DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS, LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

Tales from the diaspora: a narrative enquiry into second-generation South Asian Britons

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD June 2017

Sheena Kalayil

For my parents, Mathew and Omana Kalayil:

for making that journey

Acknowledgements

My gratitude to my supervisor Mark Sebba at Lancaster University: for his wise counsel, and for reading unruly drafts and more refined efforts with equal attention and concern. I am grateful to Sam Kirkham for his advice, and to Ben Rampton for his encouragement. My thanks also to Li-ying Wu whose doctoral thesis I read for inspiration, when I was in the very early stages of mine.

My deepest thanks must go to my husband, James: for guiding me through my toils and worries, and for never ever losing faith in me.

And to my precious daughters, Bonnie and Ruby: I wrote this for you my sweethearts, the next generation.

Abstract

I present a qualitative study using the narratives, elicited through interviews, of seven second-generation South Asian Britons; five men and two women, aged at the time of the interviews between 35 to 50 years. My participants are higher professionals who have married out of their ethnic and linguistic communities, and who are parents of dual-heritage children – a target group that is under-represented in linguistics research. I investigate the participants' relationship with their South Asian Heritage Language –the languages being Punjabi, Gujarati, Bengali, Tamil and Konkani –and the dynamics of languages in their families (their birth families and their own families), showing that the factors which influence language maintenance and transmission are varied and unpredictable, and not always related to proficiency in or affinity to the Heritage Language and culture. I also investigate how the participants exploit the interview platform I give them, arguing that the participants perform the habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) of a member of the South Asian diaspora, with acute awareness of how their lives share similarities with and differ from the Discourses (Gee, 1999) surrounding South Asians in Britain. I analyse the narratives using an emic perspective of the functional use of discourse, using aspects of conversation analysis and using a Bakhtinian perspective of language. I show how the participants use the discourse to point to Discourses as well as different linguistic and cultural capitals (Bourdieu, 1990) available to them. My thesis regards the narratives firstly as a body of text for discourse analysis, offering three themes: how the participants use temporal and spatial references, how they use 'voices', and how they 'recreate' their pasts using chronotopes (Bakhtin, 1981). Secondly, by regarding the narratives individually, I show that within the interview-time the participants present a macro-narrative of themselves, explaining and/or justifying how they have become the person they are now. By treating the narratives in these two ways I contribute to the exploration of methodologies that can be used in narrative enquiry while providing new insights into practices surrounding language maintenance and loss in dual-heritage families.

Contents

Chapter		Page
1.	**Introduction**	9
1.1	Minding one's language	9
1.2	Community, multiculturalism, diaspora and diversity	12
1.3	Identity and language	17
1.4	British South Asians	20
1.5	Conclusion	26
2.	**Literature Review**	29
2.1	Multilingual families	31
2.1.1	Language maintenance and language transmission	31
2.1.2	Heritage Languages	36
2.2	The South Asian context	37
2.2.1	Studies on South Asians in educational settings	37
2.2.2	Studies on South Asians in non-educational settings	39
2.2.3	South Asian accents and phonology	43
2.2.4	The marriage question	46
2.3	British South Asians in public discourses	50
2.3.1	The political arena	50
2.3.2	The non-political public	

arena 51

2.4 Conclusion 55

3. Methods 57

3.1 Gathering data 57

3.1.1 Collecting participants and interviewing ethically 57

3.1.2 Conducting the interviews 59

3.1.3 The participants 59

3.2 Qualitative research and personal narratives 62

3.3 Using interviewing as a research tool 70

3.3.1 Qualitative interviews 70

3.3.2 What exactly do you get from an interview 73

3.4 Conclusion 78

4. Theories and analysis 80

4.1 The narratives as discourse: Using an emic perspective of the functional use of language 81

4.2 The narratives as conversation: Using aspects of Conversational Analysis 84

4.3 The narratives as literary texts: Using Bakhtin's concepts of discourse and power, dialogism and chronotopes 86

4.4 The narratives: Big D Discourses and capital 101

4.5 Conclusion 105

5. Time and space 106

5.1 Mobility 106

5.1.1 The journey 106

5.1.2 Siblings 109

5.1.3 Other journeys 115

5.2 Local versus global 118

5.2.1 Language and space 118

5.2.2 Language and people 123

5.2.3 Space and community 126

5.3 Conclusion 130

6. Narrative voices 133

6.1 Using direct speech 133

6.1.1 Delivering a punchline 134

6.1.2 What other people are thinking 136

6.1.3 The 'real story' 138

6.1.4 The verdict 141

6.1.5 The 'where are you from?' question 144

6.1.6 Everyday realities 147

6.1.7 A fly on the wall 148

6.2 Accent and stylisation 151

6.2.1 Using Indian pronunciation and lexis 153

6.2.2 Using stylisation 158

6.3 Conclusion 161

7. Building a back-story

7.1 Past times 163

7.1.1 The common story 163

7.1.2 Uncommon stories 164

7.2 Threshold 167

7.2.1 Change and language 171

7.2.2 Change and religion 171

7.2.3 University experiences 182

7.3 Conclusion 186

188

8. My Heritage Language: Narratives of Devinder and Mumtaz 191

8.1. Devinder's narrative 191

8.1.1 Speaking the vernacular 191

8.1.2 The dynamics of families 195

8.1.3 'His' Punjabi 197

8.2 Mumtaz's narrative 200

8.2.1 Completely natural 200

8.2.2 A family language 202

8.3 Conclusion 207

9. Narrative of Kamran 209

9.1 Community and culture 209

9.1.1 A northern boy 209

9.1.2 The view from the finishing line 211

9.1.3 'Every cliché' 214

9.2 Languages and capital 216

9.2.1 English is the key 216

9.2.2 His Heritage Language 221

9.2.3 His brother's wedding 227

9.3 Marriage and consequences 229

9.3.1 A very long story 229

9.3.2 A complete disaster 230

9.3.3 Marrying for love 233

9.4 Conclusion 236

10. Conclusion 238

10.1 Tales from the diaspora 240

10.2 Limitations and future research 245

10.3 Concluding thoughts 246

11. Appendix I 247

12. Bibliography 248

1. Introduction

As a child I sought perfection and so denied myself the claim to any identity. As an adult I accept that a bicultural upbringing is a rich but imperfect thing.

Jhumpa Lahiri

1.1 Minding one's language

A few years ago I came across a programme aired on the BBC's Asian Network, *Mind your language* (2010), which shared its title with a popular 1970s television series. That programme, set in an English language evening class, offered a lovable cast of adults, each representing one of the noticeable 'groups' (Hindu, Sikh, Muslim, French, Greek) of multicultural Britain. All the students were seeking to improve their English in order to 'join in' British life; to, for want of a better word, integrate. The radio programme evoked the memory of the series to introduce the theme of language. This time, however, the language in question was not English, but the Heritage Languages of ethnic minorities, specifically South Asian, in the UK. The host of the programme, Konnie Huq, expressed regret that her fluency in Bengali, the language passed down by her Bangladeshi parents, was dwindling, and that the next generation would most likely not speak Bengali at all. Using her own experiences as a stimulus, she wanted to investigate the transmission of mother-tongues/community languages/ Heritage Languages — she became entangled in the many labels and associated baggage involved in describing these languages — among second-generation Britons.

What struck me on listening to Huq's programme was the disjuncture between the perspectives of the 'ordinary' people and the invited experts. Itesh Sachdev, from SOAS, described the "miserable" degree of maintenance that these languages exhibited among post-

first-generation Britons[1]. Although Adrian Blackledge was similarly disappointed that South Asian languages suffered from ideological discrimination — an opinion that he elaborates on in his research (Blackledge, 2004 is one example) — Angela Creese was encouraged by her studies of complementary schools, reassuring the listeners that South Asian languages in these settings were "alive and kicking", and revealing that students were allowed in these classes to become successful learners and explore "learner identities".

The tone of interviews with Huq's respondents, however, was different. 'Zee', a British Pakistani, expressed her disappointment with complementary schools and personal tutors whom she feared used the lessons for religious indoctrination: she preferred her children to be "liberal" and "well-adjusted", even if this came at the price of losing the language. Kirti and Ketan, however, were committed to the Gujarati complementary school their children attended. But their description of the demands made on their children and family life ─ classes after school, late evenings, and Sundays ─ revealed the logistics involved in maintaining the language. In effect, the voices of the parents – ranging from the middle-class Standard English accent of Zee, to the more foreign-sounding Kirti and Ketan — offered a more prosaic commentary on the language maintenance issue: that the format of lessons in complementary schools could be less than attractive to some parents, that attendance might incur logistical demands and serious commitment. In these contexts, some parents could feel that maintaining the language was too onerous or not important.

The disconnect between the experts/lay-people in the programme could point to a wider issue: while researchers focus on certain behaviours from the South Asian communities that provide rich scope for investigations into multilingualism (such as attendance at and practices of complementary schools), other behaviours, sometimes even the converse of the same (such as the *non*-attendance of complementary schools) may be largely ignored. Throughout the

[1] Throughout this thesis, the term 'first-generation' refers to migrants to the UK; 'second-generation' refers to the children of these migrants. This terminology is consistent with common usage in the UK but differs from how it is commonly used in the USA.

programme the assumption was that the children whose linguistic fate was so worrying came from families where both parents shared the same language, an assumption which ignored the diversity of the UK in general and the South Asian communities specifically. Surely some South Asian Britons married other South Asians from a different linguistic background — a Bengali speaker, say, with a Gujarati speaker? And surely some South Asian Britons have married out of their ethnic background; as I have done, as Konnie Huq has done, and as other South Asians elsewhere, like the writer Jhumpa Lahiri, quoted above, have done? What happens then to languages in these families?

I embarked on my doctoral study in order to find some answers to the questions that Huq's *Mind your language* provoked. But another reason was to give a voice to people like me who, while being privileged with a high-level of education and professional careers, are rarely 'heard' in research. I found seven second-generation British South Asians who had white English spouses and dual-heritage children and I interviewed each participant to elicit an oral narrative of their lives. Being higher professionals, holding reserves of material and cultural capital (Bourdieu and Thompson, 1991, discussed in Chapter 4), my participants all present themselves as 'assimilated' and fully effective in society. I argue, however, that from their articulation of their lives, our understanding of multiculturalism, identity and language is enriched. My participants' lives represent a microcosm of multiculturalism and intergenerational language transfer, and their stories can provide new insights into interpretations of pertinent themes: community, identity, multiculturalism, multilingualism, and mixed-race partnerships.

My study also reveals the variety of experiences related to learning the language of your parents: the varieties of proficiencies that can result, and the variety of relationships that individuals can have with their heritage culture. As members of the South Asian diasporic communities — the diaspora as I call it in the main body of my thesis — they highlight, through their story-telling, acute understanding of issues surrounding mobility and language, space and time, and give reflective, thoughtful accounts of their lives and decisions related to language. The

stories are also very human stories – of relationships with parents, siblings, friends, spouses and children – that can be recognised by everyone, all the while inhabiting that complex domain of being children of immigrants to the UK.

In the rest of this chapter I will discuss some terms that pertain to my thesis. These terms are often revisited, and their complexity is further illustrated in the workings of this thesis.

1.2 Community, multiculturalism, diaspora and diversity

The use of the term **community** is widespread in public discourse as well as in private conversation. While used commonly to describe a group of people with a shared characteristic, such as a shared ethnic and linguistic background — as I do for the most part in my thesis — each of those terms is itself complex. For example, the term 'community language' is useful in linguistic discussions but can also encourage expectations that each member of a community will have the same proficiency in the language or even the same affinity. However, a community can have a very large reach (the South Asian community in the UK) or be smaller (the Muslim Punjabi community in Manchester). Craig Calhoun relates community to a way of living, where "people live in dense, multiplex, relatively autonomous networks of social relationships", thus moving the concept away from a location or even a description of a group of people within a larger population. This allows for the 'smaller' aspects of community to be acknowledged: "a mode of relating, variable in extent" (Calhoun, 1998: 381). Lave and Wenger's (1991) 'Communities of Practice' (CoP) theory argues that community may also be formed by a shared endeavour: a CoP could therefore be a group of students of varying nationalities engaged in the same project, or a group of worshippers in a religious building. The concept of CoPs thereby also reorients **identity** (discussed later) to social practice and talk, rather than being pre-given and essential, treating an individual not as a member of one group, but rather as "an actor" who participates, in different ways, in multiple communities of practice (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992:490). Not to be underestimated, however, is the symbolism connected with the

concept of 'community' (Cohen, 1985), which can offer a sense of stability in a transient society. So, for example, South Asians living in a "network" may relate to each other because some concepts such as filial duty may be perceived as stronger in their 'community' than in others, and may be seen as symbolic of a 'culture' found in that community.

If defined broadly, culture will include the system of values a group adheres to, as well as its idea of identity (Edwards & Chisholm, 1987). But with the shifting nature of one's lived experiences, and physical dislocations, shifts can occur in 'culture'. While an inexorable link between language and culture is assumed (Edwards, 1997; Fishman, 1989), we must accept that within what may be regarded as one linguistic community there may be different 'cultures' dictated by, on a grand scale, religion, gender and education, and on a smaller scale, by family practices and dynamics, by age and peer influences. The presence of people of different cultures living in the same area — cultural **diversity** — is the starting point for **multiculturalism**. Parekh's concept of communal diversity, a sub-form of cultural diversity, where groups are "self-conscious and more or less well-organized communities entertaining and living by their own different systems of beliefs and practices" (Parekh, 2002:3), chimes with Cohen's description of the self-awareness of groups. Culture is thus related to how an individual lives his/her life, and a displaced global individual may only access this culture or be able to practise it in the domain of a 'community'. But Parekh reminds us that "loyalty to a community entails obligations" (Parekh, 2000:5), raising the question of whether or not one is obliged to adhere to these obligations in order to belong to a community or how, indeed, one can deviate from these expectations. For community does not, of course, exclude negative social dimensions (Upadhya, 2002): in the African-American community, for example, lack of loyalty to the community attracts pejorative terms such as 'Uncle Tom'; and in the South Asian and Caribbean diasporic communities, the analogous term 'coconut'.

The term **multicultural society**, often used to describe the UK, is itself still much debated. Gerard Delanty (2003) describes the UK as a paradigm of **liberal communitarian**

multiculturalism; derived from Britain's colonial history and the Commonwealth, where diversity is officially recognised, but where there is little effort to empower minority groups. Delanty offers a metaphor which is in keeping with stereotypes of British froideur: that of a salad bowl rather than the melting-pot, evoking a type of multiculturalism that he dismisses as being "frequently indistinguishable from intercultural tokenism" (Delanty, 2003:103). For Parekh, discussions of the use of the terms "multicultural society" and "multiculturalism", involve analysing the response of a multicultural country to its cultural diversity: responses which can be varied, and can lead to a range of types of multiculturalism, as Delanty has noted. Parekh argues that asking whether a country like Britain or France *can* be described as 'really' or truly' multicultural is redundant. The question is whether or not they *should* indeed remain so: a distinction between a 'multiculturalist' society "which actively seeks to entwine these difference within the majority culture" (Parekh, 2002:7) and a multicultural society where various diverse communities exist side by side within a majority culture.

All these discussions on multiculturalism are relevant to my participants' lives, all members of a **diaspora,** a particular community formed from being displaced from the homeland, and who are thereby forced to negotiate a triad of relationships: with the homeland, place of settlement and other diasporic communities (Vertovec, 1999). Some of my participants tell stories of growing up in a community which lived "side by side" with the host community, much like the salad-bowl metaphor; they all also describe present lives which are very much a melting-pot. Their current day-to-day lives enmesh their South Asian community or network with the 'majority' community, more viscerally than simply a tolerant co-habitation, because of the extra messiness that arrives with marriage and children. The details they give – of having conversations with their spouses over whether their children should learn Punjabi/Gujarati/Tamil, or the absence of these conversations, or anecdotes about their children communicating with their South Asian grandparents – offer insights into aspects of multiculturalism which transform it from an abstraction into a reality. Furthermore, the stories

they tell of their South Asian communities offer insights into how these diasporic communities *function* — what they do/when they gather/ how they regard each other — rather than whether they *exist* or not.

Diversity is now being re-considered in the contemporary world as **superdiversity** (Vertovec, 2007; Rampton, 2012; Rampton, 2013b). This concept offers a necessary reflection on the globalised nature of our world today, where the types of migrants have increased in terms of nationality, ethnicity, language and religion. These migrants also exhibit different motives, patterns and itineraries of migration, and different approaches to joining the work and housing markets (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011:1). For example, a middle-class Indian might study in the United States and then settle and work there. He might even marry 'into' one of the diasporic communities in the US or choose a bride from a diasporic community in the Gulf States. This is a very different migration experience to the low-skilled worker arriving in Tower Hamlets, London, from Bangladesh in the 1970s. Undeniably, with developments in communication technologies and global migration patterns, societies have become more complex.

But, rather than the nature of diversity itself changing, I argue that the investigations around migration have become more reflective and hence revealed more complexities than previously imagined. That is, research has not previously offered enough opportunities to delve into the migrant networks. For example, Blommaert explains that "integration" takes place in a variety of "niches": not only that of migrants' host societies, "but also those of émigré communities in a diaspora, of their 'home' cultures, of gender, age, social class, profession, workplace, religion, consumption, hobby, media and so forth niches" (Blommaert, 2013b:194). The stories my participants tell relate to nearly all of the mentioned niches. Rather than these being *new* phenomena (as Blommaert is by no means suggesting) there is simply a growing awareness of the importance of considering these niches in discussions of 'negotiations' that migrants need to undertake. That is, rather than diversity itself becoming 'superdiverse', *reflections* on migrant communities are becoming more microscopic. Further, while my participants are

second-generation (not migrants themselves) their stories show that they are still compelled to 'integrate': not only into their host (now their home) country, but 'into' their heritage culture or the culture of the local diasporic community. They too need to perform in niches.

It is true, however, that unlike in the 1960s/70s/80s when my participants were growing up, there is now the potential to retain an active connection with the home country by means of long-distance communication technologies (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011:3) and a greater variety of opportunities to engage with the Heritage Language. An example could be the wide availability of the show *Who Wants to be a Millionaire* in different countries; I myself watched it along with my husband in my aunt's house in Kerala. The show, which included questions presented in both English and Malayalam, was a good example of what Androutsopoulus (2007) describes as the need for "diasporamedia" to acknowledge that much of their audience has limited proficiency in the language of the homeland. But I caution that these opportunities do not offer a reality but a *potential*. My study shows that decisions and practices around the learning and use of Heritage languages are affected by other factors, such as social class, parental relationships and ideology, and indeed the institutional language policies of the host societies. The changes to the migrant experience that tools such as social media and the internet can enact should therefore not be over-romanticised. The assumption that innovations in technology will make a difference with the second-generation should be made cautiously: three of my participants have had regular and frequent contact with the homeland but this does not directly correlate with their attitudes to language maintenance with their children. A second generational can now keep in touch with cousins back home via Facebook or Twitter, and have access to online newspapers in more South Asian languages than before: there may be *performances* in the language hitherto seen rarely. But we cannot assume that these opportunities will be exploited or indeed if they will directly lead to language maintenance. While, undoubtedly, engagement with languages has become more complex, and new opportunities abound, other factors, as my participants' narratives show, also impact on language maintenance.

1.3 Identity and language

Any study which touches on the term 'identity' throws up numerous questions: of its fixedness or not, its nature, whether it can be manipulated, and who decides it. The latter implies **identity** is not self-contained, but rather that, "we need to be able to *imagine* a particular identity for us and other people need to *accept* the identity we aspire to" (Piller, 2002:13, my emphases). Stuart Hall has argued that alongside the enlightenment self (the inner-core of a person that does not change), the concept of identity in the contemporary world should also include the sociological subject (the identity constituted through interaction) and a post-modern self which assumes different identities at different times and in different locations (Hall, 1991; Featherstone, 1995; Scholte, 2005). The last is related to an appreciation of globalisation, migration and the concept of diasporic communities. Both Piller's and Hall's arguments emphasise the performative nature of identity and the need for knowledge of 'how' to perform. James Gee offers the term "Discourses with a capital D" for those forms of knowledge which enact a socially recognisable identity (Gee, 2005, discussed in Chapter 4), and are pertinent to diasporic communities who through nostalgia, need and desire for 'community', are wont to create these Discourses.

Contemporary studies recognise, further, that "rather than being *reflected* in discourse, identity is actively *constituted* in discourse" (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006:3-4). The acceptance of the role that discourse plays in construction of identities stems in part from Foucault's (1972, 1981) arguments that identities are socially constructed, from structures and institutions. Also, that there is a tautology in discourse, in that by speaking of a thing we create that that thing: for example, speaking of criminality creates criminals. Closely related is Althusser's (1970) concept of interpellation, where a subject is positioned or produced by discourse: a researcher interviewing a person creates a participant. Linguistic studies have investigated types of identities such as gender (see Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992 as an example), religion (Fishman, 2006 is an example) and ethnicity (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985, are an example). More recent linguistic studies have focused on researching identities near borders, where, they argue "fluidity

of such identities is much more apparent" (Cramer, 2013:147). Bejarano's (2005) study of the residents on the US-Mexico border is one example; Llamas' (2000) study of Middlesborough, on the border of Teeside and Yorkshire is another.

Essentialist categories are now contested or treated with caution: identity is now largely assumed to be socially constructed and emerging within the context of interaction (Bucholz and Hall, 2005). Over a lifetime, then, speakers will have a repertoire of identities (Cramer, 2013:147). This acceptance that identity changes, then, depending on time and circumstance — often described in critical traditions using words such as 'fleeting' and 'fragmented' — needs also to be balanced by the wish of most individuals for some consistency, for a 'category', that can give individuals a valuable sense of personal investment (Edwards and Stokoe, 2004). Eliciting a narrative of a person's life both comments on 'identity' and reconstructs the links between past, present, and future. From childhood to adulthood there are inevitable changes in roles ─ what could be described as a multiplicity of identities. This is especially true for members of a diaspora, whose lives involve change and movements over space linked to time (Pavlenko, 1998, 2001; Hall, 1990:224). When asked to talk about their lives, the choices these members make (about which stories to tell and how they tell them) give clues about how they wish to represent themselves to society, but also in the proximity of the interview setting. The ways my participants construct their life-stories show how these individuals feel about the Heritage Language and identity: the discourse they use and the Discourses they discuss. Therefore, closely related to my views on identity, is my understanding of the use of interviews as a research tool, and of narrative enquiry, both of which are discussed in more depth in Chapter 3, Methods and Chapter 4, Theories and Analysis.

My interest in their relationship with their South Asian linguistic heritage might appear inevitable when discussing identity, but is it? **Language** can be a symbol of belonging to a community (Cohen, 1985); or a characteristic (inherited or chosen) that a person or a group regards as an integral part of their self-understanding or identity (Parekh, 2002:1); or "an

ideological artefact with very considerable power […] an object of passionate personal attachment" (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011:4). If a group sees language as central to its identity, showing language shift will thus be seen as a shift in culture or identity (Smolicz et al, 2001). Gal and Irvine comment on the "persistent use of language as a synecdoche for community" (Gal and Irvine, 1995:969), even though it is now widely accepted that social categories – including ethnic groups, races, genders, classes – are also partly constructed and reproduced through distinguishing symbolic devices and everyday practices. The language-community concept endures, relying on the supposedly natural correlation of one language with one culture. A term such as 'community language', therefore, while useful in linguistic discussions, also encourages a starting point of expecting all members of a community to have a similar proficiency and relationship with the language in question. These ideas recur even when research models have moved beyond 'language' to ideas of 'linguistic repertoire' (Ferguson, 1984; Leung, Harris and Rampton, 1997) allowing, as my study shows, for the possibility that over a lifetime an individual may have a varied involvement, use and even memory of a language. And, further, that this 'language' itself will vary between individuals, in their idiolect, but also their adeptness with style, register and genre. The way people speak can be used to show identification with a certain group (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985), and this perspective allows non-group members to show identification, contested as that may be: see Sebba's (2007) discussion of the use of aspects of London Jamaican by the character Ali G.

For these reasons, I use the term **'Heritage Language'**, favoured by researchers in the US and Canada, as it offers a link between language and community/culture while evoking enough 'distance' to avoid feelings of guilt if one does not show much proficiency in the language and allowing for different patterns of usage. Users speaking the Heritage Language may demonstrate varied '**proficiency**' — a term I use in my thesis to describe my participants' self-reported adeptness at performing effectively in a variety of scenarios — as well as varied perspectives of 'what this says about them'.

1.4 South Asian Britons

South Asians ─ Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis ─ in Census 2011 numbered approximately 3 million, at the time 4.9% of the population of the United Kingdom, accounting for nearly a half of the total ethnic minority population, and nearly half of these reported as born in the UK (Census, 2011). Although they date back to the seventeenth century in the UK, post-war migration accounts for much of the Indian and Pakistani communities in the UK, and, unlike migration from the West Indies, it was often undertaken by men, who were later followed by wives and families from the sub-continent. Mostly educated and migrating in family groups, East African Asians arrived in the 1970s; Bangladeshis, mostly low-skilled workers, followed after the dissolution of East Pakistan. Peach (2006) reveals the astonishing commonalities, echoing Stopes-Roe and Cochrane's much earlier findings (1990), that exist within the South Asian sub-groups in the UK: 80% of British Pakistanis originate from the Mirpur and Chhach areas in Kashmir; 80% of British Sikhs come from Jalandhar District; 70% of Indian Hindus and Indian Muslims emanate from Gujarat; 80% of the British Bangladeshi population come from the Sylhet area. These statistics also show that these sub-groups when they arrived in the UK settled in a limited selection of areas: London and Leicester are Gujarati strongholds, British Pakistanis dominate in northern cities and towns.

I write about 'South Asians', 'British Asians', 'South Asian Britons', 'Sikh Punjabis', 'Pakistani Muslims' and more, fully acknowledging that each of these groups is heterogeneous. Public discourses surrounding the South Asian community in the UK, however, do not fully represent its heterogeneity, or the heterogeneity within its varied linguistic communities and within the Heritage Languages themselves. The tendency to homogenise South Asians, particularly in the media, persists. I offer a brief overview of media representations in Chapter 2, but below, an actor from Gurindher Chadha's programme *Desi Rascals* (Sky Living) is speaking (Elan, 2014):

> EastEnders[2] doesn't represent the whole of British Asian life. Like white British life, it's incredibly varied. You can have a very wealthy working-class family based in Bradford or a middle-class Asian family in Surrey; you can have a secular British Asian family or a non-secular one. But there's no sense of this variety in TV.

Outlets such as Sunrise Radio station and the BBC Asian Network promote a pan-British Asian identity which can be seen as empowering or perpetuating a homogeneous view, as De Fina argues — regarding the term 'Latin American' — by "blurring and de-emphasizing distinctions between different nationalities" (De Fina, 2013:559). But while this may be true in public discourse, in academic circles group classifications are treated as "increasingly precarious" (Rampton, 2012:1), or described as "an imploded, narcissistic obsession with the minutiae of ethnicity" (Gilroy, 2002: xv). My thesis will not unpack such complex themes as 'race': but I offer some thoughts. First, these "minutiae" may have very real significance in people's lives which influence their own ideas of race. Secondly, one's religion or caste may intensely influence whether one identifies racially or not, an example being that the identifier "Muslim" can transcend race. But while my participants in their narratives articulate their concepts of 'being Asian', this is mostly constructed as being 'other' to "white". By eliding (except very rarely) mention of other colours, it is their way of speaking of "blackness", highlighting that the understanding of the empowerment of this master-signifier, as Gilroy argues, persists. My study thus implicitly contributes to these discussions, because individuals who have been dislocated from a homeland, and find themselves an ethnic minority 'talk race' on an experiential level. My study reveals the variety of experiences surrounding the decision to marry and have children with someone of a 'different race'. Descriptions of these

[2] *EastEnders* is a BBC soap opera set in the East End of London.

experiences are important, for while race is a social construct, these partnerships occur in society and cannot be seen outside of that context.

The term 'white', especially when used in opposition to a term such as 'Muslim' is also reductive and misleading: a white person can be Russian (that is, from a country in Asia), and a Muslim. The challenge in my thesis, then, is to employ social categories (such as 'white', 'middle-class', 'Muslim') with integrity and in a manner that is pertinent to my analyses. I thus term the partner of my participants simply as 'white' as an indication that my participants have married out of their ethnic and linguistic community into the dominant social category in the UK. Similarly, in discussions related to religion, if my participants refer to themselves as 'Muslim' or 'working-class' or 'Catholic', showing these descriptions as occupying one facet of their lives as South Asian Britons, I reiterate these terms.

It is because the South Asian diasporic communities are so diverse that I decided to undertake a small-scale qualitative study. Rather than finding an answer to a question such as "Do second-generation South Asians Britons transmit their Heritage Language?" I wanted instead to offer a selection of individuals a platform to talk about their lives and see what could be learned from what they say and how they say it. Indeed my participants reveal the short-comings of trying to describe this very heterogeneous group of people as a 'community'. My participants include a Catholic Goan, and a Brahmin Tamil (both minority religious and linguistic groups within the diaspora in the UK). And yet these small pockets of people are part of small communities which form part of the UK cultural mosaic, as well as feed into the greater South Asian diaspora.

Devyani Sharma (2011) draws further attention to the complexity of the term "**second-generation**", one I use liberally in my thesis. Taking the diverse area of Southall as a case study — where in 2011 at least 55-60% of the 75-80% ethnic minority population was of South Asian heritage — Sharma produces a time line showing the different phases of the South Asian presence, as well as showing that continued migration has produced an older second generation

(aged 40-50, as are most of my participants) and a younger second generation born to newer migrants from India, arriving in the 1990s (Sharma, 2011:466). These generations have different experiences: between the 1970s and mid 1980s there was the rise of the National Front and race riots in Southall; post-1990, there is "co-existence, with multiracial local schools, and a visibility of Asians in British culture" (Sharma, 2011:467). The younger second generation have grown up "surrounded by an ethnically-mixed, often Asian-dominant peer group" (Sharma, 2011:468), with a presence in public discourse, an experience alien to the older second generation.

Indeed, despite having a significant presence since the 1950s, it was only in the late 1980s and early 1990s, that South Asians in the UK began to gain some prominence in the media: through the emergence of Sunrise Radio in 1989, but also through the emergence of the bhangra music scene (Back, 1996). A 'desi' identity emerged[3], allowing varied South Asian diasporic communities to connect with each other and the homeland, thereby dissolving separate smaller diasporic communities to form a larger inclusive community (Alexander and Kim, 2014). But its manifestation was largely expressed through 'home-grown' British South Asian bhangra acts, who remodelled the agrarian Punjabi dance, and gave vent to "notions of repressed Asian youth who were confused and lost", disallowing any entry by ethnic outsiders. Although Banerji and Baumann (1990) and Les Back (1996) positioned bhangra music as the definitive articulation of British Asian youth identity formation at this period, it articulated a very *particular* South Asian identity rooted in the Punjabi-based North Indian/Pakistani culture in Birmingham and London (Alexander and Kim, 2014: 354-5). In *DisOrienting Rhythms* (1996) S.Sharma, Hutnyk and A. Sharma strongly criticise the focus on bhangra music, and the marginalisation in some sections of the media of other forms of South Asian cultural production – Nitin Sawhney is one example, whose hybrid music was described as blandly middle-class and consumerist by entertainment

[3] 'Desi', a term most commonly used in North America, is derived from the word 'desh', meaning country, and is used to describe the South Asian (and in the North American case, predominantly middle-class) diaspora.

critics — thereby contributing to a narrow view of the practices and tastes of South Asians in Britain.

However, parallels can be drawn with the Caribbean community in Britain, which also has access to two identities: a global identity (that of the African/Caribbean diaspora) and a local identity (that of a Black Briton) (studied by Sebba and Tate, 2002:76). Members of a diaspora have to negotiate what this local identity will be. By adopting a Jamaican Creole as a 'heritage language', second-generation Caribbeans assert their difference from the host country, as well as use a format that is recognisable by, and compatible with expectations from, the host culture. The 'bhangra-identity' which often serves as the local British South Asian identity performs a similar function: it reflects the numerical advantage of Punjabi-speakers in the UK, takes advantage of the popularity of bhangra music, and is thereby both recognisable and compatible with expectations.

But just as the second generation is heterogeneous (Sharma, 2011), so too is the first generation. I focus on second-generation Britons, but these participants all have parents who were immigrants. Long-term bilingualism and linguistic accommodation is a defining feature of South Asia (Ritchie and Bhatia, 2006). Unsurprisingly, the parents of my participants are all bilinguals, or multi-linguals, a norm from the region but one which is often "beyond the imagination of speakers who are accustomed to Western-style monolingualism" (Ritchie and Bhatia, 2006:781). There are also very complex relationships with language: religion, for example, can be a determinant for its status. While Punjabi is considered a high-status language for Sikhs, it is considered less so for Muslims, who favour Urdu or even Arabic. Further, while English has become an "integral part of the Indian linguistic mosaic" (ibid), its domains are mostly educational, legal, scientific and official: fluency in the language is desirable and prestigious, denoting belonging to a certain type of elite (Ramanathan, 1999). When migrants leave the South Asian region, these distinctions do not disappear: those from privileged echelons in the homeland, or from regions where English is favoured over Hindi as a second language, will

already be proficient in English. Inevitably then, the experience of these migrants in the UK will differ from those from less elitist backgrounds, with little proficiency in the host language.

Raising children in the UK, with a language other than English in the home, is a complex endeavour: the situation bridges personal and governmental policies. Whereas there were discussions on the possibility of teaching community languages in schools in the 1980s, by the 1990s there was little incentive to do so from central government. Rampton et al critique the Conservative government of the day as being driven by "an explicit concern for social cohesion" (1997:225) and with locating that cohesive force in the teaching of Standard English. The influence of the National Curriculum now seems to be little mentioned in academic discourse. The Labour government and its 1999 National Curriculum, and more recently the 2014 National Curriculum all have a similar slant to those in the 1980s. One wonders whether research over the last decade that has highlighted the activity of complementary schools (Blackledge and Creese, 2010) allows policy-makers a certain degree of complacency: those communities will look after their own. Clearly, language policies in the UK are not grounded in nurturing multilingualism, and this permeates society.

Dustmann and Fabbri (2003) show that proficiency in English is linked to higher employment rates among immigrants, basing their analysis on two UK surveys on ethnic minorities: the Fourth National Survey on Ethnic minorities, collected between 1993 and 1994, and the Family and Working Lives Survey of 1994 to 1995, the only data-sets that the authors knew of that had collated information of ethnic minority immigrants and their employment status and earnings. While these findings may now be outdated ─ Census 2011 shows that approximately half of the members South Asian groups were born in the UK ─ they still make for interesting reading, showing estimates that earnings can increase by up to 20% with proficiency in English. Khattab et al (2011) offer a more recent study using data from Census 2001 on Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi men and women in the mid-to-late twenties, investigating whether ethno-religious origins impact on economic activity rates. Their findings do

not concur with previous research that linked religion with economic activity (Lindley, 2002; Model and Lin, 2002): they argue that class is the over-riding factor accepting, however, that "the class structure of South Asians is highly ethnicized" and that "ethno-religious background and class are interwoven" so as to make separation nigh-impossible (Khattab et al, 2011:1479). Their underlying argument, however, suggests again that speaking English to a high standard offers economic benefits.

Political and public discourse since the mid-nineties have also linked knowledge of English and the nation's identity. Knowledge of English is now, in practical terms, essential for citizenship; but it is also considered essential to feelings of being British, and social and intergenerational cohesion (Blackledge, 2004 and Blunkett, 2002, both discussed in the next chapter). Naz Rassool (2000) argues, however, that while the sense of 'belonging' for these minority groups remains contested and ambiguous, dependent on several factors, there are signs that the host country, willingly or unwillingly, is forced to allow these groups to carve out a social space for themselves. She cites those action-centres that were the focus of Konnie Huq's radio programme: complementary schools. While these are not state-supported, Rassool argues for their significance, that they are an indication of "a dialogic interplay between cultures, people's needs, wants and desires, and wider power processes [which] is altering the nation-state from within whilst, at the same time [...] redefining the cultural and sociopolitical terrain" (Rassool, 2000:392). For Casciani (2003), writing in *The Guardian* newspaper, these schools are sites where second-generation British Asians, with a re-ignited desire to re-connect with their heritage, are able to maintain that connection through their children. It seems that minding one's language will remain a topic for debate for some time.

1.5 Conclusion

I was inspired by Heller and Lévy's comment, in their paper on French-English intermarriage in Canada, that "despite the plethora of demographic analyses of rates of exogamy and assimilation,

no-one […] has ever bothered to ask any questions about what actually goes on in the lives of people involved in such linguistically mixed marriages" (Heller & Lévy, 1992b:14). Subsequent research studies ─ such as Piller's investigation on English-German couples (2002); Cheng's study of a Malaysian Chinese family (2003); O'Donnell's study based in Quebec and Catalonia, (2000) ─ have not changed one pervasive assumption: that ethno-linguistically mixed marriages produce bilingual children.

The different South Asian diasporic communities in the UK, taken together, compose the largest ethnic minority group, but higher professionals are under-researched. My participants represent another relatively rare sub-group (South Asians who have married 'out') while their children, being dual-heritage, belong to the fastest-growing ethnic minority group in the UK (Census, 2011). My initial interest, as sparked by Huq's programme, was in the maintenance and transmission of Heritage Languages. But as I elicited the oral narratives, it became clear that the stories that my participants told about their lives moved beyond simply describing their learning of and use of the Heritage Language, or even the scenarios surrounding their children's learning or not of it. My participants brought in other aspects of themselves and their lives, providing insights into their birth families (their parents and siblings) as well as their current families (their partners and children). In short, these personal stories are a microcosm of larger stories: the relationality between and within generations, transnationalism, multiculturalism and the South Asian diaspora in the UK.

My research questions are shown below.

1. From the narratives of my participants, what do we learn about the relationship these people have with their Heritage Language and Heritage culture, and what do we learn about Heritage Language learning, language maintenance and transmission?
2. By analysing the stories they choose to highlight, what do we learn of the participants' experiences as second-generation South Asian Britons?

3. What can we learn from the way my participants construct their narratives in the interviews?
4. What does my methodology add to the understanding of using oral narratives in linguistic research?

In the next chapter I reflect on the research that has already been conducted on, among other aspects, intergenerational language transmission and the South Asian diaspora community. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology of my research and introduces my seven participants. In Chapter 4, I discuss the theories that I will be drawing on in my analysis and why I have chosen to approach the narratives as a body of texts for discourse analysis, as well as chosen three narratives to review as 'life-stories'. Chapters 5-7 offer a thematic discourse analysis, Chapter 8 investigates the narratives of two participants selecting the discussions which were language related. Chapter 9 offers the narrative of one participant. I conclude in Chapter 10 by discussing what my thesis has contributed to the field.

2. Literature Review

Given the intricacies of the South Asian communities, it is unsurprising that research into their languages has occurred in phases of gathering complexity, from quantitative to more qualitative analyses. Alladina and Edwards' study (1991) on the 'other' languages of the British Isles, despite being restricted in scope to London and some major cities in the UK, alerted its readership to the persistence of minority languages in the UK despite largely monolingual institutional practices. The Linguistic Minorities Project (1985) released data of bilingual school students in five areas of England from 1980-1. While acknowledging the limitations of using self-reports of proficiency by the pupils, the project revealed that — outside London at least — the dominant minority languages were South Asian, predominantly Punjabi, Urdu, and Gujarati (Reid, 1988). The Adult Language Use Surveys that were also conducted used bilingual interviewers in three areas of England, finding that high proportions of the three South Asian linguistic minorities were still making use of said language at home (ibid). Even recently, quantitative survey-style studies continue to be funded: the on-going Multilingual Manchester project (2013) focuses on mapping language needs, not only South Asian, primarily in order to understand interpreter provision in public services, but also to explore how community languages influence one another. Bradford Local Education commissioned a study of languages used at home (Aitsiselmi, 2004) finding that although English is the lingua franca between siblings and friends for the younger generation among minority communities, across generations there was a desire for the Heritage Languages to be used for a range of purposes. These broad survey approaches rarely offer details but do expose the existence of these languages, thereby encouraging linguistic research (Sebba, 1992:331).

Another project in the 1990s, EMILLE, jointly conducted between Lancaster and Sheffield Universities, and The Central Institute of Indian Languages in Mysore, India, aimed to

develop corpora of spoken words for the numerically-prominent languages of Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Punjabi, Sinhalese, Tamil and Urdu. A clash of cultures emerged between researchers: corpus builders from the subcontinent subscribed to a purist ideology, dominant in South Asia, thus objecting to the occasional code-switching practices of the UK South Asian community, and to the credence given to non-standard and non-prestige forms, such as Sylheti by the UK-based linguists (Baker et al, 2002, 2004). These objections were similar to those made by teachers involved in the much later research undertaken by Creese and Blackledge (2010) in a complementary school catering for the Bangladeshi community. Furthermore, members of the South Asian communities in the UK showed reluctance to be participants, either because of the unfamiliar nature of the research, or a lack of self-confidence in proficiency in the language (Baker et al, 2004), the latter highlighting the difference between the self-reporting of proficiency and the demonstrating of proficiency.

In the 1980s, an interest in the 'other' languages of England encouraged teacher action research on multilingualism among pupils. But while offering some insights, this type of research failed to produce a "body of evidence" which could withstand external scrutiny (Rampton, Harris and Leung, 1997:227). It was not collated, and furthermore, most of it relied again on self-reported data rather than empirical evidence. The reliance on self-reporting led to "the development of a vision of multilingualism in which languages, cultures and communities were clearly bounded, relatively homogenous, and principally preoccupied either with maintaining or losing ethnic distinctiveness" (Rampton et al, 1997:228), a perception that persists today. Research in the 1990s, however, became more ethnographic. Rampton's work (1996) on language crossing was pivotal in changing the perceptions of how language was used, recognising that use was not always 'bounded'. Studies that followed dealt with the following themes: interaction styles, multilingual literacies, code switching, language crossing and language awareness, with from the late 1990s a focus on minority-language teaching in community classes

outside the state sector. We arrive at a seminal body of work such as that of Blackledge and Creese (one example, 2010) and Blackledge and Pavlenko (2004a and b).

The section which follows discusses studies which have investigated language practices and maintenance in multilingual and displaced families, and also those which have examined the nature of Heritage Languages. The next two sections review studies on British South Asians. These have been divided into those conducted in educational settings, and those in non-educational settings. The latter section includes research conducted on accents, marriage practices — both aspects which have relevance in my participants' narratives, and which I draw on in my analyses — and intermarriage. Lastly, I discuss public discourses of South Asians in the UK — in politics and the media — in order to give background to the societal context in which my participants find themselves. I reserve a discussion of the use of narratives in research for the next chapter.

2. 1. Multilingual families

2.1.1 Language maintenance and language transmission

Intergenerational language transmission has been on the research agenda for some time with studies in varied contexts investigating the maintenance, or not, of the language of the parents when transplanted to another country or region. Given the varied migration patterns that can occur, there is ample opportunity for research into how languages in families work, and indeed a variety of language situations have been examined in varied research paradigms, some examples being: three generations of a family in the Chinese community in the UK (Wei, 1994); three generations of South Asians in the UK (Mills, 2001, to be discussed later); Portuguese-speaking second-generationals in France (Koven, 1998); approaches to bilingualism in cosmopolitan cities (Fraser Gupta, 2000); children of Japanese expatriates in North American (Kanno, 2000); two extended families of Catholic Malayalees (Nambiar, 2008); an investigation of the Afrikaans community in Australia (Hatoss, Starks and Van Rensburg, 2011). Findings show that what

happens in these families is strongly related to ideologies surrounding the language in question and the new host language. While all of the studies show insights into language shift and its workings, they each, too, have a particular socio-historic background which makes each one unique. Even though these socio-historic details are not always discussed explicitly by the researcher — such as the significance of maintaining the Japanese language in the US, given the enmity between the countries during the Second World War — these elements perpetuate an interest in such investigations. More recently, Laakso et al's (2016) collection of essays on minority language maintenance in Europe, particularly in Finland, revisits the notion that European states' generally monolingual policies do not encourage minority language maintenance, and reintroduces another aspect that impinges on language maintenance: the host society's language ideology.

The fact that the family home is not impervious to outside influences makes for an irresistible domain for social, linguistics and psychology research. Tuominen (1999:73), who studies multilingual families in the Seattle area, argues that "[i]n effect, children in multilingual families are socializing their parents instead of being socialized by them". The start of school-going is often seen as a threshold for change in language use (see other studies such as de Houwer 2007, Schupbach, 2009, Cheng, 2003). Parents in Anglophone environments often show confidence that English is the best for the children's education (Mills, 2004; Alba, 2004). Pavlenko argues, in her account of teaching her son Russian, that parents' socio-economic background is another factor. Professionals of higher social and financial levels are shown to be comfortable with transmitting a minority language, as they will also be able to consolidate their children's knowledge of the host nation's language: a "weighting of all the options" (Pavlenko, 2004b:180). As Piller (2001) points out, for immigrants from lower-middle-class and working-class backgrounds, the minority language may be the language of communication best suited to parent-child interactions and the functioning of the household: bilingualism may not be an immediate issue.

Related to studies on language maintenance are discussions on the bilingual children that are produced, and their positions as complex citizens in the host country. Related to this aspect is the understanding of what constitutes bilingualism. Piller and Pavlenko (2004:489) offer a workable, inclusive definition of bilingualism, cross-referencing that of Grosjean (1982), where any use of two or more languages on a regular basis is regarded as a bilingual practice, irrespective of the age of acquisition of the language and the proficiency level. However, American mothers in Varro's study of Franco-American families in France were all too aware that "only if children are perceived as 'truly bilingual' will they obtain the hard-earned qualifier 'bilingual' from sceptical and critical observers" (Varro, 1998:105): what researchers in the field are willing to call 'bilingualism' does not always concur with public opinion or that of professionals such as teachers.

The role of parents in the language teaching process has also been much discussed, including gender-based analyses. Annick de Houwer (2007:417) reviews the commonly held thesis that children in bilingual families will tend to learn the mother's language in favour of the father's (see Veltman, 1981 as an example), re-examining Sirèn's data (1991) and refuting the claim from her study of nearly 600 bilingual families which revealed maternal language as critical in language X transmission. But while no studies have proved that language transmission is solely related to maternal or paternal language (de Houwer, 2007), women are still considered the primary socialisers (Bunnell and Beutler, 1999) and so husbands may defer to their wives' decisions. Further, women may be the primary focus of research (such as in King and Fogle, 2006). Jean Mills in her study of second-generation South Asian women and their children recounts the agonies that these mothers faced: wanting their children to maintain their 'mother-tongue' Punjabi while recognising the cultural capital associated with proficiency in English; feeling guilty about their 'failures' as mothers. These participants accepted their roles as primary socialisers for their children but then carried the guilt for any perceived failures (Mills, 2001). For mothers, as perceived guardians of a minority language, this role may be accepted with some

reluctance, or the role may be thrust upon them: through ideologies of motherhood which give little prestige to a "guardian role" but also disregard the sacrifice of the mothers' own bilingualism (Piller and Pavlenko, 2006:499). Walters (1996), in a study of western wives of Tunisian men, brings another aspect to this complex situation: the wives' efforts to learn Arabic were stymied by their husbands' discouragement, linked to embarrassment of a wife who expressed herself in faulty Arabic.

