to intergroup marriages that occur between different minority group members in Iran (see also Nercissians 2001).
The rate of Swedish naturalization and citizenship is high. It has increased about 61 times (6,097%) between 1980 and 2010. Figure 6.3 compares the growth rate of Iranians with Swedish citizenship with those holding Iranian citizenship. The high growth rate of Swedish citizenship among Iranians in Sweden can be due to the fact that the Swedish government decided in February 1998 that Iranians could apply for Swedish naturalization while keeping their Iranian nationality. The high rate of Swedish citizenship among Iranians may also be due to the fact that a Swedish passport facilitates traveling to other parts of the world, especially since 1994 when Sweden joined the European Union. However, as seen in Figure 6.3, the rapid increase of Swedish naturalization among Iranians began long before the Swedish government’s 1998 decision. This may be because they have decided to stay in Sweden and only return home for short visits. This has certainly been the case for the past 13 years. The decision to stay and make the new country a second home is also found among Iranians in other countries such as the U.S. (Modarresi 2001: 96). He maintains that this change of intention became more apparent and necessary after the Iran–Iraq war in 1980 which forced many Iranian immigrants to decide to stay in the United States longer than they had planned in the beginning.

As for the outward migration patterns of Iranians from Sweden, statistics from SCB (2010b) over the past ten years show that there about 200 Iranians migrate from Sweden to other western countries every year.
Iranians mostly live in the major cities in Sweden. The largest residential concentration is in Stockholm. According to SCB (2010a, 2010b), there are 22,444 Iranian people living in the capital city. Many of them live in the northwest part of Stockholm in places such as Solna, Sundbyberg, Kista, Akalla, Husby, and Spånga. There are many organizations and institutions catering to this group in these areas. Among these are a few daycare centers and preschools with bilingual personnel, and there are music, dance, art, and sports clubs for the younger people. For the older people there are apartments with facilities for the elderly and disabled. There are also centers that provide senior citizens with different kinds of services such as courses in Swedish and Persian, to raise literacy skills in both languages, or in sewing, cooking, and catering. In the whole northwest area there are many businesses with Persian cultural affiliations such as Persian carpet stores, arts and handicraft shops, bookstores, restaurants, food shops, and so on. Some of these institutions have some kind of governmental support, while others are run privately by their owners.

To sum up, based on the demographic data on Iranians in Sweden it may be safe to state that the overall tendency of this minority group is to stay in Sweden. The high growth rate of the number of Iranians, especially of the second generation, low emigration, high uptake of Swedish citizenship, plus a steady increase in exogamy present a picture indicating that Iranians have decided to stay in Sweden; and if they do move away from this country they move to other western countries, especially English speaking ones (see also Sahaf 1994; Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997: 184 ff).

6.1.1 Demography of the participants

Table 6.2 shows the demography of the participants in this study. It can be noted that most of the participants (n = 120) immigrated to Sweden between 1984 and 1990. A comparison between Tables 6.1 and 6.2 shows that the growth rate of the participants in this study follows the pattern of the growth rate of the total number of Iranians in Sweden. Table 6.2 also shows that in the same period, i.e., between 1984 and 1990, 33 children, i.e., one third of the student group, were born in Sweden. It can also be seen that all of the students were born to families with two Iranian parents. This means that endogamy is the marriage pattern of the families in this study. This is also shown in Table 6.3 which presents the birthplaces of the parents. It can be seen that 62% of the parents who were born in Tehran (66% in total) are married to individuals who were also born in Tehran, and only 2% of those born in other cities in Iran (34% in total) are married to people born in Tehran. It should be mentioned, however, that Table 6.3 does not exactly indicate a pattern of marrying within own minority group, because there are many different minority language speaking individuals living in Tehran and
vice versa. It can only show a strong tendency that people are inclined to find partners within their own geographical place of residence.

Table 6.2. Demographic data of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of immigration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parents born in Iran</th>
<th>Students born in Iran</th>
<th>Students born in Sweden</th>
<th>Students with both Iranian parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family structures of the participants are shown in Table 6.4. The majority of families (80%) are nuclear families (father, mother, and children). However, 20% of the families consist of one parent with her/his children. We can also see that most of the families (80%) have 2–3 children.

6.2 Socioeconomic status of the participants

This section reports the results for the socioeconomic data of the participants. The classification of occupations in the present study is based on a system developed by SCB for analyses of socioeconomic status in Sweden (see Population and Housing Census 1985, part 7: 285; Statistical Yearbook of Sweden 1992: 177, 1998: 182). This system was presented in Chapter 5 and is mainly based on the education levels required for different categories of work. It was also mentioned that this classification system divides occupations into three categories (see Table 5.1), namely manual workers (skilled and unskilled), non-manual employees (low, middle, and high), and self-employed (professional, businesspeople, and farmers).

Table 6.5 presents the parents’ occupation and education level. 7% of them have not finished high school, while 37% have. The largest group is comprised by the university graduates who are about 56%. Thus the ratio of the parents with education levels of secondary school and higher is 93%.
Half of the unemployed parents have 2 to 6 years of university education. This is also true of more than half of the student parents. These people are now retraining themselves to meet the demands of the labor market.

Table 6.3. Parents’ place of birth in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s PoB</th>
<th>Spouse’s PoB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran–Tehran</td>
<td>Iran–Other cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran–Tehran</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran–Other cities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. Family structure in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Mother + child</th>
<th>Both parents + child</th>
<th>Father + child</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5. Parents’ occupation and education level in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high proportion of secondary school and higher in this study (93%) is well in line with other studies about Iranians in Sweden as well as in other
countries (see e.g. Kamalkhani 1988: 59ff; Fathi 1991: 106; Sohrabi 1997: 47; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9: 56ff; Modarresi 2001; Jahani 2004: 98). For example, it was found in Modarresi’s study of Iranians in the U.S. (2001: 96f) that the proportion of college graduates of all Iranians in the U.S. in 1990 (about 300,000 people) was 51.3%, of those with some college education was 21.9%, of high school graduates was 15.9%, and of those with less than high school was 10.9%.

Table 6.6. Parents’ occupation and education level by gender in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6.6 occupation and education are crosstabulated by gender. An interesting point here is that unemployment is much higher among women (15%) than men (6%), at the same time as there are more women (23%) than men (2%) that are reeducating themselves.

Table 6.7 shows the socioeconomic status of the parents. The proportion of manual workers (skilled and unskilled) is 21%, while the proportion of non-manual employees is 32%. The category of “Others,” which includes unemployed (21%), students (25%), and retired people (1%) is 47%. As mentioned before, the adapted SCB system is based on crosstabulation of occupation and education level. Thus, the socioeconomic status of 47% of the parents could not be established because there was no data on their occupation. This can be considered a disadvantage of this system.
The results for degree of under- and over-qualification of the parents in the labor market are shown in Table 6.8. As seen, the category of “Others” (47%) is omitted from this calculation.
Among the remaining 53% of the parents no under-qualified person is found. About 13% have jobs which suit their education level. The rest (40%) have occupations which require less education than they actually have. The fact that 40% of the parents’ education levels are 1 to 6 points higher than required means that they are not doing the jobs for which they are trained and educated. At the same time, it may mean that they can be considered under-qualified for those jobs they have in Sweden. For example, people who drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of over- or under-qualification</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;11 12 14 16 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3 8 7 6 1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2 8 3 7 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 17 10 13 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childcare worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 5 2 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childcare worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 3 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postal worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 37 28 20 8 100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a taxi, or deliver mail and have university educations (two actual cases among the parents) may be considered under-qualified because they are not actually trained and educated for their present jobs.

The fact that only a small proportion of the participants in this study have jobs that suit their educational level, and that a large number of them are significantly overqualified for their jobs, compares well with other studies (see e.g. Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997: 46f; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9: 70ff). Hosseini-Kaladjahi (1997) compared the integration process of four minority groups (Iranians, Chileans, Poles, and Finns) in Sweden and found similar results in his study. Comparing the last and the first job before and after migration, he found that 75.6% of Iranians, 77.8% of Chileans, 76.8% of Poles, and 55.3% of Finns were occupationally degraded. He concluded that “[T]he results confirm the general occupational degradation of ethnic minorities in Swedish labour market...” (ibid: 41). In the present study, however, it is not so much the degradation that is in focus, but the degree of waste of human assets and socioeconomic change as a consequence of migration. According to Table 6.7, a little less than half of the parents (47%) are not absorbed by the labor market at all. 25% of them have university educations. Among those who are absorbed by the labor market, we can find a driver, a preschool teacher, and a business owner with 18 years of education.

A crosstabulation of the parents’ length of residence in Sweden by their occupation and education level is shown in Table 6.9. It reveals among other things that the unemployed parents have been living in Sweden 5–20 years and that the majority of the student group has a LOR of more than 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>Education in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant nurse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9. Length of residence, occupation, and education in %
It is not only the first generation of immigrants who face unequal opportunities in the Swedish labor market. This happens to the younger generation with an immigrant background as well. This question was investigated in a
longitudinal study by Behtoui (2004). He compared the differences in achievements in the Swedish labor market of young native Swedes and young people with immigrant backgrounds – those with two foreign-born parents, and those with one immigrant parent. In the latter group he even compared the achievement differences of those with a foreign-born father with those with a foreign-born mother. The participants were young people who were 18–20 years in 1990 and 26–28 in 1998. They had all gone through the Swedish education system. The findings of the study showed that the young immigrants “have consistently lower probability of being regularly employed, lower annual income and lower probability of having an income more than zero, regardless of educational attainment, gender, marital status, having children, and living in a big city, vis-à-vis our reference group” (ibid.: 650). He also found that having Swedish parent(s) has a substantial effect on the achievement of young people in the labor market because of their access to the social network of the Swedish parent(s). The results also demonstrated the larger positive effect of having a Swedish father than a Swedish mother.

6.3 Summary

In chapter 6 an attempt was made to answer first sub-question; i.e., whether or not sociocultural changes are taking place among Iranians in Sweden. The results for immigration patterns and demographic data showed that although the number of Iranians in Sweden is steadily increasing among both the first and the second generation, which could promote language maintenance by giving them many opportunities to preserve their language and cultural norms and values, it does not seem to be a great supportive and positive factor in this case. Iranians are scattered around the country looking for work and educational opportunities, except for a concentration in the northwest of Stockholm. This is not a surprising result. There are very few minority groups – the Chinese being an example – who have preserved their language and culture by settling down in small areas in major cities in the host countries around the world. The majority of minority group members are usually drawn to places where economic opportunities exist.

The results for emigration patterns showed that there is a small number of Iranians who emigrate from Sweden to other western countries every year. This may be taken as a sign that Sweden has become the second home country of this minority group. It seems that they have settled down in this country and are on the verge of changing some of their cultural values. For example, their exclusively endogamous marriage pattern is slowly changing and the amount of exogamy is increasing, especially among the younger generation. Also, while marriage may have been the only way of building a nuclear family before, today there are many Iranian men and women who are living
with partners (inside or outside their own cultural background) without a marriage agreement, something that absolutely cannot happen in Iran.

It was mentioned in the literature review that the change from endogamy to exogamy may reduce the chance of language survival (see e.g. Jaakkola 1973; Gal 1979; Clyne 1982; Pauwels 1986; Penfield 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Pütz 1991; Aikio 1992; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Winsa 1999; David & Naji 2000; Al-Khatib 2001; David & Nambiar 2002; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003). It was also maintained that in exogamy situations it is the prestigious language that will usually be chosen as the communication instrument of the family. The high status language is usually the majority language, i.e., Swedish in this case.

The results for socioeconomic data indicated that slightly under half of the parents (47%) are not absorbed by the labor market. The high proportion of unemployment among the parents in this study can be compared to the general unemployment rate among Iranians in Sweden which was about 52% at the time of data collection, and a drastic change has not occurred in this matter since then. The findings on socioeconomic status of the parents showed that 21% of them belong to the working class, while 32% are categorized as middle class. It should, however, be mentioned that the general understanding regarding Iranians who were forced to leave their home country for one reason or the other after the Islamic revolution is that the majority of them belonged to the upper-middle class in Iran. They were highly educated and lived in their own houses in larger cities in Iran (see e.g. Kazemi (ed.) 1986; Kamalkhani 1988; Fathi 1991; Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9; Modarresi 2001). Thus it can be stated that the majority of Iranians in western countries do not have the same standard of living as they once had in Iran. This statement is true for this study, as it was shown that most of the working parents were over-qualified for their jobs. Other studies conducted in Sweden point in the same direction, not only about Iranians but also about other minority groups in Sweden (see e.g. Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9). This leads one to believe that the Swedish labor market is not yet well-equipped to absorb highly educated immigrants.
Chapter 7
Results: Language Socialization

Chapter 7 presents the results research sub-question 2, the extent to which Iranian children in Sweden are being socialized in their first and second languages. The results of the patterns of language socialization; i.e., how language is transferred from one generation to the next, are reported. It explains the primary socialization of the participants in the home domain and their secondary socialization outside the home domain in different settings such as daycare centers, preschools, schools, and after-school recreation centers.

7.1 Primary language socialization in the home domain

Both the SQ and the PQ included questions asking the participants about the language they had acquired first. Table 7.1 gives the results and, as seen, Persian\textsuperscript{25} is the mother tongue of all of the participants.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline
 & Parent & Student \\
Persian & 76 & 98 \\
Persian + Azerbaijani & 11 & 2 \\
Persian + Kurdish & 7 & \\
Persian + Mazandarani & 6 & \\
Total & 100 & 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{First language in \%}
\end{table}

However, in the parent group there are about 11\% who speak Azerbaijani,\textsuperscript{26} 7\% who know Kurdish,\textsuperscript{27} and 6\% who speak Mazandarani,\textsuperscript{28} as well as Per-

\textsuperscript{25}Persian or Farsi is an Indo-European language and is the official standard language in Iran. It is spoken by 51\% of the people (www.ui.se/fakta/asien/iran; Jahani 2004).

\textsuperscript{26}Azerbaijani or Azeri belongs to the Altaic (Turkic) language family. It is the second largest language and is spoken by 24\% of the population of Iran (www.ui.se/fakta/asien/iran; Nercissians 2001:62; Jahani 2004:99; Bani-Shoraka 2005).

\textsuperscript{27}Kurdish, an Indo-European language, belongs to the Iranian language family and is the third largest language, spoken by 7–10\% of the population in Iran (Jahani 2004:99; www.ui.se/fakta/asien/iran;).
This table also shows the strong position of Persian among all the participants. This should be considered a very normal language situation in Iranian families, because inter-group marriages happen quite often in Iran, especially between Persian speakers and Azerbaijanians (see also Nercissians 2001: 62). Jahani (2004: 93f) maintains that many Iranians, especially educated people, belonging to different minority groups also know Persian, both its spoken and written form. This may be considered normal in the diglossic\textsuperscript{29} language situation in Iran with Persian as the official language and the language of education, and minority languages functioning as the means of communication in informal situations\textsuperscript{30} (see e.g. Ferguson 1959, 1964, 2000; Fishman 1967, 2000; Jeremiás 1984; Nercissians 1985, 2001; Kaye 2001; Jahani 2004; Bani-Shoraka 2005).

### 7.2 Language socialization through social institutions

#### 7.2.1 Socialization in daycare centers

Table 7.2 demonstrates that 32\% of the students did not attend daycare or preschool in Sweden. These were the majority of the oldest student participating in this study who came to Sweden at school age. The table also shows that 68\% of them attended daycare and preschool for differing lengths of time ranging from one year, mostly for the older students, to as long as 6 years for some of the students, especially those who were born in Sweden.

Table 7.3 shows that 64\% of the students attended daycare centers where the language of interaction was Swedish, while about 4\% went to daycare centers where both Persian and Swedish were used. These students lived in areas in the northwest of Stockholm where larger groups of Iranians are concentrated. The fact that Swedish is the interaction language of the majority of the daycare centers indicates the strong position of the Swedish language in the children’s lives before they begin school at the age of 6 or 7. The majority of the smaller preschool children (between 2 and 4 years) spend an average of 4 hours per day at the daycare centers, and the older preschool children (5 and 6 year olds) about 6 hours. It goes without saying that the minority children in Sweden are being socialized to a larger extent in Swedish than in their mother tongue in kindergartens during their childhood. The devel-

---

\textsuperscript{28} Mazandarani belongs to the Iranian language family and is spoken by 8\% of the population in northern Iran (Jahani 2004:93; www.ui.se/fakta/asien/iran).

\textsuperscript{29} See Chapter 3, footnote 10 for a definition.

\textsuperscript{30} There are many smaller languages like Armenian (Indo-European), Arabic (Semitic), Turkmenian (Turkic), Assyrian (Semitic), and Balochi (Indo-European). These languages are spoken by about 10\% of the population in Iran (www.ui.se/fakta/asien/iran).
development of their mother tongue is limited to the home domain, which in turn is limited by the influence of Swedish via TV at home (see below).

**Table 7.2. Length of childcare in %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of stay at childcare center</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No childcare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.3. Language of the childcare center in %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No childcare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.4. Language of literacy development in %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Literacy language</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Literacy language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian + Azerbaijani</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian + Kurdish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Socialization in schools

7.2.2.1 Literacy development

The language(s) in which both the parents and students learned to read and write are given in Table 7.4. All the parents learned to read and write in Persian, although about one-fourth of them spoke other languages, as is typical in diglossic situations (see e.g. Ferguson 1959, 1964; Jeremiás 1984; Nercissians 1985, 2001; Jahani 2004). The majority of the students (61%) learned to read and write in Swedish, while only 3% became literate in both their languages. The literacy language of 36% of the students was Persian.
The age of onset (AO) of the students, i.e., their first exposure to Swedish, their grade levels, and their literacy language(s) are crosstabulated in Table 7.5. As seen, the majority of the students who were exposed to Swedish from birth or from very early in life developed literacy in Swedish, whereas the majority of those who came to Sweden later had learned to read and write in Persian whilst in Iran.

### 7.2.2.2 Persian and Swedish in school

As mentioned in the literature review, the most common education program for the immigrant students is the *Swedish class program* in which minority
students attend regular Swedish classes where the language of the interaction and instruction is Swedish or, if needed, Swedish as a second language in a “pull-out” fashion and 2 hours of mother tongue instruction (see Chapter 3 for more information on education of the minority children in Sweden).

All the students in this study at the comprehensive school level were enrolled in the Swedish class program and studied Persian as an extracurricular activity. This means that they all received 2 hours of instruction in Persian per week after school hours and were not pulled out of their regular classes. Some of them also participated in the Tutorial Program (see Chapter 3). During the tutorial sessions, both languages were used.

As for upper-secondary school, 75% studied Persian as a second or third foreign language. The rest studied their mother tongue in the extended program (see Chapter 3). They all had 2 hours of Persian instruction per week, and none participated in the Tutorial Program.