King and Fogle (2006:696) discuss the need for investigations into "family language policies", arguing that the decisions about language use and teaching within each family will be connected to parents' understanding of 'parenthood', including culture-specific notions of 'good' or 'bad' parenting. Based on Spolsky's (2004) language policy model, three areas of family language policy can be examined: language practices, referring to the extent to which a language is used with family members; language management, referring to the choices made in relation to language use at home; and language ideology, referring to the "shared framework(s) of social beliefs that organize and coordinate the social interpretations and practices of groups and their members" (van Dijk, 1998: 8). The concept of ideology can be applied to a family, and includes how parents regard the Heritage Language. It can be seen as a 'gift' that should be passed onto offspring in order to maintain their culture (see Mills' Punjabi mothers, 2001); as an asset for expanding career opportunities in the future (see the position of Spanish and English in bilingual families in the United States, in King and Fogle, 2006); or as a potential investment, that is, a source of social–political–linguistic capital for social advancement (see Curdt-Christiansen's ethnographic study of ten immigrant Chinese families in Canada, 2009). Others may see it as something unrelated to their cultural heritage, or even 'useless' due to its geographical or social restriction (see Swiss German among immigrants in Australia, in Schüpbach, 2009).

In relation to language management, King and Fogle (2006) point out that two of the main sources used to explain family decisions are the parents' personal experiences with language learning, and the experiences of other families in the same situation (i.e. extended family and

friends). The existence of a school which friends' children attend can influence whether parents seek to overcome logistical difficulties in order to support their children's bilingualism: Leung and Uchikoshi's (2012) study of parents sending their children to Cantonese–English bilingual classes in California, and King and Fogle's study of bilingual (English-Spanish) families in the US (2006) are examples. Other members of the family can also be included in the management: Ruby (2012) offers a study of a grandmother using Bangla with her granddaughter in East London, finding that the granddaughter's uses (and choices) of language tended to be different depending on with whom she engaged. Once children grow older, they can become their own agents in their language learning: interviews conducted by McCarty et al. (2009: 291–292) show bilingual Native American parents choosing not to socialize their children in the indigenous language, but the children themselves negotiating a role for the Heritage Language in their lives. Studies on family language policies have also shown the inconsistencies between what parents believe and actual language dynamics in the home. Schwarz, for example, finds a "clear discrepancy between parents' declared commitment to first language maintenance in a bilingual setting, and their reports on actual language practice with their children" (2008:415). Further, her findings on second generation Russian–Jewish Immigrants in Israel show that the parents' language ideology did not have any impact on their children's command of the Heritage Language; rather, complex demographic, social and cultural factors surrounding the use of Russian in Israel were the main influence.

These studies in the main ask a valid question – do families maintain the language? – and gather reasons for such decisions. These studies can be read as detailed accounts of what is happening in the here-and-now of research time, rather than offering an insight into how the life-story of the participants has influenced the current dynamic. What is not always considered, and what I seek to address, is that participants can have a 'relationship' with the language, a metaphor which acknowledges that there may be changes over time.

2.1.2 Heritage Languages

All such studies, of which those mentioned are just a sample, highlight the existence of displaced families, and thus the relevance of such research in the contemporary, globalised world. In order to complement our understanding of this phenomenon, studies have been conducted into Heritage Language speakers and their language learning processes, primarily in the US context. Montrul reports on a growing realisation that learners of Heritage Languages are a "different breed" (Montrul, 2010:3). First introduced as 'heritage speaker' in Canada in the mid-1970s (see Cummins, 2005), this term has gained ground to describe the child and adult members of a linguistic minority who grew up exposed to their home language as well as the majority language (some examples of studies are Kanno et al, 2008; Kondo-Brown, 2005). Because the home language is a minority language, very few had access to education in this language as children. Hence adult speakers typically have a strong command of the majority language while proficiency in the home language varies considerably, ranging from mere receptive skills to intermediate and advanced oral and written skills, depending on the language, the community and other sociolinguistic circumstances. Studies show that pronunciation is generally very good, with Heritage Language speakers having good phonological control (Au et al., 2002; Godson, 2004). Heritage Language users know many words in the Heritage Language related to common objects used in the home and childhood vocabulary, although there are significant gaps, and at times a difficulty in retrieving less common lexical items (Polinsky and Kagan, 2007). Studies on morphosyntax show that Heritage Language speakers of languages with grammatical gender may make many errors; also errors in agreement in noun phrases and case marking are common. Moag (1995) shows more reliance on subject-verb-object sentences in Heritage speakers of South Asian languages in Anglophone environments, whereas most South Asian languages are subject-object-verb.

Contrasting L1 and L2 acquistion, Montrul (2010) shows that Heritage Language speakers straddle experiences, sharing some with L1 learners (early exposure to language,

abundant input in a naturalistic setting, aural input, control of features of language acquired very early in life such as phonology, some vocab, some linguistic structures) and some with L2 acquisition (developmental and transfer errors, variable proficiency, typically incomplete knowledge, typically fossilized, motivation and affective influences on language development). The key difference between Heritage Language learners and L2 learners is that of context of acquisition and literacy. L2 acquisition typically occurs in classroom settings, with foci on reading and writing, practice, feedback, and assessment: all lacking in Heritage Language learning.

The above-mentioned studies use assessment of language abilities mostly under laboratory settings. Few studies show how Heritage Language speakers *perform* in the Heritage Language in the real world. Such an insight is given in Anna De Fina's study of Spanish-speaking language radio shows in the US (2013), focusing on exchanges on El Zol radio station involving English and Spanish by Spanish- or English-dominant hosts. These exchanges illustrate varying perceptions about how using hybrid English–Spanish talk and accented or unaccented varieties of English impacts on claims of identity. In one example, a Spanish-dominant presenter highlights and at times corrects the errors in Spanish made by an English-dominant colleague ─ in an on-air discussion ─ thereby placing the latter's identity as a 'true' Latino in question. De Fina's study focuses on the format of a radio talk-show, but it demonstrates that the settings and frequency in which Heritage Language speakers may have to perform within and without the country of settlement are varied, some holding more import than others; an aspect alluded to by my participants in their narratives.

2.2 The South Asian context

2.2.1 Studies on South Asians in educational settings

A large tranche of research related to South Asian Britons has been conducted in educational settings (in educational research examples include: Demie and Strand, 2006; Pagett, 2006; Conteh, 2006; Beech and Keys, 1997), including the experience of ethnic-minority teachers and

assistants (in ethno-linguistics research: Creese, 2002; Creese, 2004; Ghuman, 1995; Mills, 1995) although some have attempted a crossover from home and school (Abbas, 2002; Crozier, 2005, Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2003; Mills, 2001; Ghuman, 1991; Ghuman, 1994; Harding and Riley; 1986). The use of the mother tongue as a resource in mainstream classrooms to build on prior knowledge and make curriculum content accessible, in the case of newly-immigrant children, has been recommended by a number of educators including Edwards et al (1998) and Smyth (1989). Where educators have employed such pedagogies in action research with teachers (Gravelle, 2000; Kenner, 2000; Sneddon,2000; amongst others), they have been shown to stimulate children's learning. But despite this success, bilingual approaches have yet to be used on a wider scale in schools.

More recently, scholars such as Antonella Sorace, Charmian Kenner, Eve Gregory and Gunther Kress have produced a body of work which advocates the cognitive and personal benefits of being bilingual (Sorace, 2016; Kenner, 2004; Kenner at al, 2008; Kenner and Kress, 2003; Gregory and Williams, 1998; are some examples). Kenner argues that while **s**econd and third generation children, in particular, are assumed to be learning sufficiently through English only, her study of British Bangladeshi children — aged seven to eleven in two East London primary schools, learning Bengali in after-school classes but mostly more fluent in English than in their mother tongue — showed the children responded better to bilingual literacy and numeracy tasks when able to use their full language repertoire within the mainstream curriculum. Governments now refer to "funds of knowledge" (DfES, 2004:10) in the context of inclusion issues for minority ethnic children found in predominantly white schools. Their cultural and linguistic repertoires are now being called upon to be celebrated and respected.

Andrews and Yee, however, sound a note of caution, reminding us that even their small-scale study of two ethnic minority children in out-of-school contexts in the UK runs the risk of overemphasising the "similarities between minority ethnic communities, parents and children", and that "understandings about practices engaged in by children and families remain at a level of

simplistic stereotypes" (2006:446). Kalantzis and Cope, investigating the possibilities of drawing cultural diversity into mainstream education, also warn of the dangers of an easy focus on "celebratory multiculturalism of spaghetti and polka" (1999:261). How much importance researchers place on single events can also be debated: in response, Gutiérrez and Rogoff (2003), in their study of home-based learning practices of ethnic minority children, have chosen to phrase their observations in the past tense ('she did X') rather than the present tense ('she does X') thus emphasising the difference between witnessing a practice which may occur again, and one which may not.

2.2.2 Studies on South Asians in non-educational settings

Since Rampton et al (1997) highlighted the dearth of small-scale enquiries into interactional usage of South Asian Heritage languages in the UK, many studies conducted in the ethno-linguistic arena eschew grander large-scale quantitative analyses of data and home in on the communities and their linguistic practices.

In one study that, like mine, uses interviews in a private setting, Mills follows the children (third-generation) of a group of second-generation Britons of Pakistani heritage, whose partners work in small family-run businesses or skilled/semi-skilled occupations. These families, described as "aspirant" (Mills, 2001:384), are on the higher end of a sliding scale of cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu and Thompson, 1991, discussed in Chapter 4) compared to the families in Gregory and William's portrayal of literacy practices among Bangladeshi Britons in the East End (Gregory and Williams, 1998), but are yet to slip into the more conventionally-styled 'middle' class. Her target area is the West Midlands, and all her 10 mothers and their children are Muslim, and of Pakistani heritage, with ancestral links to the Punjab or Mirpur specifically. Using Romaine's framework for analysis (Romaine, 1995:183-185) — where families are described as type (1) one person-one language; (2) non-dominant home language; (3) non-dominant home language without community support; (4) double non-dominant language

without community support; (5) non-native parents; (6) mixed languages — Mills refers to the families in her study as types (3) and (6). Several of the mothers grew up in households where only Punjabi was spoken, only being exposed to English when they went to school. Mills' interviews spanned over two years, so that any change in behaviours as a result of the interviews could also be recorded. The perceptions of the importance that the Heritage Language (Punjabi or Mirpuri) had for these participants were investigated through in-depth interviews conducted in English, the mothers themselves maintaining that they would not be able to express difficult concepts in Punjabi or Mirpuri. For their children, it was revealed that Punjabi or Mirpuri were considered crucial in family situations, such as with elderly relatives, and that being able to converse, even if stiffly, in the Heritage Language was well-regarded by members of the community.

However, Mill's study takes place in an area where the participants live in a community with apparently easy access to the extended family, possibly explaining why she was able to have discussions with third-generation South Asian children (albeit most before rebellious teenage years) about a still-present Heritage Language in their lives. Another question arises: did the mothers in Mills' study have arranged marriages with men from the homeland – that is, fluent Punjabi/Mirpuri speakers? While it is ascertained that the language maintains a presence in the house, the mothers also admit that they are unable to discuss complex issues in the Heritage Language. In focusing on particular socio-economic backgrounds and on an area where there is a strong presence of ethnic minorities sharing linguistic and religious heritages, there is much to learn, as Mills shows, but the limitations of such a study must also be acknowledged. Although Rich and Davis (2007) are one exception, carrying out research into two Muslim boys living in an area with a small ethnic-minority presence, investigations such as this, located in areas where there may be a greater impetus to assimilate, are all too rare.

Two other recent studies show many parallels with my study: both focus on second-generation South Asians adults in non-educational settings, and use interviews as the primary

tool to extract data. Both, however, are situated in a social-psychology framework. The first is a study of twelve second-generation British Asians, in their twenties, from a city in the East Midlands, termed as SGAs (Jaspal and Coyle, 2010a). The authors posit that these individuals juggle rich linguistic repertoires comprising English, their Heritage Language and their liturgical language, the language reserved for religious purposes. Most of the respondents are university students, one has a Master's and five have A-levels and GCSEs. Most are Punjabi, with two Gujaratis and one dual-heritage participant (it is interesting that Jaspal and Coyle do not problematize the dual heritage of this participant but instead propose them as second-generation South Asian); five are Muslim, four are Sikh, and three are Hindus.

The authors claim that the Heritage Languages "continue to be used among SGAs […] perhaps because the South Asian communities in Britain tend to have dense (intragroup) social networks and because regular visits to their respective countries of origin are common " (Jaspal and Coyle, 2010a:18). Using semi-structured interviews, Jaspal and Coyle adopt a critical realist approach, focusing on the content (rather than the form) of the interviews. The responses of the individuals are offered as evidence but the reader is not allowed to see how they were generated. Two aspects, for me, from a linguistic perspective, stand out: that the participants faced a dilemma during the interviews. For example, one participant called herself a 'Punjabi native-speaker' and later acknowledged her language was deficient. And, further, that the Gujarati participants make a distinction between Muslim and Hindu Gujarati, demonstrating a detailed linguistic repertoire, which is different from knowing 'how to speak' a language, but includes sociohistoric contexts. Neither of these aspects, however, is investigated fully in the study.

The second study focuses on adult, second-generation Bengalis who are "highly-educated and economically successful" (Rasinger, 2013:47), employed in higher professions: a cohort which, while I do not limit my study to the Bangla community and further include marriage out of the community as a variable, is very similar to mine.

Rasinger bases his study in the theoretical and methodological framework of Ethnolinguistic Vitality (EV)[4]. In his modestly-sized study, Rasinger finds that Bangla remains in use in these second-generation Britons, but only in the family domain. He finds maintenance falling away in the third generation, even though half of his respondents' partners were also of Bangladeshi descent. Rasinger also analyses gender-based patterns of use within exogamous partnerships, finding that irrespective of a male or female respondent, and irrespective of whether the relationship is exogamous or endogamous, the language continued to be English: it seems interest in maintaining of the Heritage Language among these second-generation Banglas is as lukewarm as Itesh Sachdev describes in Konnie Huq's radio programme.

What Rasinger's study lacks is the voices of the participants. We arrive at the end result – a group of acculturated second-generation ethnic minorities in solidly middle-class positions, both professionally and socially, who do not use their Heritage Languages in their daily lives – but we learn very little about the journey that led to this terminus, or, indeed whether it is a terminus but instead a phase, or a liminal space (Van Gennep, 1960) beyond which a different relationship with the language begins. The latter has been suggested in Casciani's article (2003), already mentioned, showing some second-generation parents with a renewed desire to teach their children the Heritage Language. We learn very little of the feelings Rasinger's respondents have about their proficiency, their perceived lack of proficiency, use or lack of use of the Heritage Language. While I draw on respondents with similar educational and professional successes, it is this lack which I address in my research.

[4] The construct of 'ethnolinguistic vitality' has been coined to describe ethnic group members' feelings of cultural threat or strength. More specifically, in introducing the construct, Giles et al. (1977) referred to ethnolinguistic vitality as that which encourages a group to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in situations involving intergroup contacts.

2.2.3 South Asian accents and phonology

I reflect in my analyses on how I receive the narratives of my participants, particularly in Chapter 6: this reception is related to what I 'hear'. Hence, in this section I discuss research conducted into 'how' South Asians and South Asian Britons speak.

It has been well-documented that a feature of Indian English is the retroflex, sounds /ʈ, ɖ/used instead of alveolar /t/ (the first sound in *tell*) and /d/ (the first sound in *dog*) respectively; and that the long vowel sounds, diphthongs, /eɪ/and /əʊ/ (used in words like *blame* and *coat* respectively) are replaced by the monophthongs /e:/ and /o:/ (Sailaja, 2009, and Fuchs, 2016 are some examples). In works such as Rampton (2013a) and Sharma and Sankaran (2011) these sounds are termed FACE/GOAT vowels. There are also supra-segmental features, such as the tendency to lengthen vowels to express emotion and surprise (Sailaja, 2009; Fuchs, 2016). Sailaja (2009:9) cites the following examples: "I had so [o:] much fun" or "great [e:] poetry."

Farhana Alam and Jane Stuart-Smith (2014) point to a surprising lack of linguistic studies into the English spoken in the various Indian diaspora, one exception being Mesthrie's works on South African Indian English (Mesthrie, 1991). In the UK, however, there has been some recent momentum in interest in the phonological features of English spoken by people of South Asian heritage. Notably, Sharma and Rampton (2011) offer a methodology ─ termed lectal focusing in interaction (LFI) ─ which tracks, during a single interaction, how an individual shifts towards purer versions of one or other of a selection of styles. Within their case studies, these are described as Standard British English, Vernacular London English and Indian English. Older men show a higher degree of LFI than younger men, leading the authors to conclude that younger men develop a single 'fused' Brasian (British Asian) identity (Harris, 2006) rather than separate practices dependent on the ethnic prevalence of different domains. This in turn is explained by the historical tableau of migration that Sharma offers in her study of the changes in style repertoire (Sharma, 2011 as mentioned in Chapter 1): the post nineties in the UK being considered a space where Asian culture is more visible than it was earlier. The older second-

generation, whose parents migrated to the UK between the 1940s to 1970s, are described as lacking an access to an accessible expression of their identity as British Asians, something the younger second generation is privileged with. Rampton and Sharma (2011) show conversations between two men both presented as Punjabi-speakers, one Sikh and one Muslim. Given that the LFI measure displays how individuals shift between a selection of styles, the assumption that the Punjabi spoken between the two religious communities will be the same needs to be unpicked. For example, Dhanjal and Bhatia (2013) outline their attempts to build a corpus of Punjabi, drawing attention to the many dialects of the language, and the two main scripts used, for Sikhs and Muslims. While the LFI measurement offers a fascinating graphic visualisation of an individual's performance between styles, when that individual is in interaction with another British Asian, the complexities of the Heritage Language (Punjabi in this case) may have some impact on the interpretation.

Recent studies have shown that British South Asians have developed their own distinctive forms of English. Some examples include Kirkham's focus on the acoustics of /t/ and /d/, finding that British Asian speakers use "shorter voice onset times" rather than fully retroflexed /ʈ, ɖ/ (Kirkham, 2011:102); Lambert et al. (2007) conclude that there is an identifiable Glaswegian Asian accent; Hirson and Sohail (2007) investigate the rhotic /r/ as a social identifier in British Asians.

But the studies already cited, focusing on English used by South Asians in a UK context, are limited in scope in terms of the speakers' Heritage Languages. For example, in the studies by Kirkham and that by Lambert et al., the participants were described as being bilingual in Punjabi and English: in Kirkham's study, the participants are described as being from the Mirpuri Pakistani community settled in Sheffield and are described as being bilingual in Punjabi and English; in Lambert et al.'s study the participants are described as being bilingual in Punjabi, but "also in Urdu" (2007:1509). Hirson and Sohail (2007) focus on British Punjabis in south-east England. Sharma and Rampton (2011), previously mentioned, describe their participants as from

the "Punjabi London community". But Sailaja (2009) outlines a comprehensive description of the variations *within* Indian English related to social class, as well as to the linguistic roots of language, laying out a comprehensive discussion of features of Indian English pronunciation (IEP) and Standard Indian English Pronunciation (SIEP) and asserting that when an Indian person speaks English it is possible to determine whether they are from Gujarat, Tamil Nadu or Uttar Pradesh. That is, within the catch-all 'Indian pronunciation' there exist certain features deriving from the mother tongue. Given that the languages of India can be divided into four main groups — Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burmese, Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic, (Sailaja, 2009:1-2) — the argument that there are different Indian Englishes, at least between those of Indo-Aryan and Dravidian background, (Kachru, 1994; Gargesh, 2004) should not be surprising. More recently Fuchs ascertains differences depending on the L1 of the speakers — for example, whether they were Hindi, Bengali, Kannada, Telugu or Tamil speakers — in his analysis of segmental (vowel and consonant) differences and supra-segmental pitch accent (intonation and rhythm) differences in Indian English (compared to British and American English). He argues that for each element there can be differences related not only to the L1 of the speaker, but also the education of the speaker — broadly whether they attended regional language-medium or English-medium schools — while acknowledging that acoustic studies often rely on disappointingly small samples (Fuchs, 2016:21-19).

Punjabi speakers are the largest group of South Asians in the UK, and hence the most accessible for research. But findings on the phonology of English spoken by these South Asians need to be tempered by acknowledgement that different factors, such as the linguistic base of the Heritage Language (Rampton refers to 'Punjabi variant' in his studies, 2013a) but also social class, might impinge on accent, as they do in the sub-continent. As I show in Chapter 6, my interviews are a conversation in English between two British South Asians — myself and the participant — who do not share a Heritage Language or even a similar journey to the UK, and

hence offer some insights into how phonology is used in these interactions, and for what purpose.

2.2.4 The marriage question

Another aspect that features in the narratives of my participants is the factors surrounding their marriages out of their ethno-linguistic communities. In this section, I review studies which have investigated marriage patterns among South Asians in the subcontinent and in diasporic communities.

Much interest has been shown by researchers in the anthropological traditions, examining the historical, colonial, cultural, and religious context that relates to marriage migration among the communities (Stopes-Roe and Cochrane, 1988; 1990). But, at least in the UK, by the 1990s, distinctions arose that moved away from sweeping generalisations of the differing ethnic groups. Ballard, in his seminal work on British Asians, compares the practices of Mirpuri Muslims, who favour cousin-marriage and bury their dead in ancestral villages, and Jalandhar Sikhs, who marry out of the family and cremate their dead, and shows how these practices explain the propensity of the former to prefer transnational marriages with a partner from the homeland (Ballard, 1990). Berthoud (2005) found that amongst South Asian women who came to Britain aged eleven or over, an arranged marriage was much more likely for Muslims and Sikhs than for Hindus. Where the respondent was born in Britain or had come to Britain before the age of ten, just over a third of Muslim and Sikh marriages had been arranged but for Hindus this was only 9 per cent. These differences between ethnic groups had earlier been addressed: Beishon, Modood and Virdee (1998), in a small qualitative study, again of Pakistani and Bangladeshi households, found that all married respondents had had an arranged marriage and about a quarter had married a cousin. Arranged marriages were, however, less common amongst the Indian and East-African Indians respondents.

Charsley and Shaw emphasise the very global lives that diasporic South Asians may live, particularly if a marriage is arranged, with family links being maintained across continents. The continents are not always obvious. For example, British Sikhs often use marriage agencies to find partners in the USA or Canada, rather than back in the Punjab (Charsley and Shaw, 2006). Dale and Ahmed (2011) peruse this body of work and cite the significance of family status and honour, the role of the individual within the family, as well as gender divisions within the family as pertinent issues. Further, qualitative interviews showed that arranging a marriage with a spouse from 'back home' was not viewed unfavourably. The legal context concerning spouse migration also impinges on and shapes migration practices: until the mid-1980s, UK legislation allowed only women to join a UK-resident spouse, thus perpetuating the tradition of women moving into the home of their husband upon marriage. In the mid-1980s UK legislation changed to allow the spouse to be either male or female. Now, while the tradition still remains in most of the subcontinent for women to move into their husband's family home on marriage and to adopt the lifestyle of their husband's family (Charsley 2005), men who migrate to the UK for marriage are in the unusual situation of joining their wife's family and leaving behind their own family, social networks, and employment.

South Asian communities have high marriage rates and, for women in particular, marriage is usually at an early age. Berthoud (2005: 240) found that about three quarters of Pakistani and Bangladeshi women were married by the age of 25, compared with 67 per cent for Indians and 55 per cent for white women. Home Office statistics (Dudley and Harvey 2001; Home Office, 2008) show that in recent years there has been no obvious fall in the overall level of applications for entry for spouses from the Indian sub-continent. National statistics show that people from South Asian backgrounds in the UK (Indians, Pakistanis, and Bangladeshis) were also the least likely of the minority ethnic groups to be married to someone from a different ethnic group. Only 6 per cent of Indians, 4 per cent of Pakistanis, and 3 per cent of Bangladeshis had married someone outside the Asian group (ONS 2005). These findings all substantiate

Peach's (2006) declaration that, for South Asian communities, marriage remains a cornerstone of social values, and is still predominantly ethnically and religiously homogamous. David Voas (2009) argues that given the number of whites in proportion to all ethnic minorities "virtually all homogamy in minority groups is significant" (Voas, 2009:1500).

My target group, then, represent a minority in their communities as well as in British society. While Panico and Nazroo (2011) examine data from the Millennium Cohort study to find that mixed-heritage children tend to have a socio-economic advantage over non-mixed households, few studies have targeted the South Asians in such mixed partnerships. Varro (1998) discusses the tensions that the word 'mixed' can evoke: that such a marriage is exceptional and needs explanation or justification; that the cultural difference between partners can be used as the reason for any disagreements; that when the cultural difference between the partners is great, the children can be seen as occupying a site of conflict with the adjective 'mixed' then paradoxically signifying "disjoined instead of combined, with the children's identity caught in the middle" (Varro, 1998:107). In its common parlance a 'mixed' marriage is composed of two people from varied ethnicities, although in different contexts it can have alternative meanings: in Ireland, it may be used to refer to a marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant; in India, between a Hindu and a Muslim or even between two Hindus of different castes. Charlie Morgan (2012) recommends acknowledgement of these complexities in his study of mixed couples in Southern California. He uses the term 'intercoupling' to denote partnerships across boundaries that include race and ethnicity, but in doing so lends a slightly temporary aspect to the relationship. I refer to 'ethnically mixed' or 'linguistically mixed' marriages in my thesis as ethnicity and language are significant factors in my thesis, and because the narratives of the participants afford enough subtleties to offer a nuanced view of their partnerships.

While at the time of writing there has been no qualitative study of South Asian diaspora members who have married 'out', studies of mixed partnerships, ethnically- and linguistically-mixed, have occurred elsewhere, predominantly with an ethnovitality/linguistic focus. Some

recent examples include: Gabrielle Varro's study of American (Anglophone) mothers married to French men and living in France, and their adult children (1998); the study of the one-parent-one-language approach used by some Japanese mothers married to Anglophone Australians and living in Australia (Takeuchi, 2008); a case-study of a mixed Chinese-Malaysian marriage (Cheng, 2003); a study of the maintenance of Vietnamese in mixed-marriages between Vietnamese and Anglophone Americans living in the US (Lam, 2011), a study of the maintenance of German in German-South African couples (Schaberg and Barkhuisen, 1998), and the study of Spanish language maintenance among Latinos in Australia (Jones-Diaz, 2003). Intermarriage has been touched on in some studies in other South Asian diasporic communities, in terms of identity formation rather than actual practice: Samuel (2010) in Canada and Joshi (2000) in Australia are two examples which use interviews of South Asian women and their opinions and dating habits. Rasinger's (2013) recent study into language maintenance among second-generational Bengalis, already mentioned, includes some respondents who have married out of their linguistic community.

However, much recent research on such 'mixed' relationships in the UK has been quantitative (see Voas 2009 as an example) and these partnerships have been included in further ethnographic studies on mixed-faith couples, for example, Arweck and Nesbitt (2010). In their three-year study, they investigated and interviewed the parents and children of 28 nuclear families, of which 23 were mixed ethnic; the parents were in their 30s to late forties. The researchers focused on whether the young people (the children) are adept at employing different discourses in different socio-cultural settings. The paper includes a case study of Sukhi, who speaks Punjabi but feels an outsider at the Sikh temple as she does not understand what is read or recited. Sukhi and her partner both wanted the children to attend classes in Punjabi, but the children did not: reasons given were extra-curricular activities, the low standard of the Gurdwara Punjabi classes, and the fact that the children showed no real desire to learn. It may highlight another commonly-held assumption: that a partnership between a white and South Asian will

add religious heterogeneity to the mix. As Arweck and Nesbitt argue, and I agree, "[s]uch families may thus be regarded as microcosms for processes which occur in wider society"; processes such as the development and negotiation of identities. While their focus is on religious practices, they report that some partners in their study felt excluded when, for example, they were not able to speak the "home language of one side of the extended family" or when they felt that they were missing out "on what they perceived as the social and personal benefits of attending a place of worship regularly" (2010:41). So, in research that is conducted with a focus on religion, language comes into play. And in research that investigates language use and attitudes to language – as mine will – religion will come into play.

2.3 British South Asians in public discourses

In this section I offer a necessarily brief discussion on what 'stories' are told about South Asians in the public domain and how they can contribute to the formation of commonly-held views about the South Asian diasporic communities in the UK.

2.3.1 The political arena

Blackledge (2005) discusses 'a chain of discourse', when an opinion or an anecdote expressed in a queue at a post-office, is then repeated in the media and possibly on the political stage, thereby gaining currency. He argues that socio-historical changes can shape the ways language ideologies and identities are linked to relations of power and politics, in communities on a small scale, and society on a large scale (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004: 10), determining identity options considered legitimate, negotiable, or even desirable. An example could be the effect of 9/11 on the public discourse of what constitutes a 'desirable' Muslim identity (Abbas, 2004). Another is the effect of David Blunkett, then Education Secretary, memorably referring to the need to overcome the "schizophrenia which bedevils" bilingual (British South Asian) families (2002), and the subsequent impact his words had on policies regarding the teaching of other languages in

school. Blackledge further highlights that, related to Blunkett's comments, current political discourse in the UK is moving towards the equation 'good English monolingual' equals 'good citizen'.

Following the Northern Race Riots of 2001, Anne Cryer (MP) (discussed in Blackledge 2005) described certain practices among her South Asian constituents that she believed retarded the acquisition and development of good citizenship, if not actively preventing its attainment. These practices include: the tendency for another language to be used at home; the first generation making little effort to encourage the speaking of English at home; long holidays in the sub-continent disrupting children's school life and education; and the practice of arranging a marriage, usually with a person from the 'motherland', the sub-continent. Introducing these ideas in the House of Commons transformed practices that she might have had knowledge of in the narrow context of her constituency, Keighley in West Yorkshire, to practices that were discussed in broader terms, across the UK, as warning signs for non-assimilative citizens. And yet prominent British South Asians in public view and public service have had such upbringings: Baroness Warsi (Conservative Party minister) has a working class, Northern, Muslim background; Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London, is the son of a Pakistani bus-driver, as is Conservative MP Sajid Javid, a member of the current Cabinet.

The persistence of such discourses, however, continues: in the same vein, David Cameron (2011) called for the need to instil "stronger citizenship," outlining that "[t]here are practical things we can do as well. That includes making sure immigrants speak the language of their new home." Given that this speech was addressing the threat of terrorism, the inclusion and prevalence of the words 'citizen', immigrant' and 'host language' (that is English), all serve to show that worries over family language ideologies continue into this decade, permeating public discourse.

2.3.2 The non-political public arena

The presence of British Asians in another public domain, the media, is complex. While there are memorable names of participants in media ─ on the BBC we have newsreaders such as Alpa Patel, presenters such as Mishal Hussein and Konnie Huq, print journalists such as Aditya Chakraborty, correspondents such as Kamal Ahmed and Rajini Vaidyanathan ─ the British journalism industry is 94% white and 55% male, according to a survey of 700 news professionals conducted by City University London (2016). Nesrine Malik (2014), writing in *The Guardian* newspaper, challenges the media to perform better than investment banks who, she claims, have more representation from ethnic minorities. Malik argues that the tendency to assign ethnic minority journalists to projects with a minority slant makes it more difficult for these correspondents to develop the wider profiles and expertise that white, male journalists are offered.

Yet, it is also true that British South Asians hold prominent positions which are therefore *reported* on in the media: examples include the already-mentioned London Mayor Sadiq Khan, human-rights activist Shami Chakrabarty, and authors such as Salman Rushdie. British Asians themselves have promoted their 'stories' through the film industry. Films such as *East is East* (1999), *Bhaji on the beach* (1993) and *Bend it like Beckham* (2002), directed and/or written by British South Asians, have been critical and/or commercial successes. They have centred around the issues that second-generation South Asians in the UK face, especially in matters of love. Even when films are not written by South Asians, such as Ken Loach's film *Ae Fond Kiss* (2004) which follows the love affair between a white Northern Irish woman and a Glaswegian Pakistani, the narrative is of a partnership which needs to overcome censure. These portrayals, although grounded in some elements of reality, contribute to an ideology that being South Asian British in matters of love entails a clash of cultures and inter-generational conflict. The families portrayed in the aforementioned films can be described as working-class or lower-middle-class: it seems that South Asians from these socio-economic backgrounds, while they may represent a large section of the population, have been chosen as ambassadors to represent a very diverse ethnic

group. But these characters also do not undergo the more intense explorations of socio-economic-historic background that white characters in films which also deal with intergenerational conflict enjoy. Two examples are the background of the miners' strikes of the Thatcher era in the film *Billy Elliot* (2000) and the anxieties linked to expectations of masculinity in the white working-class protagonist in *Looking for Eric* (2009). Further, media outlets and events tend to promote a 'British Asian' identity, eschewing distinctions of class, religion and language. Radio stations such as BBC Asian Network and Sunrise Radio, already discussed in Chapter 1, are strong presences in the media; awards such as British Asian Business award and British Asian Music awards, while celebrating the contributions and successes of the South Asian diasporic communities, also perpetuate the public's view of a homogenous, united group with a strong, singular identity.

The way British Asians are *portrayed* in the media is a source of discontent. A poll conducted in 2014 by the Runnymede Trust, a platform for ethnic minority issues, found 78% of respondents of all ethnic backgrounds believe that media portrayal of minorities encourages discrimination (Runnymede Trust, 2016). Among people of Pakistani descent the figure rose to 94%. Amir Saeed (2007:443) writes that "[t]he media representation of minority groups is a 'double-edged sword'. First, it marginalises minority voices, thus, they are virtually ignored or invisible. Simultaneously, actual representation of minority groups is often construed in negative discourses". Saeed's last argument can be exemplified by the recent convictions of a group of men from Rochdale for grooming under-age girls for sex: media reports were often styled using 'Asian men/British Pakistani men' and 'white girls'. One example, taken from *The Telegraph* (Bunyan, 2012) discusses the prevalence of this phenomenon (of predatory Asian men), with Bunyan writing: "Ann Cryer, the former MP for Keighley, who first came across the issue nearly a decade ago, believes the practice of arranged marriages may also have a bearing on the issue. This, she says, is because such marriages often involve the arrival in Britain of young, uneducated young men suddenly transplanted from remote villages in Pakistan". The association of spouses

from the homeland with convicted child sex abusers is a perilous and tenuous link, but when written in a quality, national newspaper and with the secondary authority of an MP, can gain currency.

Saeed's first comment, that ethnic minorities are 'invisible' in the media, might seem hyperbolic, but it is his comment about 'voices' that I wish to explore. I show below an extract from an article appearing in *The Guardian*. One aspect which gathers much attention in the media is the concept of being British+being Asian: what that means and any conflict that arises. In his article, journalist Stephen Moss (2012) collects views from a variety of people on being British:

> *Tarun Patel, 32, mortgage consultant*
>
> *Bradford, West Yorkshire*
>
> *My parents came from India, but I was born here and class myself as a British Asian. Britishness is about fitting in and being with the community. If you're born here I reckon you just go with it. I'm as British as you can get. Look, I'm sitting here drinking a pint. There's no divide as far as I'm concerned. I'm a Hindu and go to the temple, but I'm sitting here with a Muslim and a Sikh.*

Here, Moss is a ghost-writer: it is unlikely that Tarun Patel's exact words are transcribed verbatim, although they are presented in the first person. But what does Patel mean by "the community"? When he discusses a "divide" he is not referring to an Asian-white divide, but differences within the South Asian community on religious lines. He connects having a pint with being British but this correlation is not clarified. Instead, his words are presented as a challenge ('Look, I'm sitting here…'), with an implicit plea: *What more can I do to prove my Britishness*? But primarily: what *exactly* did Patel say before his words were edited by the journalist? The pseudo-personal-narrative format gives the readers of this article the erroneous impression that, in contrast to Saeed's argument, British Asian voices *are* 'heard'.

In another article, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown (2011) writes about her relationship with her mother-in-law, following her second marriage:

> *When her blue-eyed son phoned her to tell her of our getting together she didn't know how to respond. I was in the middle of a disagreeable divorce, the mother of a young boy, a Shia Muslim and a troubleshooting, uncompromising journalist. Vera, bless her, listened, paused for an awfully long time and then spoke: "Oh dear! I've never met anyone who is divorced. Hope I don't say the wrong thing." That's how English she is.*

Here, Alibhai-Brown describes herself with great detail: as a Shia Muslim, demonstrating her unwillingness to be lumped into a broader category of 'Muslim'; as "uncompromising" and a "journalist", thereby dispelling any assumptions that she is a submissive South Asian woman. But she also subverts the expected genre of the disapproving (possibly racist) mother-in-law and portrays Vera as determined not to offend and extremely polite: both commonly-held views of the English. The readability and engaging nature of the text points to Alibhai-Brown's prowess as a writer, a prowess one cannot expect everyone to have. It is thus in sharp contrast to the extract from Tarun Patel, which is moulded by the journalist to present a usable item for a larger piece on 'being British'.

But both 'narratives' from Patel and Alibhai-Brown have something in common: when given an opportunity to talk about themselves, each chooses to defuse expectations of South Asian-ness which arise from public discourses. So, Patel likes a beer and considers himself British; and Alibhai-Brown, feisty and independent, has not suffered for her marriage out of her ethno-religious community. Both extracts show these South Asian Britons talking about their lives: this thesis will offer the participants of my study the same opportunity.

2.4 Conclusion

The public could be forgiven for thinking that South Asian Britons speak their Heritage Languages, have affinity with their Heritage Languages, and that ethnically mixed marriages will hence produce bilingual children. Further, that a professional second-generation South Asian who has assimilated in terms of most markers (of dress, accent, behaviours) – 'westernised' for want of a better word – has little affinity with the Heritage culture and language.

I have shown in this chapter that a wealth of academic research has been conducted on issues such as language maintenance, being South Asian in Britain, marrying out of one's linguistic and ethnic community, varying in emphasis on pursuing understanding of identity, practice or language, but all confirming that these topics are a reflection of contemporary societies. Focusing on the South Asian context, I have shown that this group has also been of interest in studies and discussions in public discourse, including the media. This two-pronged attack — from academic and lay researchers — may result in a sense that this is a well-worn topic, with only room for subtle changes in variables. But I have also shown that a radio programme such as Konnie Huq's *Mind your Language* can cut through all of those studies and ask the question: what really 'goes on' in these people's lives? My study offers participants who are articulate, educated, British South Asian professionals the opportunity to narrate their life stories and describe how they have become the person they are today. The challenge I set myself, and which I discuss in the next two chapters, is how to do justice to such rich narratives, and use them to answer the question above, and more, in order to fully exploit the insights they offer.

3. Methods

In this chapter, I discuss how I gathered my data for analysis and my research tool, interviews. I begin by describing how I identified my participants and conducted the interviews, before introducing my seven participants. I then discuss qualitative research and illustrate how I ensure the quality of my study, before discussing the research tool I use —interviews — to elicit the narratives.

3.1. Gathering data

3.1.1 Recruiting participants and interviewing ethically

I initially thought to recruit respondents through my own social circle, but I realised that should each read the final thesis they might identify each other. I decided it would be more ethical to widen my net, even if the process of gathering participants became more difficult. The necessity of maintaining this ethical stance is highlighted by the person I have not included on these grounds. As a consultant in the NHS, he outlined the extremely stringent processes he had to comply with in his research, memorably saying to me in response to my assurances that I was "fairly certain" that I could maintain his anonymity: "Sheena, you can't be fairly certain. You have to be hundred percent certain." I therefore employed other methods: I sent speculative emails and succeeded in recruiting Devinder and Padma; a former work colleague gave me Paresh's contact, an acquaintance gave me Kamran's[5]. I know the remaining three socially, but from separate social circles. The final cohort, after prospective participants dropped out for health or personal reasons, is composed of seven individuals who do not know each other: a better ethical position than if they were all known to me and to each other.

[5] These are pseudonyms: my choice of names is discussed later.

The ethics of research, rather than being an addendum, have informed both my research process and my analysis. I completed an ethics application for Lancaster University which was approved. I identified myself as a researcher, both in person where possible as well as through a letter attached to my consent form. In this letter, I gave details about where I work, who I am doing my PhD with, a provisional title, and my target group. I also included some possible questions that the participants could have. These included: *Will my names be anonymised? When and where will your findings appear and who will read them?* For each question I gave a response. Question 5 and its response is shown below:

> Q5. I notice you are doing a PhD in Linguistics. I only speak English …does that matter?
>
> *No, not at all. I am very interested in your experiences and narrative, and not in your linguistic abilities!*

I included this question because even at the very first stages, any possible informants were pre-empting me with "I don't speak much Punjabi/Gujarati/Tamil". My letter/consent form proved rather successful, and my acceptance rate was high at this stage. Further, as well as preparing the interviewees for the interview (Gillham, 2005:50) it helped to set the tone of the interview from an early stage.

I conducted two interviews with each participant; each interview lasting between 40-50 minutes. After conducting each interview, I stored the audio files, and later the transcripts, as well as email correspondence on my password-protected personal computer. I anonymised my participants' names while maintaining some salient aspects: the names I chose reflect their religion, if their original names do the same; Nick and Joshua both have English original names, and Joshua's is, in addition and in his words, "a Jewish name". All the names of family or friends that they mention have also been changed. When I was writing up and analysing their narratives I emailed certain participants for permission to use certain details as I feared their anonymity

would be compromised. I proposed possible ways of framing things and also asked them what they themselves would suggest. On most occasions the participants did not mind these details being made 'public', even when certain details were potentially revelatory.

3.1.2 Conducting the interviews

I began each interview with a question: "Can you tell me about where you grew up and the dynamics of languages when you were growing up?" The interviews evolved from there. As a closing strategy in the first interviews I asked the participants if they could remember a particular incident they would like to relate: this often resulted in an opening gambit "I wouldn't say this was particularly interesting…" followed by invariably a rather interesting story. After the first interview, I asked each participant to read their transcript as we would use that as a springboard for a second interview. At the start of the second interview I asked them if they would like to talk about or amend/expand on something they said; at the end of the second interview I asked all of them whether there was anything they wanted to add. After two interviews, I asked the participants to submit a self-reflective piece of writing on the whole research process, suggesting that they discuss why they had agreed to participate. All of them have cited a wish to assist me, to help with my studies, and have said that their sympathies do not lie solely in the research questions. I composed field notes on all the interviews, including those I conducted through Skype, and informal phone calls. I have also collected any emails and messages, some of which have been responses to subsequent questions I have had, clarifying some comments they made in the interviews or details about their lives.

3.1.3 The participants

I introduce the participants in the table below, followed by a brief description of each.

Pseudonym	Gender	Age at last inter-view	Type of interviews	Length of interview 1 and 2 in minutes (1,2)	Place of residence at time of interview	Heritage Language	Occupation	Children (ages at last interview)
Devinder	M	49	Skype	1: 45 2: 45	London	Punjabi	Poet, teacher	3 daughters (19, 2,4)
Joshua	M	38	Face-to-face	1:40 2: 45	Greater Manchester	Bengali	Surgeon	2 sons (5,7)
Kamran	M	49	Skype	1: 45 2: 50	South-west England	Punjabi	TV director	daughter, (10); son (14)
Mumtaz	F	43	Face-to-face	1: 50 2: 45	Greater Manchester	Urdu	Engineer	son (11)
Nick	M	35	Skype	1:45 2: 40	Oslo, Norway	Konkani	Web designer	daughter (3) son (1 month)
Padma	F	49	Face-to-face	1: 50 2: 45	Manchester	Tamil	Academic	son (17), daughter (15)
Paresh	F	51	Face-to-face	1: 50 2: 40	Bradford	Gujarati	Mental health worker	son (16) daughter (11)

Paresh was born into a Hindu Gujarati family in Uganda, and arrived in the UK aged two when his family settled in Coventry. Later, after he had left home, his family relocated to north-west London. He grew up in Coventry, and attended Coventry Community College, where he relates that he was taught by (a pre-Education Secretary) Estelle Morris. He studied Politics and Educational Studies at Lancaster University in the 1980s, and went on to train as a teacher at

Goldsmiths College, specialising in Sociology for secondary-school teaching. Later he worked for race-equality and race advisory services. He currently lives in Bradford with his wife and two children, where he works part-time for a mental-health community service.

Devinder grew up in Hayes in Greater London in a Sikh Punjabi family. When he was sixteen his family moved to Sheffield, to open a shop, and he lived there until he went to university at age twenty-one. He went to Royal Holloway in London, where he studied English at Bachelor's and then Master's level. He had an arranged marriage and has an older daughter from that marriage. After the divorce, some years elapsed before he married again, and he now has two young daughters. Devinder is a published poet, and teaches part-time at a secondary school in London.

Kamran was born in Mirpur, Pakistan, into a Muslim Punjabi family, and first came to the UK aged two. He returned with his mother to Pakistan later, where he lived for a few years before returning to Oldham, Greater Manchester. He attended local primary schools, went to the local grammar school, and then Cardiff University where he studied Chemistry. After doctoral studies in Chemistry, he began working in the media. He lives in the south-west of England with his wife and two children.

Padma was born in Manchester into a Brahmin Hindu Tamil family. Her father worked for the Bank of India, and she speaks of regular visits to the family home in Madras (now called Chennai), in India, as a child. After studying in London, she completed her doctorate in California. She has lived extensively outside of the UK — in France, the US — and her research has taken her to Latin America. She married an Englishman while in California, and then moved back to Manchester. She moved away from Manchester during my research and now lives in the south of England.

Mumtaz was born in Uttar Pradesh in India into a Muslim Urdu-speaking family, and she arrived in the UK at age two. Her parents were both medical doctors. She grew up mostly in Surrey, for some periods in the north, before returning to Greater London, where she

completed her schooling. She did an undergraduate degree in Civil Engineering at City University, followed closely by a Master's from Imperial College, both in London. She met her husband through work – they are both engineers – and they have a son.

Joshua was born in the UK into a Hindu Bengali family, and has no siblings. His father arrived in the UK from Calcutta (now called Kolkata) and returned to India some years later to marry Joshua's mother. At age two, Joshua returned to Calcutta with his mother for a few years, before returning to the UK. His family moved around the UK during his early childhood because his father was a doctor. He recalls spending every summer holiday until he was eighteen in Calcutta with family and cousins. He attended a private secondary school in Staffordshire before studying medicine at Manchester. He is a surgeon and works in the North West; he has also completed a doctorate.

Nick was born in the UK into a Catholic Goan family, and has three sisters. His parents migrated to the UK from Kenya. After attending South Bank University, Nick worked in the south of England in various jobs. He met his wife in the UK, and they moved to her native Norway where they are now married and settled just outside Oslo. He has two children and he works as a web designer.

3.2 Qualitative research and personal narratives

Qualitative studies embrace heterogeneity and are open to participants steering the direction of enquiry. Literature on such research, however, asks the question: "[H]ow on earth do we sort out trustworthy from untrustworthy qualitative studies?" (Oakley, 2001:98). Quantitative studies are celebrated for their validity, reliability, and objectivity (Winter, 2000): qualitative studies are questioned over the authenticity of their findings (Guba and Lincoln, 2005), most commonly because the rigorous cross-checking and validation by parties other than the researcher found in quantitative analysis does not often occur. Researchers in the qualitative tradition can be regarded as cultural anthropologists (Schofield, 1990:182): ever-present, a "human instrument"

who "brings to bear (unavoidably) his or her own interpretations and cultural orientations into the picture" (Goldbart and Hustler, 2005:16). In order to elide the researcher and attain a level of authenticity, Oakley argues "enough original data to mediate between evidence and interpretation" should be shown (Oakley, 2001:98). Tracy (2010:838) offers some recommendations for a quality, qualitative study: that it covers a "worthy topic" and questions taken-for-granted assumptions; shows rich rigour; achieves sincerity via self-reflexivity; achieves credibility by allowing participants to reflect on their participation; maintains an ethical foundation; and produces a study which makes a significant contribution. I return to these tenets in Chapter 10.

Denzin (2008) argues that researchers need to *expand* the 'tent' which covers qualitative research and rather than dissuade, encourage variations and creativity in their approaches. High-quality qualitative research is marked by rich complexity of abundance (Winter, 2000) and rigorous research, which Weick (2007:16) argues, can stem from this "variety" — in terms of theoretical constructs, data sources, contexts and samples — where the tool or instrument is at least as "complex, flexible, and multifaceted as the phenomena being studied". While my data sources are restricted to the interviews, I use a multifaceted theoretical framework, along with contextual details in my analysis.

Personal narratives

While narrative inquiry falls into a qualitative research paradigm, and can be broadly described as research in which narrative, that is 'stories', plays a significant role, the concepts of narrative and narrative inquiry are "notoriously hard to define" (Barkhuizen, 2013:2). I include myself in Benson's statement below:

> The fuzziness of the boundaries within and around narrative inquiry reflects an open-ended and often experimental attitude towards research methodologies […] Many researchers turn

> to narrative in order to free themselves from what they see as the methodological formalities of other approaches to qualitative research.
>
> Benson, 2014:156

The British Household Panel Study, the Youth Cohort Studies, and the British Birth Cohort Studies, are all studies which have been lauded in the social sciences for attending to the temporal qualities of social life: individuals grow, develop, stagnate or change (Elliott, 2005:4). An extension of these are studies where people's perspectives of their lives are analysed: narratives. The recent interest in narrative has resulted in its application across the human and social sciences (Reissman, 2002a, 2002b, 2015). The kinds of texts that count as narratives, and how they can be used in research, vary from discipline to discipline and include literary fictional narratives, diaries, recorded oral narratives, or, as in my case, a narrative obtained through an interview. Significant examples of narrative as a method of inquiry of socio-cultural phenomena are Bauman (1984, 1986), Geertz (1995) in anthropology, Riessman (1993, 2002b) in psychology and Clandinin and Connelly (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) in education. Studies using narratives to investigate how the self is constructed include Bamberg, De Fina and Schiffrin (2007), J. Bruner (1991), Ochs and Capps (2001) and Wu (2007).

On the varied paradigms that exist under the umbrella of narrative research, De Fina and Georgakopolou (2012: 23) admit that "[t]he reality is that there is no one-fit-for-all method of narrative analysis". This flexibility in approaches to content and methodology, as well as presentation, provokes criticism. The recent edited collection using narratives obtained from interviews of 'marked' individuals (Piazza and Fasulo, 2014), for example, is described as lacking "systematicity of analysis" between its contributors (Nao, 2016: 314): while pronoun reference is discussed throughout, only Roberta Piazza's paper on Irish Travellers (Piazza, 2014) offers a rigorous dissection. Such inconsistencies (and few instances of close textual analysis) can accrue accusations against the narrative turn, of being *too* flexible and lacking structure: that the

variability is symptomatic of the absence of a sound theoretical grounding. However, indisputably, narratives offer researchers a glimpse into the lives of individuals. These varied, complex and contextualized insights, while messy and abundant, *do* offer representation of people's perceptions of their lived experiences and their world, and can give voice to those unheard in society (Tennant, 2016:474), such as Irish Travellers. It is for this reason that any critique should include understanding of *what* different narrative research studies aim to do.

One distinction between studies lies between the use of stories as data, typically analysed using standard procedures for qualitative content or thematic analysis (analysis of narratives); and research in which storytelling is used as a means of analysing non-narrative data (narrative analysis) (Benson, 2014:155; Polkinghorne, 1995). Mishler (1995) identifies three typologies. The first focuses on the content rather than the act of story-telling, so that the texts are regarded as material for discourse analysis (an example of the many studies could be Pavlenko, 2004a). The second centres on the interactional and social work that narrators do through their stories and settings, with some studies using positioning theories (such as Bamberg, 2004; Davies and Harré, 1990; Harré and van Langenhove, 1991) to examine the co-construction of identities, and sentence-by-sentence changes in identity positions. Detractors claim that the lack of explicit relations between conversational data and the theory fails to persuade (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006:139-40).

The third type focuses on the coherence and structural make-up of the narratives, which differentiates narrative from other texts. It was Labov and Waletsky's (1967) argument that fully-formed narratives composed an orientation/complicating action/evaluation and/or resolution/coda that drew attention to structure. More recently, J. Bruner (1990) adds to the frameworks, listing five features composing a narrative: action, scene, actor instrument, goal plus trouble. From a linguistic/anthropological perspective, Ochs and Capps (2001:173) offer setting/unexpected event/psychological or physical response/unplanned action/attempt (to solve the problematic event)/ consequence.

Adopting a coding system enables researchers to squeeze an "unwieldy body of discourse into manageable chunks" (Potter and Wetherell, 1987:167), but the start and end points of a 'chunk' are chosen by the researcher. What prompts a participant to recall an incident, and transform it from a lived event into a told event (Baynham and De Fina, 2005)? Deborah Schiffrin (2009) queries some assumptions made in such canonical approaches to narrative: that each 'narrative', chosen by the researcher, is mutually exclusive and can be analysed in the absence of what precedes or follows the extract. Further, privileging time over space, where the 'place' that things happen is often relegated to 'orientation', 'scene' or setting' does not acknowledge the connectedness of time and space (Schiffrin, 2009:423; Baynham, 2005). While narrative provides an opportunity to construct self or identity, the canonical narrative approach leaves little room for looking at *when* the narrative is actually told, and that the narrative is co-constructed with the listener/researcher, central to my understandings of the interviews.

Goodwin (2015) reminds us that Labov invited his speakers to give a (mostly) uninterrupted telling of an event in order to acquire high-quality audio recordings of vernacular English. While Labov's structural analysis has established the use of narratives as a research method, the common use of interviews, which are at times interactive, has led to arguments for a more flexible alternative. To pluck "idealised and decontextualized examples of narrative format" (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006:134) to fit into a schema loses sight of the detailed way that stories are put together (Wooffitt, 1992). For example, judgements can be communicated in subtle ways, such as through lexical choice (Tannen, 1980); the very telling of an event deemed to be reportable could represent an evaluative act (Elliott, 2005; Nunan and Choi, 2010); the variety of stories available challenge definitions of a universal formal system of narrative (Brockmeier and Carbaugh, 2001). Further, examining the research *parameters* (De Fina and Georgakopolou, 2012:24) of various studies ─ namely, the object of analysis (the story and the event), the general methodological approach (for example, qualitative), methods of data collection (such as a semi-structured research interview), and types of data and data analysis ─shows these parameters need

not be wholly exclusive. Researchers can develop their own, innovative frameworks of analysis, which would stand up better against accusations of lack of structure (Pavlenko, 2008): one prominent example is Michèle Koven's (2004) work on French-Portuguese bilinguals. Indeed, the most convincing narrative studies — such as Koven's, Baynham's (2005) and Pavlenko (2005) — have a persuasive framework, albeit not the *same* framework.

In extracting written personal narratives, researchers have used diaries (Pavlenko, 2001, 2004), a quota of written accounts of life events (Bauer et al. 2003), or compared written and oral renditions of the same event, as in Őzylıdırım's study of Turkish university students (2009). The decision *not* to use written narratives in my study stemmed from my fear that such a request would be onerous for my participants, especially when my intention was not to limit my participants to relating four events (as in Bauer et al.'s study), but to, as far as possible, consider their lives from childhood, through adolescence and early adulthood, to the present time. Further, I feared that I would lose access to other stories that would not appear in a 'potted' history written in a contemplative mood rather than the heat-of-the-moment interaction. I was also more likely to acquire a group of target individuals if their involvement could be sustainable, and if I 'involved' myself as a sounding/bouncing board in the research, a point I return to later.

Below is an extract from Joshua's interview where he described the Bengali community he grew up with exposure to[6].

J: just uh from my experience that from the group my parents used to hang round with the you go to uh the social network was basically rotated around different houses had different dinner parties so you know two or three rooms where the grown-ups were would be loud BENGALI chatter and the other side of the house upstairs where the kids were playing it was ENGLISH

[6] The transcription convention I have adopted, adapted from Relaño Pastor and de Fina's (2005), itself adapted from Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff (1974), is shown in Appendix I.

Compare this with an extract from Joshua's self-reflective piece of writing:

> *There were also social functions where the Bengali community would meet and speak freely in Bengali. As a child and teenager I had no Bengali peers of my age group with the exception of a family friend who would stay with us during Christmas. During these meetings our mothers would talk to us in Bengali, we would reply in a mixture of English and Bengali but talk to each other in English.*

Arguably, the information that is received is the same: that there was a generational shift in which language was used. But Joshua's interview evokes a richer chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981, discussed in Chapter 4), constructed with me, the listener, in mind. An example from the interview and then the self-reflective writing is "the group my parents used to hang round with" versus "the Bengali community": the former indicating the friendships involved; the latter evoking a larger event. Similarly, "rotated around different houses" versus "there were social functions"; and "there was loud Bengali chatter" compared with "would meet and speak freely in Bengali". These comparisons show that although Joshua knew that I would be the reader of this self-reflection, the face-to-face nature of an interview can enrich a narrator's memory of events and how they present them.

However, the following extract from Joshua's self-reflection alludes to something that did not come out in his interviews, highlighting that with time for reflection, the participants may excavate other memories that did not arise during the interview:

> *After starting University my trips to India became less frequent, maybe every 3-5 years. I made a number of first- and second- generation Indian friends but there were no Bengalis. Some of these acquaintances would speak in Hindi but I could not join in as I had no experience in Hindi […]*

> *Interestingly, many second generation Indians who spoke Hindi with their peers had less familiarity with India as a country than I had, with my annual visits, and cultural identity was not a concern of mine.*

Joshua reflects on how among second-generation South Asians there may be maintenance of the Heritage Language, but this is not necessarily accompanied by a "familiarity" with the homeland (in this case, India); and vice versa. By including this in his self-reflection, he suggests that affiliation to the homeland may be achieved through means other than proficiency in language. Clearly, the short dissection of the different texts as above illustrates the dilemmas that narrative researchers face, and hence the variety of approaches they assume.

Asking someone to tell their life-story is itself a research device, offering a mode of communication in which an individual can externalise his or her feelings. In doing so the individual indicates the elements of those experiences that are most significant, often making sense of them in the telling (Pavlenko, 2008, Elliott, 2005, Relaño Pastor and De Fina, 2005). These experiences may have been stored in memory, and only become known through the discursive practice of telling them (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998). The event is re-lived through the telling, but this told event is a discursive practice, not a re-enactment and may differ from the lived event (Baynham and De Fina, 2005).

What is central, then to the researcher, is whether the historical truth is more important than the narrative truth (Eakin, 1999). A narrative may reveal facts: Baynham (2005) shows how Moroccan women exploit a range of linguistic resources in their daily lives. But when the primary concern is how the narrator sees themselves in narrating their lived experiences — returning to Baynham, that these women see themselves as significant players in the family's settlement in the UK — then the issue of extracting the 'truth' becomes less important (Reissman, 1993).

For the reasons I have already given, I decided on using spoken narratives. But another reason is that the interview is a particularly useful tool for enabling a researcher to question an entire sample of people on the same issues (Potter and Wetherell, 1987), increasing the chances

of acquiring relevant, usable data (beyond what may be acquired through ethnographic observations or recorded interactions). The participants, other than complying with the set of variables I chose (South Asian, parents of dual-heritage children, professional), also fulfil the following further three criteria. Firstly, they are willing participants: they have never shown any antipathy to the process, and have answered subsequent queries on their interviews quickly and positively. Invariably they have insisted that I do not worry about asking more of them. The second is my ability to maintain their anonymity to a required level. Cameron (2001) relates how even after conscientious identity hiding, coincidences can happen and a person can be exposed. The final pool of respondents are, I hope, sufficiently removed from each other to be unrecognisable to each other in print. Thirdly, while I have not actually had to exclude any of the participants on this basis, I *would* have if I had not considered the interviews 'quality': if I felt that the interview did not successfully offer them a platform during which to vocalise their feelings.

3.3 Using Interviewing as a research tool

In this section I show how I arrive at the constructionist view of interviews: that is, that the data received from interviews needs to be seen as being produced from the interaction between interviewer and interviewee, a mutually-constructed knowledge, rather than a stand-alone unit of knowledge. The difficulties of presenting a coherent view of my methods arise: my understanding of the interviews in this way is influenced by my views on the discourse and the nature of what we say and hear, which derive from a Bakhtinian perspective. The two are intertwined, but I will present a discussion on interviews first, before showing in Chapter 4 how they can be analysed most richly through a Bakhtinian perspective.

3.3.1 Qualitative interviews

I wanted to ensure that my participants could give their accounts in their own way, giving nuanced descriptions of aspects of their life, rather than disrupt the "thread of the narrative" with structured questioning (Gillham, 2005:45). An unstructured interview allows the narrator to

organise their experiences and recollections of specific situations and actions "into temporally meaningful episodes" (Polkinghorne, 1988:1) while also leaving the door open to unsolicited data. In Measor and Wood's study (1984) about the transition between primary and secondary school, the depth of emotional uncertainty that these children faced was only garnered because they were allowed to talk in an unstructured way, with many digressions and second-hand anecdotes, in an atmosphere of trust. This atmosphere Kvale (1996) describes as "deliberately naïve", the interviewer being open to the participants' comments and the stories they feel they should tell.

Unlike some paradigms such as interactional sociolinguistics and conversation analysis, where the emphasis is on naturally occurring talk, the research interview is rarely regarded as 'natural'. Deborah Cameron (2001) however, re-poses the question: what *is* natural (my emphasis)? While most researchers distinguish 'ordinary' talk from 'institutional' talk, that found for example in a courtroom, the distinctive talk of the courtroom is normal or ordinary for that setting, a court of law (Cameron, 2001:13). A useful metaphor for a research interview could be a "professional conversation" (Kvale, 1996: 5). It is a conversation, but it goes beyond the spontaneity of a free exchange of views as happens in everyday conversation: it has a purpose, involves more careful listening and responding or questioning. The overall aim, too, is different from both professional or non-professional conversations, which may desire to accomplish something even if that is simply to while away the time: the interviewer seeks to gain knowledge, and this underlines the inherent asymmetry within such a 'conversation'. While the researcher seeks to gain knowledge, the participant does not necessarily do so, and may have other unknown goals. And, in line with other conversations, it occurs between non-equal partners: the researcher maintains the theme and drives the interview towards the pursuit of knowledge.

Gillham discusses the importance of acknowledging just *who* you are interviewing: he describes the "élite interview" as one where the interviewees are not "naïve" but people who, because of their positions of authority in their own spheres, are "sophisticated subjects"

(Gillham, 2005:54). While none of my participants would sanction the word 'élite' in connection with themselves, none could be described as 'naïve' and all are highly-educated: all are graduates; all except Nick are post-graduates; and three (Joshua, Kamran and Padma) have doctorates. With nearly all of my participants I have talked about 'doing research' and the research process. Memorably, Padma queried the success of our interview, revealing that she has found as a researcher that 'people don't always give you what you want them to'.

The comment I have just related does not appear in the recorded interview but appears in the field notes that I compiled after each interview. I regard these conversations that happen 'around' the interview, rather than superfluous as being part of the method in their own right: adding to the rich rigour I aspire to. I consider the interviews I conducted as 'quality' (Kvale 1996:145; Mann, 2011): the participants give rich, spontaneous and relevant responses; their answers are, mostly, longer than my questions; within the interviews I followed up and clarified meanings; at times I attempted to verify my interpretation during the course of the interview.

I maintain that some ethnographic details are of value, and I include these in my analysis. For example: a few minutes after I had arrived at Padma's flat for the first time, having arranged to meet just before my family's holiday to India, she asked me, catching me unawares: "So is India still home?" The way I responded, I knew, could have an effect on the relationship that we would have and develop during the interview. In fact, she accepted my stammered response ─ that 'home' was, now, wherever my children were. But that exchange sparked off a discussion on the south of India, where we both originate from, and its distinctiveness from the north: we built a rapport that can be evidenced in the interviews that ensued.

Kvale advocates the use of leading questions, in line with Potter and Wetherell's (1987) encouragement of intervention and confrontation. I did not consciously use 'leading questions' but there are occasions where, arguably, I did as a result of the conversational turn. An example is shown below from Devinder's narrative:

S: so when you were growing up in your parents' home was it very much y'know THEIR domain and THEIR Indianness?

D: yeah

S: but now you're opening up to the wider possibilities of Indianness with like literature for example

D: YEAH that's the way [is that] to put it yeah it's that it's CLAIMING it for myself

The above shows that while I adopted an unstructured approach to the interviews, in the interests of clarifying participants' words I occasionally interjected with my interpretations, for them to agree with or not. In the context of the interview, as I will discuss later, the participants may have used those opportunities to present a more favourable 'self' or even tried to fulfil a cultural script that they believed I wanted them to follow (Alvesson, 2003): Devinder may have believed I wanted him to vocalise his ownerships of 'being Indian'. However, on other occasions the participants claim their centrality in telling *their* story. Slembrouck offers an example from his work with a social worker, (in Hall, Sarangi and Slembrouck, 1997: 281 cited in Slembrouck, 2015), where the social worker interjects in "a bid for an extended, more monological turn" to curtail the involvement of the researcher: "well look *I'll* speak".

Below I show such an instance with Devinder:

S: that's very interesting yes so they possibly

D: yeah but also just to CONCLUDE on that yes maybe my experience has been quite negative because the Sikhs I know are from farming background very MACHO

Here, while I begin to offer an interpretation Devinder interrupts in order for him to 'complete' his turn, establish ownership and offer his interpretation first. These subtle interactions display the construction of a self in the research interview: Devinder here employs his cultural knowledge to invest his telling of the event with authenticity as well as frame himself as an 'equal' partner in the conversation.

3.3.2 What exactly do you get from an interview?

Roulston (2010:224) emphasises that "[r]esearchers' theoretical assumptions about qualitative interviews have implications for how research interviews are structured, the kinds of research questions made possible, the kinds of interview questions posed, how data may be analysed and represented". In this section I discuss my primarily constructionist approach to the research interview — that the resulting narratives are jointly-constructed between us — but I will show how, unlike a 'pure' constructionist, I give credence to the knowledge of my participants in describing their social world. This viewpoint allows me to focus not only on the form of the interview, but the content.

Steinar Kvale offers two metaphors of research interviewers: the interviewer as a 'miner', uncovering buried metal, "uncontaminated by the miner" which once unearthed remains unchanged from oral to written stage; or the interviewer as a 'traveller' on a journey, a *Bildungsreise*, during which the traveller may change as well, the outcome being a tale to be told upon returning home (Kvale, 1996:5). The latter, with its implicit emphasis on the development of the scholar as well as access to knowledge appeals: the narratives I present have been filtered through my lens. A prosaic result could be the transcription schema that I have decided on not *before* the interviews, but as a *result* of the interviews. A less tangible example is the greater understanding I have of my own upbringing through listening to those of my participants. Kvale's 'miner' metaphor could map onto the first two of David Silverman's oft-cited perspectives of interviewers: positivists and naturalists, the latter initially termed as 'romantics' (Silverman,1993). The 'traveller' metaphor suits his third: the constructionist. Silverman's trio — themselves related to trait, role and humanist theories of self (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) — in turn correlate to the methods used to obtain them (Silverman, 2014:173).

A positivist would regard the status of the data as fact, indicative of behaviour and attitudes, and would obtain these data through random samples, standardised questions. For

naturalists, the data are authentic experiences, obtained through unstructured, open-ended interviews. Both these approaches agree that the best kind of data is untouched by the researcher: neutral, unbiased and representative, thus presenting a high degree of plausibility (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995). These research outputs are often demanded by 'users' in the community seeking practical help from social science research (Silverman, 2014).

However, a critique of positivist studies is that in the absence of trust the respondents of such studies may also produce superficial or cautious responses (Alvesson, 2003). A research question might elicit different responses including "misinformation, evasion, lies and fronts" from participants (Douglas, 1976, cited by Walford, 2007); the interviewee may have incomplete knowledge and faulty memory (Walford, 2007:147). A naturalist emphasises the need to establish a rapport and trust between interviewer and interviewee, in order to accomplish "deeper, fuller conceptualizations" of subjects' lives (Miller & Glassner, 1997:103). But a quest to promote sympathy does not guarantee a 'truthful' interview: indeed, if, as in Potter and Wetherell's research, the emphasis is on people's opinions, then it is arguable whether there is a 'truth' or not. Interview outcomes should be recognised to be tempered by the context of the situation and "the moves of the interviewer" (Alvesson, 2003:16).

A constructionist regards the data as "mutually constructed" and applies a close study of how participants produce sense in the research data. Potter and Wetherell argue that the accounts that people give of what happened in their lives, narratives, will show variation between versions, highlighting that social texts are less mirrors of events or objects but rather are involved in an active construction of a version of those things (1987:6); an argument related to the told event versus lived event discussed by Baynham and De Fina (2005). An interview may also offer a platform for the presentation of a "favoured self-identity" to an attentive and empathetic listener. Rather than, then, revealing a 'true self', the interview allows for the construction of this identity (Alvesson, 2003:20).

The 'pure' constructionist approach is a critical one: it challenges the assumptions, claims and purposes of those wanting to use interviews instrumentally. A valid critique of this standpoint, and one to which I subscribe, is that it underestimates the significance of using subjects who can communicate important insights of their lives (Alvesson, 2003:17; Gilham, 2005; Mann, 2011; Kvale, 1996). Like other constructionists I want to "preserve a concern" with *what* the interviewees are saying as well as *how* they arrive at saying it (Silverman, 2014:185). As Gubrium and Holstein have stated (1997:127):

> The goal is to show how interview responses are produced in the interaction between interviewer and respondent, without losing sight of the meanings produced or the circumstances that condition the meaning-making process. The analytic objective is not merely to describe the situated production of talk, but to show how what is being said relates to the experiences and lives being studied.

Miller and White (2004) provide one example: they draw on constructionism to recognise that their girl-gang respondents are not only individuals with their own unique experiences, but being members of a variety of cultures, they use culturally available resources to construct their stories (Silverman, 2014: 189). Constructionists do not need to choose between form and content: "[w]hat matters is to understand how and where the stories are produced, which sort of stories they are, and how we can put them to honest and intelligent use in theorizing about social life" (Miller and White, 2004:183).

Regarding the research interview as a construction site where layers of knowledge are built is a helpful metaphor. The knowledge that is constructed appears: as narrative (people telling stories of their lives); as language, language being both the tool/medium of the interview as well as the object of textual interpretation; as context of the interview and the worlds created; and as an interchange of two persons. Baker (1982:109) elaborates the last point:

> When we talk about the world we live in, we engage in the activity of giving it a particular character. Inevitably we assign features and phenomena to it and make it out to work in a particular way. When we talk with someone else about the world, we take into account who the other is, what that other person could be presumed to know, 'where' that other is in relation to ourself in the world we talk about.

Regarding the dynamics of interaction between interviewer and interviewee, Bourdieu (1990:611) maintains that "social proximity and familiarity" can offer more chances for the interview to be a "non-violent" communication: his choice of words emphasising the power differentials that can exist between interviewer and interviewee. While I have already shown (using Slembrouck's discussion of the social worker interview) that these power differentials can be complex and not always defined or fixed, at the same time, Cameron has warned that researchers often exploit the good will and desire to help that emanates from people who are closest to ourselves (Cameron, 2001:22). Indeed, Joshua states in his self-reflection on the research process that he would never have joined a government survey but wanted to help me as a "genuine" person.

While I acknowledge that "all kinds of distortions are embedded in the very structure of the research relationship" (Bourdieu, 1999:608), with each of my participants there are shared aspects. When the issues covered in the interviews – those of perceptions of choices of identity and belonging, not having an arranged marriage but instead having a 'love-match' with someone out of our community, varied fluency and a changing relationship with the Heritage Language – are issues that are sensitive, often regarded pejoratively by family and South Asian communities as evidence of 'being westernised', the commonalities we share offer some degree of assurance of knowledge of how these life decisions transpire. Questions which could be perceived as being "brutally objectifying" are thus tempered: my interviewees know that I have empathy and share "the risk of exposure" (Bourdieu, 1999: 611). I give an example below from Paresh's interview:

P: we've [*referring to him and his wife*] got into a situation where people just you know verbalise their thoughts and you just think do I REALLY want to pull them up on this now ↑ yeah because it might affect our friendship or

S: it's amazing (1) how I know EXACTLY what you're saying

P: [laughs]

S: {laughing voice} you never really FORGET do you ↓ you never really forget

P: no

S: that you're Asian or (2). and your friends DO let things come out that you have to let go

P: yeah

While I describe my analytical approach more fully in the next chapter, I will point out here that in the extract above the use of the pronouns subtly changes the involvement of the speakers. Paresh's initial use of 'you' ("and you just think") may be interpreted as 'I' in the situation he finds himself with his wife. But my contribution ("you never really forget, and the tag "do you" with a falling, rhetorical intonation) introduces a collective thought: 'we never forget'.

This social relationship can have effects on the results obtained, the effects varying according to other parameters that can influence a relationship – for example, whether I know the participant, whether the interview is conducted in my home or theirs, or in a neutral place, or by Skype ─ and this I felt needed to be reflected in my analysis.

3.4 Conclusion

While I have obtained a piece of reflective writing from the participants after their two interviews, field notes of the encounters, emails and summaries of informal conversations – in an attempt to collate multiple sources of data (Benson, 2014) – my final analyses rely on the interview data. This is primarily because the supplementary data varied greatly from participant to participant: I interviewed four face-to-face, and three via Skype, and subsequent field notes

have differed in quantity and content; one participant wrote a three page reflection, the others sent emails ranging from a paragraph to a few sentences; I see one participant fairly regularly and have more informal conversations with her than with the others. Therefore, I have used these other sources of data to add texture to the interviews, rather than as data themselves (Cameron, 2001). I have amassed large quantities of interview data but because of the theoretical sampling I conducted (Gillham, 2005), that is, closely identifying members of a target group, I consider all the data relevant. As all my participants are professionals, it was not surprising that they would talk in varied amounts about their educational background; they have all married a white partner and hence the absence of an arranged marriage became a talking point. They are all parents and so talking about children was inevitable.

Having introduced my participants and discussed my decision to use personal narratives elicited through interviews, I discuss in the next chapter my framework for analysis.

.

4. Theories and Analysis

Well it's true I went round the block with Bulwinder

I went with Kuswinder

I went with Subwinder

I even went to the mela with Ramwinder!

But their skirts were too short

and they loved their alcopops

they all chewed gum

and they swore too much

so none of these girls made me feel right inside.

From "*The Balcony song of Raju and Jaswinder*" by Daljit Nagra

I quote an extract from Nagra's poem because in a similar way as the perturbed Raju, I had to find what 'felt right' for my theoretical framework. Nagra's style, juxtaposing a synthesis of Sikh culture— the preponderance of names ending in *winder*, the mention of the *mela* — with that of 'British' culture — short skirts, alcopops ─ reflects Raju's internal struggles. For Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) such carnivalesque works, which use motifs, themes and generic forms drawn, in his original thinking, from a tradition of mediaeval popular culture, but which can also be translated to modern popular culture, are subversive, straining against authority. Panning out and regarding the poem as being written by a British Sikh poet, in English, in the multicultural landscape of the UK, accentuates the complex decisions transnationals may need to make when deciding their own path.

My research interviews have produced textured, complex data. I have chosen to use a theoretical framework which best exploits a spoken narrative elicited through interviews, regarding the seven narratives firstly as a body of text, and then each narrative separately. The first analysis allows me to find patterns in the discourse, and how the talk fulfilled the function of constructing a narrative. I decided on themes I observed that were crucially related to my research questions: one aspect that was notable, and not unexpected in a narrative, was the way the participants use time expressions; another was the use of direct reported speech, stylised ways of speaking and accented speech when using words of South Asian origin; and another was how they spoke about change.

I also regarded each narrative as a 'story of me'. While sections of a participant's narrative can be shown to build up an argument of my choosing, I argue that the participants *themselves* have an 'argument', and given the opportunity to tell their life story, they choose to present themselves in a certain way. For reasons of space I will not show all seven narratives in full, but I show two such narratives using specifically language-related sections, and one as a life-story. In this way, I show an approach to narratives that I believe contributes to the field: that is, recognising the different ways participants use the platform they have been given. In the rest of this chapter I detail the theories I draw on and how I use them in my analysis.

4.1 The narratives as discourse: Using an emic perspective of the functional use of language

Deborah Schiffrin (1994) offers two different definitions of discourse, with different origins and different theoretical premises, but which she argues are not absolutes. Firstly, the formalist paradigm which looks at discourse in a large way: that is language above the sentence. The functionalist paradigm looks at discourse in a small way: that is, language use. Within the functional paradigms, Schiffrin argues discourse can be analysed via an etic approach where particular units of discourse are matched to previously delimited functions, in a schema or

framework. An emic approach, however, such as that which I use, investigates how units are used and *then* draws a conclusion about the broader functions of such units from that analysis. Emic approaches begin from observation and description of an utterance and then try to infer from analysis of that utterance and its context what functions are being served (Schiffrin, 1994). For example, I noticed that by talking about an event while introducing, involving or drawing in other factors, the participants can evoke a relationship between these aspects: throughout my thesis I use the terms **bind/link/tie** to describe this function.

I will illustrate my approach using an extract from Nick's interview. We are talking about how he felt on his first visit to India, when strangers made overtures to him in Hindi (a language he does not speak):

S: […] how did that make you FEEL?

N: I've always felt very um (1) DISCONNECTED from any kind of Indian culture for a couple of reasons (1) I think the FIRST is that when we were little we grew up in HERTFORDSHIRE↑ so that was kind of out (2) there were NO KIND of Indians there then there are not so many now ALSO we went to school in Bishops Stortford which was again mainly mostly WHITE area (.) there were no Indian families at school there was just one other black family er me and the other Indians in the school were my SISTERS and so my ACCENT and the way I GREW UP was very DETACHED from any of that (.) then when I got OLDER my sisters my sister is quite ATTRACTIVE and she gets to know a lot of people very quickly and er she

S: is this your sister Miranda?

N: no LEANNE I've got three sisters she's my older sister yeah and uh she got to know some Indian guys and when they met me they were like your brother's a coconut (.) and that

S: MMM↓

N: and that has ALWAYS been the case with other Indians [.] they've always thought of me like that because of the way I speak and it's happened to me several times especially throughout my early twenties

Nick evokes different 'places' when discussing his 'connection' to Indian culture and while my question is related to India, he shifts to specific places in the UK (Hertfordshire, Bishops Stortford) where there were "no kind of Indians", and there were "no Indian families" at school, places which were "mainly white". He thus **binds** the lack of growing up among other Indians to his disconnection with Indian culture, all within the time frame of 'growing up'. He may be using hyperbole: later in his interview he talks about the Goan community that he grew up in, the many gatherings related to Catholic events, the club his relatives belonged to. This hyperbole is related to the way he uses "Indian culture", as removed from Goan culture; but the way he uses 'Indian' includes himself ("other Indians", the other Indians at school were my sisters"). In this way he constructs his narrative so that, while regarding himself as Indian, he is removed from a type of Indian-ness that he sees as different from Catholic Goan culture. That removal is **linked** to how he speaks differently to expectations of a British Indian (he refers to "my accent", "because of the way I speak") and his upbringing, "the way I grew up". The language in question here is not his Heritage Language, Konkani, but English: that is, the way he speaks English does not fit into a Discourse, discussed later, of how English is spoken by a British Asian. In India, his Indian-ness was not questioned in the sense that he was *expected* to speak Hindi: his physical appearance sufficed as enough 'Indian-ness'. His 'Indian-ness' thus becomes contested among the *diaspora* rather than in the homeland.

My comments above do not follow a rigid schema, but rather interpret how the participants are using language to frame their narratives in a certain way. Deborah Cameron (2001) argues that approaching data as discourse can involve some measure of ethnographic (in a very broad sense) field research methods. Conceptions of communications are deeply intertwined with conceptions of person, cultural values and language (Basso, 1972; Ochs and Schieffelin, 2008): so while I do not claim to have conducted an ethnography, the way I read the data and the way I choose the extracts for closer analysis draw on ethnographic concepts. As

Cameron argues (2001:55): "Central to [the idea of using ethnography as an aid rather than as a recipe] is that ethnography need not only be about description but also about explaining". It is for this reason that I consider the 'emic', insider perspective particularly appropriate.

4.2 The narratives as conversation: Using aspects of Conversation Analysis

I will not here give a detailed discussion of Conversation Analysis (CA), but rather, following a brief overview, I show how using CA's detailed attention to interaction contributes to my analysis of the narratives.

CA is grounded in ethnomethodology, Garfinkel's concern with uncovering the knowledge that each person owns (Garfinkel, 1967, 1974). It aims to avoid generalising and idealising: rather Conversation Analysts intentionally ignore what are often assumed to be unchanging features of a social world, such as a person's ethnicity or occupation. They focus on the details of actual events: they record conversations that occur without researcher prompting; they produce transcriptions which include both linguistic and non-linguistic details in order to avoid presuppositions for what might be important for either participants or analysts; they avoid including the analyst's knowledge but rely on the events that occur in the conversation, said to reflect and realize practical knowledge (Cameron, 2001:235). Study of detailed linguistic features such as delays, stress, intonation, aspirations and the selection of particular words that CA entails, has served to highlight the importance of these phenomena (Schiffrin, 1994). Conversation analysts, labelling their object of study as 'talk-in-interaction', prefer talk which is thoroughly interactive rather than with the "monologic sequences" (Cameron, 2001:87) one obtains from a narrative elicited from an interview. The notion of warrants — a piece of conversation-internal evidence to support an analytical claim — restricts engagement outside the interview situation for an explanation or enrichment. Drew and Heritage (1992, as cited in Holt, 1999) argue that Conversational Analysts reject the view of context as a determiner of the nature of an interaction.

In many aspects, then, my study as described so far lies quite far from a conversation analysis. However, Wooffitt (2005) argues that there is still a considerable overlap between the two formulations of conversation and discourse analysis, reminding us that both use *talk* as a topic for analysis with attention to the properties of these data: an example being Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) versus Gilbert and Mulkay (1984). Charles Antaki (2011) allows that alongside the canonical approach of privileging words and gesture, the use of multi-modal details has long been present in CA's output, citing the ethnographically- inspired work of Goodwin and Goodwin (1990), who argued the manufacture of slingshots was a necessary detail in their study of pre-adolescents, as one example. Applied Conversational Analysis, as shown in Antaki's edited collection (2011), illustrates the use of CA for purposes other than the investigation of practices of talk in interaction: for example, for intervention in institutions using dialogue.

Pure CA, I maintain, does not offer enough scope for me to do justice to the narratives I have procured, but their attention to the detail of the situated event can prove useful to add texture to my other methods. Their emphasis on how people make sense of their world, with a strongly functional view of talk, suits my study and my perspective of the functional use of language. One particular aspect is CA's focus on adjacency pairs, including questions and answers, offers and acceptances. Speakers are aware that a turn consists of one or more turn constructional units which may be grammatical entities such as a sentence or clause, or be delineated by prosody: stress, intonation or pauses. In a conversation, turns are allocated to the participants. Maynard et al. (2011) show that a discouraging interactional environment can be created by failing to respond in a preferred way. Dis-preferred responses can include a failure to take an opportunity to respond, giving a terse response, or using prosody, such as intonation or delay, to show resistance (2011:63-64). Conversely, an encouraging environment is produced when cues are given immediately, explicitly agreeing responses (such as 'right!' rather than 'yes') are used, expansive rather than terse responses are given, and pitch is modulated. Wilkinson

(2011) shows the importance of story-prefacing when asking sensitive questions as well as a need for a post-response account in her study of monitoring for ethnicity in telephone calls: both strategies elicit more 'preferred' responses. The above all relate to understanding the environment in which the narratives I have elicited occurred and can be used to comment on how this environment influenced the way they were constructed.

I do not argue that the interviews I conducted were ordinary conversations (Cameron, 2001), and indeed applying CA can highlight how it fails as a conversation. For example, Nick's utterance (shown on p81) — "there were NO KIND of Indians" — if seen as an exaggeration, then must seek a response from me, a receipt of news (such as 'really?'). But later, his use of the phrase "Your brother's a coconut", *does* elicit a response from me (mmm↓). A preferred response might have been an expression of shock ("oh!"). However, while I show sympathy in my tone, with my falling intonation, I do not show surprise.

Using CA to highlight this linguistic feature (mmm↓) now allows me to search for a reason: one is my own knowledge of the scathing assessments of British Asians by other British Asians based on 'how they speak' for example. I also know the term "coconut" (as I argue Nick expects me to) and its implications, and do not react with confusion or ask for clarification: Nick intends for me to hear this word, knowing that I will recognise its significance and its connotations. Hence using CA's tools to identify these features at a micro-level of discourse will allow me to comment on the macro-level of discourse: on how speakers use language with intended meanings for the listener, as I show in the next section.

4.3 The narratives as literary texts: Using Bakhtin's concepts of discourse and power, dialogism and chronotopes

A central argument embedded in my thesis is that my respondents straddle two cultures, and straddle two spaces (the homeland and here), and to 'forget' this aspect of their lives would limit appreciation of these important factors in the production of their narratives. Further, to 'forget'

that I am also a member of this displaced group is not in keeping with the ethos of the reflexivity encouraged in a quality, qualitative study.

If we consider Paresh, briefly, as an example, I will argue that it would be limited to view Paresh's life story as being simply a 'version' of a generic story of a 'second-generation British Asian' when, as I have already discussed, each of those terms can be problematized. His parents emigrated from Uganda, in keeping with the well-known account of East African Asians arriving in the UK: but they arrived in the UK eight years *before* Idi Amin expelled the Asians from Uganda. A historicist might gloss this detail as an alternative story, but I argue that it is central to the *making* of that story: that *not* being part of that expelled group has shaped the way Paresh thinks about himself and the way he constructs his narrative (I return to this example later). And I, as listener, with my knowledge of the varied trajectories that the South Asian diaspora have taken to arrive in the UK, am attuned to and respond to these details.

Further, picking out compact and boundaried units for structural analysis discounts the fact that the way my participants construct their narratives is a result of the resources they have to hand, a product of their upbringing and milieu. This knowledge of language, its nuances, and knowledge of genre reflects a habitus, Bourdieu's concept which I discuss later. For an essential part of story-telling is that firstly we understand what 'makes a story', and what makes it interesting for the listener, in this case, myself. Blommaert (2008) describes the poignant experiences of the Congolese painter, Tshibumba, whose *History of Zaire* was ignored by historians until someone, Johannes Fabian, who had the knowledge and capacity to re-contextualise the story to fit the genre of historiography, could help him (Fabian, 1996). What is needed from the narrator is knowledge of how to create a voice that will be recognised as giving a narrative, a life story (a point discussed by others including Agha, 2003; Blommaert, 2015, Wortham, 2006).

The American anthropologists Stuart Plattner and Edward Bruner's (Plattner and Bruner,1984; Bruner, 1984) arguments in the 1980s for a different perspective on narratives,

what they termed "dialogic narration", drew attention to the literary theorists from which the paradigm he suggested was derived: the members of the Bakhtin circle (Mikhail Bakhtin, Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov), of whom Mikhail Bakhtin is the most well-known. I will first discuss my thoughts regarding the narratives I elicited, and then show how and why I, like many researchers in sociology, linguistics, education and anthropology, use these works to inform my analyses.

I conducted all the interviews in English (mostly – I will show how on some occasions words from a South Asian lexicon were used), a language in which I and my participants are proficient. Also, I knew the interviews would be conducted in environs where production of a Heritage Language would be unlikely (for example we were not going to meet in a café in Southall where Devinder might order his drink in Punjabi). The interviewees, despite their varied upbringings, all now have a lifestyle where English is the lingua franca at home. However, rather than this being a reason for *ignoring* these narratives (and the participants) on the basis that sufficient multilingualism is not at play, I have already argued that my interviews provide the ideal opportunity for looking beyond 'language' as a single unitary code. Blommaert (2013a) argues that the term 'code-switching' with its implicit view that two distinct codes are involved, perpetuates an inaccurate understanding of language, culture and identity as composed of separable units.

His arguments have resonance: that while my interviews are conducted in 'English', the subtle changes in the *way* that we speak resist the gloss that we are speaking the same 'language'. No one speaks English or any national language in exactly the same way in any given context. Davies (2011), with reference to his discussions on 'the native speaker' concept describes three grammars that any language will own: grammar 1, what Saussure described as *langue*, the essential communicability of any language; grammar 2, our own idiolect when speaking a language; and grammar 3, the essential rules of any given language. While this argument for recognition of a grammar 2, moves closer to the idea that there are variations *within* language I intend to probe

deeper into the importance in these discussions of the *production* of language, be it spoken or written. For, while words can have a 'dictionary meaning' or a semantic content (an example from Nick's narrative is that a 'coconut' is a fruit, with a hard brown shell, covering a white interior), it is when they are either spoken or written that they assume a meaning that is more social in nature ('coconut' is a derogatory term usually used intra-group to describe a westernised South Asian). As Vygotsky has argued (1986, 1987), while words have a dictionary meaning, *speech* has sense. And so we arrive at a concept that is central to Bakhtin's theory, dialogism: that the words that Nick uses, all of them, but let us take 'coconut' as an example, carry a weight of historical baggage that they have gained through previous usage; but further, that Nick uses his words because he has an intention to convey to me, the listener. Voloshinov has argued:

> [I]n actuality we never say or hear words. We say and hear what is true or false, good or bad, important or unimportant, pleasant or unpleasant, and so on.
> Voloshinov, 1929:70

In the rest of this section, I will discuss more of Bakhtin's arguments which allow me to ground my data in a framework which reflects my thesis: that the narratives should be viewed in the context of the telling (the micro-discourse), as well as in a wider social context (the macro-discourse); that rather than viewing language as "unitary" – the interviews are conducted in English – we recognise that within a language there are different 'voices' which are used by the speaker and recognised by the listener to convey meaning; and that meaning depends on both the speaker *and* the listener. Finally, I will show how using Bakhtin's concept of time-space connectedness, the chronotope, enables analysis of how the narrators construct their narratives and how they highlight critical incidents in their life stories.

A Bakhtinian perspective

Bakhtin offers a perspective of a language being living, never static, and in a dialectical relationship with previous utterances, so that nothing is said in isolation. So, even the decision to respond as 'yes', 'yeah' or 'uh-uh' depends on who we are speaking to, the impression we would like to convey and the experience we have of how such responses are received. Bakhtin and his circle thereby argue that meaning is socially constituted, as spoken and written language only acquires meaning through social usage:

> The living utterance, having taken meaning and sharing in a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogical threads […] cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981:276)

While an investigation of the narratives of my participants is interesting enough from a purely linguistic viewpoint, I believe it can be so much more enriched if their narratives are seen as reflections of (or oppositions to) other, at times public, discourses: a macro-discourse. But what I also argue is that my participants *expect* me to take into account the wider social aspect of their lives, their lives as members of a diaspora. In order to satisfy this expectation, I need to use a theory that situates their narratives within a larger narrative than simply the narrative-in-interview. I turn again to a Bakhtinian perspective:

> We are taking language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view (Bakhtin, 1981:271).

I have already mentioned Paresh who was born in Uganda. I now give a transcription of the exchange in which Paresh makes it clear that what is important for him to relate, and what I

recognise too, is that his family were not members of the East African Asians who arrived in the 1970s from Uganda:

P: well I was born in UGANDA um in 1963 um and my parents came to England in 1965 ↑ because they decided that Uganda was getting independence and it wouldn't be long before the Asians were kicked out hhh so I suppose they came so I've got an older sister who was born in INDIA in Gujarat the **Rann** of **Kutch** and then me and my younger sister were born in Uganda

S: so your parents had actually EMIGRATED to Uganda [yeah] they weren't sort of the LONG-TERM [NAH] Asian nationals in Uganda

Paresh dates his arrival in the UK to 1965, and he gives some agency to his parents ("they decided") rather than Idi Amin for this decision. He also shows that the family were recent arrivals in Uganda (his sister was born in India). All this information serves to place his family out of the sphere of what I refer to as "the long-term Asian nationals in Uganda" — with its connotations of wealth and cliques. I show this recognition and he rejoinders 'nah'. I will reiterate later that my participants also have the *resources* (of language, knowledge of genre, as well as knowledge of 'expected' details) to construct a narrative, but here is an example of the dialogic nature of the narrative, and how it points 'out' of the interaction of the interview itself, to wider social contexts.

If we regard this extract, and all my interviews as 'being in English' we lose sight of valuable hints that the participants index through the way they use the language. The concept that there is 'one', "unitary language", Bakhtin argues, "gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the processes of socio-political and cultural centralization" (Bakhtin, 1981:271). He argues that a unitary language operates with (centripetal) forces in society which encourage

the reigning of one language over another. But Bakhtin also argued that there was a constant bubbling of resistance to these centripetal forces; and this resistance from individuals, these centrifugal forces, mean that the 'unitary' idea of language cannot hold.

If we extend Bakhtin's ideas of a centripetal force in language to society, I could, using a broad-brush statement, consider my participants' lives as challenging an authoritative discourse from their community or elders: that is, the discourse that recommends marriage to a person of the same religion or caste and linguistic background. But another argument would be that my participants are not challenging the authoritative discourse of UK society (and politics): to 'integrate', to 'speak English'. A Bakhtinian perspective, therefore allows me to theorize and problematize these issues rather than regard them one-dimensionally.

Bakhtin's contention that there is a constant struggle between authoritative voices (those used by groups in power – the government, schools, the media – but also the voices of parents, elders of the community) and voices that challenge the authority, allows me to investigate instances of these struggles in the interviews. These struggles arise within discourse so that the discourse produces both this power and the struggle against the power. This concept chimes with Foucault's views on power (1971): that rather than being an untouchable 'thing' somehow inherent in organisations or people, power is *given* to these entities by the discourses surrounding them. Bakhtin addresses these power struggles within language:

> But the centripetal forces of the life of language, embodied in a "unitary language", operate in the midst of heteroglossia. At any given moment of its evolution, language is stratified not only into linguistic dialects in the strict sense of the word (according to formal linguistic markers, especially phonetic), but also — and for us this is the central point — into languages that are socio-ideological: languages of social groups, "professional" and "generic" languages, languages of generations and so forth. […]

> Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted work [.]
>
> Bakhtin, 1981:272- 293

Returning to the view that language is living, gathering meaning in social use, Bakhtin provokes the concept of the internal stratification of what is often considered a single national language into, for example, social dialects or group 'jargon'. Through these internal stratifications, the use of different speech styles, a language becomes **heteroglossic**.