The extent of the use of Persian in school apart from during mother tongue instruction was also examined. This information was crosstabulated with the number of Iranian classmates each student had. The results are given in Table 7.6. As seen, 33% of the students do not have any Iranian classmates, while about half of them (49%) have 1–3, 15% have 4–5, and 3% have 6–10 Iranian classmates. It can also be seen that 22% of the students never use Persian in school although some of them have Iranian classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Persian use</th>
<th>Number of Iranian classmate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6. Frequency of Persian use in school by number of Iranian classmate in %

About half of the students (51%) sometimes use Persian in school, while about 27% use it more often. It can be stated that a very small proportion of the school hours is allocated to formal development of the mother tongue as well as to the informal interaction in Persian between peers and friends. Based on the information given here about the socialization of the students in Swedish and in Persian in school, it is safe to say that although the general aim of the school for bilingual children is to promote their development toward bilingualism with bicultural identity, the school is strongly oriented towards the development of the minority students into monolinguals in Swedish with limited knowledge of their mother tongue.
Chapter 7 Results: Language Socialization

7.2.3 Socialization during after-school hours

The students reported the kind of program they have after school hours and also the language that is used during those hours. The results are demonstrated in Table 7.7. It can be observed that 11% of the students are being socialized in Persian, while 72% are socialized in Swedish and 17% in both languages. As seen, many of the younger students spend their time at an after-school recreation center (Fritidshem) which is arranged by municipalities for school-children up to 12 years to engage them in different activities before and after school hours, during holidays, and when there are teacher seminars (Skolverket 2002a). Many of the older participants spend their time after school with friends or at a sports club. It seems that Swedish is the interaction language in settings such as the after-school recreation centers or sports clubs. However, Swedish is also used when the students are at home or with Persian friends. Thus, it can be concluded that the students are mostly being socialized in Swedish during the time they spend on different activities after school hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Persian and Swedish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In an after-school recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an after-school recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an after-school recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Persian and Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an after-school recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Persian friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Persian and Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Persian and Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7. Language during after-school hours – % of total
7.2.4 Socialization via the mass media

The students reported the extent of their exposure to Persian and Swedish via the media. As for exposure to languages via TV/video, the results are shown in Figure 7.1 and 7.2. It can be observed that 74% of the students watch Swedish programs on TV/video every day. 21% of them stated that they never watch Persian TV/video, while the corresponding figure for Swedish programs is only 1%. 79% of the students reported that they sometimes watch Persian programs on TV/video, while only 5% of them watch Swedish programs occasionally. The above figures indicate that the students’ exposure to Swedish is much greater than to Persian via TV/video. This is not surprising since there are no daily TV programs in Persian. However, there are, as mentioned in the literature review, other ways of increasing the exposure time via TV/video programs in Persian, e.g. the Open Channel, which has about one hour of Persian programs per week and also parabolic antennas that provide opportunities for rich language exposure to those who use them. Some exposure via the Open Channel was reported, but none of the students stated they were exposed to Persian via parabolic antennas.

As to the extent of exposure time via radio, we can see in Figures 7.1 and 7.2 that the students listen to Persian and Swedish programs on the radio almost equally. Slightly less than one-fourth of the students do not listen to the radio at all. About 40% stated that they sometimes listen to the radio in each language. The rest listen to the radio more often. That exposure to Persian via the radio is more popular than via TV/video is not surprising because there are programs transmitted both on the state radio (20 minutes/3 times per week) and the local radio (a few hours every day). Comparing the extent of exposure to Persian via TV/video and radio, and keeping in mind the opportunities of exposure via these means, leads one to realize that if the opportunity exists, the extent of exposure can increase, as is the case for the extent of Persian exposure via radio.

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 also indicate that the students listen to Persian music more than Swedish music. More than one-third (34%) reported that they sometimes listen to Persian music, whereas about half listen to Swedish music occasionally. 57% of the students reported that they listen to Persian music on a more regular basis, while 27% listen to Swedish music regularly. Listing to Persian music is more widespread among the students because of the regular Persian programs on the local radio and also because the parents often listen to it themselves.

As for cinema going, it can be understood from Figures 7.1 and 7.2 that the students see Swedish films much more often than Persian ones. 64% of the students never go to the movies to see Persian films, whereas only 10% do not see Swedish films. 30% of the students stated that they sometimes see Persian films, while 77% see Swedish films occasionally. The ratio of the students who see Persian films more often is 6%, while for Swedish films it
is 13%. The cinema going results should be interpreted based on the fact that Persian films are seldom shown in Sweden.

The students were asked to state the frequency with which they read books (other than schoolbooks) and newspapers in each language. It should be mentioned here that Grade 0 students have very limited literacy skills and are categorized as such. As for the rest of the students, it can be concluded that books in Swedish are read much more often than in Persian. 30% of the
students never read Persian books other than their schoolbooks. The corresponding figure for books in Swedish is only 7%. 44% of the students stated that they sometimes read Persian books, while 35% read Swedish books occasionally. 6% of the students read Persian books more often, whereas this is true of 38% for Swedish books.

Table 7.8. Frequency of exposure to Persian via media in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of exposure</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited literacy skills</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited literacy skills</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding reading newspapers in each language, Figures 7.1 and 7.2 show that the students’ exposure to Swedish via newspapers is also much greater than to Persian. Excluding the Grade 0 students with limited literacy skills, 53% never read Persian newspapers, while the figure for Swedish newspapers is only 3%. The proportion of the students who sometimes read newspapers in Swedish is about 27% and in Persian 24%. 3% of the students read Persian newspapers more often, whereas half of them read Swedish newspapers on a regular basis.
Tables 7.8 and 7.9 show the frequency of the students’ exposure to Persian and Swedish via the mass media by each grade. A general tendency that can be seen in these tables is that the older students expose themselves to Persian via the media to a greater extent than the younger students. This is not a surprising result considering that the older students are more competent in Persian than the younger ones (see also next chapter and Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b).

Table 7.9. Frequency of exposure to Swedish via media in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of exposure</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited literacy skills</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited literacy skills</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.10 shows the differences in the extent of exposure to each language through the mass media. It can be seen that the difference is significant (p < 0.05) in all categories of the media except for exposure via the radio.
The parents also estimated the amount of time their children are exposed to both languages through the media. Figures 7.3 and 7.4 present the results. 67% of them stated that their children never watch Persian programs on TV/video, while only 2% reported the same for Swedish programs. 76% stated that their children watch Swedish TV/video every day, whereas only 1% said the same about Persian programs. These figures indicate that the parents believe that their children watch Swedish much more than Persian TV/video.

The parents’ estimates of the amount of time the students spend listening to the radio did not completely confirm the picture the students themselves had given. The parents reported that their children are exposed to less Persian than Swedish via radio. As Figures 7.3 and 7.4 show, 55% of the parents reported that their children do not listen to Persian programs on the radio, and 44% said the same about Swedish radio. In both cases the proportion is more than twice than what the students had stated. 34% of the parents said that their children sometimes listen to the radio in each language. This was somewhat less than what the students reported. 22% of the parents estimated that their children listen to the Swedish radio more regularly, while 11% reported the same about the Persian radio.

As for music, the parents reported that their children are exposed to more Swedish than Persian music. About one-fourth of them stated that their children do not listen to music at all. About half of the parents (48%) reported that their children sometimes listen to Persian music, whereas more than one-third (38%) said the same regarding Swedish music. 28% of the parents reported that their children listen to Persian music on a more regular basis, whereas the corresponding figure regarding Swedish music is 39%.

The parents believe that their children go to the cinema to see Swedish films much more often than to see Persian films. In fact, 44% stated that their children never see Persian films, while this is true of only about 2%
where Swedish films are concerned. 64% stated that their children sometimes see Swedish films, whereas 49% see Persian films occasionally. Only 7% of the parents reported that their children go to the Persian movies more regularly, while this is true of 34% for Swedish films.

Table 7.11 shows that the parents believe that the differences in the extent of their children’s exposure to mass media in the two languages is significant in the case of TV/video and films at the cinema, but not in the case of radio and
music. Thus, there is a great conformity between the parents and their children regarding the amount of exposure to each language through the media. Similar results about the dominance of the input through the Swedish media, especially via TV, were obtained in other studies conducted in Sweden (see e.g. Boyd 1985; Eriksson 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997).

### 7.3 Socialization via writing in non-school-related situations

The students reported the frequency with which they write in non-school-related situations in each language. Examples of such writing were writing to friends and relatives, writing diaries, shopping-lists, and the like. The results are presented in Tables 7.12 and 7.13. As stated before, Grade 0 students (20%) have limited literacy skills. 32% of the students never write anything in Persian, while this is the case for only 9% in Swedish. The proportion of the students who sometimes write in each language is almost equal (32% and 33% in Persian and Swedish respectively). Writing in Persian is a more regular activity for 16%, whereas this is true for 38% in Swedish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV/video</th>
<th>x²-value (df = 4)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>6.464</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>51.097</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.11. Differences in exposure to Persian and Swedish via media – assessment by parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.12. Students’ frequency of writing in Persian in non-school-related situations – % within grade and total

A general conclusion that can be drawn from Tables 7.12 and 7.13 is that the extent of output in Swedish is much greater than in Persian when it
comes to writing in non-school-related situations. These tables also show that the upper-secondary students write more often in Persian than other groups, whereas this is true for Grade 9 students for Swedish writing. This is not a surprising result considering that the upper-secondary students are more competent in Persian than the younger ones, and that the students in Grade 9 are those with the longest length of residence in Sweden (see Chapter 4, Table 4.4, also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b).

Table 7.13. Students’ frequency of writing in Swedish in non-school-related situations – % within grade and total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited literacy skills</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Socialization in residential areas through network structures

The results of the residential place analyses show that the majority of the participants (76%) live in the northwest of Stockholm and the remainder (24%) come from other areas of the city. The fact that the majority of them are concentrated in the northwest of Stockholm may be due to the facilities and community services that this residential area offers different minority groups. It also provides close-knit community structures which provide frequent opportunities for both the parents and their children to practice their mother tongue. In this regard, the students were asked to state if they have Iranian or Swedish friends. They all reported that they do. They also reported the frequency with which they use Persian and Swedish when they meet their friends and adults both inside and outside school. The results, shown in Table 7.14, indicate that the frequency of Swedish use with friends and adults is greater than the frequency of Persian use in both domains. About one-third of the students meet their Swedish friends every day, whereas the corresponding figure is about one-tenth for Iranian friends. The same is also true about meeting friends outside school. Table 7.14 also shows that the students have greater exposure to Swedish than to Persian through contacts with adults. 36% have contact with adult Swedes on daily
basis, whereas only 13% of them have the opportunity to meet with Iranian adults as frequently as every day.

Table 7.14. Students’ frequency of use of each language with friends and adults in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iranian friends</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian friends outside school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian adults outside school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish friends</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish friends outside school</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish adults outside school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.15. Students’ frequency of use of each language with friends and adults in % – as perceived by parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iranian friends</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian friends outside school</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian adults outside school</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish friends outside school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish adults outside school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parents’ view of the ethnic orientation of the students towards Swedish is much stronger than that of the students themselves. This is shown in Table 7.15. 97% of the parents believe that their children use Swedish with their Swedish friends as often as every day, while this is true of 21% where Iranian friends are concerned. The same tendency is also seen in contacts with adults outside the school domain. 85% of them think that their children have the opportunity to meet with Swedish adults every day, as opposed to only 1% who have contact with Iranian adults. The results reported by the students and their parents indicate that the ethnic orientation of the students is much more towards Swedish than towards Persian.

The parents also reported about the frequency with which their children participate in activities in each language. The results are demonstrated in Table 7.16. 78% of them stated that their children are not engaged in any kind of activity with Persian as the interaction language, whereas the corres-
ponding figure regarding Swedish is 47%. 15% of the parents said that their children sometimes take part in activities using Persian, while slightly above one-fourth (26%) reported occasional Swedish activities for their children. 27% of the parents estimated that their children regularly participate in activities in Swedish, while 7% reported the same about Persian activities.

The parents were asked to state if they themselves have Iranian or Swedish friends and if so how often they meet. The results are shown in Table 7.17. The general impression of this table is that the parents have a strong, but not exclusive, ethnic orientation towards their own minority group. As seen, only 1% do not have Iranian friends. 47% of them sometimes see their Iranian friends, whereas 52% see them more often. The table also shows that 43% do not have any Swedish friends and 42% meet their Swedish friends occasionally, while 15% see them more regularly.

The parents also reported if they meet their Iranian/Swedish friends together with their child (the student participant in this study). The results are
given in Table 7.18. The children participate in the parents’ gatherings with their Iranian friends more often than the Swedish ones. This is not surprising because the majority of the parents stated that their Swedish friends are usually their colleagues and their meetings are usually work related.

Based on the results presented in Tables 7.12 through 7.18, it is safe to assert that the first generation of Iranians have more contact with their own minority group, while the second generation is more oriented towards the majority population.

7.4.1 Socialization via participation in family gatherings and traditional festivals

The students were asked to report if they participate in family gatherings and traditional festivals. All of the students stated that they do. The residential concentration of Iranians in northwest Stockholm has made it possible for them to practice some of their cultural traditions and norms in order to maintain their cultural identity, and pass it on to their children, but there are adaptations to the Swedish culture as well. For example, they usually celebrate Swedish Christmas and New Years Eve, as well as Persian New Year which occurs at the beginning of the spring. There are also other ceremonies in connection with the Persian New Year that are celebrated by Iranians living in these areas. These traditional festivals attract a few hundred Iranians each year. Children also participate in these ceremonies, and they seem to be drawn to these festivals more and more each year. These traditions are rooted in the historical background of Iranians from a few thousand years ago when they were Zoroastrians and not Muslims. Celebrating these old Persian traditions has a very specific cultural value for Iranian people living in exile. It seems that keeping these traditions alive in exile is a way of protesting against the present situation in Iran, and demonstrating that they are forced to live outside their country of origin.

7.5 Visits to the home country

Participants reported the frequency with which they travel to Iran and also their length of stay. The results are given in Tables 7.19 and 7.20. It seems that a little less than half of the students (46%) do not visit their home country at all. 43% travel to Iran occasionally, whereas 11% take a trip to their country of origin once a year. The length of stay for those who have this opportunity fluctuates from less than one month (6%) to less than three months (48%). As for the parents, it was found that 46% of them do not travel to Iran at all, while 47% occasionally do, and 7% regularly visit their home country each year. The length of stay for the visiting parents is again
from less than one month (16%) to less than three months (38%). The majority of those parents who usually visit Iran stated that they take their child (participating student in the present study) with them on these occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.19. Frequency of visits to Iran in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.20. Length of visits in Iran in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of the visits to the home country was emphasized during the interviews by the majority of the students even by those who did not have the possibility to travel to Iran. Some of the students who traveled to their country of origin reported situations where the need for improving their language skills was strongly felt. For example, the younger students explained that they needed to develop their vocabulary in domains such as the playground, reading street signs, fruit and animal names, and the like. They also reported the need to develop their reading and writing skills in order to be able to correspond with their relatives, especially those in their own age groups. The same type of need was also reported by the older students. The difference was that their need was much greater and the situations they named exactly suited their age, e.g. idioms used in relationships.

7.6 Summary

This chapter has tried to answer the second sub-question of the present study; i.e., the extent to which Iranian children in Sweden are being socialized in their L1 and L2. The general impression of the results is that they are being socialized to a far greater extent in Swedish than in Persian.

The students’ socialization in Swedish begins as soon as children are left in the care of society. The results show that the majority of children who attend daycare centers are being socialized in Swedish because that is the language of these institutions. This is also true of the school. The majority of the students develop their reading and writing skills in Swedish. The students receive about 2 hours of mother tongue instruction per week, at which
time they also develop their literacy skills in Persian. Except for the mother

tongue instruction hours and sporadic interaction in Persian with their Ira-
nian peers and friends, children grow up in a very strong Swedish environ-
ment, in schools where the language of both instruction and interaction is
Swedish. Swedish is also the dominant language for those who are engaged
in various after-school activities.

The results also show that children are being socialized to a greater extent
in Swedish than in Persian due to extreme exposure to Swedish through the
mass media, especially via TV/video and cinema. In this situation it is not
surprising that they also read (books and newspapers) and write more often
in Swedish than in Persian, even in non-school-related situations.

The results of exposure to Swedish and Persian through network struc-
tures in residential areas also point to the fact that Iranian children are
strongly inter-ethnically oriented, whereas their parents have a more intra-
ethnic orientation.

The results for visits to the home country show that about half of the par-
ticipants are able to travel to Iran, and the majority stay more than one
month. The majority of the students are very much aware of the importance
of these visits because of the beneficial effects these trips have on their Per-
sian, both oral and written (see also Boyd 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995;
Mukherjee 2003).
Chapter 8
Results: Language Competence

Chapter 8 presents the results of the data analyses based on research sub-question 3, namely the extent of competence of Iranians in their L1 and L2. It consists of describing features of three language dimensions: language repertoire, language dominance, and language proficiency. The language proficiency dimension is concerned with four types of skills in each language, namely understanding, speaking, reading, and writing. The three language dimensions jointly describe the language competence of the participants, or the degree of their bilingualism, as perceived by themselves and in the case of the students, also as perceived by their parents.

8.1 Language repertoire
The results for the complete language repertoire of the participants are shown in Table 8.1. Persian is ranked as the first acquired language by all of the participants, but as mentioned before, 24% of the parents also speak other languages such as Azerbaijani (11%), Kurdish (7%), and Mazandaran (6%). It shows that Swedish is the second language of all of the participants. It can also be seen that 34% of the students (all in Grade 0 and some in Grade 3) had not yet begun learning English at the time of data collection, whereas 66% of them had learned it as their foreign language in Sweden. The parents had learned English in Iran as their foreign language at school or university. We can also see that 36% of the students (Grades 6 and up) have reported that in addition to their usual three languages (Persian, Swedish, and English), they also know a fourth language shown here under the category of “Others.” This is commonly French but may also be German or Spanish. These languages are learned in school as a foreign language. However, their knowledge of these languages is reported to be limited. 2% of the students also said that they even know Azerbaijani to a limited extent; i.e., only 2% of the students (in the case of Azerbaijani) have been socialized in both languages of their parents. This is not surprising given the diglossic situation in Iran with Persian as the official language with higher status (See Chapter 7, Section 7.1). Iranian children in Sweden often acquire Persian as their first language. However, there are parents who succeed in passing on their own
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minority language to their children. This has, of course, a better chance of success when both parents speak the same minority language (see also Jeremiás 1984; Nercissians 1985, 2001; Jahani 2004; Bani-Shoraka 2005). Jahani (ibid: 93ff) maintains that there are indications of language shift to Persian among many educated Iranians in Sweden who belong to different linguistic minorities. She argues that this is a result of the language policy in Iran during the Pahlavi dynasty (1925–1979).

Table 8.1. Participants’ language repertoire in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English + Others</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English + Others</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian + Azerbaijani</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English + Others</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian + Kurdish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English + Others</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian + Mazandarani</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English + Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 8.1. Students’ most advanced language in %](image)

8.2 The most advanced language

The results of the most advanced language of the students, as they themselves perceive it are demonstrated in Figure 8.1. The students have a very strong opinion about their most developed language. 77% feel that Swedish is their most advanced language. 77% feel that Swedish is their most advanced language. Only 17% think they are more competent in Persian. These are mostly upper-secondary school students. 6% believe that
they are equally competent in both their languages. Again, the majority of these are upper-secondary school students.

Table 8.2. Differences in evaluation of language dominance between grade levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>x²-value (df = 1)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>2.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 &amp; 10–12</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>1.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>6.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.2. Students’ most advanced language in % – as perceived by parents

The differences in language dominance between grade levels are shown in Table 8.2. There is a significant difference (p < 0.05) in the case of the Swedish dominance and the equal dominance in both languages between Grades 9 and 10–12. Based on these results, it can be concluded that the upper-secondary school students are more advanced in Persian, whereas Swedish has that position among the students at all other grade levels (see also Namei 2002). The finding that points to a greater dominance in the second language among the second generation Iranians is in agreement with other studies of
Figure 8.2 shows the results of the most advanced language of the students as perceived by their parents. There is strong consistency between the two groups about the total results. 68% of the parents reported that Swedish was their child’s most advanced language. 17% of them think that their children are more competent in Persian, especially among the upper-secondary school students. However, 15% of the parents believe that their children are equally advanced in Persian and Swedish, especially Grade 0 students, but surprisingly this is not the case for the upper-secondary school students. This may be due to the parents’ higher expectations of the older students than the younger ones. The higher estimate of the Persian knowledge of the youngest students may mirror the parents’ appreciation of the fact that these children are learning their mother tongue against all odds, keeping in mind that 17 of them were born in Sweden and their language socialization is strongly Swedish oriented.

Table 8.3 shows the differences in evaluation of the language dominance between the parents and students. There is a significant difference between the two groups (p < 0.05) in all three cases, i.e., in evaluation of the Swedish or Persian dominance or the equal fluency in both languages, whereas the total difference is not significant. Based on the above-presented results of the language dominance of the students, it is safe to maintain that the students in upper-secondary school are more competent in Persian than the other groups, and that the comprehensive school students are more competent in Swedish.