By reconsidering language as non-unitary, and instead regarding, as Bakhtin recommends, a text in any given language as incorporating a plurality of 'voices', I find my critical views on the data have been liberated. The narratives become a patchwork, not conducted as I have previously said "in English" but in a variety of 'voices', where the speakers make recourse to knowledge of how the ways they speak will be received by their speaking partner. By maintaining this perspective, I can investigate different forms of the language, be it vocabulary, intonation, accent, mimicry, as being performances of language in their own right, which I, as listener, will recognise and respond to. I use three extracts from the interviews I conducted, to show how Bakhtin's theories can enrich linguistic analysis of these spoken texts. The extracts can be analysed in terms of their dialogism, the heteroglossia they exhibit, and the varied voices (the polyphony – which I discuss later) that can be heard.

The first is taken from Paresh's narrative, the preceding moments to the extract shown in Chapter 3, p72:

P: people make negative comments about other people or other ASIANS or when they say things like NOT BLACK people or ASIAN DOCTORS or they're not qualified to the same degree as WHITE doctors and you think oh FUCKING HELL I can't be arsed to have this discussion at this moment in time with these IDIOTS for whatever reason

How can the above be read, moving beyond a positivist view of the data as reporting a 'truth' but, rather, taking into account that Paresh has related these words within the context of an interview with me? Clearly, his language shows emotion, illustrating his intense reaction to the views he relates as being expressed by some friends (that black or Asian doctors are of inferior calibre). In doing so he subverts the formality of the traditional interviewer-interviewee relationship so that the context becomes much more like a conversation: he may be seeking to provoke a reaction from me. If Paresh's use of colourful, colloquial language within what is previously a neutral form of language is seen as heteroglot, then within the interaction in English, different strata can be discerned. So, in Bakhtinian terms, Paresh uses a stratified language which is recognisably Anglo-Saxon ("I can't be arsed", "oh fucking hell"). The question remains: what was he was trying to achieve by using such language with me? Bakhtin insists that voices have a social function and are used to maintain or resist an ideology, and embracing this argument enables a more 'political' reading of their uses. Paresh uses colloquial language adeptly; but its use is juxtaposed with what he is saying. That is, his mode of speaking exposes a tension: he is comfortable and proficient in the language of this society, but this does not mean that he always feels wholly comfortable with other aspects of the society. Some opinions of his circle of (white, liberal) friends are at odds with his own different perspectives. He is using the micro- discourse to argue against the macro-discourse: a subversive, insider's rebellion

The next example I use is taken from Kamran's interview. Central to Bakhtin's dialogism is the argument that nothing we say or hear is in isolation: we may repeat what we have heard so that it becomes our own voice reflecting another voice. Bakhtin drew attention to the varied voices found in a text: for example, the author's voice, seguing into the voice of a character, which the reader recognises as being non-authorial. For Bakhtin, this **polyphony** enables the author of a novel to express views/ use the language in a way that is different from their authorial voice. By applying the existence of polyphony to spoken text, the interviews can be

investigated for instances when the participants reach for 'other' voices to express a view which they are not certain 'belongs' to them.

Kamran believes his father decided to bring his sons up in a street a few blocks away from the heart of the Pakistani community to ensure that they learned how to speak English well:

K: err typically he wanted us to be DOCTORS and if not doctors then lawyers and if not lawyers then ENGINEERS whatever an engineer does uh um and so I think part of why he separated us from the community was to avoid that slightly y'know the NEGATIVE effects of being in completely immersed in the community and whatever his thoughts were on it at the time part of which I think is often your language suffers your integration with the language of your host nation suffers

Firstly, Kamran lists the professions that are commonly cited as 'worthy' by Asian parents, from medicine to law to engineering: this can be seen as a use of 'motifs', a set of cultural values he knows I will recognise. He does so in order to index a paradigm that I will recognise, and paints this picture of his upbringing and his father's influence to confirm his credentials: while he may not appear so 'typical' now, he had a 'typical' South Asian upbringing. He is rather dismissive of engineers ("whatever an engineer does"), thereby subtly positioning himself outside of his parents' mind-set. He then reverts to 'officialese' or language commonly used by the media and politicians: he talks about "the negative effects of being completely immersed in the community" (note his use twice of the term 'the community' rather than 'your' or 'my' or 'our' community), followed later by a long utterance "your language suffers your integration with the language of your host nation suffers" where he remains in the global 'you'. I argue this shows that Kamran's voice is polyphonic: he is evoking the voice of authoritative discourse but he is subtly distancing himself from it at the same time by not using the local 'we'. Attuning to these changes in voices,

this polyphony, is useful for my study because South Asians are often under scrutiny in the public arena in discussions on the integration of minorities, the importance of speaking English in society, and citizenship. An analysis of how individuals at the centre of those arguments use other voices provides interesting insights into how these people see themselves and present themselves in their narratives. Here, also, we see the way that narratives elicited from an interview can offer insights beyond a written narrative, but that by extension these narratives need to be subjected to an analysis that acknowledges the speech genres that we employ to convey meaning.

The third example comes from Mumtaz's narrative. I show that she modifies or stylises her 'normal' speaking voice on certain occasions: another instance of how the spoken narrative offers different opportunities for analysis than a written rendition. Below she is talking about how she and a friend felt some reluctance to join her university's Asian Society. I have used bold where her voice becomes stylised:

M: Meena and I would just be like YEAH(.) NO (.) {laughs} **not for us!** {posh voice} we'd just sit there and **be more highbrow** {posh voice}

Here, Mumtaz's use of a stylised voice, a posh English voice, which she uses in the midst of her 'normal' speaking voice contributes to the way her narrative is constructed in our interview. It is significant that Mumtaz uses a 'posh English voice', as it is a dialogic reference to a wider macro-discourse which Nick has already mentioned: that the way he spoke, his accent, was a cause for him to be branded a 'coconut'. Mumtaz stylises her voice further along the spectrum of Englishness knowing that I will recognise this as being a more extreme version of her own standard accent, and much like Paresh's expletives, her stylisation is ideological: she juxtaposes the word 'highbrow' with what she regards as the 'lowbrow' activities of the Asian society. In a wider social context, this juxtaposition can be seen to reflect the Discourse surrounding activities

associated with British Asians: Bollywood music rather than classical Indian music; the folk dance of bhangra rather than the classical Bharatanatayam dance which requires years of training. The "not for us" is what her younger self may have said to her friend, meaning then that they were not interested in those events. This rendition in interview-time is further used to index what she knows I will recognise (the emphasis on a limited set of markers used to define South Asian-ness in the UK) and can be further read as to include myself. It is internally dialogic in the Bakhtinian sense, as the intention these words had at the time when she said them to Meena is repeated when she relates this event in interview-time. In the same way as I have argued that Paresh performs a subversion in the extract I showed, Mumtaz performs a type of subversion by stylising her voice in a manner which may give rise to accusations of her being 'too posh' or 'being superior', a step away from being branded a 'coconut'.

Time and space in narratives: Finding the 'story'

As I have shown, the interviews provide rich pickings for linguistic data analysis of the words the participants use, the ways they stylise their language. I had a further question: how could I address the way my participants *tell* stories, which is an intrinsic part of narration? In this section, I show how I use another of Bakhtin's concepts — that of the **chronotope**, literally time-space — in order to identify critical moments in their life stories. And vice-versa: I argue that the participants *deploy* chronotopes to give weight to certain parts of their narrative and to maintain a narrative drive.

After acknowledging the inherent temporality of human life, from birth to death, the tendency is then to relegate the 'where' to a background feature. An example of such relegation is the term 'orientation' in Labovian structures where the space, as orientation, is not further considered: the focus lies in the complicating event, which is evaluated. But Bakhtin argues that time is inseparable to the space involved:

> We will give the name chronotope [literally, "time-space"] to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships […]. In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope.
>
> Bakhtin, 1981:84

The two factors intertwine so that a narrative emerges *because* of the significance of both time and space: one is not privileged over the other. Baynham (2005) describes spaces as representing the centre and periphery when discussing spatial shifts (in his study of Moroccan immigrants to the UK). By considering Morocco as the 'centre' of the Islamic world, a migration to the periphery (the UK) imbues this movement with a questionable value, whereas most would regard it as a positive move towards economic and political stability. However, while Baynham contends that space becomes the story, I argue that investigating how the participants use *both* time and space to construct an identity for her/himself within that narrative is more enriching. Bakhtin argues that the chronotope can be seen as an organizing centre for a narrative:

> What is most obvious is their meaning for narrative. They are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied. It can be said without qualification that to them belongs the meaning that shapes narrative […] It serves as the primary point from which "scenes" in a novel unfold, while at the same time other "binding" events located far from the chronotope, appear as mere dry information and communicated facts.
>
> Bakhtin, 1981:250

That is, by invoking a chronotope, the narrator allows us to slip back with them to their past (one book-end) and its environs (the there-and-then) and returns us to the here-and-now (another book-end). By invoking a chronotope the narrator him/herself highlights a 'story', rather than the researcher pulling out an extract of text to which they apply a framework. An example from Paresh's interview is the phrase "When we first moved to Bradford we used to live in Gurlington". He follows with descriptions of how he and his wife used to "get looks" from older Pakistani women which his wife interpreted as censorious. He finishes with "but to be honest it's never bothered me that much", returning us to the here-and-now of the interview. The 'book-ends' can be seen as the 'knots' that Bakhtin describes, where the listener is drawn into a scene in the narrator's story.

The concept of chronotope thus gives back some agency to the narrator so that even within an interview which is interactional they can reveal the stories they want to highlight to me. What is again dialogic is that I recognise these motifs that infuse the stories with temporal and spatial weight. I show using extracts from Padma's and Joshua's interviews that the evocation of a particular time-space is a catalyst for me to explore a set of complex attributes that define the plot, actors and cultural universe of the time (Blommaert, 2015). In this way, chronotopic organisation defines genres that we culturally recognise. Blommaert offers the notion of "tropic emblems" which instantly evoke a chronotope, one example being how the mention of Stalin can transport the listener to post-war Soviet Union. I argue the same with Padma's use of the name "Madras" below. Again, what is as important as who is telling the story is who is listening to it.

The extract below is taken from Padma's first interview:

Pm: when we went back to India and I would watch in Madras I would watch the TV news which is in the very classical Tamil that they use in and COMPLETELY INCOMPREHENSIBLE! (laughs)

Padma refers to 'Madras', thereby indexing the particular time in her childhood (the 1970s), before the city (space) was called Chennai. By doing so she evokes within her narrative the India before the economic opening up of the 1980s, before the changing of names of major cities in the 1990s: an India she knows I will recognise. But what she also indexes is the continued social usage of 'old' names by most Indians, thereby indexing her belonging to that identity.

Another example can be seen in the extract below from Joshua's interview, already shown in Chapter 3:

J: just uh from my experience that from the group my parents used to hang round with the you go to uh the social network was basically rotated around different houses had different dinner parties so you know two or three rooms where the grown-ups were would be loud BENGALI chatter and the other side of the house upstairs where the kids were playing it was ENGLISH

Here Joshua evokes a chronotope: his childhood in the UK, during which he had exposure to the local Bengali community. But rather than referencing an area of the UK or a city, he talks about "different houses" which "had different dinner parties". Here is an example of how Joshua indexes a trope that is familiar to me; that engagement with the community in South Asian cultures revolves around gatherings and sharing food. What he also indexes, however, is the intimate nature of the community he was involved with: unlike the larger communities (an example is the Gujarati community of North-West London) where 'community' events often occur in public venues, on account of their size, Joshua grew up in areas of the UK where there were not significant populations of Indian Bengalis. Gatherings were more intimate, took place in people's houses and there was a system of rotation so that each family 'took turns'. Here Joshua is not referring to a Bengali tradition necessarily but an activity common to members of a small diasporic community: both tropes I recognise from my own childhood, growing up in a

Malayalee community in Zambia. The space of the houses themselves function as a chronotope where the language Bengali was used, as it would be used in India.

How people tell their life-stories using the resources they have to maintain a 'platform' as teller of the story and how they maintain this narrative agency needs also to be considered. By evoking chronotopes with a sense of heightened emotion, where the time-space is charged with an element of change, the participants maintain a narrative 'drive', ensuring that I remain *interested* in the narratives. Bakhtin terms such a chronotope as a **threshold** event: "highly charged with emotion and value […] it can be combined with the motif of encounter but at its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of crisis and break in life" (Bakhtin, 1981:248). One example is how they use a chronotope of threshold when talking about their changing relationships with their Heritage Languages. Another is how some of them evoke a chronotope of encounter (a threshold event involving meeting a person) which had an impact on their sense of self.

The production of the narratives is a chronotope itself: the story-telling event being the here-and-now, and the story being the there-and-then. If the 'decoding' and deployment of chronotopes (that is, the researcher's identification and analysis of and the narrator's use of chronotopes) are seen as a chronotopic phenomenon in themselves (Blommaert, 2015:109), then we arrive at a theoretical perspective relevant to a constructionist view of the interviewing process: that the stories told are told (or remembered) because of who is talking to who. In this way, rather than just privileging the story (as historicist and structuralist paradigms would), the act and context of story-telling is also acknowledged.

4.4 The narratives: Discourses and capital

The theories I have shown thus far strongly inform how I approach the data, and inform my understanding of *why* the participants chose to talk and tell their stories in a certain way. When I was immersed in the data, however, I drew on two further concepts. Both rely on 'recognition'

by others, and can help explain *what* the participants were pointing at through the stories they told.

Wieder and Pratt (1990) show that for some Native Americans simply having a biological or kinship relationship did not suffice in order to be recognised (from within the group) as "really Indian". This concept can be linked to Michel Foucault's (1971, 1972, 1981) work on 'orders of discourse': where particular viewpoints on the world and particular ways of acting or behaving in that world are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972:49). So, a person can become 'middle-class', a 'Pakistani', a 'Pakistani-Brit' through their "practices". One can argue that identity informs language use; and ideology, such as Foucault's orders of discourse, informs identity. As I have mentioned in Chapter 1, an individual does not have complete control over the construct of identity but, rather, needs to choose one which others will accept (Piller, 2002). As James Gee has argued, "it is important to see that making visible and recognizable *who* we are and *what* we are doing always requires more than language", where language is 'discourse with a little d'. "Discourses with a capital D" are the forms of knowledge which are "socially accepted associations among ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting, in the 'right' places and at the 'right' times with the 'right' objects" (Gee, 1999:17). How do these associations arise? I argue, as shown in Chapter 2, partly through what is made commonly available, through what we see in the media, what we read about, the shops we use, the schools we attend. Gee argues:

> The key to Discourses is "recognition". If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity), here-and-now, then you have pulled off a Discourse and thereby continued it through history, if only for a while longer.
>
> Gee, 1999:27

Gee's description of 'pulling off' a Discourse is helpful, with its connotations that individuals may perform a Discourse for instrumental reasons. An example could be that an individual may modify the way they speak when in certain company, if it proves more beneficial for them to demonstrate knowledge of certain associations: that is, if they may accrue a type of capital in that arena.

The ideas of Pierre Bourdieu (1984, 1986, 1991, 2006) and his metaphor of the differing types of capital available to a 'habitus' in particular social fields are useful when analysing the narratives of my participants. In Bourdieu's economy of practice (1986), there are immaterial forms of exchange which, alongside hard currency transactions, are the source of social power and control. Bourdieu offers the notions of **field, habitus** and **capital:** where the **field** is the social space such as the school, family structure, community structure or workplace, through which individuals travel on their life trajectories. The idea of field is especially sympathetic to considering the multi-space lives of people in the contemporary world, rather than assuming fixedness in people's lives. It is especially appropriate for people like my participants who will have two very 'large' spaces to contend with: the UK and the 'homeland'. But as well, it allows us to address spaces within the UK.

As a result of primary socialisation and the social conditions they are exposed to, an individual develops a **habitus,** an ability in effect to 'play the game' in a field. The various language practices they engage in are themselves articulations of the linguistic habitus: an example could be the way that Nick speaks, as a middle-class Englishman rather than a 'British Asian'. Within these fields, and related to habitus, is **capital,** an index of relative social power, which is acquired and accumulated. As individuals move across various sociocultural fields their particular amounts of capital dictate their social position within each field.

Bourdieu describes economic capital (material); social capital (access to cultural institutions); and cultural capital, comprising embodied capital (knowledge, linguistic practices,)

objectified capital (cultural goods, texts, material objects) and institutional capital (academic qualifications, for example). The varied types of capital are "trumps in a game of cards" and "powers which define the chances of profit in a given field." But what is particularly pertinent is Bourdieu's assertion that "in every field or sub-field there corresponds a particular kind of capital, which is current, as a power or stake, in that field" (Bourdieu, 2006: 230). So, all these forms of capital must be authorised, and officially deemed to have value. Carrington and Luke's (1997) persuasive mapping of Bourdieu's sociological framework onto a model for understanding literacies in the life paths of individuals offers this overarching principle: a symbolic capital, closely related to 'pulling off a Discourse', describing the social phenomenon of prestige, status and reputation which accompanies the accumulation and recognition of other forms of capital. As in an economy of currencies, one may have particular cultural, economic and social capital and enter a field where these might have some convertible value. But unless that social field *recognises* the capital as such, that value will not be convertible.

Carrington and Luke's (1997) model avoids simplistic use of the term 'cultural capital' and the assumption that successful professionals like my participants will have vast resources of capital in any given field. Rather it promotes the understanding that the same forms and amounts of capital may result in different social positioning in relation to differing fields. Linguistic capital, for example, thus competes within various fields, and linguistic capital valued in one social field may be of limited value in another. This recognition of capital leads to acknowledgement of the negotiations and choices that individuals will make regarding their linguistic practices. For example, two of my participants are Punjabi speakers: but for one (the Muslim), Punjabi is regarded as a poor cousin to Urdu, and of little value among the Muslim community; for the other (a Sikh), Punjabi is much-valued, the language of the community and its religion.

This model also underlines the fact that the value any capital has depends on its use in conjunction with other forms of capital: my participants may have linguistic capital in their

working environments (by being articulate English-speakers), but among members of their linguistic community, their social and therefore linguistic capital may deteriorate (because of limited proficiency in the Heritage Language).

4.5 Conclusion

I have chosen a holistic approach to the narratives: to exploit the complex data that my participants and I have co-produced, and to offer a sound theoretical base for my findings. By regarding the narratives as discourse, conversation and a literary genre I can investigate why the participants tell their stories in a certain way; and by considering the Discourses and the metaphorical capitals available in society, I can investigate what the participants point to in their narratives. The next chapters use the narratives that I obtained: three use the narratives as a body of texts to analyse for common themes; three regard each narrative as a separate life-story. The sum of these approaches will be discussed in Chapter 10.

5. Time and space

In this chapter I show how my participants use spatial references in their narratives in order to emphasise their relationship with the place of settlement, the homeland and other places in the diaspora — what Vertovec (1997) has termed "triadic relationships" — but also how they establish a time frame which becomes co-indexed with these specific spatial locations or a move in spatial location. They then use these established time frames to comment on issues including exposure to languages, fluency, family, religion, traditions and identifications so that the time frames are then bound to another element of the narrative. I discuss these as firstly mobility: their journey to the UK and within the UK and associated language dynamics. And secondly as local versus global: the relation between space and perceptions of language use and culture. The narratives of the participants thus offer an insider's perspective of what it means to be a member of a diaspora.

5.1 Mobility

The following extracts are taken mostly from the earlier part of the interviews where the participants are introducing their life stories. Unsurprisingly, they speak about where and when they were born and their (or their parents') journeys to the UK. However, they also display a heightened sense of space and an awareness of multi-locality, showing that they not only understand their membership of a diaspora, but are aware of the complexities involved in having such a membership.

5.1.1 The journey

The way the participants make their first introductions gives insights into how quickly in their

narrative they perform the habitus of a member of a diaspora. Essentially, the story of their lives begins with a journey.

Below is an extract from my first interview with Paresh:

P: I was born in Uganda um in 1963 and my parents came to England in 1965 because they decided that Uganda was getting independence and it wouldn't be very long before the Asians were kicked out (.) so I've got an older sister who was born in India in Gujarat in the **Rann** of **Kutch** (.) me and my younger sister were born in Uganda

S: so your parents had actually EMIGRATED to Uganda (.) they weren't sort of the Asian nationals [NAH] in Uganda

P: NO my grandfather worked on the railways in East Africa and my father went to work there as a stonemason in Jinja in East Africa (.) but then he came to England in 1965 and brought us over (.) and my brother was born in Coventry.

Paresh establishes a time frame in the past, a period of time which saw a significant migration of South Asians to the UK, but links this closely to the varied locales of his siblings' birth, over three continents. How he describes these spaces is significant — 'India' is narrowed down to Gujarat and then the Rann of Kutch, 'England' to Coventry — highlighting specific regions in Gujarat and in England which distinguish him from a generic British Asian or British Indian description. I will show later that Paresh uses the specific reference to the Rann of Kutch once more to highlight differences between the South Asian groups within Bradford. Above, he constructs his narrative in such a way as to place himself in the 'groups' that he can belong to: Asian, Gujarati, or Kutchi.

However, in his mentions of Africa, he moves from smaller to larger: he speaks of 'Uganda' first ("I was born in Uganda"), and then enlarges this space to talk about 'East Africa' (my grandfather worked on the railways in East Africa […] my father went to work there as a stonemason in Jinja in East Africa"). East Africa becomes a tropic emblem (Blommaert, 2015)

that indexes his father and grandfather's time in Uganda as being within the British colonial period, when the area was often described as (British) East Africa. His birth, however, occurred after independence. He thus uses reference to time-space to place his (and his family's) narrative in a greater narrative: that of the period of the British Empire when there was movement of peoples within the colonies and territories.

Kamran comes from a family of four brothers:

K: I was born in Pakistan in a small village outside Mirpur sort of typical rural Pakistan probably ten twenty houses possibly a bit more and then I came to England about three to four years later (.) so we came over and my younger brothers were born who were born in 1970 and after we'd been here a little while we went back to Pakistan for another couple of years (.) which was basically to look after my grandfather from my father's side [mm]

Kamran evokes his early life which involved movements in space, when he moved from the place of his birth, "a small village outside Mirpur", in Pakistan, to England, where his younger brothers were born. He specifies the area of Pakistan he originates from: by doing so he attaches his family's trajectory to the well-worn and well-known route of many Pakistanis to Britain. I show in Chapter 9, that this is a central aspect to Kamran's narrative: that he is a 'bona fide' Pakistani Briton.

Kamran and Paresh both use their introductions to locate their parents' journeys to the UK to join the well-known and numerically significant South Asian communities in the UK. Paresh describes his father as a stonemason, Kamran highlights his Mirpuri origins: both thereby underline the working-class origins of their parents.

Below I show how Padma introduces her life story:

Pm: well I was born in 1964 and I was born in Manchester in Withington my parents had come from India in 1960 with my brother who was five at the time and my sister who was born the following year in London (.) so they arrived in London spent a couple of years in London and then came up to Manchester and the reason for all THAT was that my dad worked for the Bank of India and he was sent to London to open a branch of the Bank of India and then two years later he was sent up to Manchester to open another branch of the Bank of India in Manchester […] then it was in the 80s that they finally retired with their British pensions and went back to Madras to Chennai

She establishes a time frame of the sixties and seventies, when there was movement from India to the UK and within the UK, until the 1980s, when her parents returned to India. Like Kamran, she speaks of her parents migrating in the 1960s 'from India', as did many other migrants from the subcontinent. But she then specifies that her father moved to the UK to open a branch of the Bank of India, a position of much prestige, and later that her parents did not stay here indefinitely but chose to leave with full pensions, back to Madras. She thus distances her family's story from the commonly-held view of South Asian migration: her parents were middle-class, and they did not migrate from Gujarat or the Punjab.

5.1.2 Siblings

The three participants shown above also use their first introductions to speak of their siblings. Paresh has already shown how in one family there could be one generation born in, another born out of Empire. He continues this section of his interview by reiterating the age difference between his older sister and the remaining siblings, and reveals that his older sister got married and left the family at 17.

P: […] as time went on I suppose because three of us were born within a year of each other 63 64 65 and my other sister was 1958 and then she got married at 16 17 so she went off to live with

her husband so the three of us I suppose as we grew older were speaking more English to each other

His construction of this section of his narrative portrays his sister as different from the other siblings ("the three of us"), but also influential: he links her departure with the growing use of English between the siblings ("so the three of us were speaking more English to each other"). Baker argues that the role of siblings "is an almost unexplored territory" (2006:63) in studies into bilingualism and language maintenance; recently Kendall King (2013) has investigated the variation that can be found in one family. Except for Joshua, who is an only child, all my participants mention siblings in their narratives, and their comments chime with the findings elicited from King's study of three sisters of vastly differing ages —1, 12 and 17 — in an Ecuadorean family: that language ideologies, "how family members think about the language" (King, 2013:49-50), shape family language practices "as well as children's ascribed and prescribed identities within one transnational family" (King, 2013: 51). Paresh shows how the time-space differences between siblings' birth do not shape but can *explain* family language ideologies. Later in his first interview Paresh refers to his sister again:

P: yeah (.) my older sister's got married (.) she was born in 1958 (.) she's got a 30-year-old son and a 28-year-old daughter or something like that so (2) she had an arranged marriage married a Hindu man from East Africa and they live in London (.) they've lived in London all their lives (2) my other sister is married as well (.) she got married at 17 and she's got a 24-year-old and a 21-year-old and they seem happy

S: was that an arranged marriage?

P: yup

S: yeah

P: both of them have had an arranged marriage and my sister (.) and my brother arranged his OWN marriage but it lasted three years and so he uh is no longer with anyone

Paresh uses the year of his older sister's birth, 1958, as a springboard to bring in other issues: the circumstances of her marriage ("she had an arranged marriage, married a Hindu man from East Africa"); where she has lived in adulthood ("they've lived in London all their lives"); as well as the circumstances of his other, younger siblings. The time reference of the late fifties becomes co-indexed with the spatial references (East Africa, London) but also with the tradition of arranging marriages: all his siblings have had an "arranged marriage", his younger sister "got married at 17"). This tradition is presented as old-fashioned, extending from the late fifties to the 1980s, or even precarious (his younger sister "seems happy", but his brother's marriage "lasted three years").

These places (London, East Africa and Coventry, where his brother was born) are thus not only drawn to serve as examples of the mobility of family in their trajectory to and within the UK and his perceptions of how this may have affected the languages used in the family: they also become linked with 'adhering to tradition', at least for a Gujarati, practices about which Paresh shows some scepticism. Later, Paresh returned to his siblings to talk about language and the languages in his sisters' homes:

P: yeah my older sister does (.) they speak Gujarati in the house constantly and I suppose the kids do (.) my younger sister not so much and the kids don't really (.) I mean the daughter does but the son doesn't he speaks more ENGLISH

S: did your younger sister marry a **Gujarati**?

P: YEAH oh yeah they BOTH married Gujaratis and they're both with them after 30-odd years (2) but my elder sister is more TRADITIONAL (.) Indian speaking (1) watch Indian films very close to the Indian community in Neasden and Wembley (.) whereas my younger sister (1) she well they live in Crowthorne in Berkshire and they lived in Germany for three years Dusseldorf and they have a connection to London and they'll do all the things that need to be done (1) go and

visit family but they don't they like to sort of EXCLUDE themselves a little bit (.) because they don't want to be in everyone's pocket

Paresh ties living in London, in particular Neasden or Wembley, very much with tradition as well as the maintenance of the Heritage Language through to the third generation ("I suppose the kids do"). On a sliding scale, his younger sister is portrayed as less observant of traditions, and he binds this to movements in space. While she also had an arranged marriage with a Gujarati at a young age, her life — situated away from London, in Germany and latterly Berkshire — is constructed as a shift away from the "traditional, Indian speaking, watch Indian films, very close to the community" lifestyle tied to Neasden/Wembley. And consequently, her children are described as less fluent with the Heritage Language ("the kids don't [speak Gujarati] really").

After accompanying his mother back to Pakistan as a small child, Kamran arrived back in the UK aged seven and a half, and grew up in North Manchester. Below, he is talking about the dynamics of languages in the house he grew up in, with his parents and brothers, as well as his uncle's family:

K: my parents only spoke Punjabi and as children we spoke English between ourselves and then any older relatives we'd speak Punjabi with um and yeah the younger generation spoke English and the older generation spoke Punjabi uh my younger brothers they were less fluent, they had sort of more or less grew up here it was a short time they were there (1) so theirs is more FRAGMENTED y'know more PIDGIN especially one of them (.) iIn later years they have sort of improved but they still speak less fluently than me (.) I'm not absolutely fluent but I am FAIRLY COMFORTABLE more than conversant

He describes how he and his siblings used English between each other and Punjabi with his parents and older relatives. By then using spatial markers ("they more or less grew up here", "it was a short time they were there"), Kamran establishes within the interview two spaces (a 'here',

the UK, and a 'there', Pakistan) as he has done before, but now he links fluency in Punjabi to the *length of time* spent in Pakistan. He acknowledges the passing of time since those days and how a person's ability in a language may change ("in later years they have sort of improved"), but returns to compare his brothers' fluency with his ("but they still speak less fluently than me"), revisiting the idea that any limitations with the language are linked to the short period of time spent in Pakistan. By doing so, he also aligns his having been born in Pakistan with having a certain competence in Punjabi and an ability to assess his British-born brothers' language as less fluent ("theirs is more fragmented […] pidgin").

What Kamran also highlights in the extract above is that, as with all the participants bar Mumtaz, English was used between siblings, and the Heritage Language, in this case Punjabi, with parents and older relatives. So, the use of language is not only now linked to place, length of time spent in Pakistan, but also whether one is a member of the older generation or not. Kamran consolidates the idea that the older generation are homogenous, Punjabi-speaking, 'newer' to the UK, with stronger links to the home country and its language; but that the younger generation are less homogenous, showing varied birthplaces and varied proficiencies in Punjabi.

Padma's siblings are also all born in different locales: her brother was born in Madras, her sister was born five years later in London, Padma some years later in Manchester.
She moves on to talk about the languages that were spoken in her home, and in the extract below she brings in her brother

Pm: **Tamil** was always there **Tamil** was always there and my brother spoke very fluent **Tamil** religiously and when my parents retired he had an arranged marriage and went back (2) with his wife to live in **Chennai** and his **Tamil** is just ASTOUNDING he conducts his business he works in finance and he conducts his BUSINESS in **Tamil** it must have been there SOMEWHERE right↑ for the first five years of his life

S: because he also grew up and studied HERE

Pm: and studied here but he spent the first five years in India but there was something even if it was a kind of EMOTIONAL link but somewhere [mm] it meant that he had a greater facility or at least that's how I'm interpreting it

Padma binds an "astounding" proficiency in Tamil and the ability to conduct complex business transactions in the language with the fact that her brother spent the first five years of his life in India ("it must have been there somewhere"). But she also refers, in the same move, to her brother's arranged marriage and return to India, so that she ties a traditional marriage and living in India, back in Chennai, with fluency in the language. Her brother's trajectory (born in India, came to England, returned to India) is a mirror image of her parents' mobility, with their residence in the UK always regarded as temporary (earlier she mentioned "my dad […] would have liked to have gone back home in the 1970s"). Padma thus links the time periods (the sixties, seventies and eighties) with the different birthplaces of her family members, and so a facility with Tamil becomes co-indexed not only with a period of early life in India ("the first five years of his life"), but also with the tradition of having an arranged marriage ─ as Paresh has done with his siblings ─ and returning to the homeland.

Later in her interview Padma elaborates: her brother had an arranged marriage after a failed love-affair; Padma's older sister has married an Englishman she met at university. Padma is not, therefore, the only sibling (as with Kamran, Paresh and Devinder) to have had a 'love-match'. But she describes how her sister has taught herself Tamil, studied Sanskrit at university, sought permission from her grandmother in India for her marriage, performed rituals in the temple, and has therefore observed more traditions even though she was also born in the UK, in London. When I asked why she and her sister were so different, she cites being the youngest in the family:

Pm: it's partly the story of my studies it's partly the story of our kind of sibling relationships and things in my family but my sister was very much more invested in my mother and they shared a lot of similar values and I was the last kid the little one

King's arguments that the different ways that members of the same family think about a language shape the practices that families engage in with the language, and that each child may obtain and maintain a different identity "within one transnational family" (King, 2013:51) can be applied to Padma's narrative: Padma reveals that her sister has taught herself Tamil, not relying solely on her parents' instruction; and Padma describes herself as "the little one", ascribing to herself fewer of the values that her mother and sister shared.

5.1.3 Other journeys

Like Padma, Nick and Joshua, discussed below, as well as Devinder, were born in the UK; the siblings of Nick and Devinder were also born in the UK. There is therefore an expected difference in their introductions, but as we can see in the first part of the extract below, Nick reaches back to the previous generation in order to describe the mobility of his family, as well as 'the language question':

N: yeah well about me first (.) I was born in Basingstoke (.) Hampshire and I we moved to Hertfordshire when I was about I think I was about I must have been about seven (.) and that's where I say I'm from when people ask me where I'm from I say I'm from HERTFORDHIRE (.) I grew up there and then at home my mum and dad it was quite INTERESTING it's quite an interesting story I think to answer the language bit (.) I know why I understand everything about my family and so it's probably relevant to tell you everything from the beginning

S: OK

N: my mum my mum and dad were born and brought up in NAIROBI

S: and so when you were young Nick did you used to go back to Kenya? Did your family still have LINKS to Kenya or had they left completely by the time you were born

N: um (.) my (2) when I was (.) I've only been TWICE once when I was 4 and once when I was 14 and um my um my {sighs} all of my mother's family had pretty much gone there were some friends who were still there but my dad his mum my paternal grandmother she lived there for quite a long time until maybe quite as she started to get older she became unwell and then she came HERE well (.) to the UK and my aunt lived there with her partner (.) my dad has three sisters and two of them lived in Kenya for quite a while and then the second sister who had two children they then moved to the UK maybe like twenty years ago maybe more↑

Nick talks about his family's trajectory as "an interesting story" and then refers to the "language bit". His parents' have minimal fluency in Konkani (and more in Swahili) and Nick reports as having no knowledge of Konkani. As if he recognises that his own life will not tell 'the full story' he offers to "go back to the beginning". In this instance the beginning is not India but Kenya, where his parents were born and brought up. This highlights how the participants construct their stories as being very connected with their parents' life stories. In the next chapter I will return to how Nick describes 'where he is from', but in this part of his interview he relates that, when asked, he describes himself as being "from Hertfordshire". His parents being born in Kenya is linked to the low proficiency in Konkani in his family: just as other participants have linked proficiency in the Heritage Language to place.

I knew some of Joshua's background before I interviewed him. On introducing ourselves for the first time, he had described his family as being 'from Calcutta'. This could be why the first moments of Joshua's interviews, as also occurs with Mumtaz's, do not have the same level of detail. But I will show in Chapter 7 how Joshua does not construct his narrative as part of a grander narrative of 'diaspora', and in this extract too he does not tie movements in space with another element. Below, Joshua begins with himself and he does not initiate any information about his parents. Instead, my question about his parents ("so did your parents move here?")

indicates that I might believe his story starts elsewhere; it is only after this query that he offers more details:

J: yeah OK (.) I was born in 74 born in Bangor lived in Bangor for I think two years and then moved to quite a few cities um I don't remember most of those (.) I think we moved to Bangor Swansea Rochdale um South Shields and various places (.) Leicester and then Manchester as a student

S: why did you move round so much?

J: it was my father's work

S: OK

J: yeah (.) so he's a doctor, so he moved from hospital to hospital (.)

S: so did your parents move here?

J: yeah.

S: when they were (.) ADULTS?

J: yeah so yeah when (.) they both moved here as adults (.) there's a bit of an age difference (.) there's a seven year age difference between my father and my mother my father being older (.) so my father was living in this country for about five years maybe before my mother moved here (.) he worked for a while then went back to India came back here (.) my mother was 21 when she came over (.) and I was born three years after that so she was 24 when I was born

After evoking his childhood as being in a state of flux, Joshua is willing to end his introduction, without mentioning his parents. Following my question ("so did your parents move here?") he does point out that in keeping with the most common migrations, his father came to the UK alone, and returned to the homeland to marry and return with his bride. This information, however has been placed as secondary to what he believes is more significant: the age gap between them, "there's a bit of an age difference". As an only child, his parents' ages might have had more significance to him than any movements in space; or simply, without siblings to

compare language use and proficiency with, he does not construct his narrative around those issues.

5.2 Local versus global

While I have shown how my participants' narratives evoke Vertovec's triad (1997) — of the homeland, place of settlement and other areas of the diaspora — the participants also show that for them, the 'local' space where identities are performed and language is used can be narrowed down to a family home (a micro-local). And the 'global' space where identities are performed and language is used may not entail the transnational domain: the 'global' may begin outside the door of the family home, within the same place of settlement (the micro-global). While my participants are termed as 'transnationals', this term does not reflect the more subtle spatial belongings that occur.

5.2.1 Language and space

In the first examples I show, the use of a 'when' clause establishes a time frame related to a move in space. This is sometimes used as general ("when I go back to India"), offering the time frame as a routine or repeated action, or as a definite time in the past ("when I went back to India"). Of interest is the use of the phrase 'go back' with its implications of 'returning', so that the link to the homeland and hence the positioning of the speaker within the membership of a diaspora is emphasised. By then moving on to speak of their use of the Heritage Language, the participants link the language very much with space and as I show below, Padma and Paresh link this movement in space with a changed perception of their use of the Heritage Language, as being inadequate or antiquated.

Pm: I was certainly very comfortable understanding them I could have understood virtually anything at that point except when we went back to India and I would watch in Madras I would watch the

TV news which is in this very classical **Tamil** that they use and COMPLETELY INCOMPREHENSIBLE {laughs} and I would just sit there and think I can I CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THIS LANGUAGE!

'Madras' indexes the time-period in which these visits took place: the name was changed to Chennai in the mid-nineties, and her childhood visits relate to the seventies and eighties. There is a parallel with Joshua's narrative: he refers to Calcutta when he describes the summers he spent there as a child; and he refers to Kolkata, when speaking of the present. Similarly, in other parts of Padma's interview she has used Madras when talking about childhood experiences and Chennai when talking about experiences in the present or not-so-distant past (for example, she has spoken of her brother's return to India after his marriage: "he went to live in Chennai"). Both participants index our shared understanding of these name changes.

Padma constructs her narrative in a way that links this time-period with the space of Madras, and exposure to the diglossic nature of Tamil. On television in Madras, "classical" Tamil was used; in Manchester, in her family home she was used to hearing, and understanding, a 'lower' Tamil ("I could understand virtually anything"). She emphasises the need she feels for 'performance' —even if it is passive, a comprehension of the news — in a wider space, on a global scale, in order to consider herself proficient in the language.

Padma continues, using the phrase "as the years went by" to evoke the sense of the story occurring over a long period of time, in the past. While earlier she mentions the medium of television, she returns to comment on her use of Tamil with family members:

Pm: as the years went by we'd go back to India every four years and you know my grandmother would talk to us in **TAMIL**↑ my cousins would talk to us in ENGLISH↑ and so there was a kind of a whole mixture of things depending on generation class and lots of things which I wasn't aware of at the TIME but it wasn't as if it wasn't as if we NEEDED **Tamil** in order to be understood or to get on either in Madras or back in Manchester so when we would speak [in

> Madras] you know we were teenage cousins↑ and giggle y'know as teenage cousins do but all of that was conducted in ENGLISH all of that our relationships with my age groups were conducted in English

She introduces this extract with "we'd go back to India", reminding the listener of the 'return' to the homeland, the experience of a member of a diaspora. In this extract, which she locates in the past (using would and the simple past) she involves different places, cities this time, not countries (Madras and Manchester), the different languages (Tamil and English) and the different generations (grandmother, cousins). She therefore links the use of her Heritage Language with time, place, and generation. In Madras, her grandmother, a member of the older generation would speak to her in Tamil (although whether this was used exclusively is not made clear); but among the cousins, English was the lingua franca ("our relationships with my age groups were conducted in English"). She does not, in this section, present herself as an active agent: others are described as talking to her ("my grandmother would talk to us in Tamil", "my cousins would talk to us in English"). She begins a phrase with herself and her siblings as agents ("when we would speak"), but ends it in the passive voice "our relationships were conducted in English"). By constructing her narrative in this way she links a passivity to her visits to India, so that she ties the return of the transnational, a member of the diaspora, to the homeland with a 'normality' (an accepted membership of a local and global identity) but with a certain lack of engagement as an active actor in that space (an uneven activity in these local and global spaces).

Padma's family are upper-class Brahmins, and English is often used in these elite echelons (Ramanathan, 1999). She refers obliquely to a "whole mixture of things depending on generation, class and lots of things which I wasn't aware of", which dictated the language used. Mumtaz, who also has highly-educated, professional parents, says similarly of her family back in India, that English was often spoken fluently. The extract below is taken from her interview where she is relating her last visit to India, in 1997, for preparations for her sister's wedding:

S: when you were there could you TALK to your relatives I mean were they SURPRISED at your **URDU** or did they

M: yeah I COULD talk to them NO they weren't they knew (2) and stuff they know that we can speak **Urdu** and stuff

S: but were they IMPRESSED?

M: (2) NO I don't think so they just take it I mean they're USED to they're USED to seeing people from England especially other family members coming and going they're not y'know it's not like a NOVELTY or anything it's quite NORMAL I mean they all speak GOOD ENGLISH anyway so especially the younger ones

My own questions ("were they surprised?", "were they impressed?") themselves show the influence of previous interactions I have had with other participants, where they have described varied reactions to their use of the Heritage Language. Mumtaz switches from past to present ("they weren't they knew […] they know that we can speak Urdu" "they're used to seeing people […] they all speak good English anyway"). In so doing, Mumtaz binds her experiences during her last visit to India (in 1997) with the present time, the varied spatial locations (England and India) and movements between them ("family members coming and going"), with a comparable reception to her Urdu in both spaces. As Mumtaz self-reports as very proficient in Urdu, I interpret this as her perception that her use of her Heritage Language 'worked' in both the local (family home in the UK) space and the global (family home in India) stage.

These concepts, I term, loosely, performance on a local scale and performance on a global scale. For Mumtaz, as I have already mentioned, the positive reaction, or at least lack of a negative reaction to her use of Urdu in India, may form the grounding on which she bases her assessment of her proficiency. I now show that for Paresh, who many would term bilingual, the reaction he received in India, but also in London, has caused him to re-assess his proficiency.

Below is an extract from my first interview with Paresh:

P: I suppose when I go back to India or when I go back to London, when people speak to me or when I speak back to them they laugh at me because of the way I speak (1)

S: in London or in India?

P: both really because I don't practise enough and because I'm not exposed to it enough mine is probably the Gujarati spoken about 15 years ago, 20 years ago, the one that I learnt with my mum and dad

Unlike in the extracts I have shown from Padma's narrative, Paresh positions himself as an active agent in using the language, one who both listens and responds ("when people speak to me or when I speak back to them") and hence an active bilingual. What is interesting is that he binds the practice of 'going back' with two spaces: the homeland (India), but also another space within the place of settlement (London). Paresh did not grow up in London, but in Coventry, but by framing his narrative in his way he assigns a similar status to the two spaces as being repositories of identity, of a 'homeland' status. My question ("In London or in India?") can be seen as an attempt to revert to more accepted paradigms of the homeland being the country of origin, and hence the space, where conservative views on acceptable variations in the Heritage Language will hold.

Further, the space of the family home is also linked to a time frame in the past ("15 years ago, 20 years ago") so that his proficiency in Gujarati as well as being relegated to limited 'travel' ─ accepted and sufficient in the family home but not elsewhere ─ is connected to the family home as it was in a past which cannot be recreated: when his parents were still alive and he was still living there. By mentioning London and India within the same move, Paresh reveals his perception that the 'global' is chronotopic – linked to both space and time: that present-day London, within what would be regarded as a space for a localised British Asian identity, does not offer him a 'safe' space in which to speak Gujarati.

When I first contacted Paresh on the phone, he had said as a prelude "I don't speak much Gujarati". On reassuring him that that itself was not a barrier for my research, and on hearing in his first interview that he considered Gujarati to be the lingua franca with his parents, I returned to the subject of his proficiency:

S: so you spoke **Gujarati** with your parents and you're obviously y'know more proficient

P: YEAH

S: than you THINK you are um

P: no I can speak Gujarati and I speak VILLAGE Gujarati they say and I mean it's a sort of (1) just the version that we spoke in the family

He agrees with my first words, that he has proficiency in Gujarati, and he reasserts this in the present tense ("I speak Gujarati"), before defining the type of Gujarati ("a village Gujarati"). But by then relocating that Gujarati both in time and space, it becomes clear that he does not mean his ancestral village. He reverts to the past tense, so that the 'village' becomes the family home in his childhood ("the version we spoke in the family"). So for Paresh, the language — spoken widely in the UK, US, East Africa, in the state of Gujarat as well as by Gujarati enclaves in other states of India — has been de-globalised and inhabits one domain: his childhood home, with the people he grew up with.[7]

Padma, Paresh and Mumtaz all relate proficiency to space. Below I show how Devinder re-assesses his proficiency based less on space but on whom he is speaking to.

5.2.2. Language and people

[7] As Blommaert has noted with regard to an African asylum-seeker in Belgium, 'inferior' linguistic resources may stem from a move in space not in linguistic variety: "His French may be perfectly adequate in Kinsasha or Kigali, but it does not work in Brussels" (Blommaert, 2005:140).

Devinder also talks about using his Heritage Language when he went back to India, to his ancestral village in the Punjab using a 'when' clause ("when I spoke Punjabi in the villages"):

D: when I spoke Punjabi in the villages and no one sort of made fun of me whereas they were very OPENLY MOCKING of people I think I probably felt quite PROUD that I could communicate with them in **Punjabi** and that they could understand me they would have if they felt my Punjabi wasn't good enough

He evokes a chronotope "when I spoke Punjabi in the villages" so that the reaction to his performance becomes bound to that time and space, as when Paresh talks about speaking Gujarati in London and India. But what is also bound to that time frame and space are his feelings of pride in his proficiency, and his perceptions of his proficiency. Both are tightly related to the reaction he received rather than any objective assessment of his proficiency: "they were very openly mocking of people […] they would have if they felt my Punjabi wasn't good enough". And so time, space, the positive reactions of people and hence his perception of his (high) proficiency are linked in this extract, and the closeness of this relationship becomes clearer later in his interview when he talks about his family's move to Sheffield. The 'we' in the beginning of the extract below refers to Devinder and his older brother. Devinder uses the time expression "as we got older" to evoke the sense that perceptions and abilities — in this case with language — are not fixed over time, but mutable (echoing Kamran's comments about his younger brothers' fluency in Punjabi):

D: so I think we're both equally aware that our **Punjabi** isn't good at all because as we got older we met more SOPHISTICATED **Punjabis** proper **Punjabi**- speakers and we became aware that even when I was I was probably about 16 17 moved to Sheffield we met one or two people who spoke **Punjabi** differently

I show more of this extract in Chapter 8, but for now it can be seen that if Vertovec's triadic relationship is used, then both Sheffield and Hayes (where Devinder grew up) would be located within the same unit, 'place of settlement'. But within that same place of settlement there could be considered another unit 'other areas of the diaspora', so that the Punjabi speaking community in Southall-Hayes is different from (some) of the Sheffield Punjabis. Later, Devinder mentions specifically one man who befriended the family, introducing the other significant factor in the differences in language use: socio-economic background.

D: yeah so I should make that clear one of the people that we met was a Sikh was an ACCOUNTANT he taught a bit at the university in Sheffield and when he came round it was very obvious he saw himself SUPERIOR to my parents my relatives and they looked up to him a bit as well but he just spoke a COMPLETELY DIFFERENT kind of **Punjabi** to what they did speak

Devinder's realisation that the Punjabi he spoke was different and what he considered an inferior variety is co-indexed to social status, to the fact that his parents were not as educated as the other Punjabi speaker mentioned above.

'Local' is therefore 'within the family' or 'with relatives' or 'with the people who lived near us who shared the same socio-economic backgrounds'; 'global' means without those confines, even if it is spatially located within the same 'place of settlement'. So, while for Padma, this refers to using Tamil back in India, for both Devinder and Paresh this can mean another space within the UK, such as Sheffield or London. It was when Devinder went to Sheffield and the family came into contact with other Sikhs that his use of the Heritage Language moved into the 'global'. The stratification of the language that would undoubtedly still exist in the Punjab in India, is mirrored in the diaspora, so that social strata and assigned identities that exist in the global, exist too in the local.

5.2.3 Space and Community

Kamran and Paresh both show how 'community' can also be viewed through a local/global lens. In the following extract, Kamran speaks of his adolescent years:

K: yeah, yeah not as a child but as a TEENAGER I realised that Urdu was the posh sort of more of we were from Punjabi and it was more that the differences didn't really appear till later that this was a kind of VILLAGEY well it's not villagey because it's of a state y'know the Sikhs all speak Punjabi their dialect so it was a REGIONAL thing it wasn't considered the HIGH TONGUE in Pakistan

Kamran also evokes the idea of the village, as did Paresh, in less the spatial sense but to define the type of language spoken, as Paresh has also done ("I speak village Gujarati"): "it's kind of villagey". Kamran revisits the small to large imagery that I have mentioned earlier, listing a series of space markers, from small to large (village, state, region, country), to frame the use of Punjabi, so that he evokes a wider use of Punjabi. But he arrives at the conclusion that while it is widely spoken by Pakistanis from the Punjab area, and while it is the language for the Sikh religion, his Heritage Language is not considered a "high tongue" as is Urdu. By constructing his narrative in this way he binds the widespread use of Punjabi with an aura of 'accessibility': it is not "posh" but "villagey". Within the same conversational move, Kamran moves the idea away from language and towards community:

K: but yeah I am aware that I come from the village so I'm a HICK [laughs] but {laughs} yeah we ARE Mirpur is very low on the social scale in terms of achievement in England particularly (.) every time I meet a taxi-driver in any city it's ridiculous but NINE times out of TEN I can guarantee that they come from near our village [laughs] NO NO I tell you↑ I was in Sheffield two months ago I got chatting to the driver and I saw his name and I said all right how are you how long have you been here (1) where're you from? and he was two miles from our village!

> y'know [oh yeah, yeah] RIDICULOUS I know ridiculous (.) it was y'know that WAVE in the sixties and seventies was from a certain region and they reached *[indistinct]*

In the extract above Kamran slides the time frames from the present ("I'm a hick") to the near-past ("two months ago"), and finally to the time-period in the past ("the sixties and seventies") that closely indexes the migration of the South Asian diaspora to the UK: "that wave" from Mirpur, documented by Peach (2006). His movements in space also mimic that transnational journey: from the village in Mirpur to England. But by framing his narrative in a to-ing and fro-ing over this broad temporal aspect, sweeping over these wide-ranging spaces, Kamran binds his local (in Pakistan) 'village-hick' Punjabi identity to a very global community, existing in East and West, where even in Sheffield he can be a Mirpuri hick and he can meet, converse with, and find commonalities with a fellow-Mirpuri. His questions to the taxi-driver ("How long have you been here? Where are you from?") echo the consciousness of a member of the diaspora, of meeting and knowing people 'here' and 'there'. He further constructs this idea by describing "achievement" among Mirpuris within the UK ("Mirpur is very low on the social scale [...] in England particularly"), thereby transplanting the difficulties faced back in the homeland to the 'place of settlement', not dissimilar to Devinder's realisation of the differences in socio-economic backgrounds of the Sikhs in Jalandhar and Sheffield. But while in Devinder's narrative, the difference in socio-economic background is focused on to explain the type of Punjabi spoken, Kamran's narrative allows a different perspective: that, proficiency in language aside, the commonalities of spatial experience ("it was two miles from my village!") transcend the differences in socio-economics between, in this case, taxi-driver and client.

In the extract below, taken from the section in his first interview when we were talking about the fact that he lives in Bradford now, a city with a significant South Asian presence, Paresh begins with a series of criteria-referenced markers, for which he shows little affection. He

constructs this section of his narrative in such a way that he indexes these markers with having an identity, that of British (Hindu) Asian: a 'local' identity.

P: but yeah feeling part of the Asian community (2) I don't like Indian FILMS right↑ I don't like going to a **MANDIR** I don't like LOADS of shit I don't like knowing everyone's BUSINESS and I don't like people going to weddings and pairing people up and all that MALARKEY (1)

In his ethnography of the diverse area of west London, Southall, Gerd Baumann describes how when the dominant discourses of 'culture' and 'community' – both with their strong notions of homogeneity, fixedness and boundedness – reproduced in the everyday classifications of residents (such as Sikh, black, white), are combined with the context of ethnic pluralism and conditions of diaspora, they nurture a culture-consciousness among individuals. He describes this as a "heightened awareness that one's own life, as well as the lives of all others, are decisively shaped by culture as a reified heritage […] an awareness that whatever one, or anyone, does and thinks is intrinsically and distinctively culture-bound, and defined both in relation to one's own culture and the cultures of others" (Baumann 1996: 98, 107). Paresh, in the extract above, echoes these notions of a reified heritage —where he gives examples related to pop-culture, religious practices, traditional marriage practices — as well as the prosaic "knowing everyone's business." Within the same move, Paresh continues:

P: BUT when I go down to Ealing road or Wembley I like just being amongst Gujaratis and Hindis and I like listening and I like hearing (1) and just (1) I'm in my ELEMENT and I'll buy an EASTERN EYE or whatever (1) So (1) or **PAAN** or just {laughs} do things that I don't normally do because I don't have the opportunity to do it here regularly (1) and because the Gujarati community is very different and distinct from the Pakistani community (1) I don't have family networks here so in that sense

S: are there any Gujaratis?

I will return to his response to my question, but above Paresh ties the space of Ealing Road or Wembley in North-west London to routines and habits that he considers common among speakers of Gujarati and Hindi, and he ties the 'here', Bradford, with a more Pakistani-oriented culture. While he makes the distinction of Gujarati and Hindi speakers within an Indian heritage, he does not make the same distinction (of say Urdu and Punjabi speakers) within a Pakistani heritage. His local 'British Asian' identity, therefore, is linked more to the identity derived from the cultural practices on Ealing Road and Wembley. He sets this narrative in the present, using tenses that indicate a repeated or routine habit ("I'll buy an Eastern Eye", "just do things that I don't normally do") so that his views about the 'communities' that he talks about are bound with the present time frame. I wanted to clarify his last comments and so I continued by asking:

S: are there any **Gujaratis**? [*in Bradford*]

P: yes there is a bit (2) there is on the other side of Bradford and I suppose there are a few more spread out but again (1) if you're born and raised in Bradford then you'll know where they are or you might bump into them but if you're not then uh I pop into shops and like I go on OAK AVENUE and I go to the Indian shops or PAKISTANI shops REALLY buy some food and **masala** or whatever from there (.) you know I'll go over to that side of Bradford or whatever I go to [indistinct] or I'll go to **Preshar** a vegetarian restaurant which is like home cooking every now and then so I suppose yeah I'm LOOKING for it every now and then but I don't I'm not I don't say I IDENTIFY with them because (2) from the **Rann** of **Kutch** there are twenty-six villages and from twenty-six villages a lot of those people live around North West London

Paresh constructs this section of his narrative so that spatial location is linked with differences that exist within the Gujarati community. Here he links being on "the other side of Bradford", with "being born in Bradford" and hence belonging to that community: as opposed to larger spatial references such as "Coventry" (where he was born and raised), or "Indian" rather than

"Pakistani". He repeats the idea of moving spatially from his area of Bradford ("I'll go over to that side of Bradford"), so that this relatively small move in space (a few miles) is tied to moving quite 'far' in terms of community. Instead, the area of North-west London is bound with his origins in Gujarat ("from the Rann of Kutch there are twenty-six villages […] a lot of those people live around North-West London") so that these spaces which are separated by thousands of miles and which are each a fair distance from Bradford are both linked with his ease at 'practising' his Gujarati identity.

In an almost mirror image of his narration before my question, Paresh details his 'habits', including names of roads and types of shops, and South Asian lexis, related to maintaining a connection with his Indian heritage: "I pop into shops", "buy some food or masala", "I'll go to Preshar a vegetarian restaurant". But in this space, Bradford, where he lives, he tempers these actions with the time expression "every now and then", "pop in", emphasising the occasional and temporary nature of these forays: he did not do this when speaking about North-West London, where he no longer lives but only visits. In this way, he constructs Bradford as a space where some elements of his Indian identity are accessible, but at a more limited level. At the start of the extract he states: "if you are born and raised in Bradford then you'll know where they are". Here, Paresh binds being born in Bradford with knowledge of and access to the 'local' identity: Bradford British Asian. But he also makes a distinction between being Indian and being Pakistani, and then within the Gujarati community of emanating from the Rann of Kutch or not. Once again, London is constructed as the 'home' of the Rann of Kutch diaspora, where traditions can be accessed, and Bradford is constructed as a space where mostly Pakistani culture can be accessed, and occasionally the more 'global' Gujarati culture, ("I'll go to Preshar a vegetarian restaurant") the non-Rann of Kutch culture.

5.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown how some participants link elements such as language use, proficiency, culture and identity with time-space references, and in doing so both emphasise their awareness of being members of a diaspora, as well as give insights into what belonging to such a group 'here' entails. The participants use specific space references to highlight aspects of their life stories and to place their narrative into the grander narrative of diaspora and Empire. Place names can serve as tropic emblems (examples given were East Africa, Madras and Calcutta) as well as index shared knowledge, framing the interviews as conversations between two members of the South Asian diaspora. They thus show that within the interviews they maintain, and that it is important for them to maintain, that habitus of diaspora.

They also link differences between where and when siblings were born to any differences in language proficiency, at least when the siblings are born in the homeland. When the participants and their siblings are born in the UK, as with Devinder and Nick, no differences are highlighted. Kamran and Padma both link the length of time spent in the homeland with proficiency or affinity to the language. They thus highlight that there are differences between siblings: while all of them will be classed as bilingual in society, within a family, members make distinctions.

Certain spaces within the place of settlement in the diaspora are seen as key areas for performing a South Asian identity: Neasden, Wembley, Ealing and Southall are mentioned in this way. Movement away from these areas is given as much significance as moving away from the homeland: this highlights the complexity of the term 'place of settlement' and the 'niches' that emerge. Movement away from their community network can also be significant so that sometimes the 'local' is reduced to people from the same family or class background (as with Devinder), showing that as part of a diaspora there are occasions when social interaction that would otherwise not be likely in the homeland can occur. Vertovec's triad proves rather reductive, with the participants showing how they regard places in the diaspora in a much more complex way; what I have termed a micro-local (the family home) and the micro-global (outside the family home), so that performance of identity and perceptions of proficiency in the language

can change, as Paresh shows using Bradford as an example, even between different parts of the same city.

Underlying all their discussions is the notion of changes in linguistic capital depending on the field (space) they are occupying. In different parts of the UK or in the homeland, whether in the family home or not, depending on whom they are speaking to, their proficiency in the Heritage Language will be regarded differently and will be accepted differently. But also, having a very high proficiency and linguistic capital in English in the UK means that participants such as mine set a very high standard for what they *should* experience with their Heritage Language in terms of proficiency. Through the realisation that they may deviate from this high standard, they are able to offer these most useful insights into the Heritage Language experience.

6. Narrative voices

In this chapter I examine how the participants exploit the spoken discourse resources they have to hand when giving an oral version of their life-stories: these contribute to the construction of their narratives and their identities in producing that narrative. In the first section, I focus on the use of reported direct speech; in the second section, on the use of accents and stylised voices. While these elements do not occur uniformly as separate features (a stylised voice can be delivered in the form of direct reported speech), I discuss each in turn using a selection of examples to illustrate my arguments.

6.1. Using direct speech

> [O]ur speech is filled with overflowing with other people's words which are transmitted with highly varied degrees of accuracy and impartiality.
>
> Bakhtin, 1981:337

The probability of a person remembering another's words from a previous conversation with complete accuracy is low: Mayes' (1990) analysis of a corpus of 320 naturally occurring examples, found that the authenticity of half was doubtful. Others in the psychology and linguistic fields demonstrate that much direct reported speech is often, erroneously, received with a "verbatim assumption" (Clark and Gerrig, 1990:795). By reporting what other people have said the speaker de-contextualises the original speaker's speech and re-contextualises it in the new conversation, paraphrases or omits, but may also adapt utterances to fulfil their own communicative aims (Günther, 1999; Sternberg, 1982). Direct reported speech, therefore, performs a function, be it adding authenticity (Li, 1986), enacting agency and responsibility (Johansen, 2011), providing evidence (Holt, 1999) or giving the listener 'access' to an event (Holt, 1999).

I focus on two principal studies of direct reported speech: Greg Myers' (1999) study of the talk used in focus group discussions; and Elizabeth Holt's study (1999) of listener response to direct reported speech. Both these studies dissect the *functions* of using direct speech in conversation rather than the perspective this speech offers on the reported situation. I, however, discuss both: how the use of direct speech serves a function in the reporting of a (real or unreal) situation, and how reporting on this situation helps the participant construct the narrative of their life. Myers argues that "the functions of represented discourse emerge only if we see the interactions as rhetorical" (1999:587); that is, used as a way to persuade or influence the listener. However, what is also helpful is Myers' argument that it is not only to persuade that people talk, but that they may "talk to sort out their own confusions", by "dramatizing a contradiction or confusion they recognize in their own minds and behaviour […] often proposing views that they may or may not hold themselves" (Myers, 1999: 588). Significant for my study and this section, is what the narrators are trying to achieve or what impression they are trying to make on me as a listener by their use of reported direct speech; but also what these utterances can show us of their lived experiences.

6.1.1 Delivering a punchline

A direct speech utterance is given more weight and emphasis by being the only such utterance in a dense section, giving it an element of truth: being short and succinct, the narrator implies a verbatim delivery. If regarded as a rhetorical device, then 'delivering a punchline' as I term this, offers a dramatic effect. In this section, as in the extracts below, the instances of direct reported speech are underlined in the transcription.

D: [*speaking of an Asian friend from university*] he was very ARTICULATE and very clear on that and he was very PINPOINTING with me saying <u>y'know you're EMBARRASSED about your background</u> [oh right↓] and that's what he would say

D: [*speaking of the relationship he has with his family*] one or two of my cousins who I THOUGHT were very tolerant and ARE but one of them when she came round to see my FIRST daughter when she was born said <u>oh she doesn't look very INDIAN</u> almost in a disappointed way [RIGHT↓] which I found really OFFENSIVE

M: [*speaking of her extended family here in the UK*] yeah and I saw a picture of Saira and ALL her friends were ASIAN↓ (.) and I made a comment to my sister about it because I said <u>oh god it's SO PREDICTABLE</u>{fed-up sound} {laughs} [laughs] but I'm not it is.

I have shown only short extracts for reasons of space, but it can be seen that after each 'punchline' I give a response or reaction which assures the narrator that this dramatic effect has been noticed, but further that I acknowledge that the mode of delivery *warrants* a reaction. By using a 'punchline' strategy, the participants are pre-loading the information to ensure a favourable response from myself and to elicit sympathy from me. The question arises: why should they construct these sections of their narratives in this way?

The participants know that I am researching the experiences of second-generation Asians in Britain who can be regarded as 'successful' or 'integrated'. I argue that the participants use the punchline strategy to show an emotional involvement in the story they are relating (they can remember 'exactly what the person said'). But also because they recognise that these stories can cast a new light on what we understand of 'integrated' South Asians. So Devinder shows in his first extract that it was not until his early twenties that he could find some resolution with his Asian-ness; and in his second, that even among the more "tolerant" members of his family, his marriage to a white Englishwoman and his dual-heritage children can attract comment. He thus illustrates why his current relationship with his culture/community has cooled. Mumtaz comments on what she regards as non-participative behaviours from other members of her

family (or community) as an insider, showing that she regards herself as having a relevant opinion, an authority, on the topic.

6.1.2 What other people are thinking

Longer utterances of direct reported speech are also used to varying degrees by the participants (Joshua uses none). Below, Padma is describing the relationship her birth family had with her extended family who they visited regularly in Chennai (then Madras) in India, when she was a child.

Pm: there was a real sense that we were further up in the pecking order because we had got out and got into the first world […]but my mother's family was very much upper-middle class very well placed in Madras um and so there was no sort of financial basis to that resentment but there was a sense that you've turned your back on the family and look at your girls what are they doing ? (.) there was still a little bit of that.

The examples above are hypothetical reported discourse (Myers, 1999). Who were the 'speakers'? Further, if these words were indeed said, is Padma translating from Tamil into English? These details, she is implying, are not important. The function that these inserts of direct speech has is to represent a bigger story, a macro-discourse, above that of the interview: the tension between members of a diaspora and their families back in the homeland.

She highlights two things: firstly that there may be resentment of those who have "got out into the 'First World' from those who remain in the 'Third World', leading to accusations of abandonment ("you've turned your back on your family"). Secondly, Padma here also indexes what I will understand: that any change in behaviour among the *daughters*, any 'westernisation', will be more subject to censure than behaviour in a son, such as Padma's brother ("Look at your girls").

In the two extracts below the participants also use hypothetical reported discourse to reflect macro-discourses in society, as well as bring to life in the interview's here-and-now the voices of others, not themselves. Below, Kamran is commenting on the preponderance of Mirpuri Pakistani taxi drivers in his environs (a city in the southwest of England). His wife Sam is a character in this extract: Kamran reports on what she has said in conversation with these taxi-drivers.

K: I can guarantee I can LOOK at them and Sam's had conversations with a few and she's ended up saying where are you from and then she thinks actually I should keep out of this because what they'll end up saying actually [yeah] I know your husband or if they realise she's married to a Pakistani guy then it will get complicated they'll be like oh why are you out on your own [mm] or why are you going to a PUB [mm mm] so she doesn't bother now

Again, the direct speech inserts cannot claim to be a verbatim report: Kamran is not party to the conversations. But his polyphonic use of the Pakistani taxi-drivers' words ("Why are you out? Why are you going to a pub?") is double-voiced: what the drivers might say in conversation and a reflection of a conservative, paternalistic Pakistani society. In using their imagined words, Kamran is not expressing what he himself feels, but is placing himself outside, a counter-argument in Myers' taxonomy (1999). But when he puts forward his wife's words ("actually I should keep out of this") he implies that she (and he) believes that any censure of behaviour should be directed to Kamran: it is an argument (over one's wife's behaviour) which should remain between the men of Pakistani society, rather than involving the white English partner.

In the extract below the concept of polyphonic strategies, described by Bakhtin (1981) as a 'layering of voices', is particularly apt: the direct speech is attributed to Paresh's wife Susan, but this in turn is a representation of what she imagines the older Pakistani women are saying/thinking:

P: from Pakistani families, particularly older women (.) I said y'know it's nothing to be bothered about really but it was like Susan said it was like they were looking at us and saying why are you with one of ours? but to be honest it's never bothered me that much

Here, I argue, Paresh cannot expect me to accept the above as a verbatim situation. Rather, the the direct speech inserts serve to illustrate the larger story (at that time at least): mistrust and disapproval from the larger South Asian community of "mixed-race" relationships.

In the three examples above, I have shown how the participants use a polyphonic voice to express expected behaviours in their communities. But while doing so, they place themselves outside authority, positioning themselves either as powerless observers or in opposition. So, Padma reveals the unfair judgements made of members of the diaspora who live in supposedly 'more developed' countries, Kamran shows the conservative nature of Pakistani men and the behaviour they expect from their wives, and Paresh illustrates the resistance to 'integration' that some South Asians had (or have).

6.1.3 The 'real story'

In the example below, Padma uses direct reported speech related to a real event or events, to refer to macro-discourse ─ the 'real story' ─ but it is not clear where she positions herself. She begins by evoking a chronotope, of her childhood in Manchester and trips with her mother to the Hindu temple in Whalley Range, a working class area which contrasts with her family's home in the more middle-class Withington:

Pm: we would go to the temple here in Whalley Range um but the difference was that we were from South India and even when we used to go to the temple and I say this with the greatest respect I distinctly remember my mum saying these are not the songs we are singing why are these women

> SCREECHING [laughs] It's a very different way of celebrating God that many of the North Indians did that she just found so even within that we would go we would regularly go and we were very much part of that community but she was also quite good at drawing the line saying this is the best that we can DO ↑ this is what is on offer ↑ [yeah] and we should do this in order for you to keep up your ↑ but it's not the real thing it's not what we DO and then when we'd go back to India like I said every four years we would go to our family's temple and of [indistinct] all those things

She introduces the 'real story' herself: "the difference was that we were from South India". But she resorts to direct speech for further exemplification, and precludes the directness of what will follow with "and I say this with the greatest respect". Her introductory phrase "I distinctly remember my mum saying" (unlike the examples I have so far given) points to a concrete event or events which she is reporting. Here, then, the use of reported direct speech is to offer evidence (Holt, 1999), and lends an authenticity to the words she recounts. But she also attributes them to her mother, thereby distancing herself from the rather dismissive "why are these women screeching". She follows, however, by agreeing with her mother in saying that there was a " different way" which "the North Indians" used to worship, and that her mother was very good at making this distinction clear ("drawing the line") and accepting that while not ideal "this is the best we can do" even though it was "not the real thing".

Padma has told me that her family were Brahmins, from the upper-middle to upper class of Indian society. She indexes caste and class differences, but attributes any feelings of superiority to her mother rather than herself. The overall effect of the chronotope above is to highlight the fragmentation of 'Hindus' into regional, caste and class groups, and the over-arching North India-South India divide. But by using her mother's words Padma is also able to illustrate this macro-discourse in stronger language than she might use herself.

The next three examples, also taken from Padma's narrative, serve to show other expectations from the 'outside world' for the South Asian diaspora to 'be South Asian':

Pm: [*in Manchester*] I mean lots of people have said to me if we have a work do or a fair oh why don't you wear a sari and I have a knee jerk [laughs] I have a knee jerk

Pm: in California they say {AMERICAN ACCENT} oh my God it's so wonderful of you guys do you meditate? and [OH↓] it was just awful awful based on just very well-meaning ignorance

Pm: [*in Cuba*] some of the older people that I know writers and poets remember y'know remember Satyajit Ray they remember some of the artists of that era and that's their connection and so they would constantly see me as Indian oh you people are so wonderful and you are so creative and you are so calm and la la la la (laughs)[laughs] born in Manchester!

In the above examples Padma binds her 'identity', at least in the eyes of outsiders, to wearing a sari for a formal occasion, the likelihood of practising meditation, and of being as creative (and possibly calm) as the cinematic auteur Ray: she uses direct speech to lay bare in our interview the reductive nature of such comments. She inserts these statements as evidence, giving me access to what she assumes, correctly, I will both recognise and respond to: after "I have a knee jerk" I laugh; I groan "oh" after "do you guys meditate?"; I laugh with her over the "creative" and "calm" comment. All of the above extracts occurred at a similar place in Padma's interview, towards the latter end, and she used these anecdotes to build up a scenario that begged expansion. By 'presenting evidence' we can move onto 'analysis' which occurs not long after. In her response she returns once again to reported direct speech, emphasising that she feels this strategy will best exemplify her frustrations at such comments:

S: growing up and later [yep] do you feel that you identify with being an ASIAN {*voiced scare quotes*} in the UK? or do you have a different definition of that or do you feel [to some extent] do you identify with the community

P: NO (.) at some level there is probably some identification that we share experiences but that's IT really um and it's a bit difficult because you're constantly REMINDED that you are Asian (.) it's not that I don't want MIND my Asian-ness but in terms of sort of cultural EXPERTISE in terms of LINGUISTIC expertise in terms of FAMILIARITY I haven't been to India since I left for university I've been to India maybe three times over twenty years (.) and so people say <u>oh tell me all about Kerala and tell me all about</u> I can't do it because it's not what is familiar to me

S: although if you ask someone from LIVERPOOL to tell them about DEVON they may not actually have much knowledge about that either

P: that's RIGHT as you say there must be an assumption that you're from India you must know EVERYTHING about India and you're ASIAN whatever that means that homogenising and so I wouldn't identify as an Asian necessarily

From the very mundane examples shown previously, Padma summarises in a more abstract way: "you're constantly reminded that you're Asian". She then describes her limited repertoire in things cultural, linguistic and her "familiarity" with 'Asian-ness'. But this position is at odds with the deep cultural knowledge she has shown in the previous excerpt (about visits to the temple). I argue that this highlights the very specific knowledge that people like my participants can have of their region, religion and language. But when placed within the greater Discourse of the diaspora or British South Asians (a Discourse promoted by the diaspora members themselves, with the rise of 'desi' culture discussed in Chapters 1 and 2), the homogenising external discourse — of being authorities in a country they may have an incomplete knowledge of — can dwarf their own specific knowledge.

6.1.4 The verdict

Below I show another extract from Nick's narrative. I had asked about his first visit to India, a few years previous, on business. The memory of that visit triggered a chain of stories: of being called 'coconut' (already shown in Chapter 4) by his sister's friends, and of hearing that this pejorative term was used of him again when he was at South Bank university. These stories are followed by the longer extract below in which a variety of direct speech utterances are used.

Nick relates separate incidents each with a punchline, and at the end he delivers his own (non-direct speech) 'verdict'. He moves back and forth over time and space so that the way he has been bombarded by people's opinions about his 'identity' is linked to different time periods and locations. I will show later how he has reached a resolution and now has his 'stock answer' which ties in with his view of his identity. But below Nick shows the trials that he has had and still has. He begins by talking about an incident that happened in Norway where he now lives. The direct speech that he reports are fairly short utterances, but punctuate the long extracts, serving to build up to his own verdict, shown at the end. Below he uses direct double-reported discourse (DDR), direct reported speech (D), and a thought experiment (T) (Myers, 1999:583):

N: yeah I took my paternity leave and it's the law [yeah] I mean EVERYONE takes it and it's inconvenient when you're at work blah blah blah but I took it but one of my colleagues said to another colleague I can't believe Nick took all of his paternity leave and just left (DDR) because I just left (.) you don't have any contact with work unless it's something really serious so I just left and it's accepted because it's law and it happens but then er she had said (.) she had no intention of me knowing this (.) but she's said you know (.) I hate it when people come to Norway to take advantage of our system (DDR) which is really HORRIBLE it's a HORRIBLE thing to say (.) but it was a peculiar thing because it made me feel (.) when I was five living in Basingstoke I used to get there were these REALLY COOL kids that used to live in the area and they used to do they used to be riding around on their BMXs and everyone thought they were REALLY COOL and they used to call me Paki (.) they used to say ALL RIGHT,PAKI?(D) they used to be horrible to me and I was only FIVE

S how old were THEY?

N: they must have been (.) I've thought about it a lot (.) they must have been maybe teenagers↑ in their early teens↑ but uh that feeling of being. (.) I don't know if you had the same experience (.) but growing up I had that. (.) I got called Paki and got told to go home but you just kind of take it (.) it doesn't ever happen anymore and I didn't get a lot of it but I got it now and then (.) and then when I got called COCONUT oh sorry when this colleague said this to me it felt the same as what it felt when I was that young and y'know it's (.) that feeling when you feel you feel confused why are you being horrible to me when I haven't done anything (T) and then also and then when I got called coconut y'know (.) COME ON I CAN'T WIN (T)!

S: YEAH {laughs}

N: [laughs] you get called PAKI from white people and you get called COCONUT from brown people.

Nick uses the global 'you' in his verdict, so that he extends his difficulties to others who may have a similar background: he moves from the personal "I can't win" to the global "you get called Paki". He uses the varied forms of direct speech to build up his argument: he brings the episodes into a personal domain with his thought experiment, and then delivers his verdict.

The experience that Nick had in Norway did not involve him being called anything pejorative, at least to his knowledge, but he links that experience (through an error "oh sorry when this colleague said this") with his other experiences: of being called "a coconut" at school and later at university, and "a Paki" when he was a small child. In this way, he constructs his narrative as being continuously assigned an identity: a foreign 'scrounger', a Westernised Asian, an unwanted ethnic minority. He fights against those sobriquets but in fighting against them he gives this Discourse some credence. Earlier he explained why he was called a 'coconut': "because of the way I speak".

Nick lends himself less of that adeptness at modifying one's behaviour or adapting to the two different cultures of white Britain and their South Asian diasporic community that other

narratives show, in particular that of Paresh, Devinder, and Kamran. The three men grew up in areas of dense populations of their communities, in working class families where their parents were not conversant in English. They reflect the type of South Asian who has been much-cited in public and political discourse, and fulfil the Discourse of being a South Asian in Britain. The way that Nick constructs his narrative is that, for not belonging to that well-known and oft-cited group, he has faced accusations of not belonging to the South Asian community and lacks the 'protection' that that might offer against negative comments from the white section of the population. His position on the 'boundary' of the two sides is precarious.

6.1.5 The 'where are you from?' question

In the latter part of the extract above, Nick includes me ("I don't know if you had the same experience"). Padma, I will show below, does the same: "perhaps it's happened to you". By using these expressions they both remind me (the listener) that while they are speaking of themselves and their lives, it is not a monologue, and they do not consider me so removed from the stories they are telling as to be completely bewildered by them. They are correct: below I will show how Padma and Nick talk about the "where are you from" question, a quandary I identify with.

Pm: perhaps it's happened to you but the number of times it's happened to me in various places in the world people have said oh where are you from and when I was a rebellious teenager my answer would always be well I'm from Manchester because I was from in Manchester and between people from Manchester I was born and brought up here I have a right to be here and a right to be treated like everybody else and at some level that stuck with and that would still be my first response I'm from Manchester but my heritage is (2)

Above Padma relates her 'stock answer', which I will show Nick reveals he also has: she shows that she has developed an awareness that a 'straight' answer will not be accepted and uses the conjunction 'but' to show that she is aware of the contrast between what people might expect of

a person from Manchester and herself. She does not relate that she says "I'm British but my heritage…" possibly a more contested identification but, rather, she ties herself to a city, Manchester where she was born and brought up, and uses the word 'heritage', to give some distance from her parents' Indian background.

Nick also relates his experiences of being queried over his origins:

N: we [*he and his siblings*] were always asked people were always (.) people still are still with me and have been in the past intrigued to where we're from (.) we've got a Spanish surname or a Spanish-sounding surname (.) we've got dark skin but we're not I'm not very dark (.) so people always wondered where I was from

Nick links the questions explicitly with his appearance ("dark skin", "but not very dark") and his "Spanish-sounding surname", the latter referring to the (minority) Catholic Goan population who retain Portuguese surnames.

N: […] people used to ask us all the time <u>where are you from?</u> Indians used to ask us <u>where are you from originally?</u> that phrase you used to get it all the time (.) and when (.) up until a few years ago I was just like <u>AAGH I'm from ENGLAND y'know (.) just leave me ALONE!</u> y'know i<u>t's none of your business why d'you ask me?</u> But NOW (.) I'm much more (.) well (.) I just say <u>I'm INDIAN but I'm from the UK and my parents are GOAN (.) s</u>o I find now I'm much more interested in having a DIALOGUE with people like that or just talking to them about their experiences as well

It is unlikely that Nick in most occasions responded "just leave me alone!", and more likely that he is vocalising his feelings at the time on being the recipient of the repeated questions. Unlike Padma, Nick relates that his first 'port of call' is to refer to himself as being from 'England', the nation rather than a city; but he does not say "I'm English". In his 'stock answer' he is Indian,

referred to as an adjective (or nationality) rather than saying "I'm from India" with the implication of being born and raised there. He is "from the UK", where he was born and raised, and his "parents are Goan".

In the last section of his phrase Nick reveals his desire to elucidate, even to strangers. Goa remained a Portuguese colony until it was invaded by India in the 1960s and has a distinctive identity within the sub-continent. But what Nick also elides in his 'stock answer' is the fact that neither of his parents were born in Goa: they were born and brought up in Kenya. Even Padma's answer does not include the many years she has lived abroad and her affinity to Latin American culture. Here I argue that the two participants perform the habitus of the South Asian diaspora: that in the end the homeland is Mother India rather than anywhere else, even when the realities of their lives may diverge. In doing so, the participants perpetuate a Discourse of British South Asian having a close and un-complex connection with the homeland.

What has also transpired from Nick's narrative, as I will show in the next section, is that he has, alone among the participants, received the most negative attention and speaks about great difficulties he had over his identity. Towards the end of his interview he was talking about his new home, Norway, and the greater peace he has found in himself and being in his skin:

N: if it's snowed a lot there'll be lots and lots of people (.) families out skiing (.) but you don't see BROWN faces when you're skiing (.)so when you DO see brown faces we always kind of (.) we always kind of look at each other and think <u>HEY</u> [laughs] <u>what are you doing here? (</u>laughs) Or

S: you acknowledge each other?

N: I try to always nod or smile

S: Oh GOOD

Nick moves from the global 'you' at the start of the extract to the inclusive 'we': "you don't see brown faces…so when you DO see brown faces we always…". This shift in pronouns

corresponds with a shift in his perception of himself as an 'observer' looking onto an Asian-ness that he doesn't feel he owns, to a sense of belonging to that greater 'we'. My response ("oh good") shows my happiness that Nick has found some resolution, compared to the more troubled times he has spoken about.

6.1.6 Everyday realities

The following examples show how reported direct speech is used to show in mundane detail the everyday realities of being a multilingual, multigenerational family. Devinder and Kamran use direct reported speech to allow me access into the interactions between their parents and their children: Devinder in order to emphasise the negativity that arises from his parents, and Kamran to highlight coping strategies that such families undertake. Devinder has most likely translated these words from Punjabi:

D: they're [*his parents*] just very negative to them [*Devinder's daughters*] I mean they tell them you're OVERWEIGHT you're not very BRIGHT things like that (.) and my parents will talk to them in Punjabi and the kids will reply in English and they usually give them a one word reply oh get out the room bit like me and my brother used to get so

Again, Devinder's narrative can be seen as polyphonic when his parents' brusque words are constructed as being far from his own views of how communication between grandparents and grandchildren should be, or his thoughts about his daughters. By using direct speech, he dramatizes the difficulty that communicating with his parents entails and by extension the difficulties he has faced with them. He is also offering me evidence for what he will say later in his interview: that he sees *not* passing on Punjabi to his younger daughters as a way of protecting them.

Kamran uses the same strategy but this time it is unlikely the reported direct speech is translated. Although he describes the interactions as not "conversation" but "chitchat" he offers evidence on how communication can exist without a shared language between the first and third generation:

K: they TRY you know my dad is how are you doing what are you doing how's school and mum can say do you want some food and this that (.) they kind of almost communicate almost through SIGN LANGUAGE or through bits bobs there isn't conversation there's the odd chitchat how are you how's things and it sort of stops there [ok] and we don't see them obviously enough for that language to be something that develops […]the children just communicate through the um SWEETS and so forth

S: Yeah (.) like MY parents as well (laughs)

While my parents are very conversant in English there are still communication difficulties related to unfamiliar accents, vocabulary, and themes. How Kamran and I construct this section is to acknowledge that even though the Heritage Language is not being used, it is still possible for our children to maintain a relationship with grandparents, alongside other difficulties which are common to families of any culture.

6.1.7 A fly on the wall

The last example I show very much relates to Holt's (1999) argument of reported direct discourse offering the listener 'access' to an event: I term it a 'fly on the wall' event.
Earlier that day Mumtaz had been in Salt Mills, a shopping centre in Bradford, which she jokingly described as 'the last bastion of the white middle-class' trying to escape the large local population of conservative-minded South Asians:

M: we were talking the other day and my sister had said about Shahara [*her sister's daughter*] who's sixteen and my sister had said something in passing about GOD I don't want her to marry an ASIAN y'know they're all AWFUL kind of thing{laughs} [uncertain laugh] and my mum was really HORRIFIED and she said y'know it's a different TIME I'm from a different time a different PLACE y'know I can't hear these things without it HURTING me [oh she said that] yeah and I was saying I know it IS difficult but I understand where **Appa** is coming from (2) y'know we just want them to be happy

S: so you think she CAN'T be happy with an Asian

M: (2) she MIGHT be [mm] (2) but I don't

S: but not a type of Asian that you've seen in BRADFORD! [mm]

M: or the types that I've seen at (.) Ali said this to me today actually it's interesting you should interview HIM

Above Mumtaz uses a layering of voices, of varying levels of emotion (Bakhtin, 1981) to relate this section of her narrative. First, is her sister's voice, declaiming Asians ("they're all awful"). Then her mother: first using a statement ("my mum was horrified") before giving evidence of her emotions ("I'm from a different time and a different place I can't hear these things without them hurting me"). Then is the voice of the peacemaker, Mumtaz, brought into the here-and-now ("I know it is difficult"), and expressing the reasonable hopes of a parent ("we just want them [*our children*] to be happy"). The way that Mumtaz constructs her narrative in the above extract, shows how she places herself (and her sister) apart from 'other Asians' by using the third person plural ("they're all awful"), and her agreement ("I understand where Appa is coming from"). She also evokes an unsurprising chronotope of 'generational conflict' (her sister and her are second-generation, their mother is a first generation Briton).

But there is a tension between what Mumtaz says and the context of her life. She uses the antiquated term of reference for her older sister ("Appa"), thereby showing that the sisters continue with traditional practices such as use of respectful terms: but their discussions show a

certain disregard towards South Asian people and practices. Further Mumtaz shows that the sisters both have an *expectation* of marriage for their children, and an *interest* in their children's prospective partners ─ another very traditional South Asian trope of giving marriage importance and of 'gossiping' about their children's prospects ─ at odds with how they place themselves apart from 'other' South Asians. And finally, she excludes her own life-story from these discussions: she is a South Asian who was able to and did choose who she wanted to marry, but she has reservations about offering choice to the third generation.

As can be seen by my uncertain laugh, I was not sure how to react to the reported direct speech of Mumtaz's sister ("they're all awful"). Mumtaz continues by giving her mother's reaction in detail, and her own reasoned response, in what can be seen as a mitigation of her sister's extreme comment. I query her opinion ("so you think she can't be happy with an Asian?"), to which Mumtaz hesitates before expressing uncertainty ("she might be"). She does not complete her starter ("or the types I've seen at") but follows on quickly with a reference to fellow Muslim, Ali.

Her comment, "you should interview *him*" could have meant that she wanted to introduce me to another person who shared her views (that fears of the children marrying an Asian are reasonable) or a possible participant. But as I will show, the opposite is made clear in the extract which follows on, shown below. Mumtaz, in conversation with Ali (Muslim, Pakistani-origin, friend and former colleague with older children), is discussing Ali's daughter who is at university, and who he has advised against any relationships with non-Muslims.

M: Ali said this to me today […] I said <u>what scares you about her marrying someone who isn't</u> [yeah] and he said <u>there are so many differences I don't think it would be right it would be difficult</u> so I said <u>are you worried for HER or are you worried for YOU↓</u> [mmm↓] and he was saying <u>oh for both of them</u> and he said <u>I just think it's important at the end of the day it's about Islam and I</u>

think this is what's right and I said yes I suppose you can look at it like THAT↑ [laughs] OBVIOUSLY {laughing voice} but I said HAPPINESS does count for a LOT

I could re-write the above as a script for a play:

M: what scares you about her marrying someone who isn't [*Muslim*]

A: there are so many differences I don't think it would be right it would be difficult

M: are you worried for HER or are you worried for YOU↓

A: oh for both of them I just think it's important at the end of the day it's about Islam and I think this is what's right

M: yes I suppose you can look at it like THAT↑ OBVIOUSLY {laughing voice} but HAPPINESS does count for a LOT

By presenting both her words and his in the first person, Mumtaz uses a rhetorical device: the listener (me) is persuaded that they are being offered a fly on the wall perspective, and an accurate re-enactment of this conversation between two, professional Muslim South Asian Britons. Mumtaz offers Ali as a case study of a mind-set that she has been referring to, of stubbornly-traditional ("awful") Asian men. Mumtaz again uses reported direct speech to offer, as verbatim evidence, what Ali said ("it's about Islam"). The overall effect is to show me: 'look at what we are up against', thereby explaining her sister's comments, her own opinions, and answering my question ("so you think she [*Mumtaz's niece*] can't be happy with an Asian?").

6.2 Accent and stylisation

All of my participants show native speaker abilities in English on a morpho-syntactic level, and having all grown up here in the UK in the main and being higher-professionals, this is not unexpected. So how are interactions played out between two middle-class, professional South Asians conversing in English, but making some allusions to sub-continental languages? I show that the pronunciation used by the participants, and — as the 'judge' of their pronunciation, my

own reflexivity as a researcher — contribute to the narratives we co- construct in the interviews. These interviews contrast with the interactional data of Sharma and Rampton's work (2011: 2) mentioned in Chapter 2, where the two participants are both Punjabi and engage in code-switching at a clause and sentence level. While this code-switching is unsurprisingly absent in my interviews, what persists is the reference to place-names and terms of South Asian derivation. While it is common in the sub-continent to code-switch on a word level —an example from Sailaja (2009) is 'Morarji Fabrics'— in my interviews, single words or a pair of words of South Asian derivation are dropped into dense talk in English. Some parallels occur in the public domain. The 'solution', for example on the BBC, is that pronunciation of presenters' names is decided by the presenters themselves; but place names which are well-known (such as Delhi) need to be pronounced using the most-recognised English pronunciation (BBC, The Editors, accessed 2015).

My interviews were conducted in a more private setting and the approaches to pronunciation have been varied, pronunciation of names being one example. While I have not heard the participants Kamran and Devinder say their names, Mumtaz and Padma pronounce their (real) names using features of Indian pronunciation. Paresh on the other hand pronounces his (real) name with English pronunciation; Nick and Joshua both have English (real) names. While I have noticed some variations between individuals, however, that is not to say that there might not be variations *within* an individual. The way I pronounce my family name varies depending on context: while I never change the syllable stress (KA-LA-YIL rather than an anglicised ka-LAY-il), the vowel sounds *do* change from /a:/ to /ae/. What is pertinent then from my own experience is that a 'lesser' Indian pronunciation does not necessarily mean that the participant *cannot* produce, or *never* produces, an Indian pronunciation.

Unlike the studies cited in Chapter 2 (Hirson and Sohail, 2007 is one example) which investigate very specific phonological aspects, such as the variation of the rhotic /r/ pronunciation (ibid) in British Punjabis, I am not conducting a variability study. Instead, I

interpret the pronunciation the participants choose to use as performing a function in our interview. The participants could choose to pronounce words as if they were a monolingual English speaker without South Asian background, that is 'English pronunciation' (underlined in transcription). Or they could choose to use 'Indian pronunciation': as if a monolingual speaker of the relevant language (**bold** in transcription); or with a 'gesture', or more, in the direction of the L1 pronunciation (**bold** in transcription) (Sebba, p.c.). I use bold for the latter two because rather than how 'authentic' their accents are, I am more interested in whether there is any modification at all.[8]

But in order to describe in some way what I hear, when appropriate I will identify retroflexed /t/ and /d/, extended /n/, FACE/GOAT vowels, and syllable stress which deviates from an expected anglicized pronunciation.

6.2.1 Using Indian pronunciation and South Asian lexis

I use examples of some of the participants' pronunciation to argue that the way they use pronunciation either perpetuates the Discourse of a pan-British Asian identity which does not reflect the diversity of the South Asians in the UK, or resists it. Below are some extracts from Devinder's narrative which use South Asian lexis and he uses recognisable (by me the listener) Indian pronunciation[9].

1. D: So she spoke a bit of **Punjabi** not much 'cos her mum didn't speak that much **Punjabi**.
2. D: they still use the words '**gora**' or '**goree**' [mm]

[8] My gratitude to Sam Kirkham and Mark Sebba of the Linguistics Department at Lancaster University for their advice on phonological aspects of extracts from the narratives.

[9] The word 'Punjabi' is used with equal syllable stress (PUN-JA-BI rather than pun-JA-bi). 'Kabba**d**i', an Indian ball game, is delivered using a retroflexed /d/, also shown in the rendition of 'Jalandhar', and equal syllable stress (KAB-BAD-DI). The word 'gora' is used in languages from the Indo-Aryan family to mean 'white man'; 'goree' is 'white woman'. Devinder stresses both syllables equally (eg. GO-RA).

3. D: when I was younger one of them was a **kabbadi** player so he used to play for the Southall **kabbadi** team
4. D: Near **Jalandhar** but not **Jalandhar** itself

Devinder switches from English to Indian pronunciation even word to word ('she spoke a bit of **Punjabi** not much', 'not **Jalandhar** itself'): this adroitness ties in with his overall narrative of being both bilingual and bicultural. Significantly, he does not query my understanding of the terms 'kabbadi', 'Gurdwara' (extract not shown), 'gora/goree'. He (rightly) assumes that I am familiar with the words 'gora' and 'goree', both in terms of meaning and implication. These words, however, while recognised widely in India ─ Rabindranath Tagore's work *Gora* (1910) is a far-reaching example of the term ─ are less used in South India. They *have,* however, entered the discourse of British Asians in the UK as discussed in Chapter 2, and as shown in the Urban Dictionary (2003). I interpret Devinder's use of the words here as a way of placing us both within what he imagines is a pan-Indian discourse, but which I regard as 'British Asian' discourse: which being primarily North Indian-derived and limited in its scope I do not fully identify with. His wish to be inclusive, therefore, becomes rather exclusive.

In the same move however, Devinder elaborates:

D: and I don't think that has really changed so they [*his parents*] refer to my wife THE **GOREE** [OH OK↓] as they have once or twice in the past now I find that OFFENSIVE

Above it can be seen that when Devinder places the use of the word into the context of being used about his wife I express my disapproval of its use. While we are different in terms of the North-South divide, our shared desire for tolerance and rejection of the insularity that can be found in the Asian cultures prevails.

By his second interview, Devinder had established my South Indian background. The following extract is taken from that interview:

D: I'm working on a verse [*indistinct*] of **Heer Ranjha** do you know that one? [no] **Heer Ranjha** it's more the north **Punjabi**, old **Punjabi** stories

Here, he does not assume my knowledge of the Heer/Ranjha stories, first querying and then explaining, highlighting that they originate from 'the north'. His Indian pronunciation reflects our shared Indian background, while emphasising his in-depth cultural knowledge, the North-South divide, and the Heer/Ranjha tradition (discussed later): now he is moving away from a pan-British Asian identity.