The parents also rated their own language knowledge, ranking the most advanced language first and the least advanced last. Figure 8.3 shows the results, and as seen their Swedish knowledge is crosstabulated with their age of onset, i.e., their age of first exposure to Swedish grouped in four categories: up to 20, 21–30, 31–40, and 41–50 years. This crosstabulation was to find out whether or not there were any differences in the self-evaluation language knowledge with respect to their age of the exposure to Swedish. Many studies show that the age of first exposure to the second language influences the level of attainment (see e.g. Ellis 1997; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson
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2003; Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam 2004 for a literature review and a discussion about the Critical Period Hypothesis). It seems that second language learners who begin their language learning as adults are not able to achieve a native speaker competence in different aspects of the second language such as grammar or pronunciation.

The results show that Persian is ranked as the most advanced language by all the parents. The results on second and third most advanced language in terms of age of onset are interesting. Those who were first exposed to Swedish before the age of 20 have ranked Swedish as their second most advanced language and English as their third, while this is true of 82% of the second age of onset group, 79% of the third, and 75% of the fourth. The total results indicate that 15% put English as their second most advanced language, whereas 3% rank both Swedish and English in second position.

8.3 Perceived language proficiency

This section presents the linguistic knowledge (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills) of the participants in both Persian and Swedish based on their self-assessments, and their parents’ assessment in the case of the students’ skills in Persian. The order of presentation is that the language proficiency of the students is presented first followed by the parents’ results.
8.3.1 Understanding skills in Persian and Swedish

8.3.1.1 Students
The students evaluated how well they understand Persian. The results are shown in Figure 8.4. 97% of the students believe that they understand Persian better than average, while 3% think that their Persian understanding is average. The students in Grade 9 and upper-secondary school have the highest Persian understanding skills.

![Figure 8.4. Students’ understanding skills in Persian in %](image)

The students estimated their understanding of Swedish as being higher than that of their Persian. Figure 8.5 shows that 72% of them understand

![Figure 8.5. Students’ understanding skills in Swedish in %](image)
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Swedish very well and 28% understand it well. 90% in Grades 3 and 9 understand their L2 very well, whereas this is true of 50% of those in Grade 0, 75% in Grade 6, and 55% in Grades 10–12. These results are not surprising keeping in mind variables such as the students’ age of first exposure to Swedish and their length of residence in Sweden. Other studies conducted in Sweden and elsewhere found similar results (see e.g. Jahani 2004). A chi-square test analysis revealed significant difference between the students’ understanding skills in Persian and Swedish (p = 0.000, df = 12 and Pearson chi-square value = 33.105).

The parents assessed their children’s ability to understand Persian lower than the students’ own evaluation. The results are shown in Figure 8.6. 79% of the parents think that their children understand Persian better than average. The students in the upper-secondary school make up the largest proportion, and the preschoolers the smallest. 22% of them believe that their children understand Persian at the average level. However, 7% of them evaluated their children’s understanding skills in Persian to be below average. The chi-square test showed a significant difference between the parents and students (p = 0.000, df = 4 and Pearson chi-square value = 24.614).

Based on the results presented in Figures 8.4–8.6, it can be concluded that the students assess their understanding of Persian as being lower than that of Swedish. Those who understand their first language very well are mostly the students in Grades 9 and up. The parents assess their children’s understanding of Persian as being lower than the students’ evaluations.
8.3.1.2 Parents

The parents also evaluated their own ability to understand Persian and Swedish. These results are presented in Figure 8.7. All of the parents understand Persian very well. As for their Swedish understanding, 15% stated that they understand it very well, while 80% of them understand it average or well. However, 5% feel that their understanding of Swedish is poor or very poor. Similar results were found in a study by Jahani (2004: 101).

An interesting point to note is that those parents who have been exposed to Swedish before the age of 20 rank their understanding higher than the rest, while of those with the latest age of onset 8% are the only ones in the study who feel that their Swedish understanding is very poor and none of them think that they understand Swedish very well.

8.3.2 Speaking skills in Persian and Swedish

8.3.2.1 Students

The students assessed their speaking skills in Persian, and the results are given in Figure 8.8. 65% of the students speak Persian better than average, while 31% speak it at an average level and 4% (only in Grades 9 and up) feel that they speak their mother tongue at a less than average level. Most of the students in the upper-secondary school speak their first language very well, while the majority of Grades 9 and 6 speak it well. Many of the preschoolers believe that they are average speakers of Persian, while the majority of Grade 3 students speak it better than average.
The students assessed their ability to speak Swedish higher than that of Persian. The results are shown in Figure 8.9. 92% of them believe that they speak Swedish better than average, whereas 8% speak it at an average level. Most of the students in Grades 6 and 9 speak their second language very well, while the majority of those in Grades 0 and 3 and in upper-secondary school are among those who speak Swedish well. The chi-square test revealed significant difference between the students’ speaking skills in Persian and Swedish ($p = 0.000$, $df = 3$ and Pearson chi-square value = 28.727). The results of the students’ higher speaking abilities in the L2 than the L1 sup-
port other studies of Iranian students in Sweden (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; Jahani 2004).

The results are also in accordance with studies of other minority groups in Sweden (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). For example, Sohrabi (1997) studied language maintenance of two Iranian teenage groups. The first group included 10 students who were born in Sweden or who were not older than 6 at their time of arrival to Sweden. The second group also included 10 students who were born in Iran and had moved to Sweden after the age of 10. This study showed that 70% of the second group considered their Persian

The results are also in accordance with studies of other minority groups in Sweden (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). For example, Sohrabi (1997) studied language maintenance of two Iranian teenage groups. The first group included 10 students who were born in Sweden or who were not older than 6 at their time of arrival to Sweden. The second group also included 10 students who were born in Iran and had moved to Sweden after the age of 10. This study showed that 70% of the second group considered their Persian
speaking abilities much better than, slightly better than, or as good as their Swedish speaking abilities. The corresponding figure for the first group was 40%, although some of them were born in Sweden or had moved to Sweden in their early childhood.

The parents in the present study evaluated the students’ competence in speaking Persian not so differently from the students themselves. The results are presented in Figure 8.10. 65% of the parents indicated that their children speak their first language better than average, while 27% rated their children as average speakers of Persian. However, 8% of the parents believed that the speaking abilities of their children, especially the oldest ones, are poor. According to the parents, the upper-secondary school students are the most skillful speakers of Persian. The chi-square test confirmed that there was no significant difference between the parents and students (p = 0.177, df = 4 and Pearson chi-square value = 6.305).

Based on the results presented in Figures 8.8–8.10, it can be concluded that the students have a higher speaking competence in Swedish than Persian. The most competent speakers of Swedish are Grade 9 students, while the upper-secondary students are the most competent Persian speakers.

8.3.2.2 Parents
The parents estimated their own speaking skills in Persian and Swedish. Their Swedish skills are again crosstabulated with their age of first exposure to Swedish divided into the aforementioned four major categories. The results are given in Figure 8.11, which shows that speaking skills of the parents in Persian are of course much higher than those of in Swedish. Similar results were found by Jahani (2004: 101). All of the parents think that they speak Persian very well, while the corresponding figure is only 2% for Swedish. The majority (78%) of those who came to Sweden before the age of 20 estimated that they speak Swedish well. This is also the case for 56% of the second age of onset group (21–30 years). The majority of those who were first exposed to Swedish after the age of 30 years feel that they are average speakers of Swedish. Very poor speaking skills can be found only among those with the latest age of onset (8%).

8.3.3 Reading skills in Persian and Swedish

8.3.3.1 Students
The students assessed their reading abilities in Persian lower than their speaking or comprehension skills in their mother tongue. This is not surprising considering the extent of formal instruction which the students receive in the mother tongue or the overall extent of their socialization. The results are presented in Figure 8.12. 27% of them believe that their reading skills in Persian are above average. About half of them (45%) are average readers
and 12% are poor or very poor readers in Persian. 16% have limited literacy skills in Persian. These are all the students in Grade 0. Most of the students in Grades 3 and 6 are average readers in Persian. Among the very good readers we only find some students in Grades 9 and up.

The students believe that they read much better in Swedish than in Persian. The results are shown in Figure 8.13. 81% of the students believe that their reading skills in Swedish are above average, while 3% are average readers and 16% of them, all in Grade 0, have limited literacy skills. The best Swedish readers are among those in Grade 9 (85%). Half of the students in Grade 6 and upper-secondary school read very well in Swedish. The chi-square test revealed significant difference between the students’ reading skills in Persian and Swedish ($p = 0.000$, $df = 5$ and Pearson chi-square value = 84.129). The fact that the students assessed their reading skills in Swedish higher than those in Persian should be expected if we take into consideration the extent of schooling they have in their second language. Similar results were also found in the study by Jahani (2004: 102).

The parents’ assessments of their children’s abilities in reading Persian did not significantly differ from those of the students. The results are demonstrated in Figure 8.14. 24% of them indicated that their children read Persian better than average. About half of them (45%) estimated that their children are average readers in Persian, while 20% thought that their children’s reading skills in Persian are below average.

The main difference between the parents and students lies in the evaluation of the reading abilities of the students in Grade 0. 11% of the parents...
rated these students as having limited reading skills as opposed to 16% rated by the students themselves. According to the parents, most of the very good readers are among the upper-secondary school students, those who read well are in Grade 9, and those who read at an average level are in Grades 3 and 6.

The chi-square test confirmed that there was no significant difference between the parents and students \((p = 0.416, \text{df} = 5 \text{ and Pearson chi-square value } = 4.998)\). Based on the analyses presented in Figures 8.12–8.14, it can
be concluded that the students assessed their reading competence in Persian to be much lower than that in Swedish. Those who read best in Swedish are in Grade 9 and the most skillful Persian readers are in Grades 9 and up.

![Graph](image_url)

**Figure 8.15.** Parents’ reading skills in Persian in %

The parents also estimated their reading skills in Persian and Swedish. The Persian results are given in Figure 8.15 and the Swedish ones in Figure 8.16. They rated their reading skills in Persian much higher than in Swedish. Their reading skills are crosstabulated with other variables in order to better ex-
plain the findings. In the case of reading skills in Persian, the results are crosstabulated with their levels of education and, in the case of Swedish, with the four categories within the age of onset. As seen, 97% of them believe that their reading skills in Persian are above average, whereas 3% are average readers. The majority of very good readers are university graduates, while the education level of the majority of average readers is lower than secondary school.

The results of the parents’ estimations of their reading skills in Swedish show that 59% of them read Swedish better than average. 34% are average readers and 7% have poor reading skills in Swedish. Those with an earlier age of first exposure to Swedish are more skillful at reading Swedish than those who are exposed to it later in life. The fact that the parents are more skillful in reading Persian than Swedish is not surprising. Similar results have been found in other studies conducted in Sweden about Iranians and adults belonging to other minority groups (see e.g. Jahani 2004: 101).

8.3.4 Writing skills in Persian and Swedish

8.3.4.1 Students

The students rated their writing skills lower than their reading abilities in Persian. The results are shown in Figure 8.17. About one-fifth (21%) think that they write better than average, while about half (48%) of them are average writers of Persian. 14% have poor writing skills, and 17%, only in Grade 0, have limited literacy skills in Persian. It seems that very good writers of Persian are found among the students in Grades 6 and up, with the upper-secondary school students making up the largest portion. Most of the students in Grade 3 are average writers of Persian. The results indicating higher reading than writing skills in the mother tongue are not surprising taking into account the extent of the students’ written production in Persian compared to their reading production, and they are in agreement with other studies conducted in Sweden examining the same and other minority groups (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Jahani 2004).

The students rated their writing skills in Swedish much higher. The results are presented in Figure 8.18. 73% of them believe that their writing is above average, whereas 10% are average writers of Swedish. 17%, only in Grade 0, have limited literacy skills in their second language. The most competent Swedish writers are in Grade 9. Most of the students in Grade 3 write well, followed by those in Grade 6 and upper-secondary school. The chi-square test revealed a significant difference between the students’ writing skills in Persian and Swedish (p = 0.000, df = 5 and Pearson chi-square value = 68.757). The results pointing to higher writing skills in Swedish than the mother tongue correspond very well with the results of other studies (see e.g. Jahani 2004: 102). This is likely to be the result of the greater extent of
written production in their second language (see also Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995).

The parents also evaluated the students’ writing proficiency in Persian. The results are illustrated in Figure 8.19. 25% reported that their children write above average and 43% believe that they are average Persian writers. 21% think their children have poor skills in writing in Persian, and 11%, only in Grade 0, have limited skills. According to the parents, the upper-secondary students are the most skillful writers. Those who write well are a
few students at each grade level. The students in Grades 3 and 9 are the most average writers in Persian. The chi-square test revealed that there was no significant difference between the parents and students (p = 0.667, df = 5 and Pearson chi-square value = 3.212). Based on the analyses presented above, it can be concluded that the students assess their writing skills in Swedish to be higher than in Persian. Those who write best in Swedish are the students in Grade 9. It can also be stated that about one-fifth of the students write better than average in Persian. Those who write best in Persian are the students in upper-secondary school.

8.3.4.2 Parents

The parents also evaluated their writing skills in Persian. The results, which are crosstabulated with their education levels, are given in Figure 8.20. It was found that their writing skills were much higher in Persian than in Swedish (see also Jahani 2004: 101 for similar results). 89% rated their writing abilities in Persian to be better than average, whereas 11% write at an average level. The majority of very good writers are university graduates, while the education level of the majority of the average writers is less than secondary school which was also the case for reading skills in the mother tongue.

Figure 8.21 shows the results of the parents’ estimations of their writing skills in Swedish. These results are crosstabulated with the four categories within the age of onset. Slightly under half of them (48%) believe that they write better than average Swedish, while 41% are average writers. 11% write poorly in Swedish. As in the case of reading, those with an earlier age of first
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exposure to Swedish input have better writing skills than those exposed to the language later in life.

![Figure 8.20. Parents’ writing skills in Persian in %](image)

**Figure 8.20.** Parents’ writing skills in Persian in %

![Figure 8.21. Parents’ writing skills in Swedish in %](image)

**Figure 8.21.** Parents’ writing skills in Swedish in %

### 8.4 Summary

In this chapter an attempt was made to answer the third sub-question, namely the degree of language proficiency of Iranians in Sweden. This question treated three aspects of language competence: language repertoire, language
dominance, and language proficiency. The results of both the student and parent groups were presented.

The results for language repertoire showed that Persian was the first language of all participants, at the same time as 24% of the parents also had other mother tongues such as Azerbaijani, Kurdish, and Mazandarani (see also Chapter 7, Table 7.1). It was also demonstrated that Swedish was the second language of all of the participants and English their first foreign lan-

Figure 8.22. Students’ language proficiency in Persian in %

Figure 8.23. Students’ language proficiency in Swedish in %

The results for language repertoire showed that Persian was the first language of all participants, at the same time as 24% of the parents also had other mother tongues such as Azerbaijani, Kurdish, and Mazandarani (see also Chapter 7, Table 7.1). It was also demonstrated that Swedish was the second language of all of the participants and English their first foreign lan-
language, except for all of the students in Grade 0 and some of the Grade 3 students who had not yet begun learning English at school. Some of the participants maintained that they also knew other languages such as French, German, or Spanish, but to a limited extent.

![Figure 8.24. Parents’ language proficiency in Persian in %](image1)

![Figure 8.25. Parents’ language proficiency in Swedish in %](image2)

The results indicated that the most dominant language of the parents was Persian, whereas the students were more dominant in Swedish. Those parents who had been exposed to Swedish earlier in life reported that their
second most dominant language was Swedish, while the latecomers stated that English held that position. It was also shown that the upper-secondary school students were the most competent in Persian, while Swedish was the most advanced language of the students in comprehensive school. These results are consistent with other studies of language proficiency of Iranian students in Sweden (see e.g. Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Jahani 2004) and other minority groups who are learning their mother tongue under the same conditions as Iranian children in Sweden (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995) and also with the results of other studies conducted in other host countries (see e.g. David et al. 2003).

Where the linguistic knowledge (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills) is concerned, the results indicated that the linguistic abilities of the students were lower in Persian than in Swedish. Their total proficiency results in both languages are shown in Figures 8.22 and 8.23. We can see in Figure 8.22 that the students are more advanced in understanding and speaking skills (oral proficiency) in Persian than in reading and writing (written proficiency) in the same language. Figure 8.23 shows that the majority of the students have a high degree of both oral and written proficiency in Swedish (see also Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997; Al-Khatib 2001; David et al. 2003; Jahani 2004 for similar results).

The results for the parents are shown in Figures 8.24 and 8.25. We can see in Figure 8.24 that Persian is a full-fledged language for the parents. Figure 8.25 shows that about half of them also understand, speak, read, and write Swedish better than average.

Table 8.4. Total differences between parents and students in proficiency skills in Persian and Swedish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>$x^2$-value (df = 2)</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>$x^2$-value (df = 3)</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.749</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>139.489</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>$x^2$-value (df = 4)</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>$x^2$-value (df = 4)</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.515</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>64.776</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4 shows the differences between the linguistic skills of the parents (representing the first generation of Iranians in Sweden) and those of the students (representing the second generation). As seen, the two groups differ significantly in their language skills. However, the high degree of the parents’ competence in Swedish (Figure 8.25) may indicate the extent of their ambition to master their second language in order to succeed in Sweden.
Chapter 9
Results: Language-Use Patterns

Chapter 9 presents the results of the data analyses based on research sub-question 4, namely the language(s) that Iranians in Sweden choose in different domains. It describes language-use patterns in the home domain in different interactions such as parent–child (i.e., parent–the student participant in this study), child–parent, child–younger sibling(s), and child–older sibling(s). It also presents the language-use patterns outside the home domain in settings such as inside and outside the school domain. These patterns are through interactions such as between student–Iranian peers and student–Persian teacher (inside school domain), student–Iranian friends, and in family gatherings and traditional festivals (outside the school domain).

It was mentioned in Chapter 4 that the number of parents who returned the questionnaire was 88, including 22 fathers and 66 mothers. All of the calculations concerning the parents are based on 88 persons and are given in percent in order to be able to compare the results of the mothers and fathers. As for the students, some did not have siblings, fathers, or Iranians friends, and so on. In all of these cases the same procedure used for the parents is followed (see also Chapter 5 for analysis procedures).

9.1 Language-use patterns in the home domain

9.1.1 Parent–child language-use patterns

The parents reported the language they use when speaking to their children. Table 9.1 demonstrates the languages that fathers use when they speak with their children, as perceived by the fathers themselves. 59% of them believe that they only use Persian in communicating with their children, whereas 41% use some Swedish. It is interesting to note that they use more Swedish

---

31 This chapter was first published as an article titled Language Choice Among Iranians in Sweden, in: Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 2008, Vol. 29, No. 5, 419-437, ISSN: 0143-4632.
with the younger children and less with the older ones. This table also gives the mean values within each grade and totally.

**Table 9.1.** Father–child language-use patterns – as perceived by fathers – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.2.** Mother–child language-use patterns – as perceived by mothers – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.3.** Father–child language-use patterns – as perceived by student – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.4.** Mother–child language-use patterns – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2 shows the languages that mothers use when they speak with their children, as perceived by the mothers themselves. 33% of them think that Persian is their only means of communication with their children, while 67% use some Swedish in these conversations. It can be seen that mothers do not only
use Swedish in their interactions with the younger children but also with the older ones. However, the extent of the Swedish use is greater in interaction with the youngest children, as was the case for the fathers. The table also shows the mean values within each grade level and totally. These results are also illustrated in Figure 9.1, which is based on the mean values of language-use patterns of each parent with their children as perceived by the parents themselves. Generally speaking, this figure shows that mothers use more Swedish in their conversations with their children than fathers do. However, both parents use more Swedish with their younger children than the older ones.