Paresh, in the examples shown below, also varies his pronunciation of South Asian words, so that he uses Indian pronunciation for some, and English pronunciation for others, demonstrating his adroitness in moving from one pronunciation to the other, as did Devinder, and by doing so, indexes his adeptness in moving between the cultures. But there are some differences which I will explain below:

1. P No there was a very strong Gujarati community and there was a **mandir** and temple
2. P: so I've got an older sister who was born in India in Gujurat in the **Rann of Kutch**
3. P: Well I suppose we spoke in Gujarati, that was our first language
4. P: I was a Hindu, raised a Hindu, always a Hindu I suppose but um not uh yeah not practising.
5. P: so we do **raksha-bandan** every August. (.)

Paresh uses the glottal stop /**ʔ**/ in 'Gujara/**ʔ**/' and 'Gujarat/**ʔ**/i'; 'Hindu' is pronounced with /d/ rather than the retroflexed /ɽ, ɖ/. It can be argued that while this word is closely bound to

Paresh's heritage — as 'Punjabi' was to Devinder — it is also, if not in common parlance, at least widely recognised in the UK. By using an English pronunciation, he indexes his knowledge of how they would be pronounced or rendered by the wider UK society, binding these words to a multilingual, multicultural space such as the UK where these terms may be employed by speakers who do not have a Gujarati/South Asian heritage or connection.

However, he pronounces more unusual words using Indian pronunciation: for example, an extended /n/ in Ra**nn**; retroflexes in man**d**ir and ban**d**an. He binds the Indian pronunciation to words or terms which are very particular for his heritage culture and which display an insider's engagement; and as with Devinder's first extract, he assumes that I will understand the terms. He thus indexes his very in-depth knowledge of his Heritage Language (Gujarati) and (Hindu) culture, but he also places me in both those camps: as someone who will recognise the 'inside' as well as the 'outside'. Thus Paresh, through his efforts at being inclusive, perpetuates the homogeneity of 'British Asian' experience.

The extract below from my second interview with Padma, uses bold letters to show retroflexed sounds:

P: I en**d**ed up picking it pre**d**ominantly because my (.) boyfriend was at Oxford, and I ha**d** a place at E**d**inburgh well I didn't show up for my interview at E**d**inburgh [ok] confessions as well {laughs} [laughs] I pretended I ha**d** but I ha**d**n't […] I knew I was going to continue to study (2) but I guess the boyfrien**d** was a way of distancing myself

Padma does not use the retroflex uniformly, but what *is* uniform is that she *does* use it: inconsistently in its position but consistently in its presence. While morpho-syntactically she is clearly a native speaker of English, she is also identifiably audibly of Indian origin, irrespective of whether she is using South Asian terms or names. I checked that she did not display these features in our interview alone: she had a podcast discussing her courses for undergraduates, and

in this podcast her speaking style was consistent with that during our interviews. Her pronunciation of South Asian terms consistently shows Indian pronunciation, whether they can be considered well-known in the UK (such as Tamil and Chennai) or not (such as Bharatanatayam). But, she also uses a retroflexed /d/ in a stream of English talk, as above.

I interpret the consistency of her pronunciation of South Asian terms, whether directly related to her Heritage culture or not (see her pronunciation of Pakistan later) as serving to link herself to an in-depth knowledge of the *sub-continent*, rather than just her own Heritage culture. Padma does not thus place herself within the British Asian domain, but rather aligns herself to the sub-continent, or India. This reflects her 'greater' narrative of having parents who arrived in the UK with an 'expatriate' status and psyche, and the family considering themselves as visitors rather than immigrants: her parents returned to India on retirement, and her brother has also returned to India.

There were occasions in our interview, as well, when her pitch-accent changed markedly, over and above what I have shown above. Below, at the beginning, we were talking about her experience at university. The words, sometimes whole clauses, in bold show marked Indian pronunciation which I discuss later:

P: university felt like a white version of that [*school*]

S: so were there actually quite a few Asian kids

P: they were **QUITE a FEW NOTHING like there is NOW it's just STAGGERING↑ the GIRLS' SCHOOLS SHEENA! You should SEE the GIRLS' SCHOOLS in Manchester** [you mean] **FULL of Asians** [that's interesting] partly because of the SEGREGRATION the GENDER [yeah] segregation

S: I know WHALLEY RANGE is very Asian but Manchester GRAMMAR↑ I mean

P: Manchester GRAMMAR↑I think it happens more with the girls' schools Manchester HIGH and WITHINGTON Girls' school [right] **SO MANY** Asians there [right right right] (2) but even in MY year in my time there in every year secondary upwards there must have been three or four

> Asian girls [ok] and I remember when they finished their O levels at least two of those four girls disappeare**d** they got marrie**d** they went to **India** or **Pakistan** y'know BRIGHT GIRLS

At a segmental level, Padma uses an extended /n/ for 'nothing' and 'now', a change in the /l/ in 'full' (described as syllable-final velarized-l, Fuchs, 2016:24), and a longer vowel /o:/ in 'so'. But, further, her intonation and stress show features of Indian English. She stresses both 'quite' and 'few', for example. She uses several pitch-accents on 'content' words: 'staggering', 'girls' schools', and 'full' (Sailaja, 2009 and Fuchs, 2016). The overall impression, however, is not of Padma adopting a stylised accent as does Kamran in the next section, but of Padma remaining 'herself', but with more marked Indian pronunciation. By using a stronger-than-usual Indian pronunciation, Padma links this section of her narrative, where she is commenting on the prevalence of South Asian girls in the girls' schools in Manchester – the macro-discourse of ethnic minority behaviour in the UK society – with the micro-discourse, our interview, a discussion between two female South Asians.

I have already mentioned Padma's reference to the distinctive (Dravidian) culture of South India, less noticeable in the public domain in the UK. The South Asian population in the Manchester area is predominantly Muslim, with Urdu, Bengali or Punjabi speakers, that is, North Indian, (Multilingual Manchester, 2015; Census, 2011), and it is to these South Asians that Padma may be referring. She indexes her knowledge and experience of South Asian culture through her Indian pronunciation to temper her words, which show some censure at the tendency of South Asians to 'clog up' the girls' schools. This censure is constructed less offensively if it is conducted from the inside: she therefore places us both inside the South Asian experience.

6.2.2 Using stylisation

The opportunity to use a word or phrase which is very particular to South Asian culture or his Muslim upbringing did not arise in the interviews I conducted with Kamran. The only words that were used were: Punjab, Punjabi, Pakistan, Mirpur, all of which showed English pronunciation. All these, as I have reasoned with my discussion of Paresh's narrative, can be regarded as commonly used in the UK. The one exception may be 'Mirpur', which is, however, cited in the media frequently, especially since the July 2005 British suicide bombers were of Mirpuri origin[10]

However, I show that Kamran uses stylised ways of speaking within his narrative: 'an Imran Khan accent' and a 'Goodness Gracious Me accent', explained later. These are in opposition to what I call a 'Peter Sellers accent': where the speaker delivers a parodic, amusing but, for me, an inauthentic accent of a South Asian speaker, such as that used by Peter Sellers in his films and song *Goodness Gracious Me (1960),* and more recently used by Hank Azaria's Apu in *The Simpsons.* A 'Peter Sellers' accent is not only the domain of non-South Asians: for example, Dev Patel, a British Asian actor, misses my expectations of an authentic, middle-class Indian accent by some distance in the film *Best Exotic Marigold Hotel* (2012).

In the extract below, Kamran is speaking of his brother's wife. His three brothers have had arranged marriages with Urdu speakers, and one of his younger brothers has only recently married:

K: his wife is more <u>PAKISTANI</u> y'know in terms of born and raised there and then moved here maybe five six or maybe ten years ago I don't know how long ago but she has that (.) her accent is more PAKISTANI ENGLISH? ↑ it has that sort of IMRAN KHAN sort of style of speaking that sort of **talks like that you know sort of well-received English Pakistani** {*assumes well-*

[10] Bunting's article 'Orphans of Islam' (2005) in *The Guardian*, for example, emphasises the Mirpuri history of the men, as explanatory for the isolation they felt as Muslims.

spoken Pakistani accent} [Oh VERY GOOD! (laughs)] {laughs}THANK YOU! yeah so I DUNNO

By using the educated and mellifluous tones of an 'Imran Khan accent' when speaking of his sister-in-law, an accent that indexes social opportunities and class, Kamran binds her family to a social stratum that is well-above the Mirpuri "hicks", as Kamran describes his own family. Yet he immediately follows by using a very colloquial "yeah, so I dunno*",* tying his 'normal' use of the language with being a native speaker of British English. He can in this way contrast his native-speaker-ness and position inside British society, with his sister-in-law's 'other-ness'. His use of the 'Imran Khan accent' amused me: it is very different from his normal speaking voice but it is also what I consider a very accurate rendition of an educated Pakistani accent. In our interaction, my recognition of the 'Imran Khan' accent positions me as a discerning fellow South Asian: one who would appreciate the quality of Kamran's mimicry. He shows pleasure at my amusement: "Thank you!"

Weedon (2000) has discussed the use of comedy in smoothing disturbed inter-cultural waters, and points to the strengths and pitfalls of such an approach: while it can establish commonalities in enjoying humour between cultures, it can also be accused of perpetuating stereotypes. His essay, *Goodness Gracious Me*, makes reference to his case-in-point: the popular comedy series of the same name written by British Asian comedians, including Meera Syal and Sanjeev Bhaskar, (1998-2001). The title is itself a reference to Sellers' song from 1960. In the extract below, Kamran constructs a narrative indexing some common features of a sketch from the comedy series: a tight cast of definable characters (older brother, sister-in-law, father and hapless son); a familiar 'Asian' scenario, such as an arranged marriage introduction; the culture clash between generations; and misunderstandings related to interpretations of language. He also uses reported direct speech in what I have termed the 'fly-on-the-wall strategy'. I will return to

this in Chapter 9, but an extract is shown below. Kamran and his family are driving back home after an unsuccessful meeting with a prospective bride:

K: we were in the car and we'd left their house and my dad said so what d'you think? (.) and my older brother who had married through an arranged marriage just turned around and said what do you MEAN what do you THINK you have to ASK that question↑ I mean

S: yeah {laughing voice}

K: so my BROTHER thought it was ridiculous and my SISTER-in-law was OH! you don't have to ASK and my dad was like **WHAT D'YOU MEAN WHAT DO YOU MEAN?** {*Assumes Goodness Gracious Me accent*} {laughs}[laughs]

As with his 'Imran Khan' accent, his 'Goodness Gracious Me' accent is identifiable while being linked in narrative structure to the comedy series. In this way his use of different accents evokes a chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981): that of the first generation of working-class parents who arrived in the UK in the 1960s with imperfect English. Here, too, the question his father asks "what d'you mean?" is double-voiced: he understands Kamran's brother's impatient "you have to ask?" but he does not understand the macro-discourse, the challenges facing the second-generation to maintain traditions from the homeland while the host society has become 'their' society. And so Kamran further binds his experiences, and mine, with the 'culture' clash that has been well-documented in the media that may exist between first and second generations in the UK. His use of stylised accents did not have the effect of 'excluding' me: the stylised English had a more universal appeal, binding our narrative more to the macro-discourse of the second generation experience, rather than to the Discourse of British Asians.

6.3 Conclusion

In the first section I showed how my participants employ polyphonic strategies involving reported direct speech — such as delivering a punchline, or offering a fly-on-the-wall perspective

— in *telling* their life stories. They thus use reported direct speech rhetorically, to explain aspects of their life which deviate from what they know as a Discourse surrounding South Asian Britons; they also use strategies to connect the micro-discourse of the interview with a 'bigger' story, the macro-discourse. The second section very much also includes me, my 'hearing' of voices, and my interpretations: significant factors in *receiving* a spoken narrative from a participant. This chapter, thus, addresses the methodology of using interviews to extract a spoken narrative from participants with knowledge of the genre.

Viewing the interviews through a chronotopic lens, the fact that they occurred in the UK in the 2010s shows that even today second-generation British South Asians have a sense of the import given to maintaining traditions, marrying within co-ethnic and co-religious groups. When their lives deviate from such traditions, they want to explain their decisions. They show through their narratives that they are aware of how their identification as a South Asian might be challenged because of those deviations from expected behaviours. 'Identity' thrives on the idea of 'authenticity', described as a "moving target" by Blommaert and Varis (2011:3-4), and a helpful description of identity, identity discourses and practice is that they are "discursive orientations towards sets of features that are seen (or can be seen) as emblematic of particular identities", which depend on the different degrees of 'fluency' in recognising these orientations (Blommaert, 2013a:614). Hence, my participants show awareness that in their lives as well as within the interview-time, they can be regarded as 'experts' of authenticity or even 'novices' depending on with whom, and in which context, the interaction occurs.

7. Building a back-story

In this chapter I show how the participants build a back-story, taking the listener to the there-and-then of their childhoods and earlier lives. This fulfils the purpose of explaining (or even justifying) how they present themselves in the here-and-now of the interview and their present-day selves as integrated, assimilated, middle-class professionals. Their narratives can therefore be viewed as building towards a response they perceive will be relevant to my research angle: how did you get to be where you are now? Rather than viewing the interviews simply as a performance for my benefit, however, these narratives also give insights into the decisions the participants have made, as well as illustrate the strength of the Discourse surrounding expected or acceptable behaviours among South Asian Britons.

I show how some use chronotopes to locate the time-frame of their recount firmly in the past, as opposed to the here-and-now of interview-time, which I term 'Past times'. They also evoke chronotopes to reveal a turning point in their life, related to their use of the Heritage Language, their involvement with the Heritage culture, and their understandings of themselves and their identity, which I term 'Threshold'.

7.1 Past times

When a person is asked to talk about their life, there are some expected discourse features. As well as time references ('in 1970'; 'when I was eight years old'), the person is likely to use the past simple or continuous tenses ('I went'; 'I was living'). Further, they might refer to past habits or routines that they no longer engage in by using, 'used to' ('I used to smoke'; 'I used to have'). They might also use the modal verb 'would' to talk about repeated past actions with a degree of emotional engagement or nostalgia ('My mother would take us'; 'I would play'). Similarly,

participants, when they are talking about their childhood, can be expected to use phrases such as "I grew up" or "when I was growing up". But, in addition to these functions, in this section I examine how some participants talk about their pasts in a way that emphasises how they fit into a narrative of 'migration'; whereas others choose to place their pasts into a more personal or individual framework.

7.1.1. The common story

In Chapter 4, I showed how Joshua evoked a chronotope that was familiar from my own past: a diasporic group that unlike a large community was rather a collection of families, with small-scale social gatherings. Below I show an example taken from Kamran's interview:

S: what did your dad sort of what was his job?

K: um. (.) at the time I mean as a child when we grew up he was a BUS DRIVER so that was bus conductor bus driver that was how I knew him as um. (.) we just we grew up in a house which eventually became to be five boys from my uncle's side and four boys from our side four adults and occasional passing through cousins or uncles who coming through from Pakistan (.) find their FEET stay with US and then move onto another THING

He evokes a past time, a chronotope ("when we grew up" in Manchester in the 1960s) and then returns with "we grew up in a house". This house, he relates, was full of people, thirteen in total, predominantly male, with relatives as transients, with comings and goings. These aspects all evoke well-documented stories and images of migration, particularly from Pakistan: mostly driven by males, close bonds between family members, high-density living. Kamran uses this chronotope to place his own life story firmly within that greater migrant narrative. I argue that he does so in order to establish his credentials as a son of a migrant, but further, as I show later, to

contrast his upbringing with his life now as a middle-class, 'integrated' and 'assimilated' South Asian Briton.

Paresh speaks of his upbringing in Coventry:

P: there was a very strong Gujarati community and there was a **mandir** and temple and again we had people we had to go and see and Mum was very good at keeping in touch with other people so she'd drag us along to the temple or whatever

Paresh lists several 'aspects' that fall into the traditional story of migrants: "strong community", a religious focus ("mandir" and "temple"), the presence of a parent (a first-generation migrant) and community networks ("people we had to go and see"), as well as the reluctance from the second generation to adhere to traditions ("she'd drag us along"). He binds this chronotope then to behaviours which continue traditions from the motherland, but the way he lists them in the past tense emphasises that they are 'finished' actions.

The examples below are taken from Devinder's interviews:

D: I grew up fairly observant Sikh so we used to have to go to the temple on Sundays most of the time on Sundays to Southall to temple and we went shopping in Southall with western shopping in the supermarket and other things like other things drumsticks vegetables or whatever that were more Indian –oriented we got from Southall (.) so I kind of guess a DOUBLE-CULTURAL LIFE of kind of being quite westernised and also that Indian part

D: yeah so there was a very strong community so yeah there's kind of that was my kind of strong NETWORK in a sense when I was growing up (.) we had lots of our relatives lived nearby so my relatives from my mum's side and my dad's side and their friends so quite often we'd visit them or they'd visit us so very STRONG TIES (.) and my uncle lived with us we had various relatives

living with us when I was younger one of them was a **kabbadi** player so he used to play for the Southall **kabbadi** team and he was England captain all this sort of stuff

In the first extract, while he speaks of "being quite westernised" he does not expand on what that entails (entailed): rather his examples relate to his "Indian part". Devinder, in the second extract, makes reference again to "various relatives living with us", "very strong ties", similar to Kamran's narrative. In both extracts he uses the past tense, unsurprisingly, but the way that he constructs his narrative here, with the use of 'used to' and the modal 'would' ("he used to play", "we'd visit"), serves to emphasise that the descriptions he is giving, while habitual and repeated in the past, no longer feature in his current life. He is referring to a 'finished' past.

Below, Paresh and Kamran use more overt reference between the past 'then' and 'now', with Kamran in particular giving several examples using 'would'. In these extracts, I have italicised key phrases:

P: *but it's a different type of Asian community when I was growing up in the seventies* and eighties we had a lot of anti-racist stuff going on I'm a political animal (.) that's why I did politics and so *I used to do anti-racist anti-fascist stuff like* and my music was The Specials (.) two-tone and reggae (.) and stuff like (.) I also had message and consciousness stuff

K: I think *when I was growing up you wouldn't* have seen English food (.) it would have been once in a while you'd go to the chip shop and have some chips the rest of the time it would be CURRY CURRY CURRY CURRY CURRY CURRY CURRY and now you've got there's food and there's cultural references (.) *growing up in the 70s if you'd* gone into an Asian house you would have been like oh my gosh (.) this is a bit stark y'know there'd have been sort of different feel (.) and they [*his children*] would have felt the difference so they're not they're able to cope they don't notice it as vastly different

The three men grew up in areas with high-density community populations and so it is unsurprising that the descriptions of their childhoods should make reference to 'community' and 'tradition'. But I argue that the *way* they construct their narratives allows them to perform the habitus of 'past members' of their communities, giving them some authority to comment as second-generationals. By emphasising the 'past' of their involvements with their communities, they are also highlighting the more 'monocultural' (British) nature of their present lives, compared with their 'bicultural' upbringings. Whereas in the past they took part in religious observances, went shopping in Asian shops, had relatives dropping in, lived in houses that were rather "stark", now they all live in middle-class, mostly-white areas, with middle-class habits. By evoking a chronotope, they highlight the evolution to their current life and their self in interview-time. The cumulative effect is also that they tie the present time with an 'easier' South Asian community with regards food and practices, but, in Paresh's view, less political engagement or fewer political issues: an unobtrusive and 'passive' community.

7.1.2 Uncommon stories

Nick's narrative below shows a contrast. He places his involvement with the Goan community also in the past, but shows some uncertainty of his knowledge. Firstly, he talks in the present tense to describe the Goan community, and begins speaking about his childhood after my prompt:

N: so regarding the Goan community (.) I would say that it's pretty much religious religious celebrations (.) y'know standard stuff (.) but also the religious celebrations that are to do with stages in development first of all baptisms First Holy Communions confirmations weddings funerals (.) not that that's a celebration (.) and also Christmas Easter New Year's

S: and did your family used to participate in a lot of these celebrations or gatherings? was the community quite strong where you were growing up or

N: YEAH (.) I would say so I mean um my uncle was a member of this club (.) not really a club but an institution called Simba which were um Goans in the UK and I remember very clearly that there were lots and lots of people attending those (.) attending the Christmas parties New Year's parties (.) all the time up until (2) I mean now I've sort of stopped going when I was in my early twenties I suppose there's a lot happening (.) I don't know if there is so much now because I suppose the younger generation is not so interested in that particular aspect of our community but it was (.) it was VERY STRONG

He talks about other family members ("my uncle"), religious observances ("First Communion", "baptisms") and large numbers of community members ("I remember very clearly that there were lots and lots of people attending"): all features which are shown in the other extracts. But by bringing the discussion back to the present day "I suppose there's a lot happening", he links his past with his present. He follows with a question about how 'strong' the community is now, and reminds us that "it was very strong", showing how Nick does not exclude the present from his reflections on the community. Unlike the three participants previously, he does not construct his narrative to show a disassociation with his past life: his present engagement with his community may remain at a similar level. Further, he introduces some element of doubt or incomplete knowledge ("I don't know", "I suppose") which does not give him an air of an 'authority'. He makes no mention that "Simba" ('lion' in Swahili) could indicate that the club his uncle belonged to was composed of Kenyan Goans. Despite the clearly large community of Goans, Nick does not see his narrative as 'fitting in' with the traditional story of migration: the Heritage Language Konkani did not feature much when he was growing up, and Catholicism is not viewed as an Asian religion. He shows awareness, as do others, that his narrative would be considered 'unusual' for a second-generation South Asian.

Later in his interview Nick makes a reference to how he views his present life as more 'multicultural' than his past life:

S: OK and just about Norway and your life in Norway um is there an Indian community in Norway I mean are there people like that in Norway?

N: not very much (.) um the area in which I live is considered the kind of area with a lot of immigrants (.) there are a lot of Indian people here there are a lot of sweet shops Indian sweet shops there are restaurants butchers halal butchers (.) there are a lot of shop owners in this area who have fruit vegetable areas so it's IRONIC RIGHT (laughs) [Laughs-yeah!] I feel quite COMFORTABLE living here

He lists a series of aspects that could well describe the areas that Devinder, Kamran and Paresh grew up in: lots of Indian people, sweet shops, halal butchers, restaurants, shop owners. And he views that he is an adult 'living the life of an immigrant' as "ironic", an implicit reference to how his life *now* falls into an expected migrant narrative. His comment that he feels "quite comfortable" should be seen in the context of the other extracts that I have shown where he has discussed his troubled history with his 'identity': being able to 'muck in' with traditional migrants is a self-assuring situation.

In the interviews with Joshua, Padma and Mumtaz, most of the time the phrase "growing up" appears in my *questions* rather than their responses ("when you were growing up…?"). Below I show one example from Mumtaz's interview:

S: but saying that you said that you (.) did you still (.) did you go to FUNCTIONS y'know Asian functions when [MMM] you were growing up

M: a bit only FAMILY ones really and my parents had a few friends and we would do things with them but OVERALL no like especially now I see like my cousins live in Lichfield and one of them lives in Bradford

In response to my question, Mumtaz emphasises that as a child her family did not attend the large "Asian functions" associated with large communities: she describes attending "family"

events, and gatherings with a small circle ("my parents had a few friends and we would do things with them"). Rather than remaining in her "growing up"-time, she ties this situation with the present day ("especially now"), where she meets with her cousins, rather than a larger community.

Padma uses the phrase "growing up" only once in her response locating her narrative in India:

Pm: we'd go back to India every four years when we were small and each time we went back at least two weeks of a summer holiday would be spent learning classical music or learning scales and all that and a little bit of **Bharatanatayam** just a little bit (.) so there were SIGNS that she [*her mother*] wanted us not to lose touch with all of that but I don't think language was necessarily an issue when we were growing up (.) she knew that we COULD do it if we wanted to

And below, where the extract refers to her childhood in Manchester, already shown in full in Chapter 6:

Pm: we would go to the temple here in Whalley Range um but the difference was that we were from South India […] and then when we'd go back to India like I said every four years we would go to our family's temple and of [indistinct] all those things

While Padma uses the modal 'would' and the phrase 'used to' to locate the actions as 'finished' past, she moves quickly to highlighting the differences between her family and the rest of the 'community': "but the difference was that we were from South India". The cumulative effect of these two extracts is for Padma to locate her past as being 'Indian in Britain', rather than 'British Indian'. I argue that Padma constructs her narrative to show that she is aware that her back-story does not fall into the traditional South Asian migrant to Britain Discourse, but she highlights the

very strong links to India that her family maintained and the deep cultural exposure ("Bharatanatayam", her Brahmin mother) she had.

I use all the examples I have shown in this section to argue that the way that the participants construct their back-story illustrates whether they feel they 'fit in' with the Discourse of South Asian migration to the UK in the 1960s and 1970s. But it also shows their *awareness* of such a Discourse, and its strength.

7.2 Threshold

In this section, I show how some participants use discourse features including "I remember", until-clauses, or when-clauses in such a way as to lend the chronotope they are evoking with an element of significant change, a threshold. Their proficiency in the Heritage Language, their decisions to pass it on or not to their children, their religious affiliations, their identification with 'their' community or with being South Asian, their sense of identity (or self) are discussed using language which evokes a cross-roads or decisive moment (a threshold). By using discourse features which produce this effect, they highlight their awareness that they may be 'judged' for their decisions: in the interview situation they move towards understanding that decision themselves — the 'making sense' that Schüpbach (2009) describes — but also explaining it to me as a researcher.

7.2.1 Change and language

Going to school

In the extracts in this section, I have italicised key phrases. Firstly, in the extract below, Paresh is talking about the languages the family spoke in the home:

P: I suppose we spoke in Gujarati (.) that was our first language *until I went to school really* but then I spoke English and I suppose over time became more proficient in English but in the home it was always Gujarati (.) Mum spoke very little English and Dad spoke a bit more but not a great amount (.) so I suppose I was the one who helped them communicate with the outside world in terms of reading stuff that would come through or (.) yeah dealing with OFFICIALDOM I suppose but in the house it was always Gujarati (/) y'know we didn't really speak English.

Paresh's use of the time expression "until I went to school" presents his narrative as a before-and-after: there was a turning point before which English was not present in the house. He highlights the need for at least one person to speak English: that he needed to become a conduit between the outside world and his family home. He gives himself some agency as a person who was then given the responsibility to liaise between his parents and the "outside world" and "officialdom": he thus describes himself as a language broker, a child who interprets for their parents (some recent literature investigating this practice commonly found in migrant families are Bauer (2016) and Orellano and Phoenix (2016)).

Among the notes that Paresh gave me after his first interview were the comments that his parents hired a tutor to ensure that his English was of a high standard. Again, he links the proficiency he has attained in English (and subsequent loss of proficiency in Gujarati) with 'necessity', and with his parents' desire for him to succeed.

Devinder speaks about his early years below:

D: we spoke **Punjabi** at home **Punjabi** is my first language my mum didn't speak any English and my dad spoke a little English and then I must have picked up English *when I went to primary school and I remember* having special lessons for reading when I was 8 or 9 so I must have been a bit behind in terms of the English

Devinder links a significant change in his language use to a specific age in his early life ("I remember […] when I was 8 or 9"), as well as to a general time period of "when I went to

primary school". He constructs his narrative so that the age of "8 or 9" is seen as a threshold for his *English* usage: before this his English was regarded as below par. In this extract, therefore, Devinder uses the onset of schooling as an explanation of why he speaks 'good' English, rather than why he speaks 'bad' Punjabi. Devinder depicts himself as achieving his present-day high proficiency in English *despite* having parents with little or no fluency in the language: he needed some extra 'help' when he was of primary-school age. This ties in with how he has constructed his childhood as falling into the traditional image of migration, and having parents whose knowledge of the host language is deficient. Being born in the UK and going to school did not guarantee Devinder's proficiency in English ("I must have been a bit behind in terms of the English"); the "special lessons for reading" are evidence for a need to improve his English skills. His parents are not shown explicitly as 'helping' him achieve this proficiency in English (as Paresh shows in his narrative) and this chimes with Devinder's 'larger' narrative of conflict with his parents, as I show in Chapter 8.

Padma narrows a threshold from a general period of time to a specific event, again introducing it with the "I remember" structure:

Pm: *I distinctly remember* my mum coming home and telling us we were still in primary between five or six

S: so this was in a private girls' school

Pm: private girls' school

S: in the 70s it would be by now

Pm: mmm late 60s early 70s it must have been late 60s (.) that the headmistress at primary had told her that we should not be speaking **Tamil** at home that it would retard it would slow down our development in English and she was ANGRY about it she was upset about it but I also know that they were sort of CONFLICTED in the sense that they wanted us to fit in they wanted us to do as well as we possibly can and yet they weren't sure how to negotiate all of that with the

> language so my sister and I would speak English well siblings we would speak English I could speak passable **Tamil** with my parents

Padma uses the phrase "I distinctly remember" to validate the authenticity of her anecdote, and also specifies her age ("between five or six") as well as the time period, correcting my interjection in the process ("it must have been late 60s"). By including the school ("the headmistress at primary") as an actor in her story, Padma ties the decline in her use of Tamil to the actions of an external agent on her parents, described as "upset" and "conflicted" over the possible damage their use of Tamil in the home would cause their children's proficiency in English ("they wanted us to fit in"). Padma continues with "so", constructing her narrative as a cause-effect: that the direct effect of the headmistress's edicts is that she and her siblings assumed the lingua franca of English between them. She therefore attributes her present-day limited proficiency in Tamil (but high proficiency in English) as being at least partly a product of 'the times', society.

The three examples show how for these participants the decline in their proficiency in their Heritage Language, and/or the assumption of English as the language which they have most mastery in, requires some explaining, in the participants' views, but for different reasons. Their narratives are thus constructed to show an external reason instead of a personal, self-directed decision, such as antipathy to learn/maintain the Heritage Language or a personal desire to integrate into Anglophone society.

Growing up and growing older

While the examples above tried to 'explain' how my participants have obtained proficiency in English, what do their narratives show of their relationship with their Heritage Languages now?

Kamran is talking about his use of Punjabi, and Mumtaz about her use of Urdu below. Significant phrases are italicised:

K: *when I hit* the classic teen period from say fourteen to sixteen my language very much dipped my communication sort of FELL AWAY *and then* it felt like sort of MAGICALLY it REAPPEARED [laughs].

M: oh yeah probably *as a teenager* I tried not to use it in front of my friends talking to my parents in front of my friends when you feel awkward *but once I started university* I was absolutely fine I think there were just a few years in between when I found it y'know I was trying hard to fit in really I just y'know *as a child* I wasn't bothered and then *as young adult* I wasn't bothered it was in between the awkward years as I say I probably shied away from it

Both Kamran and Mumtaz above construct their narratives so there are two moments of change or threshold. Kamran uses the metaphor "when I hit" to describe a sudden, steep decline in his use of Punjabi ("my communication sort of fell away"). He indicates another threshold, again using metaphor, to describe how he started using Punjabi again ("it […] magically reappeared"). Mumtaz also talks about a reticence at using Urdu ("in front of my friends") and sandwiches these "awkward years" between two moments of change: "once I started university" and "as a teenager".

Both Kamran and Mumtaz construct their narratives in such a way so as to show that their Heritage Language use did not remain consistent over their life: there can be periods, such as adolescence, when the use of the language may constitute another domain of teenage angst such as appearance. But they also show that the relationship that they have with their Heritage Language is unlike a 'first language': it is regarded as something that can be put aside (for example, 'not in front of friends') and picked up again ("it magically reappeared"). The language is then less a means to communicate, but more an additional facet to their lives. It is not 'necessary' and is not cited as playing an essential role in their current achievements.

They also reveal that their perception of their relationship with the Heritage Language differs from a mother-tongue or first language. Devinder still speaks Punjabi with his parents,

but because their relationship is fractious, and because his parents spend half of the year in Canada where his brother is settled, these visits are "infrequent and last no more than half an hour". I have shown and will show later that Devinder has a positive relationship with Punjabi, and hence my question:

S: do you miss it ? do you miss speaking Punjabi more now?

D: that's quite an interesting question I DO probably miss some aspects of it because I used to quite ENJOY speaking it but I do feel frustration I didn't have a wider vocabulary and I'm interested in words themselves and sounds of words but I didn't have the language

Our discussion, instigated by my question, treats the language as a 'relationship': I could replace "it" with "her". Devinder brings back the discussion to 'language', mentioning "wider vocabulary", "sounds of words", but his tenses swing from present to past ("I do feel frustration", "I didn't have the language") so that this complex 'relationship' is very much alive, just as feelings between partners might persist after the end of a relationship.

Paresh who also self-reports as being fairly fluent in Gujarati explains his current relationship with his Heritage Language:

P: I don't practise enough and because I'm not exposed to it enough […] we used to go to the older sister's house *but after my mum passed away then* we had a bit of a fall out so I only see my brother and sister in Bracknell

Paresh constructs his narrative so that his lack of practice and exposure to Gujarati is linked to the change in sibling dynamics that occurred after their last parent died ("but after my mum passed away"). There followed a decline in gatherings at his older sister's house, which had become a substitute space for the parental home when his parents had retired to India.

Joshua brings up a change in family dynamics as well, but in relation to his children's engagement with Bengali:

J: they [*his children*] know my mum they see my parents every one or two weeks um they are aware of Bengali as a language and my mum's taught them some simple words and [oh] food and numbers (.) that that's probably when they were a bit younger (.) hasn't been so much now (.) there's been a bit of a change in my family dynamics *because my mother's been particularly unwell over the last year* (.) so I think that kind of because all of that came from my mother (.) so that's taken on hold really this last year (.) they haven't had so much exposure because that's how my mother's been unwell and but we're planning on going back to India next year and try to maintain a bit of a link (.) so even if they don't, they're not Bengali speakers because to be honest I've become so rusty

Joshua describes his Bengali as "rusty", but reveals that it is also important for him to "maintain a bit of a link" to India with his children. As well as language, maintaining connections with the children's grandparents and the homeland constitute his efforts to instil a sense of being part-Bengali in his children. A change has resulted with his mother's illness. Joshua, despite self-reporting a very low proficiency in Bengali, despite considering himself "more English than Indian" (a point I mention again later) has both visited India with his wife and family (twice to my knowledge in the last four years) and encouraged his children to use Bengali (with his mother as facilitator). He also spent nearly every summer until the age of eighteen in Calcutta, and has travelled in India as an adult. Unlike Devinder, Kamran and Paresh whose links with the homeland became rather tenuous when their parents moved to the UK, Joshua's family, as have Padma's and Mumtaz's — all participants whose parents were highly educated professionals and fluent in English — had a constant point of reference with India. Joshua evokes his perception of being Indian as very personal and familial, rather than linked to a 'community' or to belonging to

a wider British South Asian group: rather than framing his narrative as being a story of diaspora, it becomes one family's story.

Padma describes her changed relationship with her Heritage Language as a result of her declining proficiency, and shows some regret at not passing it on to her children:

Pm: there was lots of encouragement [*to speak in Tamil*] when we went back [*to India*] not necessarily from our own peers but from our aunts uncles grandparents family friends of my parents' generation who would really instil in us come on you must be speaking Tamil and they would insist that you must speak in Tamil (.) but the kids the kids were completely different we'd just read cartoons watch cartoons and read comics and watch films and that was our language um

S: and did you respond in Tamil was that

Pm: yes I did and I don't remember feeling uncomfortable about it and I'm only saying that now because NOW I'm INTENSELY UNCOMFORTABLE and I'VE REALLY LOST CONTACT with that Tamil and I can't pass it on to my kids in the way that my brother certainly has been able to but also my sister is much more committed to I mean that's something when she formally learnt Tamil she bought herself some primers and took some classes I can't remember where she was (.) she taught her husband her husband can read Tamil he's WHITE ENGLISH but he can read Tamil and so she sort of made that investment in keeping the language going and I didn't (.) but there were times when y'know it wasn't uncomfortable to be using that language

Padma speaks frankly about how her proficiency has affected her kids ("I can't pass it on to my kids") and how she feels about being in a Tamil-speaking environment ("I'm intensely uncomfortable"). But she also indicates that she is aware of what might be expected from her: the Discourse that South Asians in Britain are bilingual and maintain the Heritage Language in the home (as her brother who had an arranged marriage does, albeit back in India), and that in a mixed marriage the children will not only be bicultural but bilingual as well (as with her sister's situation). I discuss further the issue of passing the language down to children, in more detail in

the following section and show how they also show more insight into the realities of these 'bilingual' families.

Parenthood

Another threshold moment is constructed around parenthood. Below the participants talk about when they had children.

D: I mean Emily raised the issue when our daughters were born that maybe I should speak **Punjabi** with them so they learn a second language but I didn't really feel comfortable about I didn't really feel confident in my **Punjabi** so I didn't really want to do that with them because I think my vocabulary is quite restricted and when you trying to teach nouns and naming all the objects some of the words my parents used were in English

P: see Susan my wife wanted me to speak Gujarati to them when they were born but I didn't feel well I didn't well confident enough to say my Gujarati is interspersed with English and there's lots of times when I'm not really sure what the Gujarati word or the Gujarati term is can't be ar can't be bothered really it wasn't an important issue for me […] that's the lack of confidence in the language it wasn't anything else

K: when our eldest was about two or so well I tried more from encouragement from my wife she said you have another language why don't you so I tried talking with him and he'd be like UGGH DAD what are these strange noises you're making [laughs] he was literally like (.) he was still a baby but he was slightly {MAKES A FACE] [laughs] CONFUSED by it so I'd try saying words like (.) and then I thought WHY AM I DOING THIS? it's not my language in terms of my every day (.) it's not how I think and sort of (.) and we've had a bit of ups and downs about this and conversations about this my wife often says you could have taught them and I was like it's not my mother tongue effectively (.) it IS my mother tongue but it's not my FIRST language

The wives of three men above will have had experience of extended family networks, and will have seen their husbands 'performing' in the language. From personal experience, I know that their performance might have given their spouses an over-inflated view of their abilities in the language! While previously he has spoken of his comfortable proficiency in Punjabi, now Devinder casts doubt on his proficiency ("I didn't feel confident") and describes his vocabulary as being "restricted". Similarly, although Paresh has described himself as a fairly proficient speaker of Gujarati, he now downplays his fluency ("my Gujarati is interspersed with English") as well as his confidence ("I didn't feel […] confident enough"). What he also suggests is that, while language transmission is of great interest in academic studies, he did not have much interest in teaching the children Gujarati: "can't be ar[sed?] can't be bothered really it wasn't an important issue for me". His wife, as the non-Gujarati speaker showed more interest.
Kamran constructs this section of his narrative so that his attempts to speak Punjabi are very much bound with his wife's desire not his; and that the period of time during which the language could have been passed on has now elapsed ("my wife often says you could have taught them"). I show in Chapter 9 how Kamran compares his children with his brother's, but below I show that Padma returns to comparisons with her sibling's families (in the case below, her sister's) to express a regret that she has not passed Tamil on to her children:

Pm: when the kids were born something really shifted partly I guess because having children means more becoming more responsible when the kids were born and I feel it now they've lost that link that linguistic and I'm responsible for them losing that link and I look at my sister and I would like to be more like that

Later in the interview I asked her to clarify her comments about her sister and her sister's children:

S: what do her kids do in terms of the language? does she speak to them in **Tamil**?

Pm: she HAS taught them a lot more they can't FUNCTION in **Tamil** I wouldn't have thought but they can speak a lot more so they are a lot more a lot more of the BABY words and a lot more phrases a lot more than I first done with mine

S: but it's still a foreign

Pm: it's STILL a foreign language because BASICALLY it would just be the three of them talking to each other and her husband interjecting the five or six phrases that he knows and I think it's really that that there's no reason no strong REASON to be speaking this language other than to preserve that heritage

While she returns to the idea of the new experience of parenthood ("more than I [had] first done with mine"), reiterating that her sister has taught her children more Tamil, she now elaborates that these are "baby words" and "phrases", and describes her nieces and nephews as 'passive' users: "they can't function in Tamil". She continues to agree with my interjection ("it's still a foreign language"), and in an echo of her comments on how when she was growing up she didn't "need" to speak Tamil either in Madras or Manchester, she says: "there's no reason, no strong reason to be speaking this language".

In this section of her narrative, with me as a supportive conversational partner, therefore, she eschews the more regretful tone of earlier, rationalising language learning for two main reasons: to fulfil a function or to preserve a heritage. Neither of these she finds a strong enough reason to engage with Tamil. While earlier she may have been trying to give some credence to a Discourse and measure herself against that, in what I term a more 'romantic' way, when I make it clear that I am not testing her against that Discourse, she is more willing to be pragmatic. Later in the interview, I asked whether her husband had initiated a discussion on whether the Heritage Language should be taught to the children:

S: and when you went back to India when the kids were young as a family were there any moments then when he said y'know you seem very comfortable with **Tamil** should we be doing [no] this at home or

Pm: NO I think he knew me well enough by then NO I think he knew me well enough that I had sort of y'know who I AM is who I AM or who I WAS was who I WAS

Padma constructs her response so that the lack of transmission of her Heritage Language to her children is closely bound with her sense of self: another reason it could be called, alongside function and heritage, for language learning. She shows that despite her parents' strong connections with India, despite the frequent family holidays to India, despite her siblings' proficiency and affection for Tamil, Padma feels that the Heritage Language plays a small role in *her* sense of self, her identity. Her narrative has evolved in the interview, from being regretful of the children losing "that link", to being pragmatic and recognising they do not need the language as it serves no real purpose, to defining an identity: a mother for whom passing on Tamil does not feature high in a list of priorities.

While Devinder has already cited his lack of confidence with Punjabi as a reason for not passing on his Heritage Language, he also mentioned that he "felt uncomfortable". He returns to this sentiment later in that same section of his interview:

D: but I felt uncomfortable about teaching them **Punjabi** as well because I didn't want them to be too exposed to my parents [mm] enough for them to have a conversation with them in **Punjabi**

Devinder continues by saying that his parents who spoke in Punjabi to his first daughter (from his first, arranged, marriage) used to call his daughter "fat" and tell her she was "not clever". He wants to avoid his younger daughters having a similar experience. He thus affords the Heritage Language with another function: as a tool for communication or, by its removal, a tool for severing communication. It is also seen very much like a 'linguistic link', not only to the culture

(as Padma exemplifies) or a heritage but to certain people, such as grandparents. This very prosaic use, however, can have more concrete 'effects', negative and positive, than a more grandiose, romantic wish for a link to a culture.

7.2.2 Change and religion

While to different degrees the participants talk about their relationship with their Heritage Language with a need for explaining the current situation, what was also very present in their early lives was religion. Religious affiliation is a cornerstone of identification in South Asian culture, as Joshua himself alludes below. He is talking about how he considers himself more "English" than "Indian":

J: I'm uh I'm not a religious man y'know I'm not particularly spiritual so that side of India doesn't come into my day-to-day life (.) in fact I'm totally um um I very much an ATHEIST so there is no sort of spirituality that is a large part of India so that doesn't enter things

While he uses some hesitation noises ("um") these are in keeping with his general style of speaking, rather than being an indication that he was uncomfortable during this extract. In the examples I show, the loss of religious affiliation, which all the participants except for Mumtaz report, is not delivered with the same emotional involvement or 'soul-searching' that the loss/decline/lack of passing the Heritage Language is given. Paresh emphasises that he continues with certain rituals if duty arises and so shows that he fulfilled his filial duty (another cornerstone in South Asian culture), but does not frame his loss of religious affiliation with a turning-point or specific moment:

S: and did you have a religious affiliation or do you have a religious affiliation

P: NO well YEAH I DID when I was growing up (.) I was a Hindu raised a Hindu (.) ALWAYS a Hindu I suppose but um not uh yeah not practising

S: um

P: NO but I do do the things I need to do if I need to them (.) for example both parents have passed away now

S: oh

P: yeah uh so I did all the rituals

S: when they died?

P: when they died and I'll go to the **mandir** when I go to London (.) I'm not that bothered about going to church or temple (.) I mean if I go to church I'll light a candle for Jan's mum but I'm not religious in any sense really

Mumtaz self-reports as Muslim, but as I show below she is quick to point out that she is not pious or completely observant:

S: but growing up y'know because your parents made SURE in whatever way they made sure that you were both fluent in the language [yes] you're you're a PRACTISING Muslim I THINK↑ or at least [I'm not] you were [I AM] brought UP [YES↓ YEAH↓]

M: yes I WAS I mean I don't FAST and I don't PRAY regularly but [mm] it doesn't mean I don't know HOW [no] to and if I'm ever really STUCK I start sort of praying in my head

S: well you're sort of like me the way I'm CATHOLIC is probably the way you're MUSLIM {laughs}

Two participants frame the loss of religious affiliation with a chronotope of threshold, as I show below, but the threshold event is one of a *release*. Below Devinder talks about his "great relief":

D: yeah so yeah so things changed a little bit when we moved to Sheffield (1) we had some relatives there who'd bought a shop in Sheffield and there wasn't a TEMPLE a Sikh temple a

GURDWARA in Sheffield and so we didn't go frequently anymore and so the whole lifestyle CHANGED (1) the shop was open seven days a week and everything revolved around the shop so that kind of Sikh identity diminished significantly (2) to my great RELIEF! (laughs)

Pm: I would recite every night I would recite **Sanskrit** prayers which I still have in my head I can do it like THAT and y'know I remember being about fifteen and realising I had NO IDEA what this means I had no idea what these words mean and I can't do that so mauvaise foi BAD FAITH as such I don't if it was actually something else that was happening if it was a kind of SIBLING RIVALRY or A REBELLION I have no idea but I DO remember making a conscious decision I'm not going to do this anymore so I would go through the motions when I was at home but as soon as I left to go to university that was it I stopped completely

While Devinder begins his narrative with referring to a small change ("things changed a little bit"), through the rest of this extract he details fairly large changes before acknowledging at the end that the result was a 'significant' change in what he regarded his Sikh identity. The changes were mostly practical: there was no gurdwara in the near vicinity in Sheffield, so the family's visits became less frequent, particularly as their life "revolved around the shop". Consequently, the move to Sheffield is framed as a chronotope of threshold after which "that kind of Sikh identity diminished significantly".

Padma frames the threshold very much as personal journey towards honesty ("I can't do that mauvaise foi"). Padma uses the phrase "I remember" and later "I do remember making a conscious decision" once again to construct her narrative so that there is significance relating to a change, in this case a recognition of her lack of belief in Hinduism, at the age of fifteen. Once she left her parents' home she was free to abandon the pretence: "as soon as I left to go to university that was it I stopped completely". Padma frames this change as a very personal decision.

None of the participants cite their partners as encouraging them to teach their children the faith, as some partners have encouraged them to teach the Heritage Language. Even when Kamran related how he asked his wife to convert to Islam (as I show in Chapter 9) he frames it as being for convenience's sake. There seems to be therefore, less of a 'trauma' surrounding the loss of religious affiliation. The change happens gradually and so may not warrant a threshold event, and if it does (as with Devinder and Padma) it is seen as a positive 'loss'. Why do the participants construct their narratives in this way? One reason could be that, knowing my field is linguistics, they do not feel this area is 'relevant'. Another reason could be that by being 'plugged into' British society, they know that a lack of orthodox religion will not be regarded negatively; with "Eastern" religions regarded as being very much the 'other'.

I argue, however, that this is another way the participants show how different their current lives are from their upbringings. But, further, they are also emphasising the difference from the life they might have lived if their parents had not placed them in the diaspora. They are also showing awareness of the sub-continent where, while religion is certainly important, peoples group together predominantly on a linguistic and regional basis (Hindu Punjabis versus Hindu Tamils). Their community gatherings (in the diaspora) as children were the same: primarily linguistically and regionally based, rather than based on religion. Their affiliation with these communities, therefore, in the diaspora is manifested more strongly through the language.