![Figure 9.1. Parent–child language-use patterns – as perceived by parents](image)

![Figure 9.2. Parent–child language-use patterns – as perceived by students](image)

Tables 9.3 and 9.4 show the students' assessments about the language their parents use when they speak with them. They too think that their mothers use more Swedish with them than their fathers and that both parents use more Swedish with the younger children than with the older ones. These results are also demonstrated in Figure 9.2 which is based on the mean values of language-use patterns of each parent with their children as perceived by the students. The chi-square tests revealed that there was no significant difference between the evaluation of the fathers and those of their children (p
= 0.637, df = 3 and Pearson chi-square value = 1.699), or between mothers and their children (p = 0.792, df = 2 and Pearson chi-square value = 0.466).

To summarize, it is safe to maintain that Persian is the main instrument of communication in parent–child interactions. However, Swedish is also used, although to a limited extent, and it is used more by mothers than by fathers and to a greater extent when the parents speak to their younger children than to their older ones. The results of the present study are in line with the findings of other studies of language-use patterns of Iranians at home (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; Jahani 2004). These results are also in agreement with other studies that show the leading role of women in language shift (see e.g. Gal 1979; Penfield 1987; Aikio 1992; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003).

9.1.2 Child–parent language-use patterns

The students reported the languages they use when speaking to their parents. Table 9.5 shows the results for the language-use patterns with their mothers, and also the mean values within each grade and totally. 37% of them use only Persian in these conversations, while 63% use some Swedish. This table also demonstrates that the tendency of using Swedish with mothers is stronger among the younger students than the older ones. Some of the students in Grade 9 have the strongest tendency to use both languages.

Table 9.6 shows the students’ patterns of language use with their fathers and the mean values within each grade and totally. This table indicates that 45% of the students use only Persian in these interactions, while 65% of them use some Swedish. Comparing Tables 9.5 and 9.6 shows that the tendency to use some Swedish is stronger with mothers than with fathers, and the younger the students the stronger the tendency. This is also shown in Figure 9.3. The students in Grades 0 and 3 use more Swedish in their conversations with both their parents than the students at other grade levels.

The parents also reported the languages their children use in child–parent interactions. Table 9.7 presents the child–mother language-use patterns, as perceived by the mothers, and also shows the mean values within each grade level and totally. 39% of them believe that their children use only Persian when talking to them, whereas the remaining 61% think that their children use some Swedish in these interactions. This shows that the tendency of using Swedish in interactions with mothers is stronger among the comprehensive school students. Some of the students in Grade 0 have the strongest tendency to use Swedish in their conversations with their mothers.

Table 9.8 shows the patterns of language use in child–father interactions, as perceived by fathers, and also gives the mean values within each grade and totally. This table indicates that half of the students use only Persian when they speak to their fathers and the other half use some Swedish. A comparison between Tables 9.7 and 9.8 shows that fathers believe that their
children have a greater propensity to use Swedish with them than with their mothers, and the younger the students the stronger the tendency. This is also shown in Figure 9.4. The parents believe that the students in Grades 0 and 3 use more Swedish in their conversations with them than any other group.

**Table 9.5.** Child–mother language-use patterns – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.6.** Child–father language-use patterns – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.7.** Child–mother language-use patterns – as perceived by mothers – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.8.** Child–father language-use patterns – as perceived by fathers – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The chi-square tests revealed a significant difference between the evaluations of fathers and those of their children \((p = 0.046, \text{ df} = 3 \text{ and Pearson chi-square value} = 7.983)\). However, mothers did not differ significantly from their children \((p = 0.345, \text{ df} = 3 \text{ and Pearson chi-square value} = 3.319)\).

![Figure 9.3. Child–parent language-use patterns – as perceived by students](image)

![Figure 9.4. Child–parent language-use patterns – as perceived by parents](image)

The results presented in Tables 9.5 to 9.8 point to a general understanding that about 40% of the children use only Persian when speaking to their parents, while about 60% of them use some Swedish, and that this tendency is stronger among the younger children than the older ones. It can be stated that Persian is the main instrument of communication used by the children in interactions with their parents. Swedish is used to a larger extent in child–parent than in parent–child conversations and it is used more by the younger students than by the older ones. Similar results have been found in other studies (see e.g. Govindasamy 2003; Jahani 2004).
9.1.3 Child–older sibling language-use patterns

The students reported the language they use when speaking to their older siblings. As mentioned before, those students who reported not having older siblings (33%) are omitted from these calculations. Table 9.9 shows the results, which indicate that only 9% of the students use Persian exclusively in interactions with their older siblings. These are only the older students (Grades 9 and up), while 91% use some Swedish. The tendency of using mostly or only Swedish is stronger among the younger students (Grades 0 and 3). In fact, the extent of using Swedish is greatest among the students in Grade 3. The students in upper-secondary school do not show this tendency at all; nonetheless they do use some Swedish with their older siblings, as do some of the students in Grades 6 and 9. Table 9.9 also gives the mean values of language-use patterns in child–older sibling interactions.

Table 9.9. Child–older sibling language-use patterns – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Only Persian</th>
<th>Mostly Persian</th>
<th>Persian and Swedish</th>
<th>Mostly Swedish</th>
<th>Only Swedish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parents also reported what language their children use when speaking with older siblings. Table 9.10 presents the results showing that 30% of them believe that their children use only Persian in their interactions with their older siblings, whereas 70% of them think that they use some Swedish in these interactions. The parents also indicated that the children in upper-secondary school use much less Swedish than the other age groups. Children in Grade 3 show the strongest tendency to use Swedish in both the children’s and the parents’ reports.

Table 9.10. Child–older sibling language-use patterns – as perceived by parents – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Only Persian</th>
<th>Mostly Persian</th>
<th>Persian and Swedish</th>
<th>Mostly Swedish</th>
<th>Only Swedish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.1.4 Child–younger sibling language-use patterns
The students reported the languages they use in conversations with their younger siblings. It should be mentioned again that the 30% of them who do not have younger siblings are omitted from these calculations. Table 9.11 shows the results, which indicate that just 7% of the children use only Persian in interactions with their younger siblings. These are some of the oldest children (Grades 9–12) and surprisingly also a few of the youngest ones (Grade 0). However, 93% of those at all grade levels use Swedish in varying degrees. Table 9.11 also presents the mean values in these conversations. The average of those in Grades 0, 3, and 9 shows that they use both their languages equally frequently, with Grade 6 and upper-secondary school students following them closely.

The parents believe that their children use more Persian with their younger siblings than is reported by the children themselves. Table 9.12 presents the results. 22% of them think that their children use only Persian in these interactions and 78% report the use of some Swedish. The parents also indicate that the children in Grade 6 and upper-secondary school use much less Swedish than the children at the other grade levels.

The language-use patterns in the child–older sibling and child–younger sibling interactions are illustrated in Figures 9.5 and 9.6, based on the evaluations of the students and their parents respectively. As seen, children in Grade 3 show the strongest and the upper-secondary students the weakest tendency to use Swedish in interactions with their older siblings.

### Table 9.11. Child–younger sibling language-use patterns – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Swedish</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.12. Child–younger sibling language-use patterns – as perceived by parents – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chi-square tests revealed a significant difference between the evaluations of the parents and those of their children in child–older sibling interactions \( (p = 0.016, \text{df} = 4 \text{ and Pearson chi-square value} = 12.170) \). However, the evaluations of the parents did not differ significantly from those of their children in child–younger sibling interactions \( (p = 0.058, \text{df} = 4 \text{ and Pearson chi-square value} = 9.135) \).

To summarize the language-use patterns of both groups in the home domain, we can conclude that Persian is the main instrument of communication. The second generation (the students) use more Swedish than the first generation (the parents). Swedish is used more when speaking with mothers than with fathers. Younger children use more Swedish than the older ones when speaking with their parents and older siblings. These findings confirm
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the results found of other studies conducted in Sweden and other countries (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; David et al. 2003; Cheng 2003; Jahani 2004).

9.2 Language-use patterns outside the home domain

This section presents the results for the language-use patterns of the students in two different domains. First, the interactions between student–Iranian peer and student–mother tongue teacher inside the school domain are presented. Then the language-use patterns of the students outside the school domain are discussed in student–Iranian friend interactions, during after-school hours, and in interactions during family gatherings and traditional festivals.

9.2.1 Language-use patterns inside school

9.2.1.1 Language-use patterns in student–Iranian peers interactions

The number of Iranian classmates each student has was presented in Chapter 7 (Table 7.6), as was their frequency of using Persian in school. It was shown that about one-third of the students do not have any Iranian classmates, while about half of them have 1 to 3, and about one-fifth several Iranian peers. It was also discussed that although the majority of the students have Iranian classmates, the extent of the use of Persian in school, apart from during the mother tongue instruction, is very limited.

The patterns of the students’ language-use with their Iranian peers are given in Table 9.13. Only 3% of the students use Persian exclusively in their interactions with Iranian classmates, whereas one-fourth use only Swedish. The table also shows the mean values of language-use patterns at different grade levels. As seen, the tendency of using Swedish to a higher extent is stronger among the younger students than the older ones, while the older students from Grades 6 and up tend to use both their languages in speaking to their Iranian peers and friends in school.

9.2.1.2 Language-use patterns in student–mother tongue teacher interactions

The students reported the language they choose when speaking to their Persian teacher during mother tongue instruction hours. Table 9.14 shows the results, which indicate that the majority of the students (69%) use only Persian when speaking to their mother tongue teacher, whereas 31%, mostly in Grades 0, 3, and 9, use some Swedish. The mean values of language choices shows that Persian is used slightly more by the students in Grades 6 and up, but the difference is very small among different age groups. A comparison between Tables 9.5, 9.6, and 9.14 indicate that the extent of using Persian
exclusively is greater when the students speak to their mother tongue teachers than to their fathers and mothers.

To summarize the language-use patterns of the students inside school, it can be maintained that Swedish is the main instrument of communication used by the students inside the school even with their Iranian peers and friends, and that the younger students use Swedish more than the older ones in these interactions. However, Persian is the main communication means in student–mother tongue teacher conversations.

9.2.2. Language-use patterns outside the school

9.2.2.1 Language-use patterns during after-school hours

The language-use patterns of the students during after-school hours are shown in Table 9.15. As seen, 27% of the students are not engaged in any after-school activity and are mainly at home, while 73% attend an after-school recreation center, participate in sports activities, or spend time with Persian and Swedish friends. It also shows that Persian is exclusively used by 14% of those students who are at home after school. However, Swedish is used exclusively by all of those who participate in sports clubs or spend time with Swedish friends, and by almost all of those who spend time in recreation centers. It is also the main communication means for those who spend time with their Persian or Swedish friends. The table also gives the mean values of the language-use patterns for different activities after school hours.

### Table 9.13. language-use patterns in student–Iranian peers interactions – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.14. language-use patterns in student–Persian teacher interactions – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.15. Language-use patterns during after-school hours – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only Persian</th>
<th>Mostly Persian</th>
<th>Mostly Swedish</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.16. Language-use patterns between student and Iranian friends outside school – as perceived by students – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Swedish</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.17. Language-use patterns between student and Iranian friends outside school – as perceived by parents – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Swedish</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.18. Language-use patterns at family gatherings and traditional festivals – % and mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Persian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Persian</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian and Swedish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Swedish</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Swedish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.2.2 Language-use patterns in student–Iranian friends interactions
The students reported the languages they use when speaking to their Iranian friends outside school. The results shown in Table 9.16 indicate that 10% of
them use only Persian, while 90% use Swedish in varying degrees in these interactions. The table also shows the mean values for language-use patterns in these interactions. The students in Grades 9 and up use more Persian than others. The tendency of using only Swedish is seen among the students in Grades 0 to 6. Grade 0 students use Swedish most of all.

The parents also reported about the language their children use when speaking to their Iranian friends outside school. Table 9.17 shows the results which indicate that only 3% of them believe that their children use exclusively Persian, while 97% believe they use some Swedish in these interactions. The mean value indicates that the parents believe that Grade 3 students tend to use Swedish more than any other group, while the students in upper-secondary school use it least of all.

The chi-square tests revealed significant difference between the evaluations of the parents and those of their children about the language-use patterns in the interactions between the students and their Iranian friends (p = 0.017, df = 4 and Pearson chi-square value = 12.110).

9.2.2.3 Language-use patterns at family gatherings and traditional festivals

The students were asked to report about the language they use at family gatherings and traditional festivals. The results are shown in Table 9.18 and indicate that 21% of the students use their first language exclusively, whereas 79% use some Swedish. As before, the mean values of language-use patterns show that the younger students use Swedish to a greater extent.

Based on the results presented above, it can be maintained that Swedish is the main instrument of communication used by the students during after-school hours when they are engaged in different activities such as when they are with friends, attend an after-school recreation center, or are at a sports club, whereas both languages are used at family gatherings and traditional festivals. It can also be concluded that the younger students use more Swedish than the older ones in these interactions.

9.3 Summary

This chapter tried to answer the fourth research sub-question; i.e., what language do Iranians choose in different domains when speaking with various interlocutors. Language-use patterns of the subjects were studied in two different domains: at home and outside the home domain. In the home domain the language-use patterns between the parents and their children and also between siblings were studied. Outside the home domain the language-use patterns of the students in interaction with different interlocutors inside and outside the school domain were examined.
Table 9.19. Implication scale of language-use patterns – as perceived by students – mean values at each grade level and total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Persian teacher</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father–student</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–father</td>
<td>*2.11</td>
<td>*2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother–student</td>
<td>*2.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–mother</td>
<td>*2.15</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Iranian relatives</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–younger siblings</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Iranian friends outside school</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–older siblings</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Iranian friends inside school</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in after-school recreation centers</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.20. Implication scale of language-use patterns – as perceived by parents – mean values at each grade level and total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father–student</td>
<td>*2.33</td>
<td>*2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother–student</td>
<td>*2.08</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–father</td>
<td>*2.67</td>
<td>*3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–mother</td>
<td>*2.50</td>
<td>*2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–younger siblings</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–older siblings</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Iranian friends</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deviating

Table 9.19 summarizes the results of the language-use patterns as perceived by the students. This table is based on the mean values at each grade level and the total mean values in descending order. It can be seen that the main propensity of the language-use patterns is that Persian is the main instrument of communication when the members of the first generation speak with the members of the second generation and vice versa. The first generation is here represented by Persian teachers and the parents, while the second generation is represented by the students and their siblings, peers, and friends. Grade 0 students and some of the students in Grade 3 deviate (shown by * in the table) from the main tendency in that the extent of their use of Swedish increases when they speak with their parents or vice versa.

Table 9.19 also implies that Swedish is used to a greater extent in communications between the members of the second generation. The students in Grades 9–12 diverge to some extent from this implication (shown by * in the table). It can also be discerned from the table that the younger the student is the more Swedish is used (see e.g. David et al. 2003 for similar results).
Table 9.20 summarizes the results of the language-use patterns as perceived by the parents. Similar tendencies can be seen in this table as were found in Table 9.19. The difference is that the number of deviations is greater (shown by * in the table), which indicates that the parents believe that the extent of Swedish use is higher than is reported by the students, that their younger children use more Swedish when talking to them, and that they themselves have the same preference when talking to their younger children. The results for the language-use patterns in this study are in agreement with those studies that show that women tend to shift their language more quickly than men (see e.g. Aikio 1992; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labeve 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003).
Chapter 10
Results: Language Attitudes

Chapter 10 presents the results of the data analyses based on research sub-question 5: how Iranians feel toward their home country, country of residence, their mother tongue, and Swedish. It describes whether or not participants think that it is useful to learn Persian and Swedish and if so what the reasons are. It also reports the levels of proficiency in Persian and Swedish that the parents desire for their children to attain. This chapter then explains the language preferences of the students and situations where they may avoid using their mother tongue. The students’ attitudes towards their mother tongue are also accounted for. The chapter also provides some information about whether or not life in Sweden and Iran (in the case of travel) is enjoyable and why, and if whether they desire to stay in Sweden or go back to Iran and live there instead and why.

10.1 Attitudes towards Persian and Swedish

10.1.1 Reasons for learning Persian and Swedish

The students were asked to state if they think it is useful to learn Persian and Swedish. All of them answered positively to both questions. Their reasons could be categorized as either sentimental or instrumental. The results for learning Persian are presented in Table 10.1. It can be seen that about half of the students (51%) have instrumental orientation towards learning their mother tongue, whereas 45% have sentimental reasons and 4% are not sure why they should learn Persian. The table also shows that learning Persian is sentimental for the majority of the oldest students, while it is instrumental for the younger students. Sentimental motivations are exemplified below:

- “Because it’s my mother tongue.”
- “I like Persian.”
- “Because I am from Iran.”

The instrumental motivations included responses such as:

- “I enjoy getting to know my origins better.”
• “I can communicate better with my parents and relatives.”
• “Because I can read and write letters from Iran.”
• “I use Persian when I travel to Iran.”
• “I may one day want to move back to Iran.”

Table 10.2 shows that 90% of the students have instrumental reasons for learning Swedish, whereas only 9% attach sentimental values to it and 1% are not sure why they learn Swedish. It is interesting to note that all of the students in upper-secondary school gave instrumental reasons for learning their second language. The instrumental answers included:

• “Because I live here.”
• “I want to be able to speak with my friends and teachers.”
• “I need to know Swedish because I go to school here.”
• “Because then I can read and write Swedish.”

Their sentimental responses can be exemplified with:

• “Because this is also my country.”
• “I like to learn languages.”

The chi-square tests revealed a significant difference between the types of reasons for learning Persian and Swedish that were given by the students (p = 0.000, df = 2 and Pearson chi-square value = 36.587).

The parents also indicated if they think it is useful for their children to learn Persian and Swedish. Again, all answered positively to both questions. As seen in Table 10.3, 51% have sentimental and 49% instrumental reasons for wanting their children to learn Persian. However, Table 10.4 shows that the reason for their children to learn Swedish is totally instrumental.
Their responses for learning Swedish typically include:

- “Our children live here in Sweden and therefore they have to learn Swedish in order to succeed in school and later in their higher education and at work.”

The same type of responses for learning Persian can be exemplified with:

- “It is important for them to learn their mother tongue to be able to communicate with their relatives and countrymen and also to be able to travel to Iran without any language difficulties.”

The parents’ sentimental responses generally resembled those of the students:

- “Because Persian is their mother tongue.”
- “Because they are from Iran.”

The chi-square tests revealed a significant difference between the sentimental and instrumental reasons for their children to learn Persian and Swedish that were given by the parents ($p = 0.000$, $df = 1$ and Pearson chi-square value = 60.458).

The results of the present study concerning the instrumental view about learning the majority language are similar to those of other studies (see e.g. Sahaf 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Ellis 1997). However, the instrumental motivation for learning Persian among about half of the participants is interesting, because according to the aforementioned studies, learning the mother tongue is usually associated with sentimental values. The instrumental motivation results of the present study may be explained by the actual experiences of the participants, especially those who have had the opportunity to travel to Iran in the past few years (see the data analyses on this issue in Chapter 7, Tables 7.19 and 7.20). This may have made them realize that in order to communicate better with relatives and countrymen they need to learn more Persian.
The parents were asked to indicate the extent to which they want their children to learn Persian and Swedish. These questions aimed at finding out if there were any differences in the parents’ attitudes about the level of language proficiency their children should achieve in Persian and Swedish. The results are demonstrated in Tables 10.5 and 10.6. It can be noted that the majority of the parents want their children to learn both their languages very well (73% and 82% for Persian and Swedish respectively).

The parents expected their children to reach a somewhat higher level of proficiency in Swedish than Persian. One possible explanation of this may be that they think that their children do not have the opportunity to become equally proficient in both their languages (see Chapter 7 and compare the extent of socialization in each language). The unequal expectations may also mirror the attitudes of the parents towards each language; i.e., Swedish may benefit from a somewhat higher status than Persian. However, the chi-square tests revealed that the parents did not differ significantly in the levels of proficiency they desired their children to achieve in each language (p = 0.181, df = 2 and Pearson chi-square value = 3.418).

### 10.1.3 Attitudes towards mother tongue learning

The parents were asked to report about their children’s attitude towards mother tongue learning. The results, given in Table 10.7, show that 56% think that their children have positive attitudes towards mother tongue learning, while 12% are negative and 32% stand in the middle. The fact that the majority of the students in the present study have positive attitudes towards learning their mother tongue is in line with the high participation rate of Iranian students in mother tongue instruction in Sweden.
Table 10.8 presents the five minority groups in comprehensive school with the highest participation ratio in mother tongue instruction (1996–2009). Participation in Persian instruction has been stable (about 60–70%) during the past 14 years. The high participation rate of Iranian students in mother tongue instruction may be due to their positive attitudes towards learning their mother tongue. It may also mirror the enthusiasm and encouragement of their parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Minority languages</th>
<th>No. of entitled students</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Participation ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 545</td>
<td>4 808</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>19 361</td>
<td>12 163</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 479</td>
<td>3 952</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>4 682</td>
<td>2 630</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9 917</td>
<td>5 291</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 704</td>
<td>5 075</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>21 073</td>
<td>13 858</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 574</td>
<td>4 128</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 102</td>
<td>2 957</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10 207</td>
<td>5 541</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>4 298</td>
<td>3 087</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 773</td>
<td>5 118</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>22 785</td>
<td>14 852</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 624</td>
<td>4 267</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 239</td>
<td>3 077</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>4 396</td>
<td>3 199</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 634</td>
<td>5 173</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>24 053</td>
<td>16 014</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 537</td>
<td>4 182</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 183</td>
<td>3 044</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>5 052</td>
<td>3 680</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 601</td>
<td>5 137</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>24 935</td>
<td>16 583</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 685</td>
<td>4 276</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 363</td>
<td>3 147</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>5 347</td>
<td>3 991</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>25 648</td>
<td>17 412</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 671</td>
<td>5 130</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 521</td>
<td>4 148</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 428</td>
<td>3 286</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>6 053</td>
<td>4 393</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>27 940</td>
<td>18 451</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 595</td>
<td>4 965</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 574</td>
<td>4 008</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 461</td>
<td>3 237</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>7 369</td>
<td>5 331</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30 135</td>
<td>19 729</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>7 277</td>
<td>4 685</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 607</td>
<td>4 114</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 646</td>
<td>3 344</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>8 622</td>
<td>6 205</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>32 134</td>
<td>21 292</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>6 974</td>
<td>4 385</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>6 692</td>
<td>4 040</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>5 899</td>
<td>3 436</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** National Agency for education: Descriptive data on childcare and educational organization in Sweden (1997–2010)
10.2 Attitudes towards the home country and the country of residence

The students were asked to state whether or not they enjoy living in their countries of origin and residence. As seen in Table 10.9, about half of them (51%) stated that they enjoy living in Iran, and 7% do not, while 42%, mostly who do not have the opportunity to travel to the home country, are not sure if they would enjoy living there. The results also show that there is almost no sense of uncertainty when it comes to the country of residence. 94% enjoy living in Sweden. Interestingly, this is also true in the case of the parents. It seems that the majority (85%) of them enjoy living in Sweden. The students were also asked to state if they wanted to live in Iran. Slightly over half of them (54%) responded negatively, whereas 41% were positive and 5% were not sure. It can be seen that the majority of the youngest and the oldest students are positive, while those in between are more negative.

The results on wanting to live in Sweden are slightly different. 60% of the students, evenly distributed over all grade levels, responded positively. 35% answered that they did not want to live in Sweden and 5% were not sure. It can be seen that the majority of the youngest and the oldest students are positive, while those in between are more negative.

The most typical reason the students gave for wanting to live in Sweden was “because there is more freedom here,” while in the case of wanting to live in Iran it was “because of the feeling of solidarity and affection that exists between people.” A characteristic reason given by many of those not
wishing to live in Sweden was “because it is too cold here,” whereas in Iran’s case it was “there is no freedom there.”

Table 10.10. Students’ language preference in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.11. Parents’ language preference in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3 Language preference

In order to find out more about the language attitudes of the students, they were asked to state their language preference. Hoffmann (1991) maintains that language preference is an important variable that psychologically justifies the choice of language that each individual makes (see also Slavik 2001). The language preference question in the present study did not specify any special interlocutor or any specific situation. It aimed at finding out the language preference of the students in general. The results are shown in Table 10.10. 42% of the students prefer to use their first language, whereas 36% like to use Swedish. However, 22% of them stated that they prefer to use both their languages. This may indicate that they do not favor using one over the other. The preference of using the mother tongue is highest among the upper-secondary school students, while Grade 9 students mostly prefer to use Swedish. The students in Grades 3 and 6 have a greater desire to use Persian than Swedish, while those in Grade 0 prefer to use both their languages. The higher degree of favoring the use of Persian among the students may be due to the sentimental values that they attach to it, especially those in upper-secondary school. The greater preference of Persian among the oldest students may also reflect their proficiency and their sense of confidence, which allow them to use their mother tongue. This usually leads to an increased functionality of the language (see e.g. Gal 1979; Fase et al. 1992; Jaspaert & Kroon 1993). The results of the present study do not confirm the results of other studies, which show a clear preference for second language use among the second generation indicating a more advanced language shift process (see e.g. Slavik 2001 for a study of Maltese in Canada).
The parents were also asked to state their language preference. Table 10.11 shows the results, which indicate that 94% prefer to use Persian, while 6% use both their languages. It is interesting to note that the latter group is among those whose children are in Grades 0 and 3, which may explain the results of the students in those grades. The result of Pearson chi-square analyses shows that the difference between the language preference of the parents and students is significant ($p = 0.000$, $df = 2$ and Pearson chi-square value = 59.629).

Table 10.12. Students’ reaction to the use of Persian in public – as perceived by parents – % within grade and total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Very negatively</th>
<th>Negatively</th>
<th>Neither negatively nor positively</th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>Very positively</th>
<th>Do not use Persian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 Language appropriateness

Language attitude may also be investigated by determining whether it is appropriate to use a specific language in certain situations (see e.g. Lewis 1980; Boyd 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). The parents were asked to report about their children’s reaction when they speak with them in Persian in public. The results, which are presented in Table 10.12, show that apart from 3% who avoid using Persian themselves in these situations, only 7% think that their children react negatively, while 35% believe that their children are positive to Persian being used publicly. More than half of them (55%) indicate that their children act neither positively nor negatively.

The fact that only 3% of the parents feel that it is not appropriate to use Persian with their children outside the home domain may point to the sentimental values and sense of pride that these parents attach to Persian. The same can also be said of their children based on the fact that only a small proportion (7%) of them react negatively to the use of Persian in public. The sense of pride in speaking Persian is also confirmed by the 35% who have positive attitudes towards their mother tongue. However, it is difficult to interpret with certainty the 55% who react neither positively nor negatively. This may be due to the large proportion of the younger students who may not yet have built a solid attitude towards their mother tongue. It may also be the case that they think that it is only natural that their parents almost always
speak Persian with them. Children usually make it clear to their parents not to use their mother tongue publicly, if they think otherwise.

10.5 Language avoidance

Another way of investigating language attitude may be to determine whether its use is avoided under certain conditions (see e.g. Boyd 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995). The parents were asked to state whether or not their children ever avoid speaking Persian, and if so, when. The results are shown in Table 10.13, which indicates that 42% of the parents think that situations can be found where their children avoid using their first language, whereas 58% reported that this does not happen. The students in Grade 0 avoid speaking Persian to the greatest extent, while the upper-secondary school students have the lowest proportion of avoidance.

The parents reported the types of situations where using Persian is avoided by their children. These are listed in descending order of frequency.

- When Persian words are partially or completely unknown.
- When they want their feelings, intentions and thoughts to be conveyed perfectly.
- When the topic of the conversation is school-related.
- On the playground
- When they speak with peers or friends.
- When Swedish interlocutors are present.
- When they speak with relatives, especially from the same age group.

It seems that language knowledge and familiarity with the topic strongly affect avoidance of mother tongue use. Factors in avoiding Persian mentioned by the parents are among the language choice factors mentioned in other studies (see e.g. Ervin-Tripp 1968; Grosjean 1982; Schmidt 1985; Woolard 1989). As mentioned in the literature review, Ervin-Tripp (1968: 197) presents four major domain factors which cause changes in verbal behavior. These are setting, participant, topic/content of discourse, and function of the interaction. The circumstances that are mentioned by the parents can be categorized under these four domains. This is shown in Table 10.14. It seems that participant and topic play an important role in the choice of language among the student participants of the present study (see e.g. Blom & Gumperz 1972; Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Schmidt 1985; Namei 1993; Tuomela 1993; Pan 1995; Gupta & Yeok 1995; Labov 2001).
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10.6 Summary

This chapter tried to answer the fifth research sub-question: how do Iranians in Sweden feel about Iran and Persian compared to Sweden and Swedish. The attitudes of the participants towards their first and second languages were examined from different perspectives.

The results showed that the majority of the students have positive attitudes towards learning their mother tongue. In fact, the participation rate of Iranian students in mother tongue instruction in Sweden is among the highest of all minority students during the past 14 years. This may point to a strong desire on the part of Iranians that their children learn and develop their mother tongue. It was also shown that they have both an instrumental and sentimental orientation towards learning Persian. It was discussed that the instrumental motivation to learn the mother tongue, which is unusual compared to other studies and shows more sentimental feelings towards learning the mother tongue, may very well be based on the fact that more than half of the students have the opportunity to travel to Iran during the past 15 years. This may have made them realize the need for learning and improving their mother tongue. It was also demonstrated that the parents wanted their children to achieve a high level of proficiency in Persian.
The results showed that learning Swedish is highly desired and instrumentally motivated because they think that Sweden is their second country and therefore they must master the language to succeed in school, at the university, and later at work. The results showed that the parents wish for their children to attain a very high level of proficiency in Swedish.

The results for the participants’ attitudes towards their countries of origin and residence revealed that an overwhelming proportion enjoy living in Sweden. It was also shown that this was also the case for half of the students regarding Iran, while others were not sure about their feelings. When it comes to wanting to live in Iran or Sweden, it seemed that the majority of the students like living in Sweden to enjoy the freedom, and do not want to live in Iran exactly because of the lack of it.

The language preference results revealed that the parents prefer to use their mother tongue, while the language preference of the students is divided between their languages; i.e., some (mostly the oldest students) prefer to use Persian, while others (especially those in Grade 9 who have resided the longest in Sweden) prefer to use Swedish. About one-fourth do not show any preference, and like to use both their languages.

The results for language appropriateness showed that very few of the students react negatively when they are spoken to in public in their mother tongue. It was also shown that Persian is not avoided by the majority of the students, and when it is, it is usually when their Persian knowledge is lacking. Domain factors such as participant and topic may also affect the use of their mother tongue.
Chapter 11
Discussion

Chapter 11 summarizes and discusses the results of the present study in order to shed some light on the main research question.

11.1 Discussion of research sub-question 1

**Sub-question 1** Are any sociocultural changes taking place among Iranians in Sweden?

This sub-question was raised, firstly, to describe the demographic situation of Iranians in Sweden in terms of their residential patterns, birth rates, immigration/emigration, and marriage patterns, because these factors affect the group’s language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Gal 1979; Andersson-Brolin 1984; Ramirez 1985; Milroy 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Pütz 1991; Kristiansen et al. 1991; Pittam et al. 1991; Aikio 1992; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Prabhakaran 1998; Winsa 1999; Atkinson 2000; Al-Khatib 2001; David & Nambar 2002; Govindasamy & Nambar 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003). The second purpose was to investigate whether or not social and economic changes have taken place in this minority group, because these determinants have a strong impact on the language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Fishman et al. 1966; Fishman 1972a, 1985; Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Conklin & Lourie 1983; Boyd 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Shameem 1994; Bloom & Grenier 1996; Grin 1996, 1999; Grenier 1997; Arua & Magocha 2002; Behtoui 2004). Research sub-question 1 raised hypotheses A and B which are discussed here:

11.1.1 Discussion of hypothesis A

**Hypothesis A** The demographic data of Iranians in Sweden points to their intention to integrate in the host country.

The results for the demographic data of Iranians in Sweden positively confirm hypothesis A. It was shown that a large group of Iranians came to Swe-
During the 1980s both after the so-called Islamic revolution and when the Iran–Iraq war intensified (see Chapter 6, Table 6.1). It was shown that the total number of Iranians in Sweden is about 80,000 including both the first (circa 55,000) and second generations (circa 25,000). It was shown that the majority of Iranians live in the major Swedish cities with a large concentration in the capital city of Stockholm, especially in the northwest part of the city, where there are many Persian speaking institutions and organizations with bilingual personnel that make life easier for Iranians of various age groups. Although this residential concentration has some facilitating effects, it is not enough to guarantee the maintenance of the language. It is vastly different from the concentrations of Chinese people in Chinatowns around the world. The majority of Iranians are drawn to places where economic and educational opportunities exist. This, of course, has a negative effect on preserving the Persian language and culture as a joint effort of the members of the group (see e.g. Kloss 1966; Fishman 1972a; Jaakkola 1973; Giles et al. 1977; Gal 1979; Andersson-Brolin 1984; Ramirez 1985; Milroy 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Pütz 1991; Kristiansen et al. 1991; Pittam et al. 1991; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Prabhakaran 1998; Atkinson 2000; David & Nambiar 2002; Govindasamy & Nambiar 2003 for similar results).

Statistics revealed that the size of the second generation has increased very rapidly pointing to a high birthrate. The majority of these children are born to two Iranian parents. However, the number of children from mixed marriages is also increasing, which indicates a change taking place in the marriage patterns of Iranians in Sweden (see Chapter 6, Figure 6.2). This change in the marriage patterns may reduce the chance of minority language survival, as in exogamy situations it is the prestigious language, usually the majority language, that is usually chosen for communication between the family members. The finding that exogamy exists among Iranians in Sweden is in line with other studies of this minority group conducted in Sweden and in other countries (Modarresi 2001; Nercissians 2001; Jahani 2004). It also confirms the results of studies of exogamy and its effects on other minority groups living in the host countries (see e.g. Jaakkola 1973; Gal 1979; Clyne 1982; Pauwels 1986; Penfield 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Pütz 1991; Aikio 1992; Clyne & Kipp 1997; Winsa 1999; David & Naji 2000; Al-Khatib 2001; Slavik 2001; David & Nambiar 2002; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003; Yagmur & Akinci 2003). As was mentioned in Chapter 6, Iranians’ exogamy should be investigated and discussed in the light of the long history of many intergroup marriages between members of different minority groups inside Iran (see also Nercissians 2001). This may have accelerated the rate of exogamy, especially among the younger Iranians in Sweden.

The results of the demographic study also showed that very few Iranians (about 200 per year) move from Sweden to other western countries, especially to English-speaking ones. It was further discovered that the rate of Swe-
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dish naturalization is very high, with a total of circa 48,000 having either Swedish or both Swedish and Iranian citizenship, compared to about 13,000 with only Iranian citizenship (see Chapter 6, Table 6.1 and Figure 6.3). These results may indicate that Iranians show a strong intention to stay in Sweden and make this country their second home. This is also seen among Iranians living in other western countries (see e.g. Kazemi 1986; Kamalkhani 1988; Fathi 1991; Sahaf 1994; Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; Modarresi 2001). It may be a consequence of the ongoing harsh living conditions in Iran which have forced many Iranians to remain in the countries to which they immigrated in the second half of the 1970s and the 1980s. It may also be due to the lack of opportunities for the second generation to create an economically and socially stable life for themselves in Iran. One of the reasons for this may be their lower level of linguistic competence in their first language compared to their second language. This issue will be further discussed below in relation to the discussion of the third sub-question.

Based on the demographic results, it is safe to state that the characteristics of the Iranian minority group in Sweden are changing. It seems that they intend to stay in Sweden and there are some attempts in the direction of integration in the host country. The high rate of changing citizenship, the increasing rate of exogamy, and the small number of outward migrations point to this intention to integrate. However, the most important indicator, after the harsh conditions in Iran may be that the second generation is poorly equipped to seriously consider living in Iran for a period longer than a short summer vacation (see Chapters 7, 8, 9, and 10 for more details).

11.1.2 Discussion of hypothesis B

Hypothesis B The socioeconomic changes that are taking place among Iranians in Sweden have a negative impact on their mother tongue maintenance.

The results for the socioeconomic status of the participants are in conformity with hypothesis B. It was found that a very small portion (7%) of the parents have an education level lower than secondary school, while 37% have secondary school education and 56% have 2 to 6 years of higher education (see Chapter 6, Table 6.5). The parents’ high education level found in this study is well in line with the results of other studies which indicate that Iranian immigrants in host countries around the world are well educated (see e.g. Kazemi 1986; Kamalkhani 1988; Fathi 1991; Sohrabi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9; Modarresi 2001; Jahani 2004).

The results also revealed that the manual workers among the parents of this study make up 21% of the total, while non-manual employees stand for 32%. However, it was also found that 47% of them have not been absorbed
by the Swedish labor market even though only a very small proportion have less than secondary school education. 21 out of 47% are unemployed, the majority of whom are women (15%), 25% are categorized as students, and 1 person is retired (see Chapter 6, Tables 6.6 and 6.7). The high rate of unemployment among the parents can be compared with that for Iranians in Sweden in general, which is about 52% (SCB: AKU 2003; see Behtoui 2004 for labor market achievement of young people with immigrant background in Sweden that points to unequal opportunities for this group).

The analyses of the degree of under- and over-qualification of the parents in the labor market indicated that none of them were under-qualified for their jobs. 13% of them had jobs that suited their education level, whereas 40% were 1 to 6 degrees over-qualified for their jobs (see Chapter 6, Table 6.8). Similar results were found in other studies about different minority groups in Sweden (see e.g. Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9). About 3 million Iranians immigrated to the western countries because of the harsh living conditions in Iran after the Islamic Revolution in 1979 and the Iran–Iraq war in 1980. The majority of them were highly educated and belonged to the upper-middle class in Iran. Studies about the living situation of Iranians in western countries such as Canada, USA, Australia, Norway, France, and Germany also show similar results as in the present study (see e.g. Kamalkhani 1988; Fathi 1991; Modarresi 2001). These results indicate that immigrant Iranians living in different western countries around the world have a lower socioeconomic standard compared to when they lived in Iran (see e.g. Hosseini-Kaladjahi 1997; SoS-rapport 1998: 1, 1999: 9). Their standard of living has not improved even though the majority of them are highly educated, a very positive contributing factor if they lived in Iran (see e.g. Grenier 1982, 1997; Jasso & Rosenzweig 1989, 1990; Grin 1996, 1999; Behtoui 2004 for the effects of education for immigrants in the host countries). However, Iranians are very ambitious people. For example, the results showed that 25% of the parents are students. More than half of them already have university degrees. These student parents, the majority of whom are women (23%), are retraining themselves to meet the demands of the Swedish labor market. Other studies mentioned above show similar results.

The ambition to gain at least the same standard of living, and at the same time the realization that the key is to learn Swedish in order to facilitate their integration into the new country, may have had strong negative impact on the issue of language maintenance among Iranians in Sweden. Some of the studies reviewed in Chapter 3 showed that highly educated minority members who belong to the middle or upper class may rapidly shift to the majority language. This is motivated by the fact that knowing their mother tongue does not pay off in the linguistic marketplace of the host country, whereas knowing the majority language provides social and economic mobility (see e.g. Shameem 1994, 2002; von Gleich & Wölck 1994; Bloom & Grenier 1996; Vaillancourt 1996; Grin 1996, 1999; Arua & Magocha 2002; David &
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Nambiar 2002; Morita 2003; Kamwangamalu 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Behtoui 2004). This seems to be one of the factors that has impinged negatively upon the maintenance of Persian in this group.

11.2 Discussion of research sub-question 2

Sub-question 2 To what extent are Iranian children being socialized in Persian and in Swedish?