7.2.3 University experiences

In speaking of their young adult lives, the space of university is evoked in all the participants' narratives, except for Paresh's. Below, I show extracts from the narratives of Devinder and Mumtaz:

D: yeah in terms of university uh it was very much a fresh beginning {yeah} um I was anticipating that so I was prepared to make friends with anyone I made a few kind of friends mostly sort of

white friends[…] towards the end of my first year in my undergraduate of my first year I met an Asian guy↑ and became very good friends with him and he was probably MY FIRST ASIAN FRIEND he really helped develop my consciousness of myself […]That was a KEY turning point for me then becoming AWARE and I was 22 then because I went to university at 21 but I was 22 in November so effectively [mmm] I was in my early twenties so it was LATE to realise this the politics of the self

M: when I went to uni actually that was probably the FIRST EXPOSURE I had to any ASIAN sort of INDIAN or (.) because where we lived was very white middle-class area […]when I went to uni I was I was really I'd never been exposed to that CLIQUEY FACTOR↑ [mm] that seems to GO ON and there was a LOT of that […] and there were a lot of ASIANS but I REALLY didn't fit the MOULD I went to ONE meeting of what they called the ASIAN SOCIETY and it just so wasn't for ME I just found it really ALIEN to me

For young ethnic minorities, university is a space where they enter the wider society. In Li Wei's study of three Chinese youths (2011), university was a space where, for the first time, these youths connected with other British Chinese and, unlike in the complementary Cantonese schools they attended, were allowed to speak English. In a different way, my participants were thrown together with non-Asians but also other Asians from various parts of the UK, from various backgrounds, and who were not family members.

Both participants above construct their narratives so that with these threshold encounters/events came a greater understanding of their sense of self or even their place in the wider British South Asian community. As a result of that threshold, in his current life Devinder does not 'hide' his background in his publications but embraces it; in her current life, Mumtaz does not subscribe to a cliquey behaviour. In the extracts above again they use a chronotope of threshold to explain how they have chosen their behaviours today.

I end this chapter, and the discourse analysis sections of my thesis, with an extract from Nick's narrative. Below he is speaking of his first visit to India, for work, for a trade fair a few years ago.

N: it was very moving when I was there to see that [*he is referring to poverty*] (.) that and just how DIFFERENT Indian culture is to European culture and how many people are there and just like (2) I mean I'm sure you're familiar with these kinds of things but when you have these events there's always a lot of activity and you always need before they start and there are always people setting up their BOOTHS and that sort of stuff (.) and I remember outside there were MASSIVE rolls of carpets HUGE rolls of carpets and in between those massive rolls of carpets that were stacked up against each other PEOPLE were sleeping in between those carpets (.) taking a break (.) and also you had these MASSIVE hoardings for companies or what have you and then behind those hoardings in the hall people were COOKING preparing FLOWERS I mean it was just ANY kind of space that is FREE or available can be utilised for something (.) and I don't know just that kind of INTENSITY that INTENSITY of life I'd never seen that anywhere before.

Nick grew up without much exposure to his Heritage Language Konkani, and unlike all the other participants, his parents arrived in the UK from Kenya, not the subcontinent. I have already shown in the two previous chapters how Nick has had difficulties from both white and South Asian sections of society. While he speaks very much as if he were an outsider ("just how different Indian culture is to European culture and how many people are there"), and uses the past tense to evoke a chronotope ("I remember outside there were massive rolls of carpet"), in the here-and-now of the interview he also uses the present tense at times, bringing in the there-and-then and using an inclusive 'you' ("when you have these events there's always a lot of activity and you always need before they start and there are always people setting up their BOOTHS and that sort of stuff"). The overall effect of his swinging between tenses and his vivid and detailed description of his memories from his visit to India, is as if he is re-living the

moment and awakening to his greater narrative: that, no matter what his journey might have been, or how he may be regarded by others, he is still a member of the diaspora from a complex subcontinent.

7.3. Conclusion

I have shown in this chapter that when the participants speak of their lives, they perform the habitus of a member of a diaspora, emphasising the transnational, bicultural and bilingual aspects of their pasts, and contrasting this with their more 'mono-cultural' present-day. They are also aware of whether or not their life stories, past and present, fit into an expected Discourse of British South Asians: in some instances, for example Padma's musings on not passing Tamil to her children, they show that they regard the interviews as a platform on which to explain or justify why and how their lives deviate from these Discourses. By charging certain turning-points in their lives with emotion, they show awareness that they may be 'judged' for being the people they are today and need to present their life-stories in a persuasive way.

A loss in proficiency in their Heritage Language, or a low proficiency, is sometimes explained through external agents (for example the ideology of the school), and changes in the use of the Heritage Language are often explained through threshold moments: school, becoming a teenager, becoming a parent. While some participants self-report a high proficiency in the Heritage Language, they also describe how use of and proficiency in the language can change, alongside attitudes towards it: proficiency in it or not can be linked to a sense of 'self', rather than a South Asian 'identity'. Discussions which touch on identity show that as young adults, participants could also feel 'tested' when sent out of the family home: and that this sense of being tested did not always occur back in the homeland, but within the place of settlement among larger groups of British South Asians, a setting where a Discourse of British Asian will be particularly strong.

My participants have the resources to construct their narratives in such a way to offer insights into the choices, decisions, negotiations and compromises, that people like themselves will have made and are still making in their multi-spatial, cross-cultural lives. The reasons are not always grand — a choice of a culture or an identity as a South Asian — but can be more prosaic, and more connected to the very specific circumstances of their personal lives.

8. My Heritage Language: Narratives of Devinder and Mumtaz

In the previous chapters I have shown how discourse analysis of the collection of the participants' narratives can reveal common themes, give insights into their lives, and expose strategies that the participants employ when telling their life stories. In the next two chapters I address my contention that the participants construct their narratives with a purpose in mind, revealed when the narratives are examined as a whole, as a macro-narrative. However, I also argue that the participants have separate threads running through their narratives, which taken together contribute to the macro-narrative they present. In the next chapter I present one such macro-narrative, that of Kamran. In this chapter, however, I examine one thread ─ the story of the Heritage Language ─ from two narratives, showing how the 'whole' story about one particular element of their life story, a micro-narrative, can be used for further understanding of that element. I focus on the micro-narratives that two participants, Devinder and Mumtaz, construct about their learning of their Heritage Language, and the decisions surrounding whether to maintain and pass it on to their children.

8.1 Devinder's narrative

8.1.1 Speaking the vernacular

Devinder self-reports as being proficient in Punjabi: below I discuss his descriptions of his linguistic abilities, taken from the middle of his first interview.

S: so when you went to India those two times that you mentioned were you comfortable to communicate with people in Punjabi y'know did that was that quite straightforward?

D: yeah I think I probably felt quite proud that I could communicate with them in **Punjabi** and that they could understand me because they'd always be mocking all people who live in England all

the Indians they can't speak **Punjabi** any more yet me and my brother could so I felt quite GOOD about that and no one sort of made fun of me when I spoke **Punjabi** in the villages whereas they were very openly MOCKING of people and they would have if they felt my **Punjabi** wasn't good enough.

S: so they considered your Punjabi good?

D: maybe yeah probably I assume they probably did (.) maybe they made fun of me behind my back but (.) I could tell my accent was different but they weren't using any words that I didn't understand so I assume their **Punjabi** was very basic like mine to be a sort of child's level of language [laughs] {laughs}

The reception of the people in the village back home is seen as a barometer of how good his Punjabi is: "I felt quite good about that. They would have [mocked me] if they felt my Punjabi wasn't good enough". But he then continues to show more texture: he could 'hear' that his accent was different from the other villagers but with regards to vocabulary there was parity. He then reassesses their level of language: "I assume their Punjabi was very basic like mine to be a sort of child's level of language".

Later, Devinder spoke of when his family moved to Sheffield, and the accompanying change in their lives, which now revolved around the business and its opening hours. There was also a decline in attendance to the Gurdwara, the Sikh temple, and a curtailed involvement with other members of the community. There was no network of relatives as there had been in Hayes/Southall, and the family began to meet Sikhs who did not belong to their family circle. Devinder opens the extract below by describing his proficiency in the language, which he has earlier described as "absolutely identical" with his brother:

D: so we [*Devinder and his brother*] both just SPOKE **Punjabi** we never learnt how to read it or write it (.) err our parents never taught us how to read and write it and there wasn't a school nearby where you could learn it um and yeah so we have the equivalent VERNACULAR ability in

> Punjabi so I think we're both equally aware that our **Punjabi** isn't good at all because as we got older we met more SOPHISTICATED **Punjabis** proper **Punjabi**- speakers and we became aware that even when I was I was probably about 16 17 moved to Sheffield we met one or two people who spoke **Punjabi** differently

He moves from describing himself and his brother as agents ("we never learnt to read and write it") to assigning agency to his parents, "our parents never taught us". In this way he highlights a common scenario for second-generation children: that whether they learn the Heritage Language or not, or how much they learn of it, depends largely on the parents' (the first generation's) family language policy (King and Fogle, 2006), or on logistics ("there wasn't a school nearby"). His awareness that he is not literate in Punjabi pervades his narrative: here he describes his proficiency as "vernacular". The use of this term indexes not only the type of language that he used, but also social class: "vernacular" is most often used when speaking of working-class communities (Rampton, 2010). Just as he attributed the positive reception to his Punjabi in the village in the homeland to the fact that he was interacting with speakers at "basic" level, here he continues to define himself in opposition to more proficient, in a different sense, speakers: "sophisticated Punjabis" who were "proper Punjabi speakers".

Devinder thus binds re-calibration of his proficiency to a growing awareness of his parents' limited knowledge of "sophisticated", or cultural aspects of Punjabi Sikh culture, and stagnant engagement with the latter: this, despite their being born and brought up in India. While other participants such as Kamran, Padma and Paresh, have talked about siblings in order to contrast the different proficiencies within a family, Devinder describes his Punjabi as "absolutely identical" as his brother. For him, the 'story' does not lie in the variations that may occur between siblings but in the variations between the Heritage Language learned in the family environment, compared with this language in a wider society.

I queried his comments about meeting other "proper Punjabi-speakers":

S: how would you mean more SOPHISTICATED what do you mean by that?

D: they were using words I didn't know the meaning to and I could tell y'know um they'd done y'know I was aware for the first time that they were using LONG SENTENCES they were talking in complex sentences

S: and were they the same age as you?

D: no it was sort of OLDER people so my parents age [mm] but when I was younger I was only um kind of very familiar with our relatives who all spoke in a very BASIC **Punjabi** and that was my interpretation anyway (.) my interpretation when I was about sixteen seventeen anyway we sort of speak a very basic RAW ROUGH COLLOQUIAL **Punjabi** and there are educated people who speak a different type of **Punjabi** and they even they don't SHOUT (laughs) {laughs} and y'know they kind of very CALM DETACHED voices that kind of approach so that was kind of ALARMING ↑actually [yeah ?] to to notice I guess kind of variety within **Punjabi** and we were at the bottom end and my **Punjabi** was kind of at the BOTTOM END of the hierarchy of speakers I guess

Here, Devinder extends his description of his family speaking a "vernacular" to speaking "raw, rough colloquial Punjabi", evoking again the idea that his relatives were unsophisticated and "rough". He gives concrete examples here of how his (and his brother's) Punjabi was limited: the other "educated people" spoke in "long, complex sentences", using an expanded and unfamiliar lexis. Further, "they didn't shout" and they had "calm detached voices". He links non-linguistic behaviours to the perception of "sophistication". This section is built around an "alarming" discovery he made at that age: "to notice […] we were at the bottom and my Punjabi was at the bottom end of the hierarchy of speakers". This knowledge is obtained when he observes his parents' performance outside of their network of relatives rather than in Hayes/Southall or in the ancestral village in the homeland. His assessment of his proficiency in the Heritage Language is tied to his realisation that his parents in particular, and the first generation in general, just by

dint of being *born* in the homeland, India, were not more *knowledgeable* or 'better' Indians. He thereby identifies a tension that can exist between the first and second generations, regarding ownership of the language and culture.

8.1.2 The dynamics of families

I show in this section from his first interview how Devinder locates his relationship with his Heritage Language very closely with his family's language policy.

S: what are the dynamics of languages now in your family? y'know with your three daughters and your wife now what would you say

D: yes so I've got daughters with Emily wife and my oldest daughter from a previous marriage is at university so she's now eighteen nineteen (.) nineteen as of yesterday {laughs} so yeah we speak English I mean Emily raised the issue when our daughters were born that maybe I should speak **Punjabi** with them so they learn a second language but I didn't really feel comfortable about I didn't really feel confident in my **Punjabi** um so I didn't really want to do that with them because I think my vocabulary is quite restricted and when you trying to teach nouns and naming all the objects some of the words my parents used were in English anyway I think like tomato ketchup was **ketchup** and cereal they just called **cornflakes** everything was CORNFLAKES y'know so that kind of English and they didn't use **Punjabi** equivalents so it would have been very restricted anyway

When his wife "raised the issue" of passing on Punjabi to their children, so that they could "learn a second language", Devinder states that he didn't feel "comfortable", which he rephrases immediately as: "I didn't really feel confident". He states that his vocabulary is "restricted", then singles out two items – "tomato ketchup" and "cornflakes" – as examples of words that he was not taught equivalents of in Punjabi. His choice of examples is intriguing — these words are

recognisable in many languages ─ whereas he could have mentioned more prosaic words such as 'table' or 'chair'. He underlines the issue that his parents were his teachers: hence his "vocabulary is restricted" because his "parents used […] English". This low regard for code-switching (the implication being that this was how he learned and uses Punjabi himself) is thus linked to the low regard he has of his parents as teachers and as repositories of Punjabi. This in turn is thus bound to the desire he has that, if his children were to speak Punjabi, he would like them to speak well, in those "long and complex" sentences that the sophisticated Punjabi speakers he met in Sheffield used. Within the same move, acknowledging that the examples he has given could be regarded by me, the listener, as rather lame, and returning to his original pronouncement that he "didn't feel comfortable", Devinder then moves on to a more persuasive argument:

D: but I felt uncomfortable about teaching them **Punjabi** as well because I didn't want them to be too EXPOSED to my parents [mm] enough for them to have a conversation with them in **Punjabi (.)** my parents just tend to be very CRITICAL people and they would tell them they're not very bright or a bit stupid or a bit fat or a bit ugly they would have (.) they tell people what's wrong with them [yeah that's] and they would have told my children about me how I'm a bad son y'know because they did that with my older daughter who's nineteen

Devinder begins the extract by offering another reason for his non-transmission of Punjabi to his children: "I didn't want them to be too exposed to my parents […] to have a conversation with them in Punjabi". He becomes more specific ("my parents just tend to be very critical"), followed by details of what he would expect his parents to say: "They would tell them they are not very bright or a bit stupid or a bit fat or a bit ugly […] and they would have told my children about me how I'm a bad son". This situation is imaginary in the sense that it has not occurred with his two young daughters, and Devinder is translating their imaginary words, but Devinder then produces his evidence "because they did that with my older daughter".

In these two sections — the first concerned with the *type* of Punjabi he and his parents speak, the second with the channel of communication Punjabi allows — he therefore builds up a strong case for not transmitting the Heritage Language to his children: his parents have a limited use of Punjabi and taught him a "raw, rough, colloquial" Punjabi, and he was thus unable to attain a standard of Punjabi that he considers worthy of passing on; and his parents disapprove of his lifestyle choices and values, and he does not wish to bridge a linguistic gap between the first and third generations. In this way, Devinder both affords himself power in determining the language policy in his new family, as well as constructs this policy as a reaction to his parents.

Placing this family into the larger field of the UK, in Bourdieu's terms, the second-generation son has a greater cultural and linguistic capital than his parents, demonstrated by his cross-cultural adeptness and proficiency in both English and Punjabi. His children, as non-speakers of Punjabi, may have a reduced linguistic capital in the home of the first-generation and in the Punjabi-speaking community, as well as lack the currency of being bilingual, a cultural capital. But the cultural benefits are seen as secondary when Devinder prioritises his children's well-being, and when their lack of bilingualism does not impact negatively on their effectiveness in British society.

8.1.3 'His' Punjabi

Towards the end of our first interview, after it had become clear that the occasions for his use of Punjabi are now infrequent, I asked Devinder:

S: do you miss it. ? do you miss speaking Punjabi more now?

In response, Devinder gives an overview of his relationship with Punjabi, which mirrors his own life story and relationship with his Sikh background. I have divided it into three sections even though it was related as one long turn:

D: that's quite an interesting question (.) I DO probably miss some aspects of it because I used to quite enjoy speaking it but I do feel FRUSTRATION I didn't have a wider vocabulary and I'm interested in WORDS themselves and SOUNDS of words

Above he mixes the past with the present ("I used to quite enjoy […] but I do feel frustration", "I didn't have […] I'm interested") so that his initiation to the language (in his past) has an impact on how he feels about the language now. He follows this with a long section in the past:

D: but I didn't have the language so it was always a source of frustration I DID want to learn more of it and I DID want to learn how to write it when I was younger and you just get busy and then I didn't have enough time and I lost interest in it when I realised what a marginal language it was so I didn't really bother to learn to write it or read it

He highlights practical obstacles to language learning: as a young person he depended on his parents' decisions about learning the language, and as an adult he got "busy". He also alludes to a growing awareness that the usefulness of the language was limited ("I realised what a marginal language it was"). In fact, his comment does not reflect the value of Punjabi on the sub-continent, where it is spoken by Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims, in India and Pakistan, and where it is the language of religion of the Sikhs. And considering that it is the biggest South Asian language numerically in the UK (Census, 2011) it could be regarded as rather well-placed. His comment that Punjabi is 'marginal' might allude to the margins outside of the sphere of his life at that time: that is, when he was in higher education and on joining the workforce, Punjabi did not carry any value.

He continues:

D: and y'know maybe I should have because y'know because I'm quite interested in writing versions of Indian stories and it would be quite good to have a sense of the **Punjabi** stories so I REGRET that aspect but y'know it was POSITIVE that I enjoyed speaking the language when I was younger and I didn't have a problem communicating

His regret at not learning Punjabi formally is related to his literary interests ("I'm quite interested in writing versions of Indian stories") which are directly related to his current working life. There has therefore been a change: whereas in his earlier adulthood his success in the workforce did not have need for his bilingualism, and therefore he regarded Punjabi as superfluous, Devinder has now carved out a professional life in which Punjabi *does* play a role.

The sense that Devinder has learned more from external sources and now has a different perspective of himself – beyond being a son of his parents – is strengthened in the extracts that follow. The first is taken from the middle of his second interview:

D: I'm probably much happier with the language sort of thing and my relationship with the past (.) I don't know if I talked about this last time but one of the ways I've become much happier about the past is starting to write things out on the Ramayana which is coming out soon and that was really helpful for me because I wanted to find SOMETHING that I really admired (.) um and RESPECTED about INDIANNESS [yes] so I went looking for it and in my second book I did a couple of um poems using Indian stories so hence doing the Ramayana really helped me admire Indian authors and since then I've been reading loads of different Indian poets and I'm working on a verse [*indistinct*] of **Heer-Ranjha** do you know that one? [no] **Heer-Ranjha** it's more the north **Punjabi** old **Punjabi** stories Pakistani Indian [OK, yeah] the old Pakistani Muslim Hindu story North Indian stories old classic mediaeval [oh right↑] stories and through that I've been discovering lots of Persian **Punjabi** poets Bhakti tradition and Bhakti writing which I've read a bit for the (.) so I suddenly found myself exposed to a WHOLE WORLD OF LITERATURE which I hadn't been until really a year and a half ago

Devinder constructs the above section very much as if he is an adventure-explorer, with a goal in mind ("I wanted to find something […] I respected about Indian-ness"), emphasising the lack he felt of such, and thus embarking on a quest: "I went looking for it". He shows that in writing about the Ramayana, a series of stories related to Hindu teachings, he has made some discoveries: "I've been discovering lots", "I suddenly found myself exposed to a whole world of literature". Devinder describes, with some depth, aspects of Punjabi literary traditions, which contrast with the previous description of his knowledge of Punjabi as "vernacular […] raw, rough, colloquial"[11]. Devinder portrays himself as an auto-didact: displaying knowledge of both Sikhism (the religion of his parents) and writings in Punjabi (the language of his parents) which he self-acquired, "a year and a half ago". Just as he has indicated that he arrived at understanding the "politics of self" at a relatively advanced age, in his early twenties, shown in Chapter 7, Devinder here underlines that he has only discovered this world of literature recently. What is different from the chronotope he evoked about his university friend, is that in the above extract, Devinder highlights his own agency ("I went looking for it") rather than an external source.

8.2 Mumtaz's narrative

8.2.1 A completely natural situation

Mumtaz self-reports as being proficient in her Heritage Language Urdu. Below I show three extracts related to her use of Urdu, which range from the very beginning of our first interview to the middle section of the same:

M: basically my parents were er (.) very CONSCIOUS of speaking to us in **Urdu** and they spoke to us in **Urdu** quite a LOT and my sister was NINE when we came to the UK

[11] Bhakti is a term that is used in Sikhism to describe the love and devotion felt between a guru and his disciple, but it also refers to a literary trope in Punjabi folk stories of the, often doomed, love between a man and a woman, in this case Heer and Ranjha (Singh, 2006).

S: oh she was quite OLD was she

M: YEAH and her mother-tongue up to the age of nine was **Urdu** and so it would be NATURAL for them to carry on with her like that and obviously I was there too because I was seven years younger so I was TWO so I just picked up on it naturally (2) I don't think they made any (.) they didn't make any FORMAL ARRANGEMENTS they just it was THERE

S: […] when you were older I mean was there (.) any issues about you speaking **Urdu** OUTSIDE of the home

M: I tried not to use it in front of my FRIENDS talking to my parents in front of my friends

S: this is in the past

M: in the PAST oh YEAH yeah probably as a teenager when you feel awkward but after that (2) I mean once I started UNIVERSITY I was absolutely fine (.) I think there were just a few years in between when I found it (2) y'know I was trying hard to FIT IN really (.) as a lot of teenagers do

S: so around this time in your late twenties Mumtaz if I could bring back the language again when you went back home was it still the language that was spoken [YEAH] in the

M: yeah it's always spoken (.) if my mum's HERE even NOW we'll generally we'll speak **Urdu** [mm] (.) I think I use it as well as a time to practise my **Urdu** [mm] when she's around

S: because the opportunities [yeah] are rare [rare]

M: yeah so it's nice

Over three time periods (her early childhood, university years and adulthood) and in three different spaces (India, her childhood home and her home now), Mumtaz presents her family's relationship and her use of Urdu as continued and unchanged. The only break she relates occurred in her adolescence ("there were just a few years in between") when she would not use it "in front of friends". In response to my question pertaining to the past (her "late twenties") she slides the time frame to the present ("if my mum's here, even now we'll generally speak Urdu").

By conflating the past with the present, Mumtaz conjures the adventure-novel chronotope discussed by Bakhtin (1981) where the heroine remains largely unchanged through time, from the beginning to the end of the novel. Even when we spoke about her visits to India in her early twenties she does not re-configure her knowledge and facility in Urdu.

S: when you were there *[in India]* could you TALK to your relatives I mean were they SURPRISED at your **URDU** or did they

M: yeah I COULD talk to them NO they weren't they knew (2) and stuff they know that we can speak Urdu and stuff

S: but were they IMPRESSED

M: (2) NO I don't think so they just take it I mean they're USED to they're USED to seeing people from England especially other family members coming and going they're not y'know it's not like a NOVELTY or anything it's quite NORMAL I mean they all speak GOOD ENGLISH anyway so especially the younger ones so yeah

My persistence ("but were they impressed?") can be seen as fishing for drama. Mumtaz does not comply and instead returns to the idea that not only is English also used in the home environment in India ("they all speak good English") but that neither her family's dislocation to the UK and subsequent return trips, nor her bilingualism are noteworthy. Her relatives "just take it" and are "used to it", "it's not a novelty": it is 'no big deal'.

8.2.2 A family language

Unlike the other participants, Mumtaz extends her use of Urdu as a child to her present life. All my participants have highlighted that the use of the Heritage Language, if any, was intergenerational, hence my line of questioning below:

S: do you communicate in **Urdu** with your SISTER?

M: (2) only if we don't want the children to understand what we are saying.

S: so there IS some communication there.

M: pretty (2) yes there is but LARGELY because we don't want the children to know what we are up to (.) we've used it as a CONSPIRACY LANGUAGE! OPENLY! {laughs} [laughs] we use it in front of SHOPKEEPERS and the CHILDREN (laughs) it's not (.) it's quite funny.

S: CONSPIRACY language↑ {laughing voice}

M: yeah {laughs} so you know (2) quite often we'll be like (.) you know when we go to an ENGLISH MARKET we can be like oh don't pay that much he's just trying to rip us off but YEAH no (.) yeah it's interesting isn't it?

Using reported direct speech she shows how being bilingual can offer an opportunity to be subversive, breaking rules of etiquette and polite behaviour ("oh don't pay that much he's just trying to rip us off"). In this extract, Mumtaz shows how the shared language can allow the sisters to perform the identity of 'the Other'. It is noteworthy that this performance occurs with her sister: I show later that this is another example of how Mumtaz binds her use of Urdu very closely to family members, rather than to a wider Urdu-speaking community.

By translating her words into a 'verbatim' transcript, Mumtaz also gives me the listener a concrete example of what is said in Urdu. In contrast, she does not elsewhere elaborate on exactly *what* she talked or talks about with her mother in Urdu. She has specified that her knowledge of Urdu is purely oral ("there was no formal education") and so one can assume that she did not share reading literary texts and newspapers with her parents; but her assessment of her Urdu is that she does not 'struggle' in any situation, and is proficient.

While Mumtaz uses the term 'Urdu' throughout her interview, Hindi and Urdu are often considered interchangeable in spoken form, with a different written script referred to as Hindi/Urdu in academic papers (one example being Butt and Ramchand, 2001). This view belies the strength of feeling that exists among Urdu-speakers of the lack of recognition of the

'sovereignty' of each language[12]. Below Mumtaz is contributing to a discussion we had over the apparent prevalence of Punjabi-speakers over Urdu-speakers in the Muslim community in the UK, and the reasons for her parents' affiliation to Urdu.

M: yeah we know it's POETIC it's considered to be more poetic [*than Punjabi*] and y'know because obviously it comes from PERSIAN heritage as well so they [*her parents*] do know that but it's just NATURAL for them especially my mum being from Lucknow (.) that is how they speak it's nothing AFFECTED it's just that is IT (.) my dad's a bit different because he was from Allahabad and though he speaks Urdu with his brothers they have a sort of slang it's not Punjabi though [mm] it's Urdu slang

Mumtaz shows knowledge of the stratification that occurs in a language. Moving from Lucknow, the state capital of Uttar Pradesh, to Allahabad in the south, the language alters and there is evidence of a dialect or "slang", used in a domestic environment ("with his brothers they have a sort of slang"). Mumtaz's parents' use of Urdu is not "affected", but "natural", a reminder of Kamran's description of the use of Urdu by Punjabi speakers as an "affectation". While her awareness of these intricacies is clear, when voicing these complexities Mumtaz moves her position as being an involved Urdu-speaker in her family ("we know it's poetic") to being an observer of her parents ("they do know", "it's how they speak"), thereby casting her parents as the 'owners' of the language. Further, although her father has died, Mumtaz uses the present tense here to refer to him ("he speaks Urdu with his brothers"): as if Urdu, which is still 'alive', is

[12] Farouqui (1994) reports on three-language policies of India, where the treatment of Hindi and Urdu as the same language has caused disquiet in Hindi-speaking states. In these, children are expected to learn Hindi, English and another Indian language, with no mention of Urdu. Farouqui argues that this policy has resulted in Urdu being learned or recognised solely by Muslims. He describes Uttar Pradesh, from where Mumtaz's parents emigrated, as "a state which has been the traditional centre for Urdu learning for centuries" (Farouqui, 1994:782).

inseparable from her father. I have shown the extract because it links to the following, in which in a rare instance of emotion, Mumtaz relates that her father, before he died, had been particularly unhappy that Mumtaz was not teaching her son Urdu.

M: oh he [*her father*] was he became very cantankerous when he was ill he used to say in quite a CRUDE way like quite (.) he used to say quite a lot of things in quite a GRUMPY way really

S: was that uncharacteristic for how he used to be

M: no not really [laughs] it was just more acute and I think he thought he didn't have much time to bother not that he didn't bother before (.) [laughs] but it was really out of the window before the end (2) yes he just got really (2) there was one day in particular that he said it in front of other people and pissed me off [what did he say] OH he was just saying he was just being like oh you know like WHY DOESN'T YOUR SON SPEAK **URDU**? Why're you not teaching him? Y'know people come here from ROMANIA and they come and speak ROMANIAN {laughs} and things like that! I was just like oh what's this nonsense [mmm]

Mumtaz evokes a chronotope ("there was one day in particular") and uses direct speech and colourful language for the first and only time in our conversation ("[he]pissed me off"). All this lends this exchange some weight although at the end she downplays her evaluation of the event as "nonsense", returning to her usual understated tone. The question arises: why should this event be given a more emotional narration? Mumtaz relates that while her father was often "grumpy", the instance she relates occurs "in front of other people." By tying her irritation with the fact that their argument occurred in a more public domain, Mumtaz again links her perception of the use/maintenance of the Heritage Language with a personal or closed family domain. Further, Mumtaz uses direct speech to offer what I will receive as a verbatim transcript of her father's words ("why doesn't your son speak Urdu?" "why're you not teaching him?"). His reported use of "your son" rather than his grandson's name is seen here to show how he emphasised her position as mother. And clearly, he placed the onus on transmission of the

language firmly on Mumtaz (and not on the grandparents, for example). I argue that Mumtaz, therefore, judges that this exchange is worth relating, with a fly-on-the-wall perspective, as we are both mothers, considered the primary socialisers of our children, and the knowledge-bearers of the Heritage Language in our marriages. The fate of our children's bilingualism rests with us, and given this similar responsibility, she is confident that I will empathise with her position and her reaction to her father. Unprompted, Mumtaz continues below:

M: ALTHOUGH I WISH (.) I think Dxx would like to speak MORE and know more words and my mum tries to teach him now it's quite SWEET [yeah] so (.) it's just what it is really I suspect that I found it quite difficult with Simon because obviously he doesn't speak it at all (.) so (.) it is HARD because you feel like you're speaking in code (3)

S: so if Simon is in and your family comes over does he JOIN in or

M: no [yeah] he just sits there [mm] it's so completely different (2) and to be honest I don't think he's ever had an INTEREST at all [mm] so we didn't really DISCUSS it (.) I suppose living in Australia we were quite when Dxx was little and then we were just busy WORKING [mmm] when we came back here and then it just (2) y'know it felt like the window had PASSED really before we knew it

Having constructed her story to elicit sympathy from me on how unreasonable her father's expectations were, Mumtaz then expresses a wish that her son would engage more with Urdu. She prefaces this revelation with an "although", stressed for emphasis, and to acknowledge that she is not completely in disagreement with her father's comments. The rest of the extract seeks to justify this turn of events. Her mother, now widowed and spending more time in her daughters' houses has assumed the position of educator, and is teaching Mumtaz's son some Urdu, which Mumtaz pronounces as "sweet", book-ending this observation with a philosophical "it's just what it is really". But she follows this pronouncement with a reflection beginning "I suspect I found it quite difficult", which highlights two elements that she binds to the

maintenance of Urdu: her husband's encouragement and the right 'space'. Unlike in the families of Devinder, Kamran and Paresh (where their wives expressed an interest in them teaching the Heritage Language to the children) and similar to Padma's situation, Mumtaz refers to her husband's disinterest in the language as a factor ("I don't think he's ever had an interest", "we didn't really discuss it"). She also cites their living in Australia, in Brisbane, when their son was very young, and where she was removed from her family (her parents and sister). She attributes her disinclination to pass on the Heritage Language to her son partly to this dislocation from her family. Her comment "it felt like the window had passed" indicates that some conscious effort needed to be made for her to use Urdu with her son as a child.

Because she does not have a similar ownership of the language as her parents, despite her proficiency in and her continued use of the language through her adult life, and despite it being natural for her parents to pass on Urdu to her so she be bilingual, it was not natural for her to *maintain* it.

8.3 Conclusion

Devinder and Mumtaz come from different family backgrounds and have different Heritage Languages, but both self-report as being proficient in the language and have a continued engagement with the Heritage Language. Devinder highlights the difficulties of growing up as a child of migrants: the dependence on the first generation for engagement with the heritage culture, alongside the expectations from this first generation for their children *to* engage, regardless of how conducive the environments the parents have engendered. So, for example, while his parents did not consider him a "proper Indian", neither did they try and instil in him a deep understanding of his Sikhism or a more literate proficiency in Punjabi. He, by himself, began exploring the Punjabi literary traditions which have informed his later oeuvre.

Devinder's description of an oral proficiency in Punjabi is similar to all the participants who self-report as fluent, such as Mumtaz (but also Kamran, Paresh). While other participants

(Paresh, Kamran, Padma) discuss the varied proficiencies among their spread of siblings, Devinder prefers to discuss his own limitations in his language, attributing them to his parents' own limited proficiency. His disinclination to transmit Punjabi to his children is also constructed as a way to protect them from his parents' criticisms. In these ways, his narrative, more than others, is infused with a tension between his parents as first-generation, and himself as second-generation British South Asian. His painful relationship with his parents is used as a foil for his happier self now where he has sought more understanding of his culture, in particular of literature. This micro-narrative on language is one thread of the macro-narrative that Devinder constructs as someone who, in reaction to the way he was brought up and after a long personal journey, has arrived at his own understanding of himself, his Heritage Language and cultural history, and his membership of the diaspora.

Mumtaz self-reports as proficient in her Heritage Language, but also shows that this did not motivate her to pass the language onto her son. She also constructs her use of Urdu as continued and unchanged from past to present (from her birth family home to her home now) and in different spaces (in the UK as well as in India). Further, she uses the language inter-generationally: with her parents, as well as, in certain 'conspiratorial' settings, with her sister. Her bilingualism is presented as wide-reaching both spatially and temporally, but as a natural turn of events. She is equally philosophical about the fact that her son does not speak (much) Urdu. For Mumtaz, the micro-narrative related to language, that being bilingual is unsurprising and not 'a big deal', is one thread of her macro-narrative: of her belief in the plurality of Britishness, and herself — as a bilingual, a South Asian, a Muslim — as one paradigm of such.

9. Narrative of Kamran

In this chapter I show how Kamran constructs his life-story as a rich source of insights into the daily workings of a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual family in the UK. I have divided his narrative into three sections, which focus on the areas for which he offered most insights: community and culture, language and capital, and marrying out of his ethnolinguistic community. Through his narrative he exposes strong Discourses expected of a person like him (a second-generation Pakistani Briton) and denotes areas where his life story differs from these. But he also places his narrative very much within that expected experience of a second-generational, giving himself the authority to comment on behaviours of his community. In doing both of the above, Kamran positions himself alternately within his community and without: showing himself to be truly 'bicultural', a member both of his community and the greater British society.

9.1 Community and culture

I show in this section that Kamran offers his perspectives on the Pakistani community that he knows and its culture, but that he constructs his narrative so that he is speaking about himself as a 'finished product' — a fully-integrated South Asian who maintains credentials within his community — which I later term as 'the view from the finishing line'. The extracts presented below did not occur in chronological order, and so I will point to where in Kamran's narrative they appeared.

9.1.1 A northern boy

Throughout his interviews, Kamran speaks of his wife, prompting me to ask the question shown below towards the end of our first interview:

S: how do you think she regards your for want of a better word ASIANNESS?

K: {laughs) yeah um don't know really (.)I've never asked that question (.) It was one of those things I actually thought the BIGGER differences are in some ways our cultural differences (.) are I am from the NORTH of England and she's from the SOUTH

S: {laughs}

K: y'know it's more that I'm a SOUTHERNER and she's a NORTHERNER [*sic*] there are (.) a recent conversation was that why what about the culture where's MY CULTURE that I could give the kids (.) there's a sort of LACK of it in Britain the culture is sort of SOMEWHAT THIN it's difficult to define (.) it depends how you define culture so I (.) the thing is I don't really KNOW what my culture is how I express that. (.) my culture is my UPBRINGING and my IDENTITY and my FAMILY and those things but I through CEREMONY↑ or through RELIGION↑ or through DRESS↑ I don't really have that (.) I'm not a religious person by any stretch so I wouldn't push that onto the kids (.) the ceremonies we have are fairly few and far between the weddings or they happen you eat food you shake hands and you give money to somebody there are a few other bits here and there but they are just VARIATIONs of a THEME you know

Kamran has talked during his interviews about how his wife has in the past encouraged him to teach the children Punjabi. He also speaks above about "a recent conversation" when the question of what "culture" he could pass onto the children arose. His initial response ("I've never asked that question"), therefore, can be perceived as disingenuous. When he responds to the question I ask, of his wife's view of his 'Asianness', he interprets it as identifying "cultural differences". His answer — that their "cultural differences" can be found in the north-south divide in the UK — receives a laugh from me, and he affirms that he is "a northerner" and she is "a southerner" (although in the interview he transposes these two terms by mistake), two well-used terms for people from England. Kamran therefore initially binds his marriage to a 'normal' 'English' marriage, reminding me that whereas my research emphasises mixed ethnicities and

languages, his marriage can also be 'mixed' in other ways. But he continues from here to give an extended answer which has relevance to my enquiry, showing himself as a supportive conversational partner and research participant, as well as acknowledging that there is some worth in my question.

He queries the word 'culture' and its definition, tying it in his view to very personal things such as "my upbringing", "my family" and "my identity", using the singular first-person pronoun rather than a larger 'we'. He contrasts these personal issues with more overt factors (ceremony, religion, dress), commonly seen as strong signifiers in society of his 'culture', relating that "I don't really have that". In this section he does not mention 'language' which he *does* 'have', choosing here to separate language from culture. Instead, he gives insights into the realities of some of those aforementioned signifiers. Ceremonies are described as when "you eat food you shake hands and you give money to somebody" – highlighting that what can be quite mundane actions gather a significance when done en masse. His take on Pakistani Muslim culture, therefore, is that it is also "somewhat thin", as he has described British culture. The cumulative effect is that he shows awareness that he is considered, at least by his wife, to possess a "culture", but that culture is as insipid as 'British culture'.

9.1.2 The view from the finishing line

The following extracts show how Kamran speaks of his community within the broader South Asian community.

K: I was always surprised [*sic*] that my generation would change (.) the system would change but for some reason I dunno a naïve assumption that there would be a RAPID ASSIMILATION into this community and whatever the next generation would do and it didn't quite happen (.) but then I think I was just yeah we'll all get everyone will get on and everyone will mix and it will be

wonderful and lovely and this kind of United Colours of Benetton uh but I think it hasn't happened.

Kamran expresses surprise that the second and third generations do not exhibit "rapid assimilation". I argue that this extract is polyphonic: by adopting this rhetoric ("rapid assimilation", "next generation", "everyone will get on", "everyone will mix") coupled with a direct reference to the Benetton advertisements[13], Kamran employs the voice of political discourse and of the media to express the view that immigrant cultures need to 'assimilate'; that from generation to generation more 'mixing' should occur. In this extract Kamran defines inter-racial relationships as a marker of 'assimilation' ("everyone will mix"); something that as I have shown in Chapter 2 remains relatively uncommon in South Asian communities, but something he is involved in.

When the main part of our interview was over but the recorder was still running, we remained talking and an extract from what he said is shown below:

K: I know PhDs need to be a very NARROW slice of a field I tell you what on the topic you're saying it I often used to (.) perhaps before I was married it was one of those things that I often used to THINK about (.) y'know mixed relationships where society goes and homogenisation of it etcetera etcetera intermingling of society and cultures DA DA DA DA DA then I'm sort of IN it I'm LIVING it I have CHILDREN in it and suddenly it becomes (.) I stop THINKING about it and I'm DOING it

S: yeah

He presents his marriage ("before I was married") as a threshold event: by using "used to often think about", he places his reflections on "mixed relationships", "homogenisation",

[13] In the 1980s and 1990s Benetton used a series of photographs which included models of different ethnicities, under the slogan 'United colours of Benetton'.

"intermingling of society and cultures" in the finished past. His use of these terms, heavily nominalised, is polyphonic, again evoking the media and academic studies, which he now shows he feels dismissive of ("da da da"). He then returns to "his" voice ("then I'm sort of in it I'm living it I have children in it") with the use of present tense to emphasise that this is relevant even in the here-and-now of the interview as well as in his life. He contrasts "thinking about it" with "doing it": a contrast of cerebral involvement with action. All through his narrative, Kamran has emphasised his background as a second-generational, and I interpret the above extract not as a dismissal of my academic study, but again an assertion that he has credentials to discuss the issues we are discussing. He is not just an onlooker but an active participant in this element of society.

In the middle of our first interview, Kamran spoke specifically about his community:

K […] and if if I think the community(.) particularly the PAKISTANI MUSLIM community allowed itself to be a bit more OPEN if it allowed people out as well as in it'd it'd be better for it (.) I think the Hindu (.) the English Hindu community (.) as far as I see it (.) seems much more able to do that (.) I think they have a slight head start (.) most of the Indian immigrants that I've met came from a more middle-class background invariably with the African East African wave of immigration (.) so they arrived MIDDLE-CLASS and could quite quickly then step up (.) the Pakistani community has been slightly sort of encumbered by its upbringing (.) the BAGGAGE that they brought with it and from where they came.

He gives agency to the Pakistani community ("allowed itself") so that responsibility to be open lies with it (rather than on the host society). His lexis, using phrases such as "head start", "step up", evokes a 'race' towards success in the host society. He binds this success with being "open", being "middle-class"; and difficulties in reaching success come from being weighed down by "baggage", "encumbered by upbringing". While he uses the phrase "I think" to introduce his

arguments as opinions, he constructs this section as showing in-depth knowledge from the 'finishing line'.

The cumulative effect of the extracts I have shown is that Kamran's narrative begins to comment on his perspective of his community from his position as an "assimilated", "open", "integrated" Pakistani Briton: someone who has reached the finishing line in the 'race' for success in the host society. That is, it is a commentary by a member of the diaspora who has achieved a truly bicultural status.

9.1.3 'Every cliché'

In the middle of our first interview, I returned to his role as a TV director and inevitably we began to discuss media portrayals of South Asians in the UK. My line of thinking was: while we as South Asians may balk at representations of ourselves in the media, we also have opportunities to 'tell our own stories'. Directors such as Gurwinder Chadha (mentioned in Chapter 2), a Sikh Punjabi Briton, and novelist/writer/actor Meera Syal, another Sikh Punjabi, have brought South Asian lives in the UK to the big and small screens. And yet on viewing these offerings we South Asians critique them as false, while in fact a film or TV show is never a reality. Below, my question is related to Kamran's earlier comments about not wishing to engage with Pakistani issues in his directorial work. We move on to discuss the Film *East is East*, written by Ayub Khan-Din, whose Pakistani father, white English mother, and childhood in Salford, Greater Manchester, formed a basis for his play and the subsequent film:

S: there was just one thing I wanted to ask you during the interview (.) you know you were talking about the media and how you've sort of shied away well not SHIED away but moved away [yeah] but you've been so APPROACHABLE and so amenable to my research (2) why is that Kamran why do you not mind talking to me about this stuff? is this not (.) does THIS not feel like I'm DIGGING or it's too close to you

K: NO NO NO I mean me going into my community↑ and that sort of {sighs} why didn't I do it? ↑ it's been so long since I've pursued that line of thought so I'm just trying to think of WHY I didn't do it at the time (.) I DID want to and I (.) my brothers often say we should make a film of our lives and experiences y'know made in the Asian community and they're so CRAP and quite often they miss the TRUTH as we perceive it

S: and quite maybe one-dimensional

K: YEAH yeah I think East is East came quite CLOSE in some ways of our experience of a certain period of time but then it had too much slapstick and too much comedy (.) it threw every element that you could possibly (.) you know there was the GAY son there was the ITINERANT son there was the TRADITIONAL son and it was like yeah every cliché's in there so but (2) so I'm not against it I think I just moved away from somehow (.) I honestly can't remember (.) I'm just trying to think WHY why did I do that? I think partly I think it's not wanting to spend a great deal of time (.) I find every time I spend time back in Manchester I realise WHY I moved away from my community

Kamran and I find the film unsatisfactory, but perhaps for different reasons. While Kamran's upbringing is perhaps closer to the film's screenplay, he finds it cliché-ridden, and "slapstick". For myself, the family is as far-removed from mine, in terms of space, language and religion, as is possible. Neither of us feel that the film 'represents' our experiences, but the fact that we have that expectation is telling. If the film is assumed to be a representation of the South Asian British experience by UK society, then South Asians themselves will find a multitude of discrepancies from their own experiences. In this extract, both Kamran and I adopt an identity position: of being real and authentic South Asians, sharing the same negative opinion of a fake story. But in doing so we are denying the varieties of narratives that we know are possible, all describing the South Asian experience: it is not out of the bounds of reality that a family such as that in *East in East* did indeed exist.

Kamran uses thought experiments (Myers, 1999) ("why didn't I do it?") to bring his queries into the here-and-now of the interview, so that his verdict ("I find every time I spend time back in Manchester I realise why I moved away from my community") emphasises that he keeps a distance from his community, and that this distance is self-imposed. Once again, he gives himself agency in the person he has become, as well as frames his actions as the right decision, over which he has no regrets.

9.2 Languages and Capital

9.2.1 English is the key

Very near the beginning of his first interview, Kamran introduces his father: his father's role in both bringing his family to the UK as the first-generation migrant, and his view that it was important for his sons to speak English. Below Kamran is speaking of when, as a young child, he returned to Pakistan with his mother, and his father visited. He constructs this section as a chronotope of threshold, so that it begins "I do remember", follows with "he realised I'd forgotten any English I'd learned" and finally "so x months [….] later […] me and him came back to England".

K: I do remember him re-appearing into our life in Pakistan and as a small child I'd forgotten the EXISTENCE of this person and he picked me up and he said oh hello and I said to my mum what did he say? I didn't understand what he'd SAID! I just didn't remember that moment and he realised that I'd forgotten any English that I'd learned while I'd been here [*sic*] and that I should come back to Pakistan uh to England (.) so x months or whatever time later possibly a year later I don't know the details me and him came back to England

The threshold event is constructed around his father's dismay at his son's lack of English, and this becomes a recurring element of Kamran's narrative. His father's decision to bring his son

back to England to repair any linguistic damage, is in contrast to a strong Discourse which would suggest that his father would value Punjabi over English, that his father would value his son's upbringing in the 'centre' of Islam, a Muslim country, over an upbringing in the 'periphery', a country where the faith would be in the minority. Kamran further elaborates on this break with the Discourse later when he is describing where he grew up:

S: and what were the sort of environs like I mean was it a place where there were a lot of other people from y'know other Pakistani people

K: NO no (.) no we were the only ones on the street (.) it was a working-class town [*indistinct*] of the CORONATION-y type very y'know typical Manchester red-brick working-class not far from the local football ground (.) it wasn't the sort of the LOW end of the scale there was a sort of (.). probably a mile up the road there was a sort of most of the Pakistani community from the Punjab from Mirpur lived in that sort of 'ghetto' in inverted commas [mm] it wasn't that bad but it was just where they congregated. (.) my dad had moved us a little bit further out for whatever reasons I don't know but he always said he didn't want to be part of that collective family it was too kind of too intimate

His descriptions of the space where he grew up evoke the chronotope of a 'working-class upbringing in the 60s and 70s'. He mentions Coronation Street, a British soap opera which started in 1960, the decade during which Kamran and his family moved to the UK. The terms "red-brick", "not far from the local football ground", I argue, are tropic emblems, very evocative of a northern, working-class British upbringing ("typical Manchester"), which Kamran uses to cement his position in a working-class community. When he details the location of the South Asian community ("a mile up the road"), he uses very specific geographical details from the sub-continent: from large to small (Pakistani community>from the Punjab>from Mirpur) binding his narrative with in-depth knowledge of *this* community as well.