As mentioned previously, this sub-question was raised due to the importance of language socialization in connection with language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Hill & Hill 1977; Heath 1983; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988; Schieffelin 1990; Kulick 1990; Clyne 1991; Aronsson 1991; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Hornberger & King 1996; Nauclér & Boyd 1997; Hyltenstam et al. 1999; Lainio 1999; Nauclér 2003; Remennick 2003). The primary socialization in the home is carried out mainly by parents and other family members, but also by relatives or other people who interact with the child. The secondary socialization takes place in daycare centers, pre/schools, after-school recreation centers, sports clubs, and the like. Other social institutions such as the mass media are also very much involved in children’s socialization. Those minority members who maintain a close contact with their home countries are able to delay the process of language shift. This study has examined the language socialization of the participants in all the above-mentioned settings. Research sub-question 2 raised hypothesis C which is discussed below:

11.2.1 Discussion of hypothesis C

Hypothesis C The extent of socialization of Iranian children in Persian is much less than in Swedish, which in turn limits their chances of maintaining their first language.

The results of the present study are in strong agreement with hypothesis C. The data on the primary language socialization in the home domain demonstrated that the first language of all of participants was Persian. However, some of the parents also had other first languages such as Kurdish, Azerbaijani, and Mazandarani (see Chapter 7, Table 7.1 for details).

The results of data on the secondary language socialization of the students showed that the majority of them had attended daycare centers and preschools in Sweden, and that the interaction language of the majority of the daycare centers and preschools was exclusively Swedish (see Chapter 7,
Tables 7.2 and 7.3). Although the children had acquired Persian as their first language in the home domain, attending daycare centers and preschools with Swedish as the interaction language as early as around the age of 2, strongly weakens their opportunities to continue to develop Persian, especially considering the long period of time (on average 5 hours a day) that they usually spend in these institutions. This strongly implies that these children are being socialized in Swedish before they enter school at the age of 6 or 7 (see also Ekstöm 1982; Enström 1982; Källström 1982; Tingbjörn 1984; Hyltenstam & Arnberg 1988; Garefalakis 1994 Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Arnberg 1996; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996; Nygren-Junkin; 1997).

It was also shown that the majority of the students developed literacy in Swedish, whereas Persian was the literacy language of the parents (see Chapter 7, Table 7.4). The results also revealed that all of the students attended Swedish schools where the language of instruction and interaction was Swedish. They all participated in mother tongue instruction for about 2 hours per week. It was also found that the interaction language during after-school hours, in recreation centers, sports clubs, or the like, was almost exclusively Swedish (see Chapter 7, Table 7.7). These results indicated that children were being socialized in Swedish during the absolute majority of their school hours and during after-school activities. It was contended that although the stated aim of the Swedish school regarding bilingual children is to promote their development towards bilingualism with bicultural identity (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.5.3), in practice the school is strongly oriented towards developing the minority students into Swedish monolinguals with limited knowledge of their mother tongue. This type of education is one of the weak forms of bilingual education and is called transitional bilingual education (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.5.1). It was maintained that this program provides for the minority children, “for their own good,” to gradually shift from their mother tongue to the majority language and to be assimilated into the host country as soon as possible in order to master the L2 which is the key to enjoying equal opportunities such as employment opportunities (see also Paulston 1980, 1992, 1997; Edberg & Holmegaard 1982; Ekstrand 1983; Municio 1987; Appel & Muysken 1987; Hyltenstam & Arnberg 1988; Fishman 1989; Boyd 1993; Baker 1993; Namei 1993, 1997, 1999; Sahaf 1994; Garefalakis 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Hill, M. 1995; Romaine 1995; Hornberger & King 1996; Hyltenstam & Tuomela 1996; Thomas & Collier 1997, 1999, 2000, 2001; Namei 1993, 1997; Smolicz et al. 1998; Winsa 1999; Tacelosky 2001; Papademetre & Routoulas 2001 for similar thoughts on the vital role of the school in fostering cultural pluralism).

The results for exposure to Swedish and Persian through other social institutions such as the mass media (TV/video, radio, music, film, books, and newspapers) revealed that the extent of exposure to Swedish was much greater than to Persian (see Chapter 7, Figures 7.1 and 7.2 and Tables 7.8 and 7.9). There were significant exposure differences between the languages
in all cases except for the radio. It was maintained that this exception was due to the greater accessibility of regular daily Persian programs on the Swedish local radio. A general tendency was that the extent of the exposure of the older students to Persian through the media was greater than that of the younger students. It was asserted that this may largely be due to their higher competence in Persian compared to the younger students (see Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b). These results are similar to the results of other studies conducted in Sweden (see e.g. Boyd 1985; Eriksson 1994; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997). The greater exposure to the second language via the mass media gives these children opportunities to improve their knowledge and increase their competence in that language. However, mass media in Swedish facilitates its penetration into the home domain, and thus the children’s chances to develop their mother tongue decrease dramatically (see e.g. Hill & Hill 1977; Appel & Muysken 1987; Renz 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Winsa 1999).

One explanation for the greater exposure to Swedish than to Persian via books and newspapers is that they are not as widely available to the children in Persian as they are in Swedish. It may also be due to the difficult variety of the language that is used in the Persian media. The importance of the language variety and the level of complexity used in the mass media was discussed in the literature review (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.1). It was maintained that if the language of the mass media is understood by most of the minority group members, it can be used as an effective and powerful instrument to boost and promote the minority language. On the other hand, if many individuals in the minority group, especially children, are omitted because of their low comprehension level, then a very rich resource for language maintenance is not fully utilized (see e.g. Renz 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Boyd-Barret 1996; Winsa 1999). The language that is used in the Persian mass media in Sweden is difficult for the children to understand since it is very close to the written Persian variety. Written Persian is usually learned and developed in school. This is one of the types of diglossia that exists in Iran (see e.g. Jeremiás 1984; Nercissians 1985, 2001; Jahani 2004). The teaching Persian in Swedish schools provides some opportunities for the children to learn this variety, however not enough.

It was also shown that the extent of written production in non-school-related situations (e.g. writing notes, diaries, and short stories) was greater in Swedish than in Persian, and that the oldest students (grades 10–12) wrote more in Persian, whereas Grade 9 students wrote more in Swedish (see Chapter 7, Tables 7.12 and 7.13). It was maintained that the greater extent of the older students’ written production in Persian may be due to the majority of them having come to Sweden around the age of 9, at which time they already had some literacy skills in their mother tongue. The greater extent of the written production in Swedish among the students in Grade 9 may be because the majority of them were first exposed to Swedish before they
started school and had developed their literacy skills during the 9 years of comprehensive school (see also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b for similar results and discussion). The general tendency that the students wrote more in Swedish than in Persian is undoubtedly due to their greater written language development in Swedish considering the extent of their written production in each language in school. It is not only the quantity of the written production, but also its quality that should be discussed. During the school years, students learn to write Swedish in different genres and styles, and they practice various writing techniques. This opportunity is only available to a very limited extent in Persian (see also Heath 1983).

The results for exposure to each language via social networks in the residential areas through friends and adults, taking part in activities in each language, and participating in traditional gatherings demonstrated that the student group has a strong interethnic orientation, whereas their parents are more intra-ethnically oriented (see Chapter 7, Tables 7.14–7.18). It was shown that the interethnic orientation of the students leads to their greater exposure to and use of Swedish even outside the school surroundings, a finding that is confirmed in other studies (see also Gal 1979; Li Wei 1982; Milroy 1987; Pütz 1991; Prabhakaran 1998; Govindasamy & Nambiar 2003).

The results on visits to the home country revealed that slightly over half of the students and their parents are able to travel to Iran (see Chapter 7, Tables 7.19 and 7.20). It was stated that these visits provide opportunities to improve proficiency in the mother tongue vocabulary in domains such as the playground, reading street signs, fruit and animal names, and the like, as well as idioms used in relationships and reading and writing skills in general in order to be able to correspond with relatives (see e.g. Boyd 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Mukherjee 2003). The fact that about half of the participants do not travel to Iran, however, may be due to logistical limitations (e.g. not having a valid Iranian passport) rather than a lack of awareness of the importance of these visits or a desire to visit the home country.

Based on the socialization results, it can be stated that Iranian children are being strongly socialized in their L2 from the time they are left in the care of all social institutions. They are also socialized in Swedish when spending time with friends or via the mass media during those few hours when they are at home after school. In this situation parents do not stand a great chance of safeguarding the home domain from L2 penetration, especially because they themselves feel the need for their children to master their L2 because it will pay off better later in the children’s lives. Parents may not directly encourage their children to shift from Persian to Swedish, but they do not make a great effort to hinder it either, especially seeing as they put their whole trust in the Swedish education system and silently accept its consequences.
11.3 Discussion of research sub-question 3

Sub-question 3  To what extent are Iranians in Sweden competent in their languages?

As mentioned before, this sub-question was raised because language competence strongly affects language maintenance and shift. Limited language proficiency may be a result of limited language use, and that may lead to limited functionality of the language in different domains. Language competence of minority groups is also influenced by the attitudes towards their own and the majority language and culture, which may in turn affect speakers’ language-use patterns. The more positive attitudes minority members have towards either of the languages, the greater the extent of their use of that language in different domains (see e.g. Fishman 1972c; Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Schmidt 1985; Boyd 1985; Clyne 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Tandefelt 1988, 1992; Hill, J. 1989; Hart-Gonzalez & Feingold 1990; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Jaspaert & Kroon 1991, 1992, 1993; Fase et al. 1992; Holmes 1992; Eastman 1992; Romaine 1995; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Andersson 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004).

This sub-question accounted for language repertoire, language dominance, and language proficiency (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills in both languages) which together provided a language competence indicator for the participants. It raised hypothesis D which is discussed here:

Hypothesis D  First generation Iranians are more competent in their first language than their second, whereas second generation Iranians are more competent in their second language than their first.

11.3.1 Discussion of hypothesis D

The results of the present study support hypothesis D. However, there are other interesting results to be discussed about the language competence of the first generation. The data analyses of the language repertoire showed that Persian was the first language of all of the participants. However, some of the parents stated that they also had other first languages, such as Kurdish, Azerbaijani, and Mazandarani. A very small proportion of those with Persian and Azerbaijani as their first language had been able to pass both their languages on to their children (see Chapter 8, Table 8.1). Minority groups in Iran tend to shift to Persian and this tendency is much stronger and takes place more rapidly among Iranians living outside Iran. This language shift may be due to the language policy and the diglossic situation in Iran with
Persian as the official standard language learnt and used formally, while other minority languages are learnt and used informally. A high proportion of mixed marriages may also have paved the way for the language shift in Iran (see e.g. Jeremiás 1984; Nercissians 1985, 2001; Jahani 2004; Bani-Shoraka 2005). The results of the language repertoire data also demonstrated that Swedish was the second language of all of the participants, while English was their third or foreign language. Some of the participants had some knowledge of other languages such as French, Spanish, or German.

As far as language dominance is concerned, the results revealed that the parents were more dominant in Persian, whereas the most advanced language of the students was Swedish (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.1 and 8.3). Some of the oldest students stated that Persian was their most advanced language, whereas Swedish held that position in all other groups (see also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b; David et al. 2003 for similar results). The results for the language dominance of the students were also confirmed by their parents (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.2 and Table 8.3).

Based on the age of their first exposure to Swedish, the parents ranked their L2 and foreign language differently. Those with an earlier Swedish start stated that they were more competent in Swedish than English, while for the latecomers the situation was the other way around (see Ellis 1997; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson 2003; Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam 2004 for discussions about the effects of the age of onset). The language dominance results of the present study, which indicate that the second generation is more competent in the L2 than the L1, are consistent with the results of other studies of Iranians in Sweden (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Jahani 2004) and other minority groups in Sweden and other countries (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; David et al. 2003).

As far as proficiency in understanding is concerned, the results obviously demonstrated a much greater level of Persian skills in the parent group than among the students (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.4 and 8.7). The results also revealed that the oldest students had the greatest understanding skills in Persian. This was expected considering the fact that the majority of them had moved to Sweden after the age of 9 (see Chapter 4, Table 4.2, and also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b). The parents’ assessments of their children’s understanding of Persian were significantly lower than those of the students (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.6). The difference between the parents and students may partly be due to possible discrepancies in self-evaluation techniques. It may also be caused by the higher expectations of the parents on their children. They may think that their children should know Persian more than they actually do and that may have caused them some disappointment.

It was also shown that the students understood Swedish better than Persian (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.5). The differences were in fact significant. This greater understanding of Swedish was true for the comprehensive school students, whereas the upper-secondary school students were equally
skillful in both their languages. The fact that the students are more advanced in understanding their L2 than the L1 and that the older students are more proficient in understanding Persian than the other students, compared to the comprehensive school students who are more proficient in understanding Swedish, does not change even though there are significant differences between the parents and students or there may be discrepancies in data collection. These students’ vocabularies in both their languages were investigated in another study (Namei 2002) which pointed in the same direction: that they have a deeper knowledge of their second language than their first. Namei (ibid.) maintained that this result is not surprising considering variables such as the age of first exposure to Swedish and the length of residence in Sweden, and also the fact that they are exposed to Swedish, through both input and output, to a much greater extent than to Persian. Similar results are also found in other studies of language understanding skills of Iranians in Sweden (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; Jahani 2004).

The results for understanding skills of the parents not surprisingly revealed that all of them understood their L1 much better than their L2 (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.7), as it was found in other studies (see e.g. Jahani 2004). However, the interesting result of this study was that the majority of the parents also understood Swedish better than average. Another interesting result based on the parents’ age of Swedish onset showed that those who were exposed before 20 years of age felt that they had a deeper L2 understanding than those who started later. Although this result is based only on the parents’ self-evaluation of their L2 knowledge, nonetheless it provides an interesting perspective on the discussion of the Critical Period Hypothesis and the influence of the onset age of learning an L2 (see e.g. Ellis 1997; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson 2003; Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam 2004, 2009).

In the case of speaking proficiency, the total results pointed in the same direction as the understanding skills results and showed of course that the parents were much more skillful in Persian than the students (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.8 and 8.11). The majority of the students stated that they speak Persian skillfully, especially the oldest ones (Grades 9 and up). However, a small proportion of the students (only in Grades 9 and up) stated that they speak Persian poorly. This may be due to the influence of their parents and the way they express their greater expectations that the oldest students will be proficient in Persian. This was clearly demonstrated in the parents’ assessments (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.10). Although the difference between the two groups was not significant, the parents had rated their children’s speaking abilities in Persian somewhat differently than the students themselves had done. This was especially the case for the oldest students, a small proportion of whom (5%), according to the parents, spoke Persian very poorly.

The results for the Swedish speaking skills revealed that the students were more proficient in their L2 than their L1 (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.9). In fact, their speaking abilities in the two languages were significantly different (see
e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997; Namei 2002; David et al. 2003; Jahani 2004 for similar results). As discussed in the case of their understanding skills, these results should be interpreted in the light of other variables such as their age of first exposure to Swedish, length of residence in Sweden, and also their having much greater exposure to Swedish than to Persian both through input and output.

The results on the parents, speaking skills showed that they all spoke of course their mother tongue much better than their L2 (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.11), as found in Jahani’s (2004) study. The majority of the parents assessed their Swedish speaking skills to be above average. The highest Swedish speaking results were demonstrated by those who were first exposed to Swedish before the age of 20 and the lowest by those who were exposed latest.

The results on reading proficiency confirmed that the parents had much greater proficiency in Persian than their children (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.12 and 8.15). The results also revealed that the students evaluated their Persian reading abilities as being lower than their understanding and speaking skills. This result should be interpreted in terms of the extent of formal instruction (2 hours/week) that they receive in Persian and therefore as an expected result. Only the oldest students demonstrated the highest Persian reading skills, which was also expected, considering that they first developed literacy skills in their L1 in Iran (see also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b). The parents’ assessments of their children’s reading skills in Persian were not significantly different from those of their children (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.14).

The results for the students’ Swedish reading skills differed significantly from the Persian results, and pointed to a greater proficiency level (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.13). The fact that the students assessed their reading abilities in their L2 as higher than in their L1 are in agreement with other investigations (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997; Namei 2002; David et al. 2003; Jahani 2004) and should be discussed with respect to a greater exposure to Swedish in different settings both oral and written.

The results for the parents indicated greater reading skills in their L1 than their L2 (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.15 and 8.16). Similar results were found in Jahani’s (2004) study. The data on their reading proficiency in Persian were crosstabulated with their level of education. It was shown that the university graduates were the most proficient readers of Persian, while the majority of those with the lowest level of education were average readers. As was the case for understanding and speaking skills in Swedish, their reading abilities were crosstabulated with their age of first exposure to Swedish. The majority of the parents stated that they read Swedish better than average. As before, the earlier their exposure to Swedish the higher their proficiency level in L2. An interesting result was that they evaluated their reading skills in Swedish to be somewhat greater than their speaking abilities, almost as high as their understanding skills. This may be due to the greater opportunities to be formally and informally exposed to written language than to oral interaction in
Swedish. This is an issue that adult learners often discuss with their Swedish teachers, namely that they have very few occasions to orally practice their language informally with Swedish people outside the school.

The writing proficiency results supported those for the three aforementioned proficiency skills, indicating that the parents were much more skillful in writing Persian than their children (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.17 and 8.20). It was shown that, except for the majority of the youngest students (6 years old) who had limited literacy skills, a great proportion of the students considered themselves to be average writers of Persian, and also that the oldest students showed the greatest Persian writing skills, again, due to the fact that they developed literacy skills in Persian whilst in Iran (see also Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b for a discussion on these students’ deeper L1 vocabulary knowledge compared to the comprehensive school students). The parents’ assessments of their children’s Persian writing skills did not differ significantly from their children’s self-assessments (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.19).

The Swedish results showed that the students were much more skilled at writing Swedish than Persian (see Chapter 8, Figure 8.18), which has also been found in other studies (see e.g. Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995; Sohrabi 1997; David et al. 2003; Jahani 2004). The differences between their two languages were significant. The majority of them evaluated their writing skills to be above average. Grade 9 students showed the greatest proficiency which should be considered normal because the majority of them moved to Sweden before they started school, which means that they had nine years of written production experience in Swedish.

The results for the parents’ writing skills revealed that they had much greater skills in their L1 than their L2 (see Chapter 8, Figures 8.20 and 8.21), as found in Jahani’s (2004) study. Their writing proficiency in Persian was crosstabulated with their level of education. University graduates showed the greatest writing skills in Persian, while all of those with an education level lower than secondary school believed that they were average writers in the L1. Their writing abilities were also crosstabulated with their age of first exposure to Swedish. About half of them asserted that they wrote Swedish better than average. Again, the earlier exposure to Swedish seemed to have resulted in a higher writing proficiency level.

It was mentioned in the literature review that language competence as perceived by the minority members may strongly affect language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Gal 1979; Fase et al. 1992; Jaspaert & Kroon 1993). A lack of or limited proficiency in the L1 may lead to limited functionality of that language in different domains (Jaspaert & Kroon 1991, 1993), which may, in turn, result in limited L1 use. The total results for the parents’ and students’ proficiency in both their languages, which were presented in Figures 8.22–8.25, revealed that the functionality of the mother tongue of the students is concentrated to a large extent on oral communicative skills, while their skills in Swedish are all encompassing (for similar results see also Kos-
toulas-Makrakis 1995 Sohrabi 1997; Al-Khatib 2001; David et al. 2003; Jahani 2004). The higher Persian proficiency in oral compared to written skills in the student group may reflect that they do not receive enough support from the education system of the host country to guarantee a parallel development of the two languages.

The parents’ results showed a full-fledged L1 and also an advanced L2, indicating a greater ambition and intention to become integrated and achieve opportunities and means to succeed in Sweden. The situation for the second generation, however, is different. The results may point to a language shift tendency already being present in this generation. The tendency may be stronger among the younger than the older members. These results confirm the findings of other studies (see e.g. Al-Khatib 2001; David et al. 2003).

It was also mentioned in the literature review that the rate of language shift depends on the nature of the relationship between the majority and the minority group. When both groups choose integration over segregation, the minority group will gradually shift to the majority language (see e.g. Jaspaert & Kroon 1993). The general implication of the language socialization results was that Iranians have chosen to be integrated in the Swedish society. The language competence results strengthen this conclusion by showing that the second generation Iranians are more advanced in their L2 than L1 in all four types of language skills, and also that the first generation has advanced oral and written second language skills alongside a full-fledged first language. In order to demonstrate the process of language shift, the Haugen model (1953) was presented (see Figure 3.1) which is based on minority members’ proficiency level in their L1 and L2. The language competence results of the present study based on Haugen’s model are presented in Figure 11.1.

Figure 11.1. Language shift model for Iranians in Sweden (based on Haugen 1953)

Key: A = First language B = Second language Ab + aB = Unbalanced bilingualism AB = Balanced bilingualism FG = First-generation SG = Second-generation

It is important to mention that the FG and SG marks on the continuum (marked by x) are only approximate and should be taken symbolically. It was maintained that language shift among immigrant minorities usually takes three to four generations. The language shift process across different generations can be described as (1) monolingualism in L1 among the first generation, (2) bilingualism among the second generation, and (3) monolingualism in L2 among the third generation. This process can be faster among minority groups who desire to be integrated in and become part of the majority country and act to fulfill their wishes. This is consistent with the situation
for the first generation Iranians in Sweden. The process can even be more rapid for children born in the majority country or who immigrated at a very early age and are being socialized in the majority language and culture. This may be the case for the second generation Iranians in Sweden.

11.4 Discussion of research sub-question 4

Sub-question 4 What language(s) do Iranians in Sweden choose to speak with whom and where?

As mentioned before, this sub-question was raised because numerous studies have found that the extent of use of the L1 or the L2 in different domains plays a very important role in language maintenance and shift (see e.g. Weinreich 1964; Fishman 2000b; Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Clyne 1982; Boyd 1985; Penfield 1987; Woolard 1989; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991, 1996; Aikio 1992; Namei 1993; Tuomela 1993; Pan 1995; Cormack 1995; Sohrabi 1997; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003; Jahani 2004). This study aimed to find out the patterns of the participants’ language use in various domains such as the home and outside the home domain in different settings. Sub-question 4 led to hypothesis E which is discussed below:

Hypothesis E Persian is the only means of communication in the home domain, while Swedish holds that position outside the home domain.

11.4.1 Discussion of hypothesis E

The results for the present study did not support hypothesis E, in that both languages were used in both settings. As for the home domain, it was shown that Persian was the main instrument of communication in parent–child interactions (see Chapter 9, Tables 9.1 and 9.2 and Figure 9.1). However, some differences between the language-use patterns of mothers and fathers were observed. It was shown that the majority of the fathers believed that they only used Persian when they spoke to their children, but some Swedish was also used, especially with the youngest ones. The study also found similar results in the case of the mothers, only here the extent of the use of Swedish was greater than that of the fathers, and Swedish was not only used in communications with the youngest children, but across all age groups. None of the parents used Persian exclusively with their youngest children.

The students judged parent–child language-use patterns as somewhat but not significantly different (see Chapter 9, Tables 9.3 and 9.4 and Figure 9.2).
They asserted that their mothers used more Swedish than the mothers reported themselves. The results are consistent with the findings of other studies of language-use patterns of Iranians conducted in Sweden (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; Jahani 2004). They also give support to other studies that show the leading role of women in language shift (see e.g. Gal 1979; Penfield 1987; Aikio 1992; David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labov 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003).

As far as the students’ own assessment of their language-use patterns with their parents (child–parent) are concerned, the results revealed that Persian was the main instrument of communication (see Chapter 9, Tables 9.5 and 9.6 and Figure 9.3). It was found that the extent of the use of Swedish in child–parent interactions was greater than in parent–child, and that children used Swedish with their mothers more than with their fathers. This was especially true for the younger children.

The parents’ evaluations of their children’s language-use patterns in child–parent interactions were somewhat different than those of the children, although not significant (see Tables 9.7 and 9.8 and Figure 9.4). Both parents reported that their younger children used much more Swedish than was reported by the children themselves. Similar results have been found in other studies (see e.g. Govindasamy 2003; Jahani 2004).

The results for the language-use patterns among siblings demonstrated that the younger students used more Swedish than the older ones. It was shown that in child–older sibling conversations only a very small proportion of the older students used Persian exclusively (see Chapter 9, Table 9.9 and Figure 9.5). Others used Swedish to varying degrees and the youngest did so to the greatest extent. The parents’ evaluations differed significantly from those of the students, and they reported that the children used much less Swedish in their interactions with their older siblings (see Chapter 9, Table 9.10 and Figure 9.6).

It was also shown that the language-use patterns in the child–younger siblings’ interactions differed from those with the older siblings in that the extent of the use of Swedish was less, because the older students used more Persian with their younger siblings (see Chapter 9, Table 9.11). The parents almost always agreed with their children in these evaluations (see Chapter 9, Table 9.12). The results for the language-use patterns among siblings confirmed the results found by other studies in Sweden and in other countries (see e.g. Sohrabi 1997; David et al. 2003; Cheng 2003; Jahani 2004).

The total results for the language-use patterns in the home domain indicated that Swedish has not only entered the most important domain of the mother tongue through different types of media, especially TV (as the results for language socialization demonstrated in Chapter 7), it has also won ground in the interactions between the family members. In the language maintenance situation, the home domain is safeguarded, especially by the parents, to avoid penetration by the majority language. In this study, howev-
The parents do not seem to be doing that. By using Swedish themselves in interactions with their children, they are consenting to their children using their second language at home and in this the mothers seem to play the leading role and are most responsible. The results also give an impression that the parents are not socializing their children, especially the youngest ones, exclusively in their mother tongue, but instead are socializing themselves in Swedish through their children who, to some extent, compensate for the limited contact they have with Swedish people. In this study the degree of the parents’ awareness or lack of it cannot be determined. In either case this cannot be an auspicious situation for maintaining Persian.

Swedish was used to a great extent in all of the settings outside the home domain, except in student–mother tongue teacher interactions. However, the use of some Persian was also seen. The language of communication between the students and their Iranian peers, especially the younger ones, was mostly Swedish. However, the extent of the use of Swedish in student–mother tongue teacher interactions was very limited, in fact, less than in child–parent interactions (see Chapter 9, Tables 9.13 and 9.14).

Swedish was the main interaction language in the settings outside the school (see Chapter 9, Table 9.15). It was shown that during after-school hours the younger children spend time at an after-school recreation center where Swedish is the language of communication. This was also the case for all those who were at sports clubs or with Swedish friends. It was demonstrated, however, that both languages were used by those who spent time with their Persian friends and or were at home after school.

Swedish and Persian were almost equally used in interactions between student–Iranian friends outside school (see Chapter 9, Table 9.16). Again, the younger students tended to use more Swedish. The extent of Swedish use with Iranian friends was higher according to the evaluations of the parents (see Chapter 9, Table 9.17). In fact, the two groups differed significantly.

The language-use patterns at family gatherings and traditional festivals were found not to differ from the above-described general patterns; i.e., the two languages were almost equally used by the younger students, whereas Swedish was less used by the older ones (see Chapter 9, Table 9.18).

The results for the language-use patterns as perceived by the students were summarized in an implication table, which was based on the mean values at each grade level and the total mean values in descending order (see Chapter 9, Table 9.19). The general tendency was that Persian was the main instrument of communication in the first and second generation interactions. The youngest students deviated from the main tendency in that they used Swedish to a greater extent when they spoke with their parents or when their parents spoke with them. It was also demonstrated that Swedish was used more by the members of the second generation. In this case the older students deviated from this implication; i.e., the younger the student was, the more Swedish that was used (see e.g. David et al. 2003 for similar results).
The results for the language-use patterns as perceived by the parents were also summarized in an implication table (see Chapter 9, Table 9.20). Similar implications could be drawn from this table. The difference was that the number of deviations was larger, which showed that the parents believed their children used Swedish to a greater extent than was reported by the students themselves, and that their younger children used more Swedish when talking to them; they themselves also had the same inclination when talking to their younger children. It was also found that the mothers in this study not only used Swedish more than the fathers and in interactions with their children of all age groups, they also gave their consent to their children to do the same. These results are in agreement with those studies that show that women tend to shift their language faster than men and that they play a leading role in this process (see David & Naji 2000; AL-Khatib 2001; Labove 2001; David 2003; Cheng 2003; Naji & David 2003; Mukherjee 2003).

There may be several reasons for the greater extent of Swedish use in the interactions of Iranian mothers, e.g. they are much more involved in their children’s education, a role which they had carried with them from Iran. This involvement demands greater second language skills because it involves contact with Swedish people who are socializing and educating their children in different settings. Not only do they have to understand the language that it is spoken to them, they also have to make themselves understood, and it is important for them to achieve this. The topic of education in Swedish will gradually constrain the language that the mothers share with their children. It slowly becomes easier to speak Swedish with children about the rules of Swedish games played at daycare centers. It also becomes easier to speak Swedish with their school-aged children about mathematics, biology, and so on when providing help with their lessons. It is time consuming and strenuous to try to explain all the technical terms in Persian. Continuous effort is needed to succeed in this attempt. The choice of the majority language in these situations seems to be painless and straightforward.

Another reason may be that women and children use their shared second language to break the patriarchic power system in the families. By choosing the majority language, women redefine their role in the family and in doing so they try to impose a balance in power relationships, especially because they have also become economically independent compared to the system they were used to in Iran. Using the majority language can provide social mobility for Iranian women within their families.

It may also be the case that using the majority language grants women social advancements not only in their families but also in society as a whole. They do not want to be associated with the Islamic system of Iran which by its laws and regulations limits their role in society. They want to dissociate themselves from the Islamic profile with which they are linked and affiliated. They seek modernization, something they once benefited from and enjoyed (see also Darvishpour 2003).
11.5 Discussion of research sub-question 5

Sub-question 5 What are the attitudes of Iranians toward their home country and country of residence, their mother tongue and Swedish?

This sub-question was raised because many studies have shown that language maintenance may be strengthened by positive attitudes and associations among minority group members who are individuals belonging to the middle or upper social classes with higher education or groups that include religious, cultural, and/or political leaders (Fishman et al. 1966; Boyd 1985; Hart-Gonzalez & Feingold 1990). On the other hand, being negatively associated with poorly educated people with a low economic status may cause a rapid language shift among minority groups because they seek social mobility and welfare in the host country and the key to this is the majority language (see e.g. Gal 1979; Dorian 1981; Clyne 1985; Boyd 1985; Appel & Muysken 1987; Hyltenstam & Stroud 1991; Holmes 1992; Shameem 1994; Romaine 1995; Andersson 1999; Falk & Sarmiento 2003; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina 2004; Yagmur 2004; Lee 2004). It was also discussed before that people may not only have negative or positive feelings about their language and culture, but can also be indifferent towards them, which may, for example, allow the majority language to penetrate the minority language domains (see e.g. Edwards 1985). Sub-question 5 led to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis F The majority of Iranians in Sweden have positive feelings toward their home country and country of residence, and about their mother tongue and Swedish.

11.5.1 Discussion of hypothesis F

The results for the study confirmed hypothesis F. It was shown that all of the participants believed that it is useful to learn both Persian and Swedish. It was also demonstrated that both groups attached both sentimental and instrumental values to learning Persian (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.1 and 10.3). It was maintained that the instrumental motivation for learning Persian found in this study, which was unusual compared to others that show more sentimental affections, may be because more than half of the students have had the opportunity to regularly travel to Iran during the past few years. This may have made them realize the need to learn and improve their mother tongue (see also Boyd 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis 1995 for similar results). It was shown that both groups had almost exclusively instrumental reasons for learning Swedish (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.2 and 10.4) because they believed that Sweden is their second country and therefore they must learn the
Language in order to succeed in school, at university, and at work (see Ellis 1997). However, the two groups differed significantly in their types of reasons for learning Persian and Swedish in that a greater proportion of the parents attached sentimental values to learning Persian and greater instrumental values to learning Swedish compared to their children. As for the attainment level in each language, the parents wished for their children’s Swedish to reach a somewhat higher level, but the difference was not significant (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.5 and 10.6).

It was also shown that, according to the parents, the majority of the students had positive feelings towards learning Persian (see Chapter 10, Table 10.7). This was also demonstrated by the participation rate of Iranian students in mother tongue instruction in Sweden in the past 14 years which is among the highest of all minority students groups (see Table 10.8). It was argued that this may point to a strong desire within the Iranian community that children learn and develop their mother tongue.

The results for the participants’ attitudes towards their countries of origin and residence revealed that an overwhelming proportion enjoy living in Sweden (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.9). It was also shown that this was also the case for half of the students about Iran, while others were not sure of their feelings. In the case of wanting to live in Iran or Sweden, it seemed that the majority of the students like to live in Sweden because of the freedom, and do not want to live in Iran precisely because of the lack of it.

The parents and the majority of the oldest students preferred to use their mother tongue (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.10 and 10.11), while the students at other grade levels preferred Swedish. This was especially the case for Grade 9 students who have resided the longest in Sweden. Some of the students did not show any language preference.

It was found that very few students reacted negatively when they were spoken to in Persian in public (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.12). Persian was not avoided by the majority of the students and when avoidance did occur, it usually happened when their Persian knowledge was lacking (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.13). Among the domain factors, participant and topic seemed to play a more important role (see Chapter 10, Tables 10.14).

Based on the above results, it can be contended that all participants have positive feelings about their L1 and L2, their home country, and the country of residence. It was mentioned in the literature review that positive feelings towards the majority society and its language and culture may strongly and negatively influence the minority language maintenance. These positive feelings towards the majority country may undermine psychological hindrances in the language shift process. These barriers may exist in the minds of minority members, at least the adults, and they can be transferred to the children in the process of socialization. Examples of such psychological obstacles for language shift are being aware of the significance of the home domain as a holy place for the mother tongue, knowing that parents should
only interact with children in the mother tongue, being aware of the importance of socializing minority children outside the home domain in both languages and cultures, and being conscious of making serious efforts together with other members of the minority group to maintain the mother tongue. If these barriers are destabilized and diluted it may lead the minority individuals to accept the prevailing language shift situation and gradually become indifferent and numb towards his/her own language and culture. It seems that it is not enough only to have positive feelings for the mother tongue and the home country. What is decisive is how such positive feelings are transferred into real efforts to maintain the mother tongue against all odds in the majority country.

11.6 Discussion of the main research question

This study has examined the following main research question:

**Research question** Are Iranians in Sweden maintaining their mother tongue or are they shifting to the majority language?

The results for the six themes examined in the present study indicate that a language shift is taking place among Iranians in Sweden. Evidence was presented indicating sociocultural and socioeconomic changes among this minority group in Sweden. A significant motive for sociocultural changes was presented, namely a strong desire for integration into the new society. It was also maintained that many immigrant Iranians in western countries belonged to the upper-middle class before they emigrated from the home country. These people make a very strong effort to attain the same socioeconomic standard in the host countries. They seem to be very conscious of the fact that knowledge of their mother tongue does not pay off in the linguistic market of the host countries, while majority language knowledge provides social and economic improvement for them. This was also supported by the language competence results of the parents which showed that they had attained advanced second language skills (see also Figure 11.1). To achieve social and economic enhancement by means of second language knowledge seems to be one of the factors that have had a strong negative influence on maintaining Persian in Sweden.

The language socialization results indicated a very intense socialization of the students in Swedish by all related social institutions. The effects of the socialization policy of the host country were confirmed by the language competence results for the student participants. It was shown that they were much more skillful in their second language than their first. It was contended that these results may point to a language shift tendency already among the second generation Iranians. This was also supported by language-use pattern
results. Evidence was given that Persian was the main instrument of communication between the parents and children in the home domain. However, some Swedish was also used, especially by the younger children when they spoke with their parents or when their parents spoke with them. It was also demonstrated that Swedish was used to a great extent among the members of the second generation. It was found that mothers in this study not only used Swedish more than fathers and in interactions with their children of all age groups, but also gave their consent to their children to do the same because children used more Swedish with their mothers than with their fathers. Several reasons were provided for the greater use of Swedish by Iranian women. For example, it was argued that it may be because they are more involved than the fathers in their children’s education, as in Iran, and that carrying out this responsibility demands greater second language skills because it involves contact with the many social institutions involved in socializing and educating their children. It was contended that the topic of education in Swedish will gradually constrain the language that the mothers share with their children. Another reason discussed was that women and children use their shared second language to break the patriarchic power system in the families and that this has a direct social mobility effect for Iranian women, not only within their families but also within society as a whole. They do not want to be associated with the role that the Islamic system of Iran has put upon their shoulders through men. They want to dissociate themselves from the Islamic profile with which they are linked and affiliated. These sociopsychological causes seem to be stronger and more influential than just psychological factors such as positive feelings about the home country and the mother tongue. These sociopsychological factors appear to be more decisive in the language maintenance and shift process, in that they gradually pave the way for language shift to take place. Edwards (1985: 140ff) maintains that the needs and necessities of everyday life are what generally occupy minority members’ thoughts. Most of them are pragmatic and concern a “desire to make the act of emigration worthwhile.” This is largely an assimilationist attitude.

In the literature review, the term language shift was defined as referring to language-contact situations where a minority group gradually abandons the regular use of its own language and develops habitual use of another language, and also to the fact that language shift may be socially motivated (see e.g. Gal 1979: 17). Based on the findings, the present study defines the term language shift as referring to the process in language-contact situations where minority individuals gradually abandon the regular use of their mother tongue and develop a regular use of the majority language and in so doing are socially, economically, and psychologically motivated. This means that factors at the individual level should be expanded to also include socioeconomic and sociopsychological determinants.
It was explained in the literature review that all groups in societies, both the dominant and the dominated, try to retain their group identity and distinctiveness. In this attempt, the dominant group with its positive associations towards its own group features, strives to maintain its domination, and if it feels threatened by other groups it hardens its boundaries. This may very well begin with the socialization of the minority children in the majority language. The subordinate group, on the other hand, depending on its positive or negative associations towards its own social, economic, and psychological needs chooses different strategies such as submission to the dominant group and assimilation into it in order to gain greater social and economic opportunities, or it redefines and creates new group characteristics to associate and be associated with positive features (see e.g. Tajfel 1974, 1981). It seems that the Iranian minority group in Sweden has chosen exactly these two types of strategies towards the majority group. As was explained in the literature review, one way of conceptualizing these strategies is by means of Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles et al. 1987, 1991), according to which speakers/ethnic groups tend to converge or move towards each other in order to decrease their social distance to the interlocutors/majority groups. However, speakers/ethnic groups may desire to diverge from each other, accentuate their differences, and increase their social distances. Iranians have chosen to move towards the dominant group in order to decrease their social distances from the majority country. At the same time, it seems that they have chosen to diverge from their own group in order not to be associated with its negative characteristics. These two strategies seem to have been adopted by immigrant Iranians not only in Sweden but also in other western host countries.
Chapter 12
Conclusions

Chapter 12 presents some general conclusions based on the study’s major findings. There is a discussion on strengths and limitations of the study, and finally, some suggestions for future studies are given.

12.1 Summary of the study
This study has examined whether Iranians living in Sweden are maintaining their mother tongue or if they are shifting to the majority language. In order to shed some light on the research question, six themes were chosen in connection with some influencing factors at the minority group level and at the individual level. Demographic data at the group level revealed that some sociocultural changes are taking place among Iranians in Sweden. For example, their exclusively endogamous marriage pattern is slowly changing and the amount of exogamy is increasing, especially among the younger generation. Also, while marriage may have been the only way of building a nuclear family before, today there are many Iranian men and women who are living with partners (inside or outside their own cultural background) without an official marriage agreement, something that is unthinkable in Iran. It was also demonstrated that they are rapidly changing their nationality to Swedish. Findings on emigration patterns showed that a small number of Iranians migrate from Sweden to other western countries every year. The changes in marriage patterns, rapid growth of naturalization, and low rate of emigration may be interpreted as meaning that Sweden has become the second home country of this minority group. It seems that they have settled down in Sweden and are on the verge of changing some of their cultural values. Based on the socioeconomic results, it was maintained that many immigrant Iranians in western countries belonged to the upper-middle class before they migrated from their home country. They try very hard to attain the same socioeconomic standard in the host countries. They are aware of the fact that it is knowledge of the majority language that brings them social and economic improvement.

The language socialization results showed that the second generation is being socialized to a much greater extent in their second language than in
both languages by all those social institutions that they come in contact with from very early childhood. This was also true of the home domain because of the intense exposure to Swedish via the media, especially television. The results also showed that the second generation has a conspicuous interethnic orientation, while the first generation is more intraethnic.

The results for language competence showed that the dominant language of the parents was Persian, whereas Swedish was the dominant language of the students. This was also supported by the findings on their linguistic abilities, as the second generation showed less proficiency in Persian than Swedish, and their oral proficiency was higher than their written skills in Persian. The findings on first generation language proficiency showed a full-fledged first language and an advanced second language, which may be taken as evidence of their intention to integrate.

The results for the language-use patterns in the home domain showed that Persian was the main instrument of communication between the parents and children. However, some Swedish was also used, especially by the younger children when they spoke with their parents or when their parents spoke with them. It was also demonstrated that Swedish was used to a greater extent among the members of the second generation, especially the younger members. The mothers in this study used Swedish more than fathers and in interactions with their children of all age groups, as opposed to the fathers who communicated only in Persian with their older children, but used some Swedish with the younger ones. The role of Iranian women in the language change process was discussed and several reasons were given for the greater extent of their Swedish use. For example, women use more Swedish because they are much more involved in their children’s education than the fathers, as in Iran, and because carrying out this responsibility demands greater second language skills because it involves contact with many social institutions that are involved in socializing and educating their children. It was contended that the topic of education in Swedish will gradually constrain the language that mothers share with their children. Another reason discussed was that women and children use their shared language to break the patriarchic power system in the families, and that this has a direct social mobility effect for Iranian women not only within their families but also within society as a whole. They do not want to be associated with the role that the Islamic system of Iran has put upon their shoulders. They do not want to be associated with the negative Islamic profile.

Based on the above results it was suggested that the sociopsychological causes seem to be stronger and more influential than just psychological factors. They emerge as being more decisive in language maintenance and shift process, in that they gradually pave the way for language shift to take place. It was suggested that factors at the individual level should be expanded to include individuals’ socioeconomic and sociopsychological factors.
12.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the study

12.2.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the research instruments

In Chapter 4 there is a discussion about some of the identified issues concerning the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative and quantitative methods of investigation, both of which are used in investigating minority language maintenance and shift. It is also mentioned that it is very common to use the typical quantitative method, i.e., a survey study in the field of sociology or sociolinguistics.

Advantages and disadvantages of each methodological paradigm which were discussed earlier will not be repeated here (see e.g. Lieberson 1980; Fasold 1984; Gorter 1987; De Bot & Weltens 1991; Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; De Vries 1992). This section discusses some related issues that are relevant to this particular study.

One of the strengths in terms of validity and reliability of using questionnaires is that they may make available an enormous amount of data from a large group of people (188 persons in the present case). The data collection is easier and more manageable. It is often possible to use advanced statistical techniques which may give the researcher opportunities to compare the effects of variables on each other. One of the disadvantages of this method is its heavy reliance on self-reports, which makes it difficult to control the reliability and validity of the supplied information because the researcher does not know if the reported data is based on reality or the informant’s wishes or beliefs. One way of resolving this problem is to use both quantitative and qualitative approaches together. One could also use supplementary documentation in order to examine the survey material from different angles or, as Gorter (1987) puts it, to have “built-in consistency checks” during the interviews, i.e., the same questions put in different ways.

The effects of the above-mentioned disadvantages are reduced in the present study, at least to some extent, by using different methods. Firstly, some of the answers given by the students were compared with those of their parents. Secondly, some supplementary official documents were also gathered, in an attempt to give a more complete picture of the situation. Thirdly, the fact that the researcher herself has the same background as the minority group under investigation gives her an opportunity to reduce the effects of the above-mentioned disadvantages through her possession of insider information. Fourthly and most importantly, because this particular study is a part of a larger study, the results for some of the self-assessment reports can be compared and combined with the results obtained from the other parts (see Namei 2002, 2004a, 2004b), especially in the case of the student group. Nevertheless, it is true that the disadvantage of the self-assessment reports remains in the case of the parent group.
Another issue is that the questionnaires addressed six different themes, namely demography, socioeconomic status, language socialization, language competence, language-use patterns, and language attitudes. Each questionnaire contained some questions dealing with each theme. At some stages, it was felt that further information could better illuminate the issues in question. On the other hand, lengthy questionnaires have their own particular problems, e.g. they can tire out the respondent, and are therefore, advised against (Dörnyei 2003). Further studies with different and complementary qualitative research methods are needed to further explore different issues of language maintenance and shift among Iranians in Sweden.

12.2.2 Strengths and weaknesses in data collection procedures

One of the strengths of this study is its procedure for collecting data from the students. Structured interviews gave both the researcher and the students greater opportunities to clarify uncertainties and ambiguities than might have been the case otherwise. This data collection technique may help to increase the study’s reliability. Another strength of the student data collection procedure is that it made it possible for the researcher to achieve a 100% response rate. This makes the effort worthwhile.

The parent questionnaire, done by mail, had an 88% response rate. Although this is a very high response ratio, it is not perfect. There is always a risk that mail questionnaires will not come back, or that questions will be left unanswered. This is due to the “self-administered” nature of mail questionnaires. Here there is a clear advantage for interview techniques on both accounts: higher response rate and fully understood and answered questions. However, conducting interviews with 100 parents living scattered around the Stockholm area seemed impractical, expensive, and time-consuming.

The aforementioned discrepancies may have influenced the results. However, they could not strongly affect the major trends of the study.

12.3 Suggestions for further studies

Quantitative methods usually address large groups of people, making their results more reliable and generalizable, while with qualitative methods the investigator studies people’s behavior in natural settings over a period of time to examine behavioral changes. Information gathering is done by means of observations. There are usually only a few cases under observation, which results in data that is valid but difficult to draw generalizable conclusions from. In surveys such as the present study it is desirable to combine both qualitative and quantitative methods because they may provide a more complete picture of the situation under investigation.
It is also important to study other minority groups in Sweden who live under the same language socialization situation in order to find some comparable results. This may help in developing better theoretical frameworks in this area of investigation.
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Appendix 1: The original version of the student questionnaire

STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET
Shidrokh Namei
Centrum för tvåspråkighetsforskning

1. När är du född? ________________________________
2. Var är du född? ________________________________
3. När kom du till Sverige? ________________________________
4. Hur gammal var du när du kom till Sverige? ____________
5. Trivs du här? Nej ☐ Ja ☐
6. Bor du tillsammans med din mamma? Nej ☐ Ja ☐
7. Bor du tillsammans med din pappa? Nej ☐ Ja ☐
9. Hur många? ________________
10. Hur gamla? ________________________________
12. Har du iranska kompisar? Nej ☐ Ja ☐
13. Har du svenska kompisar? Nej ☐ Ja ☐
15. Vilket språk lärde du dig först? ________________________________
16. Vilket språk lärde du dig läsa och skriva på först? ________________
17. Hur mycket förstår du?

Persiska
☐ mycket litet ☐ ganska litet ☐ litet ☐ ganska mycket ☐ mycket
Svenska
☐ mycket litet ☐ ganska litet ☐ litet ☐ ganska mycket ☐ mycket
18. Hur talar du på?
Persiska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
Svenska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
19. Hur läser du på?
Persiska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
Svenska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
20. Hur skriver du på?
Persiska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
Svenska
☐ mycket dåligt ☐ ganska dåligt ☐ ganska bra ☐ bra ☐ mycket bra
21. Vilket språk talar du med din mamma?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
22. Vilket språk talar din mamma med dig?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
23. Vilket språk talar du med din pappa?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
24. Vilket språk talar din pappa med dig?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
25. Vilket språk talar du med din(a) äldre syskon?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
26. Vilket språk talar du med din(a) yngre syskon?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
27. Vilket språk talar du med din(a) iranska kompis(ar) i skolan?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska
☐ bara svenska
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28. Vilket språk talar du med din(a) iranska kompis(ar) utanför skolan?  
☐ bara persiska  ☐ mest persiska  ☐ både persiska och svenska  ☐ mest svenska  ☐ bara svenska

29. Vilket språk talar du med din persiska lärare?  
☐ bara persiska  ☐ mest persiska  ☐ både persiska och svenska  ☐ mest svenska  ☐ bara svenska

30. Tycker du att det är bra att kunna sitt hemspråk?  ☐ Nej  ☐ Ja Varför? __


32. Förutom under modersmålsundervisningen, hur ofta använder du persiska i skolan?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ ganska ofta  ☐ ofta  ☐ mycket ofta  ☐ alltid

33. Hur många iranska klasskompisar har du?  
☐ ingen  ☐ 1–3  ☐ 4–5  ☐ 6–10  ☐ fler än 10

34. Hur ofta talar du persiska med vuxna persisktalande utanför skolan?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ ganska ofta  ☐ ofta  ☐ mycket ofta  ☐ alltid

35. Hur ofta talar du svenska med vuxna svensktalande utanför skolan?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ ganska ofta  ☐ ofta  ☐ mycket ofta  ☐ alltid

36. Hur ofta talar du svenska med din(a) svensktalande kompis(ar) utanför skolan?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ ganska ofta  ☐ ofta  ☐ mycket ofta  ☐ alltid

37. Hur ofta talar du persiska med din(a) persisktalande kompis(ar) utanför skolan?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ ganska ofta  ☐ ofta  ☐ mycket ofta  ☐ alltid

38. Vilket språk tycker du att du kan bäst?  
☐ persiska  ☐ svenska

39. Vilket språk använder du helst?  
☐ persiska  ☐ svenska

40. Hur ofta tittar du på persiska program på tv/video?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ minst en gång i veckan  ☐ flera gånger i veckan  ☐ varje dag

41. Hur ofta lyssnar du på persiska radioprogram?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ minst en gång i veckan  ☐ flera gånger i veckan  ☐ varje dag

42. Hur ofta lyssnar du på persisk musik?  
☐ aldrig  ☐ ibland  ☐ minst en gång i veckan  ☐ flera gånger i veckan  ☐ varje dag

43. Hur ofta tittar du på persisk film på bio?
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44. Hur ofta tittar du på svenska program på tv/video?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

45. Hur ofta lyssnar du på svenska radioprogram?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

46. Hur ofta lyssnar du på svensk musik?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

47. Hur ofta tittar du på svensk film på bio?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

48. Hur ofta läser du böcker på persiska? (Räkna inte läroböckerna)
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

49. Hur ofta läser du böcker på svenska? (Räkna inte läroböckerna)
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

50. Hur ofta läser du tidningar på persiska?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

51. Hur ofta läser du tidningar på svenska?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

52. Hur ofta skriver du på persiska till iranska kompisar och släktingar?
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

53. Hur ofta skriver du på svenska? (Räkna inte med läxorna)
☐ aldrig ☐ ibland ☐ minst en gång i månaden ☐ minst en gång i veckan ☐ flera gånger i veckan ☐ varje dag

54. Är du med i släktbesök och olika traditionella fester? ☐ Nej ☐ Ja.

55. Vilket språk talar du under tiden?
☐ bara persiska ☐ mest persiska ☐ både persiska och svenska ☐ mest svenska ☐ bara svenska

56. Hur ofta besöker du Iran?
☐ aldrig ☐ Om aldrig, gå till fråga 59
ibland
en gång om året
2 eller fler gånger om året

57. Hur länge brukar du stanna där?
mindre än en månad 1–3 månader mer än 3 månader

58. Trivs du i Iran? Nej Ja Varför? __________________________

59. Vill du bo i Iran? Nej Ja Varför? __________________________

60. Vill du bo i Sverige? Nej Ja Varför? __________________________

Övriga kommentarer:
Om du har ytterligare kommentarer och synpunkter, är du välkommen att skriva ner dem på nedanstående rader:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Hjärtligt tack för ditt engagemang!
Appendix 2: The original version of the parent questionnaire

STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET

Shidrokh Namei
Centrum för tvåspråkighetsforskning

1. تاریخ تولد؟

2. مهل تولد؟

3. جنسیت؟ □ مرد □ زن

4. کی به سوئد آمده اید؟ □ بله □ خیر

5. آیا از زندگی در سوئد راضی هستید؟ □ بله □ خیر

6. لطفاً مشخص نمایید که به چه فعالیتی مشغول هستید؟

7. شغل شما چیست؟

8. میزان تحصیلات؟

9. اعضای خانواده ی شما عبارتند از:

□ شوهر □ زن □ فرزند، تعداد و سن آنها؟ □ کسان دیگر؟

10. محل تولد همسر شما؟

11. شما چه زبان‌هایی را می‌دانید؟ به چه زبانی خواندن و نوشتن آموختید؟

12. زبان مادری شما چیست؟

13. ندی و نوشتن آموختید؟ به چه زبانی خواندن و نوشتن آموختید؟

14. لطفاً دانش زبانی خود را از نظر دکر مشخص نمایید:

فارسی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

سوئدی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

15. لطفاً دانش زبانی خود را از نظر صحن کردن مشخص نمایید:

فارسی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

سوئدی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

16. لطفاً دانش زبانی خود را از نظر صحن کردن مشخص نمایید:

فارسی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

سوئدی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب
17. لطفاً دانش زبانی خود را از نظر نوشتن مشخص نمایید:
فارسی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب
سوئدی □ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

18. آیا شما دوستان ایرانی دارید؟ □ بله □ خیر
آیا شما دوستان سوئدی دارید؟ □ بله □ خیر

19. چقدر یکدیگر را ملاقات می کنید؟
□ هرگز □ گاهی □ نسبتاً زیاد □ زیاد □ خیلی زیاد □ هرروز

20. چقدر فرزند خود را (شرکت کننده در این تحقیق) در این ملاقات ها شرکت می کنید؟
□ هرگز □ گاهی □ نسبتاً زیاد □ زیاد □ خیلی زیاد □ هرروز

21. آیا شما دوستان ایرانی دارید؟ □ بله □ خیر
آیا شما دوستان سوئدی دارید؟ □ بله □ خیر

22. چقدر فرزند خود را در این ملاقات ها شرکت می کنید؟
□ هرگز □ گاهی □ نسبتاً زیاد □ زیاد □ خیلی زیاد □ هرروز

23. چقدر فرزند خود را در این ملاقات ها شرکت می کنید؟
□ هرگز □ گاهی □ نسبتاً زیاد □ زیاد □ خیلی زیاد □ هرروز

24. آیا فرزند شما در سوئد به مهد کودک نرفته است؟ □ بله □ خیر
آیا فرزند شما در سوئد به مهد کودک رفته است؟ □ بله □ خیر

25. چه مدت از او در مهد کودک (با محل مشابه) نگهداری شده است؟
□ هرگز □ گاهی □ نسبتاً زیاد □ زیاد □ خیلی زیاد □ هرروز

26. در این محل به چه زبانی صحبت می شد؟
□ فقط فارسی □ بیشتر فارسی □ فارسی و سوئدی □ بیشتر سوئدی □ فقط سوئدی

27. فرزند شما پس از مدرسه اوقاتش را در کجا می گذراند؟
□ درخانه □ درمهد کودک □ با دوستان ایرانیش □ با دوستان سوئدیش □ دریک
□ انجمن ورزشی □ محل دیگر

28. در این وقت از چه زبانی استفاده می شود؟
□ فقط فارسی □ بیشتر فارسی □ فارسی و سوئدی □ بیشتر سوئدی □ فقط سوئدی

29. شما به کدام یک از زبان هایی که می دانید از همه مسلط تر هستید؟ لطفاً به ترتیبی بنویسیم که زبانی را که از همه مسلط ترید در اول و آن که از همه کمتر می دانید در آخر قرار گیرد.

30. ترجیح می دهید از کدام زبان استفاده کنید؟ □ فارسی □ سوئدی

31. لطفاً دانش فارسی فرزند خود را از نظر درک مشخص نمایید:
□ خیلی ضعیف □ نسبتاً ضعیف □ متوسط □ خوب □ خیلی خوب

32. لطفاً دانش فارسی فرزند خود را از نظر صحت کردن مشخص نمایید:
Language Maintenance and Shift among Iranians in Sweden

33. Please rate your child's proficiency in Persian:([{low},{moderate},{good},{very good}, {excellent}]

34. Please rate your child's proficiency in writing:([{low},{moderate},{good},{very good}, {excellent}]

35. What is the language you speak with your child?
- Only Persian
- More Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- More Swedish
- Only Swedish

36. What language does your child speak with you?
- Only Persian
- More Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- More Swedish
- Only Swedish

37. When talking to your child in Persian outside the home, what emotional response do you feel?
- Very negative
- Negative
- Not negative and not positive
- Positive
- Very positive
- I never speak Persian to him/her in such situations

38. What language does your child speak with their older siblings?
- Only Persian
- More Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- More Swedish
- Only Swedish

39. What language does your child speak with their younger siblings?
- Only Persian
- More Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- More Swedish
- Only Swedish

40. What language does your child speak with their Iranian friends outside school?
- Only Persian
- More Persian
- Persian and Swedish
- More Swedish
- Only Swedish

41. How often does your child speak to older Swedes outside school?
- Never
- Occasionally
- Relatively often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

42. How often does your child speak to younger Swedes outside school?
- Never
- Occasionally
- Relatively often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

43. How often does your child speak to their friends outside school?
- Never
- Occasionally
- Relatively often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

44. How often does your child use Swedish outside school?
- Never
- Occasionally
- Relatively often
- Often
- Very often
- Every day

45. Do you think your child is more proficient in Persian or Swedish?
- Persian
- Swedish

46. How much do you want your child to learn Persian?
- Little
- Somewhat little
- At the level of talking
- Good
- Very good

47. Do you think learning Swedish is beneficial for your child?
- Yes
- Good
- Any negative or positive reasons?

48. How much do you want your child to learn Swedish?
- Little
- Somewhat little
- At the level of talking
- Good
- Very good
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آیا فکر می‌کنید فارسی یاد گرفتن برای فرزند شما مفید است؟ □بله □خیر

در هر صورت منفی یا مثبت، لطفاً دلیل را بنویسید.

آیا موافقتی پیش می‌آید که فرزندتان از فارسی صحبت کردن پرهیز کنند؟ □بله □خیر

آگرجواب مثبت است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است، لطفاً موافق است

آیا فرزند شما نسبت به آموزش زبان فارسی چه برخوردی دارد؟ □بسیار منفی □منفی □نه منفی و نه مثبت □مثبت □بسیار مثبت

آیا هرکس از فارسی صحبت کردن پرهیز کند؟ آیا مواقعی پیش می‌آید که فرزندتان از فارسی صحبت کردن پرهیز کنند؟ □بله □خیر

اگر جواب منفی یا مثبت است، لطفاً دلیلش را بنویسید

فرزند شما چقدر به برنامه‌های رادیوهای ایرانی گوش می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به موسیقی ایرانی گوش می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به برنامه‌های تلویزیونی ویدئویی فارسی نگاه می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به سینما می‌روید؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر در فعالیت‌های به زبان فارسی شرکت می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به برنامه‌های رادیوهای سوئدی گوش می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به برنامه‌های تلویزیونی ویدئویی سوئدی نگاه می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به موسیقی سوئدی گوش می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما برای دیدن فیلم به زبان فارسی چقدر به سینما می‌روید؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

فرزند شما چقدر به برنامه‌های تلویزیونی ویدئویی سوئدی نگاه می‌کند؟ □هرگز □گاهی □حداقل یکبار در هفته □چندبار در هفته □هرروز

آیا شما با دوستان ایرانیش تماس دارید؟ □بله □خیر

آیا فرزند شما و شما به ایران مسافرت می‌کنید؟ □بله □خیر اگر جواب منفی است، به قبیه سوالات لازم نبیش جواب دهید.

آیا فرزندتان در این سفر با شما همراه است؟ □بله □خیر
نظرات متفرقه:
لطفاً اگر نظرات دیگری دارید، آنها را در اینجا بیان داشته باشید.
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