He shows awareness that his term "the ghetto" can be pejorative ("in inverted commas", "it wasn't that bad"), but he places himself outside of that ghetto when he relates "where *they* congregated" (my emphasis). His father is again described as the main actor, with agency ("my dad had moved us a little bit further"), with his family metaphor and his use of the term "too intimate" referring back to his description of the community as not being "open", that it should "let people out as well as in".

Kamran binds this spatial location, of being a mile away from "the ghetto", with attainment of fluent proficiency in English. His father was a bus-driver when Kamran was growing up. Kamran and his brothers, however, achieved well academically, attending the local grammar school. I commented later in the interview on the success story that he and his three brothers personify: that four South Asian Muslim lads from Oldham, from a working-class family where neither parent spoke much English (his mother "very little", his father "pidgin"), are now successful professionals:

S: so you actually I mean you did very WELL considering you y'know your dad was working as a BUS DRIVER [YEAH yeah] and you ended up going to Cardiff which is a very good university (.) possibly going to Durham I mean [laughs] why did that HAPPEN (.) were your parents y'know very

K: YEAH yeah no my dad was the sort of DRIVING FORCE behind that really (.) um he always said that the reason he moved here was to give us opportunities to better himself the opportunities he couldn't afford his family (.) the only as a sort of working class y'know as a PEASANT STOCK he would never've been able to sort of give us opportunities there and it could only happen here to this DEGREE and it could only happen EDUCATION was the way forward, you know (.) you could then better yourself so if we were then educated we would be able to better ourselves and we in turn could better our children and dot dot dot dot dot (.) err typically he wanted us to be doctors and if not doctors then lawyers and if not lawyers then ENGINEERS whatever an engineer does (.) uh um and so I think part of why he separated us

> from the community was to avoid that slightly y'know the NEGATIVE effects of being in completely immersed in the community and whatever his thoughts were on it at the time part of which I think is often your language suffers your integration with the language of your host nation suffers you don't (.) and so I knew plenty of people who'd been here longer than I had whose language was stilted whose vocabulary was (.) perhaps their education wasn't as good (.) they went to uh (.) um not as good schools secondary schools y'know sort of down in the worst parts of town so (.) he was right I guess

I argue that in the extract above Kamran uses a 'layer of voices' (Bakhtin, 1981), so that a strong Discourse in society (that English proficiency is key not only to integration but to professional success) is included in the personal story that Kamran is telling. By employing the language of an authoritative discourse, the discourse of his father as well as institutions in society, ("the negative effects of being […] completely immersed in the community", "your host nation"), but by employing it without any emphasis or emotional involvement — by rote, effectively — Kamran aligns himself with this thinking, while giving more agency to others. By constructing his narrative in this way, he — with a semblance of reluctantly admitting his father was right — again presents himself as 'a product'. Previously I have shown how he presents himself as a 'finished product': here he presents himself as a (successful) product of British society's tendency to monolingualism, as well as some South Asian parents' willingness to allow English to supersede Heritage Languages in their children's linguistic repertoire.

In the first part of the extract, Kamran employs references 'here' and 'there' to establish two space-time locations: the UK (spatially, and within the timeframe of the interview), and Pakistan (spatially, and in his past). He uses the term "to better himself", which then shifts to a generalised "you could better yourself", back to his personal family situation "we would be able to better ourselves" and to the next generation "and we could better our children and dot dot dot". He evokes the well-documented story of the arrival of a male patriarch, seeking to improve

his lot by arriving in the land of "opportunities", to gain access to opportunities that would be unavailable 'there', and paving the way for the next generations.

Kamran then shows that his father chose to situate his family some distance from the heart of the community. So a Discourse may pervade that immigrant groups live together and while, by choosing Oldham, his father *did* place his family in an area with many Muslim Punjabis, this male patriarch also chose to shield his family from dominant influences from the community. A few streets' distance from the centre of community life is shown to have a distinctive and significant impact on his children's achievements. Kamran makes a direct link between employment and educational success to proficiency in English, a link that has been proved in studies as mentioned in Chapter 2. But what he also draws on from personal experience is that linguistic capital (gained through proficiency in English) can be maximised by avoiding 'complete immersion' in the South Asian ethno-linguistic community: if this occurs the language of "your host nation" is "stilted", the vocabulary less broad. There is 'good' English that opens doors and allows "integration"; and 'weak' English which falls short.

The cumulative effect of the extracts I have shown is to give his father the mantle of being "the driving force", and his father's as well as his sons' awareness that a proficiency beyond a "stilted" level was the key to 'bettering yourself'. Kamran also constructs space as being very important, so that even being a mile away from the "ghetto in inverted commas" is attributed to more success, thereby underlining the very localised experiences of a diaspora.

All the previous extracts therefore confirm that Kamran and his brothers achieved a linguistic capital in the 'host society' through attaining a high proficiency in English. In the next section I show, however, that this did not exclude their Heritage Language Punjabi from Kamran's life. The continued presence and relevance of his Heritage Language in his life serves to demonstrate the complexity of languages and capitals that pervade in the realities of a multilingual family.

9.2.2 His Heritage Language

I rely on my participants' self-reports of their proficiency in their Heritage Languages. While I would assume that they err on the side of modesty (as I do), in the first interview I conducted with Kamran, I sought to qualify his self-assessments:

S: so you've just said that you consider yourself as being MODERATELY CONVERSANT (.) how do you ASSESS yourself like that (.) can you give an EXAMPLE?

K: {laughs} um (.).I think I can speak on a (.) I can hold a fairly EVERYDAY conversation then get relatively you know hi how are you what's been going on ↑da da da da and then I could go on to a bit more personal level ↑ obviously to say how are you what's been going on in your life↑ blah blah ↓ um discussing feelings or kinda y'know the NEXT LEVEL [yeah] a bit more preliminary conversation and uh um it's not then the whatever the kinda the next layer down more COMPLEX kind of words more subtle concepts one's trying to describe I think that that I'd sort of stop THERE (.) I can UNDERSTAND I think if someone's having a conversation but I wouldn't necessarily reply in kind I wouldn't have the vocabulary to discuss LEGAL TERMINOLOGY or a POLITICAL discussion

S: it sounds to me like you're FAIRLY COMMUNICATIVE in Punjabi

K: YEAH oh YEAH yeah no it's a sort of (.) probably as much as we've been speaking so far I could carry on at that level (.) if you started to say let's have some political DISCOURSE on what's been going on ↑ I'd be a little (.) I could work my way round it but y'know

Kamran makes a contrast between the talk that would occur in "everyday conversation" on a "personal level" to "political discourse" and using "legal terminology". His outlining of the bounded areas that exist within language itself is illuminating: perhaps in multilingual contexts the question should not be 'what language do people speak in?' but 'what do people talk about (in that language)?' Not many will agree that talking about everyday things in Punjabi engenders a strong knowledge and affinity to Punjabi culture, traditions, history or even the literature or

literary language. By that same argument, a person with little ability to talk about everyday things in Punjabi does not necessarily have little affinity to the aforementioned examples. I have already shown that, language ability aside, even Kamran's rejection of a conventional Muslim Punjabi lifestyle has not severed his feelings of attachment to, and his self-positioning within, that community. But this small example may point to varied capitals that languages have in varied spaces: whereas the ability to speak about mundanities may not hold much capital in the Mirpuri community, it holds some reserves here in the UK, where, as a result, that individual can be classed as a 'bilingual'.

My first question may be seen as a challenge, and Kamran's laugh in response may acknowledge the impression of a gauntlet being thrown down. In my second question, I appear more supportive, so that the overall impression I may have given is that what is 'right' is that the Heritage Language is maintained and spoken among second-generationals. As I have mentioned already, very often participants would begin our communications with "I don't speak it much", assuming that my research were an investigation into *how much* of the Heritage Language they spoke. While I have tried to assuage any worries, and insisted that even if they were monolingual in English they were relevant to my study, I can see from the exchange above how difficult it is to move away from such a Discourse. Kamran's emphatic "Yeah, oh yeah, yeah" in response may be interpreted that he is pleased that he is giving the 'right' answer.

S: in your family being a well growing up in a Muslim family was **Urdu** considered y'know much higher status than **Punjabi**? was that something you were aware of as a child or

K: YEAH yeah not as a CHILD but as a TEENAGER I realised that Urdu was the posh sort of more of we were from Punjab and it was more that (.) the differences didn't really appear till later that this was a kind of villagey (.) well it's not villagey because it's of a state y'know the Sikhs all speak Punjabi their dialect (.) so it was a regional thing (.) It wasn't considered the HIGH TONGUE in Pakistan and even now it's sort of (.)my younger brother who's married this

> woman from Pakistan she's trying to teach him Urdu and occasionally everyone laughs at the way he pronounces the words and I'm like why should he speak Urdu? y'know there's a slight kind of AFFECTATION (.) if you don't speak it it's like trying to speak RP almost (.)the languages the two languages are not that different it's just pronunciation and the words like how words finish (.) they tend to start in the same way but they tend to complete differently on the end so it doesn't (.) it's [*not?*] really an issue for myself but he wants to and he's interested in taking it up so (.) but yeah I am aware that I come from the village so I'm a HICK [laughs] but {laughs} yeah we ARE Mirpur is very low on the social scale in terms of achievement (.) in England particularly (.) every time I meet a taxi-driver in any city it's ridiculous but nine times out of ten I can guarantee that they come from near our village [laughs] NO NO I TELL YOU! I was in Sheffield two months ago I got chatting to the driver and I saw his name and I said all right, how are you how long have you been here oh where're you from? and he was two miles from our village y'know [oh yeah, yeah] RIDICULOUS I know ridiculous (.) it was, y'know that WAVE in the sixties and seventies was from a certain region and they (.) reached [indistinct]

I ask a leading question, but the extent to which Kamran responds justifies the need to raise the topic. In the first few lines above Kamran refers to the high linguistic and cultural capital that Urdu-speakers hold, given Urdu's prestige value (as a "high tongue") in Pakistan, that it is considered "posh", endowing its speakers with a certain status compared with Mirpuri Punjabis, styled as "villagey", and later in his response as 'hicks'. But he also alludes to the heteroglossic nature of language: that while the Mirpuri dialect is low in status, the Punjabi dialect spoken by the Sikhs does not suffer in estimation in that community.

Kamran then moves on to give the example of his brother, who has recently married, and whose wife is trying to teach him Urdu. When marrying spouses from 'back home', a common Discourse will be that it is the *British* spouse who holds the economic capital, and by extension the cultural and linguistic capital. But within this couple, Kamran's sister-in-law feels it is *she* who possesses the linguistic and cultural capital, and she must try and ensure that her

husband, to borrow a phrase that Kamran has used previously, 'betters himself'. Within their family unit, but also within the Muslim Punjabi community living in the North West of England, a spouse who speaks Urdu will have greater capital than a spouse who has remained a Mirpuri hick.

Kamran expresses resentment at this state of affairs imposed by "this woman from Pakistan" ("why should he speak Urdu?"): in his childhood, his father had emphasised the importance of English above any other language. Perhaps his irritation stems from the low capital that Mirpuris hold in two spaces, Pakistan as well as in the UK. In describing their status in the UK, Kamran reverts to the language of officialdom: "Mirpur is very low on the scale of social achievement". And in these frames he does not place himself outside of the community, but within it, using 'I' and 'we': "I'm a hick!", "we are", "we are from the Punjab", "our village". For him, his brother's attempts at affecting an "RP" style of language are a slight not only to the Mirpuri community but to their upbringing. Again, through his description of the two languages (as being similar, sharing a body of vocabulary, that the words "end differently") he shows intricate knowledge of these two major languages, thereby positioning himself as having 'credentials' in this discussion.

What can also be highlighted from this extended extract is that the practice of arranged (or negotiated) marriages, while co-ethnic and co-religious, can involve many languages, where the newly married couple may have, as in the case of Kamran's brother, a resource of three languages to draw on: English and, the strongly-related, Punjabi and Urdu. Kamran's narrative draws on his brothers' experiences but shows their relevance to his own decisions over languages. And he further illustrates that differences in opinion between partners as well as varied linguistic capitals exist in co-ethnic couples, not only in mixed-race couples, as he reiterates below. We were discussing his brothers, who have all had arranged marriages, and in whose families evidence of maintenance of the Heritage Language is not strong:

K: then one has just married a few months ago so I don't know so again possibly yes (.) his wife is more PAKISTANI y'know in terms of born and raised there and then moved here maybe five six or maybe ten years ago I don't know how long ago but she has that (.) her accent is more Pakistani English? ↑ it has that sort of IMRAN KHAN sort of style of speaking that sort of **talks like that you know sort of well-received English Pakistani** {ASSUMES WELL_SPOKEN PAKISTANI ACCENT} [Oh very good! (laughs)] Thank you! yeah so I DUNNO (.) she is more traditional I guess but with a with a modern slant (.) how it will all go I don't know but I'm assuming

S: so when you all get together (.) at family gatherings and any sort of occasions what sort of happens there with you and your kids and their kids and does it stay in one language or does

K: YEAH yeah yeah but again it's because they speak only English

Kamran introduces certain variables which he relates as factors that can influence maintenance of the Heritage Language in co-ethnic marriages, and in arranged marriages with a spouse from back home: his brothers' wives are more "traditional", "religious" and "more Pakistani in terms of born and raised there".

Kamran presents his brothers as having married 'up': they have married Urdu speakers who hold reserves of linguistic capital in both Pakistan and among the Muslim community in the UK. Kamran's description of his sister-in-law as having an "Imran Khan sort of style of speaking" suggests that she comes from a family that is socially well-above the Mirpuri 'hicks' that Kamran has described his own family as. He also hints at a further stratification of the language, in this case English: from the pidgin English of his father's generation, to the less fluent English of some of his peers who did not attend the same school as he, to the educated tones of the Pakistani immigrant from a good family, the standard English that he speaks.

Kamran constructs his narrative to show that within a family are several undercurrents of varying capitals: economic and cultural capital in the UK that he and his brothers have (but

didn't have when they were growing up); linguistic capitals that any one member of the family may have greater than another, dependent on the field in question. These different capitals are noted by members of the family, and can influence the way that they interact with each other. What this shows is that what is often seen purely as a 'societal' issue (immigrants need to speak English), plays out in complex and subtle ways and has an impact at a personal, familial level.

Kamran refers to his brothers' wives again when later in his first interview he is discussing how despite his wife's wishes, he did not pass on Punjabi to his children:

K: it IS my mother tongue but it's not my FIRST language and in DEFENCE I cite my elder brother who is married to a Pakistani woman and they're much more traditional in the sense that they're RELIGOUS as well they have three children and they don't actually speak Punjabi or Urdu um because they don't the parents don't speak it between themselves so [mmm] y'know they are everyone in that house speaks English the parents are FLUENT in Punjabi and Urdu far more than I am and yet it hasn't transferred y'know BACKWARDS so um the kids yeah both kids are English-speaking and whatever language they're learning in school

In a reference to what he may perceive as a strong expectation (that South Asian parents should be teaching their Heritage Languages to their children) he 'cites' a "defence" using his elder brother who has children of a not dissimilar age, and who had an arranged marriage with a Pakistani woman. In this trope, a more "traditional" and "religious" family, with a collection of proficiencies in Punjabi and Urdu, has a similar linguistic dynamic between the parents and children as his own family: English is the lingua franca and the Heritage Languages have not "transferred". What is implicit in his reference to his brother's family is that while a strong Discourse among his community will attribute his children's lack of proficiency in Punjabi to his marriage to a white English monolingual, the reasons are actually more complex. Another Discourse from society – that 'mixed' marriages result in a multicultural, in the true sense of the word, society – is also more complex, and may not result in multilingual children.

9.2.3 His brother's wedding

I end this section with an extract from very near the end of his first interview, where Kamran is talking about his brother's recent wedding. He employs several instances of direct reported speech, and in this instance to aid with the reading of the extract I have used double quotation marks and punctuation:

K: My brother got married last November and I was asked to give a speech and my older brother was going to speak alongside and I said "Do you want to do this in PUNJABI or ENGLISH?" and he said "Oh I'd rather do it in "English" and I said "Oh YOU'RE fluent you know" and he said "No I think I'd rather do it in ENGLISH" and then I said "Well, why don't I do it in English and then YOU do it in Punjabi and then it will give some members of the family and the community don't speak English very well" (3) and in the end, we both did it in English and it was slightly odd because I think I could have got by. It wasn't a big speech with comedy thrown in there was a bit of humour but generally (.) The Best Man's speech was down to my younger brother who did it sort of in English and I thought well this is slightly unnecessary but fine ↑. And then my DAD got up to speak and it was the first time he's ever done a speech in his life as far as I am aware and he did it in URDU which is not his default language which is slightly odd ↓ but then the family he was marrying into was Urdu-speaking but NINETY-NINE PERCENT of the room of 400 people are our family and they speak Punjabi and I was they ALSO speak Urdu and understand it but Im sure [it's sort of] it was slightly strange↓.

Kamran uses direct reported speech to offer me, the listener, a 'fly-on-the-wall' experience. A wedding reception of four hundred people, to mark the occasion of Kamran's brother's marriage to his bride from Pakistan highlights the complex lives of multilinguals. A chronotope is evoked, where social traditions from past times in Pakistan are re-enacted in a different space, Oldham in the UK. Kamran reveals that the two older brothers of the groom are on hand to give speeches, and his twin brother will give the Best Man's speech, a tradition common in the West and which

may now be as common in traditional South Asian weddings. The emphasis in this chronotope is on speaking, communication between the two families involved, between the hosts and their guests, and between the brothers themselves. There are three languages: English (in which the story is related, in interview-time, the here-and-now), Urdu and Punjabi. It is clear that the language in jeopardy in this story — of a Muslim wedding attended by the Pakistani Punjabi community in Oldham — is not English, but Punjabi.

The first complication arises: in the public domain the two older brothers are reluctant to speak in Punjabi. In front of elders and members of the wider community, they feel they do not have prowess, even though between themselves they are confident of their proficiency. They are also aware of two levels of proficiency, the older brother being reminded that he is "fluent", the implication being that he is more fluent than Kamran. Kamran casts himself (the only brother who has broken with tradition and married a white woman) as a traditionalist, emphasising their duty to ensure that all members of the community are respected and allowed to engage fully in the ceremony. His attempts to be inclusive, by suggesting that one speech be in Punjabi and the other in English, were not agreed with by his brother. The resolution to this event is that he and his brothers spoke in English, a total of three speeches, and he expresses his disappointment through under-statement: it was "unnecessary" but "fine".

When the patriarch of the family (the "driving force" for both the migration and education of his sons) and the father of the groom — both positions of high status in a Pakistani wedding — makes a speech for the "first time in his life", he speaks in the language of the family of his new daughter-in-law — Urdu — rather than his "default language", Punjabi. By doing so he shows that he is fully aware of the low status of Mirpuri Punjabi, of the fact that his British son is probably marrying into a family which speaks a language of much greater capital, in Pakistan and among Muslims at least. In this way the past traditions and social strata from Pakistan are relived in a new space, the wedding hall in Oldham, Greater Manchester in the 2010s.

9.3 Marriage and consequences

9.3.1 A very long story

In our second interview I asked Kamran if he would talk about how he met his wife.

S: I'm more interested in how you felt about NOT having a marriage that I don't know maybe you'd always expected to in the end have an arranged marriage I don't know perhaps there was some time in your life when you realised maybe that you WEREN'T going to go for that? [sure] and when you ended up sort of presenting Samantha to your family I don't know were there any sort of

K: sure yeah yeah OK (.) that's a VERY long story (laughs)

S: oh no! (laughs)

At that moment he realised that his laptop needed charging, and that he needed to discuss a domestic arrangement with his wife. When he returned with the charger his wife also wandered into the kitchen where he was seated with his laptop. We resumed our conversation; her words are in underlined italics below:

K: sorry about this

S: I just want to say that I hope this is a good story {laughing voice} (Laughs)

K: (laughs) she's here NOW I'm [*I'm in my pajamas!*] I'm going to get you to wave [*I'm in my pajamas!*] wave Samantha [*hi!*] [Hello Samantha] Sheena this is Samantha [*hi Sheena!*] [hi][*how's it going?*] she's asking about how when I met you first Sam so you need to leave the room {all laugh}

As I have mentioned previously, conducting the interview through Skype at times afforded me a chance to see more of the families and their interactions – a small nod in the direction of the ethnography I had hoped to conduct. This short period for me established a few things: Kamran and Samantha's close and relaxed relationship, Samantha's interest in Kamran's interview

("How's it going?"), and Kamran's mock-exclusion of his wife from the telling of the story of their marriage: "so you need to leave the room".

9.3.2 A complete disaster

With the stage set, Kamran then began his story, a story which was familiar and unfamiliar: it was difficult for me on listening to him not to compare my own experiences around the same issues. He evokes a chronotope, using cultural markers that I recognise: he does not go to meet the prospective bride alone, but in the company of his parents and his older brother and his sister-in-law. This chronotope is also evoked as being a threshold. It occurs possibly a week before he met his wife Samantha, after which his life 'changed': a reference to his quote earlier about how he used to "think" about mixed marriages, and now he is "living" the life. The way he constructs his narrative therefore, in answer to my question of how he met his wife, is to show that he had before his present life complied with tradition. He binds this compliance with the opposite result — his love-marriage — so that the event he is about to relate is given some importance. He quickly pronounces the event a "disaster":

K: um right so about {clears voice} two weeks before interestingly enough two weeks before I met Samantha if not the WEEK before I met Samantha I'd actually gone agreed to meet someone [yeah] on an ARRANGED MARRIAGE thing through my parents um my ENTIRE life I'd never thought I'd but I'd actually I thought why not give it a go you know actually why not? [yeah] because people around me were starting to meet people (.) so I went along with my parents my elder brother his wife um {coughs} I can't remember if my younger brother was there if not (.) um and it was such a you know a complete DISASTER and it actually made me y'know confirmed for me how ridiculous it CAN be

As Kamran continues his story, it becomes clear that Samantha has remained in the room despite his mock-dismissal earlier. She hands him some water when he starts coughing.

S: so wh-what [y'know] was DISASTROUS what was disastrous about it was it {[Kamran coughing]} were you just INCOMPATIBLE

K: {coughs} sorry so just yeah so the family were from East London or living in East London they were from our neck of the woods {*Samantha gives him glass of water*}thank you just a glass of water (5) {drinks water} they were from our neck of the woods in Pakistan they were ACTUALLY (.) [*Samantha is seen leaving the room*] distantly related but er the family were still sort of what we sort of term FRESH OFF THE BOAT but not they'd been here for a long time but they were still very much [mm mmm] um (.) very very TRADITIONAL the girl had sort of ↑ she'd gone and done a y'know a degree in something but she was very traditionally brought up ↑and had the SCARF ↑and also just the person she was very SHY and very quiet and very sort of TRADITIONAL y'know we did talk and I tried to find out y'know she was religious and all these sort of things and I though oh well y'know all those MARKERS y'know my parents would know that I am not like that so why did you introduce me to this person? and then on top of that the FAMILY were so incompatible family to family was really incompatible and I thought oh why are we here this is ridiculous [mmm] hhh errm

In the first part of the extract Kamran uses a colloquialism ("they were from our neck of the woods") to describe the Mirpuri area in Pakistan. I read his choice of words as indexing a cultural knowledge of the UK that he is hinting the other family did not possess: he follows this by describing the other family as "fresh off the boat". The use of the term 'fresh off the boat' has elicited much interest in research such as Steven Talmy's (2004) investigations of different identity positions in the ESL classroom, and in the complementary classroom (see Creese, Bhatt, and Martin (2006) as an example). In this extract, however, Kamran's manner was far from derogatory. While he uses the phrase "we term" I did not feel he was including me directly as his co-conspirator but "we" as in that larger group of South Asians with the cultural and linguistic capital that being middle-class, professional and proficient in English allows. However, it was

also clear that between the two of us, it was understood that 'fresh off the boat' was an easy and quick way to encompass a myriad of descriptions and identity positions without necessarily condemning them: it will be understood as a description more than an evaluation. While I respond with a "mmm", Kamran may have felt that he needed to be more explicit in describing how 'unsuitable' the girl was as a potential spouse for him. He lists a set of "markers" that he uses to further shore up his 'case', for my benefit, that the matching of him and the girl was "ridiculous": the girl is "traditional", "had the scarf", was "very shy", "very quiet", "religious". He shows his level of emotional engagement with his memory of the encounter by dropping into direct speech: "why did you introduce me to this person?" In this way, Kamran is building his case for his assessment of the meeting, and his final parry ("on top of that"), that — another indexing of the tradition, the bridge between families — was also absent: "family to family was really incompatible".

After listening to his 'case', I ask my next question, using "such a girl" to illustrate my understanding. Interestingly, in an arranged marriage introduction the parties are often referred to as 'the girl' and 'the boy':

S: do you know WHY your parents CHOSE such a girl because they could have chosen ANOTHER y'know [I think] Mirpuri

Kamran explained that his parents had capitalised on the sudden change in his attitude: previously he had always resisted any attempts:

K: I think it had all come to them as a bit of a surprise as well and I know my dad had said often when are you're going to be when are you going to (.) I'd just I'd IGNORED it I was just no no no no no no no um (.) and so I went along and it was just it was just and we were in the car and we'd left their house and my dad said so what d'you think? (.) and my older brother who had

married through an arranged marriage just turned around and said what do you mean what do you think you have to ask that question? I mean

S: yeah {laughing voice}

K: so my brother thought it was ridiculous and my sister-in-law was OH! You don't have to ask and my dad was like **WHAT D'YOU MEAN WHAT DO YOU MEAN?** {laughs}[laughs]

In his first use of his father's words, using direct reported speech, Kamran does not modify his accent. Neither does he do so with his sister-in-law (who is from "back home"). But as his story builds up, with me as an amused and understanding listener, Kamran reaches the punchline: Kamran's use here of a South Asian accent to render his father's words ("what d'you mean what d'you mean") is intensely dialogic. Rather than using his usual Standard English accent he evokes his father's voice, the first generation: the strength of the 'authenticity' of his narrative is increased. Here, too, the question his father asks "what d'you mean?" does not refer to language but Discourse: he understands Kamran's brother's impatient "You have to ask?" but he does not understand the incompatibility that Kamran and his siblings have felt with the introduction. While the encounter could best described as unfortunate, Kamran use of exaggeration ("a complete disaster") shows his knowledge of story-telling, with a need to 'entertain' the listener, and to present a 'case'.

9.3.3 Marrying for love

By now the story was becoming so entertaining we were both laughing through our words. What transpired is that, soon after the "disastrous" introduction, Kamran met his wife Samantha and they started a relationship. Marriage plans were brought forward when Samantha discovered that she was expecting their child. It now befell on Kamran to inform his parents that he wanted to marry a white English girl, something he was sure that they would not approve of.

It is only now in the telling of this part of his narrative that Kamran reveals that despite his father's insistence that his children learn English over Punjabi, that he kept them removed from the heart of the Muslim Punjabi community in Oldham, he still expected his son to adhere to certain religious and social expectations. I show a long section below, because it shows how Kamran maintains his entertaining story-telling strategies (using direct reported speech, emphasising certain words), until he reaches a point in his narrative where he feels some uncertainty: either that I would remain a supportive/approving / empathetic listener or that he would be able to present a strong enough 'case' for his actions and decisions. The change is preceded by a long pause of four seconds, which I have highlighted as LONG PAUSE in bold for ease of recognition:

K: so I went to Manchester for the weekend (.) came back from Manchester and Samantha said how did it go and I said IT NEVER CAME UP! {laughs}[laughs] I couldn't actually TELL them I didn't know how to broach the subject! I couldn't say y'know MUUUM DAAAD (.) y'know [laughing] there was nothing in my life-training that said here is how you start that conversation

S: what I've gathered from our interview is that you actually have a really nice relationship with your parents is that true

K: yeah yeah we get on fine it's really nice […]

S: so when you EVENTUALLY {laughing voice} told them {laughs}

K: yeah well I told them in a very roundabout way I got my BROTHER to tell them [oh ok!] yeah I spoke with my younger brothers who are more open and I'm close with and he suggested telling my OLDER brother and he would tell THEM (.) but what **(LONG PAUSE 4)** we sort of figured it out would be (.) the easiest way would be if Samantha CONVERTED [um] to Islam on paper and said yeah I agree because it's a very minor trivial ceremony [yeah] and that basis I said this would make my life our life easier for me and she said (.) my life easier in terms of maintaining contacts with my family I said I'm not sure I used to think when I was younger that I could cut that off if I needed to for my relationship and MY future but I don't think I CAN now

and I said it doesn't MEAN anything to ME I'm not religious and I'd never put anything on YOU but it would just be a kind of (.) y'know err a PASSPORT into the system

S: like a sort of formality

I do not remain silent, and my comment at the end ("like a sort of formality") shows my support, but Kamran in this last part of the extract builds another case for, in contrast to the previous example, *complying* with tradition. Like before, he employs direct reported speech ("I don't think I can now", "it doesn't mean anything to me I'm not religious and I'd never put anything on you"), lexis that downplays the conversion ("it's a minor trivial ceremony", "a passport into the system").

Kamran would not know that I know other people in his position (whose spouses have converted to Islam purely for convenience), and in this section he again shows his knowledge that another aspect of story-telling is to maintain not only the interest but the *sympathy* of the listener. While he begins to talk about his wife's response ("she said"), we do not in fact hear what Samantha had to say. But in this extract Kamran also shows his desire to maintain ties with his family with the event presented as a kind of threshold: "I used to think […] but I don't think I can now". His marriage to a white (non-Muslim) woman for love, a break with tradition, is the moment when he realises the strength of his emotional bond with his family. His use of 'I' can be seen as ownership for the decision which, while it worked for some time, and his parents were happy with his wife, later produced some friction over whether his son would be circumcised, and the name he and his wife chose for his son.

K: so it was fine and then problems STARTED to arise when Hxxx was born and we didn't have him circumcised which is expected and we called him Kxxx at first and Samantha said oh actually that doesn't when the doctors call his name y'know you go through regular check ups she said

y'know he doesn't sound like MY CHILD he's called Kxxx and he has your surname so I went OK yeah fair enough she said can we change it I said sure y'know he's only five weeks old {coughs} so we changed him and we called him Hxxx with an i [mm mm] so it has a more Asian spelling but has an English sound and that suddenly caused an ERUPTION↑ why's he got it's a non-Muslim name

S: it is it can be a HINDU name as well

K: EXACTLY YEAH [ok] exactly yeah (.) and so the cat was out of the bag that everything we'd done was a bit of a PRETENCE [laughs] you know what I mean

S: but it was also Samantha asserting her rights as the MOTHER

K: oh yeah but our lot don't see it that way the rights of the mother especially the daughter-IN-LAW

At the end of the extract Kamran statess "our lot don't see it that way": his use of colloquial English again a contrast to the very traditional Pakistani (South Asian) patriarchal society, the low esteem a daughter-in-law can have, as opposed to my supportive (Western) perspective ("it was also Samantha asserting her rights as a mother"). He includes me with the "our lot" but he is also referring to the Pakistani Muslim working-class community, a community different to mine. Again, our shared knowledge, and our individual differences are brought into relief: highlighting the strength of a 'South Asian' community as well as its smaller factions. The chronotope above is again given some emotional importance with the use of direct speech, emotive lexis ("caused an eruption", "why's he got a non-Muslim name?"). My interjection is appreciated ("Exactly yeah"), so Kamran knows that his narrative is fully understood and that the effect he is constructing is noted.

9.4 Conclusion

Regarding Kamran as a participant with skills in the genre of story-telling, allows a perspective on his narrative which less examines how his story satisfies a thesis, but rather accepts that he

has a thesis himself: a view of himself that he wants to transmit in the interviews. Kamran presents himself as bicultural: 'a northerner' but also 'a Mirpuri hick'. Both these sobriquets show deep understanding of the Discourses in the two cultures and his narrative is infused with other in-depth observations. He shows how the decisions made by the patriarch of the family — to move to the UK, to ensure his sons learned a high standard of English by avoiding bringing them up in a dense community — have been instrumental in Kamran's evolution into a fully-participating member of British society. But he also shows that he believes his own decision — to marry a white English woman for love — has ensured Kamran is a fully-*integrated* member of British society. He has also given insights into the presence of multiple capitals and multiple languages that can be found in families such as his. And, by now living a lifestyle which he believes makes the most of the country that is now his home, Kamran shows that he wishes others from his community the same resolution and achievement.

A quantitative survey might have elicited that Kamran is 'bilingual', and that his children are 'dual-heritage'. It might even have elicited that he is a 'Muslim'. But his vivid narrative offers rich insights into the journey he has taken to become the person he is today: stories which offer much-needed perspectives on the lives of second-generation British South Asians in multilingual families, in multicultural Britain.

10. Conclusion

> *As a minority, no sooner do you learn to polish and cherish one chip on your shoulder than it's taken off you and swapped for another. The jewellery of your struggles is forever on loan, like the Koh-i-Noor diamond in the crown jewels. You are intermittently handed a necklace of labels to hang around your neck, neither of your choosing nor making, both constricting and decorative.*
>
> Riz Ahmed

Academic research has already recognised one issue facing the transnational: that people can be regarded as "reified speakers of community languages, [and] in the process their ethnicities are also reified" (Leung et al, 1997:553). Roxy Harris (2006:34) has described how young participants of South Asian heritage in his studies are often "bashful and rueful" in their acknowledgements of their own deficient expertise in their community practices. Indeed, Konnie Huq, in her radio programme, *Mind Your Language*, begins by expressing regret at her diminishing fluency in Bengali. In her interviews with the South Asians who do not maintain the language, there is a tacit acknowledgement of 'letting the side down'; but whether that 'side' is oneself and family, or whether that 'side' is the wider UK society, is not clear.

The quotation above is taken from British-Pakistani actor and songwriter Riz Ahmed's contribution to Nikesh Shukla's (2016) edited collection of essays by British ethnic minority writers. This book, crowd-funded and produced in three days, is perhaps an indication that others like myself have felt that there is a need to hear directly from people who live the life of an ethnic minority about what that life entails. The premise of the collection, titled *The Good Immigrant*, is to give voice to those who at times feel unwelcome in the country they call home; a country which simultaneously prizes their presence in the bid to be branded 'multicultural'.

When observing a complementary school, a researcher would expect to find students interacting with the Heritage Language and parents invested in this learning. By choosing to

interview people like my target participants, I was unsure of their attitudes towards maintaining the Heritage Language even though I expected an open-mindedness about marrying out of their South Asian community. Given that there is a trend for an increasing number of intermarriages in the next generations, insights into factors involved from articulate, reflective people who have lived experiences in this area are valuable. My participants see themselves as British but plural, and therefore emphasise the plurality of British reality.

Notably, none are completely disengaged from their language or heritage, and this maintained connection gives us an insight into another paradigm of multiculturalism: not discrete cultures living alongside each other as in Delanty's (2003) salad-bowl metaphor, nor a melting pot with its implications of a new culture formed from an amalgam of many, but what I term the "restaurant-menu". This metaphor allows for the difference between each dish which is eventually chosen by the diner, but also allows for the limited options available: options offered by the restaurant/host society. There will be some 'missed opportunities' depending on the dish you choose; the dish you eventually decide on involves some reflection on what is important to you and what is not, but may also result from the influence of those you are dining with. Bringing this metaphor to reality, questions that may be asked include: is it important to maintain a close connection with my birth family? Is it important to observe my religion? Is it important that I marry someone who comes from the same culture as I? Is it important for my children to speak the language I learned from my parents? Is it important for me to feel part of UK society?

The narratives I have gathered are individual and are driven by the individuals. This is a methodological point: rather than extract a large body of evidence or information in a journalistic sense, I wanted to give voice to these participants and allow them to present themselves in the way they want to present themselves. There is an epistemological grounding: that stories about being a second generation British Asian, having a Heritage Language, marrying out of the linguistic/ethnic community and thereby enacting 'multiculturalism', are the best ways of understanding these aspects, and understanding what multiculturalism means on an everyday

basis. The diversity of the participants' narratives shows how they are 'in charge' of their narratives: they are not naïve participants but actively construct a position and a theme within the interview to best reflect how they see themselves at that time. Not only do I show what we can learn of each participant's particular understanding of themselves and their lives, but I show how their life stories confirm the heterogeneity of the South Asian diaspora in the UK.

10.1 Tales from the diaspora

Heritage Languages

The stories that my participants tell describe how Heritage language maintenance and transmission are influenced by several factors. Further, that within a family there can be differing proficiencies in the Heritage Language between siblings; that is within the second-generation. Examining *how* the participants construct their stories in the interviews shows how within interview-time they try to make sense of, explain and even justify their own proficiency in their Heritage Language, as well as their children's engagement with the Heritage language. In doing so, they acknowledge the Discourse of South Asian Britons as being bilingual, and allude to the varied linguistic capitals related to bilingualism. They also bind their relationship with the Heritage Language to their parents' (the first generation) proficiency and engagement with the Heritage Language; their parents are constructed as the participants' conduit to the Heritage Language.

The participants emphasise their awareness of the very specific knowledge of the Heritage Language and culture that they have, strongly entwined with their personal circumstances and their upbringing, but in their narratives the Discourses surrounding people like them are highlighted. They do this at times to show how they deviate from a Discourse; but in doing so they also *perpetuate* a Discourse. An example is the way Nick regards himself: by not falling into the accepted mould of a 'British Asian', in how he speaks and how he grew up, he regards himself as not being a 'real' British Asian. Their engagement with the Heritage Language

is very much described as a relationship: with changes in use and how they regard it over time, some changes constructed as threshold moments when they reflected on its use or used it more often (for example, parenthood). After my contact with them, there could be another change/threshold.

None of my participants, at least during the period of my research, intend to maintain or pass on the Heritage Language to their children: an attitude described as 'dismal' by Itesh Sachdev. But what my research highlights is the very big ask society or academia place on people like my participants by *expecting* this transmission, given the inconsistent institutional support for the teaching and learning of South Asian Heritage Languages, and ambiguous reactions from government to bilingualism. If the passing on of the Heritage Language among my participants is low, is this unsurprising when the languages in question are so varied, lack currency, and are seen as unnecessary? Further, my participants' stories are a reminder that having grown up in the UK, the way they learned the Heritage Language and how they use it is very different from if *they* were the immigrants, not their parents. The participants are very aware that they are second-generation: they build a back-story to explain why they have become who they are, why they are so different from their parents. These back-stories show that wide, sweeping statements on language maintenance are unhelpful and reductive: what happens in language maintenance is a product of different factors.

The varieties of South Asian Heritage Language play a part in complicating language transmission and maintenance. If immigrants settle in an area where there is a significant South Asian presence, but this presence is composed of speakers of another South Asian language – as in Padma's situation – then this might narrow the domain of use of the Heritage Language to the family home, and limit the necessity for using the Heritage Language outside of this home. But the narratives show that even such common-sense assumptions may be ungrounded: Mumtaz grew up in mostly white areas, but self-reports as the most proficient in Urdu. The high status of Urdu, having an older sister, and the socio-economic confidence of her parents might explain

her proficiency more than the density or not of a linguistic community. Paresh grew up in a close-knit, large community but feels that his proficiency in Gujarati never reached a high level, but remained 'villagey' and functional: even though his life story matches expected Discourses of British South Asian, he prefers to see himself as a "political animal". Kamran describes growing up among Punjabi speakers; but one mile away from the high-density community, a spatial shift which he believes accounts for his academic achievements and success.

The varied linguistic capital that they have in the Heritage Language causes them to re-think their ownership of the language: but having become successful in the UK, they are also aware that the language is not necessary. It becomes an additional facet, which might be replaced, or not, by something else: their commitment to their work, their hobbies, even another language, such as Spanish for Padma.

Being second generation

From the narratives I obtained, I have shown that the participants draw in other issues which reveal that they see their stories as being placed in the diaspora, as well as relational to their parents and, if they have siblings, their siblings. They bind their stories to notions of space, and while doing so they show awareness of the Discourses surrounding South Asians in the UK.

In a section I have not discussed, Devinder tries to interpret the hurtful relationship he has had with his parents, explaining that they would be "different people" if they had stayed in India and "being an immigrant makes them different". The participants show that they consider their lives as a story which involves a journey: that is, they link their life stories very much with the stories of their parents' lives, migrants who left the homeland and relocated to a new country. They emphasise this by enacting the habitus of the diaspora: binding their formation with their parents' dislocation from a motherland, and showing their family home as a space where their cross-cultural upbringing was manifested.

As their life story begins with a spatial movement, space assumes significance in other elements: an explanatory factor for their proficiency or not in the Heritage Language; an explanatory factor in their motivation to learn or maintain it, and the opportunities afforded for its use. Space is used to explain differences in proficiency in and affinity for the Heritage Language between siblings. The participants have different views on their proficiency, even between each other, highlighting the reductive nature of the term 'second-generation', even though all of them might well be described as 'bilinguals'. The participants have also shown that their use of the Heritage Language is valued differently in different spaces; a reflection of globalization and the mobility of many sub-continentals.

As members of a diaspora, they are aware of their local identity as British Asians, and the global identity of being a member of a diaspora: but the construction of where the 'global' begins can be outside the family home in which they grew up. The 'global' can also be less spatially fixed and more related to people outside of their family network. These distinctions are used to show how the participants have a changing relationship with their Heritage Language, not only in terms of time (they were more exposed to it as children) but in terms of space (they might change their assessment of their proficiency depending on where they are and with whom they are speaking). Thus, simultaneously these participants acknowledge the 'normality' of having a homeland, of having a local and global identity, but by constructing the 'global' as chronotopic, linked to time and space, they can restrict this domain to a very small time period and a very specific spatial location.

Telling their stories

The participants use the resources they have as articulate story-tellers with a keen ear for the genre to exploit the platform of a spoken interview. They show awareness of the need to persuade, entertain and involve the listener, as well as the need for authenticity to validate their stories. They highlight certain aspects of their lives by infusing parts of their narratives with

suspense or emotional involvement. They drive the narrative to allow me the listener to understand why they have become the person they are now. Again, their stories shed light on the subtleties that can occur: Nick has found a resolution in his Indian-ness after marrying a white woman and settling in Norway; Joshua, despite not identifying himself strongly as Indian, maintains the closest connection with India.

My thesis shows that narratives elicited from interviews offer a rich source of data for analysis into how discourse is used to tell a story, perpetuate a Discourse, struggle against a Discourse, interest and engage the listener. Any analysis should include reflexivity of the researcher and the question: why are they telling this story and why are they telling it in this way? They use the resources they have to exploit the platform they have been given, using 'other' voices, direct speech, accents, lexis, as well as indexing tropes and scenarios that they know I will recognise.

Further, that by investigating how they speak, identity performance need not only be connected to changes in language and code-switching. Close analysis of the myriad of 'voices' they reflect, why I recognise them, accents as a type of performance: all these allow the narratives, conducted in English, to be a rich commentary on language and identity issues more traditionally associated in linguistics with multilingual data.

Using narratives in linguistic research

Recognition of these 'narrative voices' offers a new approach to monolingual data. The same items of data can be analysed for content (what knowledge do we gain) as well as for form: what can we learn from how the participants present themselves and why they do so in the interview.

I have shown in my thesis that the participants are making an argument. The narratives, when regarded as whole entities, offer a perspective that would be missed should the stories only be broken up for discourse analysis. For example, it is only when Mumtaz's narrative is taken as a whole that the way she disregards her own life story (a Muslim South Asian girl who married a

white Englishman and who still practises her religion) is revealed when she discusses the intransigence of British South Asian communities: in this way, as someone who has deviated from Discourses (by marrying out the Discourse of a Muslim girl; by maintaining her religion as opposed to the Discourse of a predominantly irreligious society) she still perpetuates Discourses.

Practically, rare are the occasions when the researcher can indulge in single-participant studies. However, threads can be investigated, as I have shown by selecting all the instances when language was discussed and then reading that as a 'micro' narrative. By comparing Devinder's and Mumtaz's narratives on language, I could show the heterogeneity of experiences, in terms of upbringing and attitude, but also the irrelevance of proficiency in a language when predicting its maintenance. The one 'whole story' macro-narrative that I show, Kamran's, gives a vivid insight into the decisions and events that occur in anyone's life, but which are tightly connected to the cornerstones of South Asian culture if one is a member of the South Asian diaspora: language, religion and marriage.

10.2 Limitations and future research

In Section 3.1, I highlighted Tracy's (2010) recommendations for ensuring quality in qualitative studies. I have adhered to these as closely as possible, but as is the inherent nature of qualitative research, my presence remains. Therefore, from adopting a methodology to deciding on how to transcribe the interviews, from choosing the themes of analysis to choosing which participants' narratives to show in near-completion: all these decisions have been made by me, and another researcher might have chosen differently. I have tried to mitigate this by analysing the narratives as being co-produced, and theorising the way my own experiences influence my recognition of how and why the participants highlight certain stories.

Personal stories and small sample sizes do not map easily into policy change and my thesis does not offer a clear direction for the future of a multilingual Britain. Immigration experiences also, as I have shown through the narratives, vary greatly, from motivation to

manifestation. If I had found a further seven participants, their stories are likely to have had similar variations and subtleties as my thesis shows. But what my sample of participants *does* show is the need for such qualitative research to complement quantitative studies. My thesis, while it may not influence policy, might well encourage quantitative researchers to frame their surveys/questionnaires differently and, further, to broaden the range of target groups.

My participants are of South Asian origin and constraints do not allow me to explore in detail the complex relationship between English and the South Asian sub-continent. For instance, transliteration into Latin script has always been used in the Indian media (one example is for film titles) acknowledging that within India this script, and the English language, is often used as a common communication (see Surana and Singh, 2008 and Lavanya et al., 2005 for some discussions on transliteration in acadaemia). This complex relationship may not be replicated in studies of language maintenance of other non-Latin script languages (Chinese or Russian for example). A contrastive study taking note of people's relationship with English (rather than focusing on their Heritage Language) might thus also be useful.

10.3 Concluding thoughts

My participants do not engage in practices that would perpetuate Britain as a multi*lingual* space: this might be seen either as a lament, or as a celebration of integration. Whichever, my participants' narratives do give insights into the way people live very multi*cultural* lives: firstly, from stories of their upbringings, where their heritage culture and the host culture were either impervious to each other or allowed osmosis between; and secondly, from stories of their current lives where their families, with spouses and children, are microcosms of multiculturalism. And such detailed evocations of their lives, past and present, showing diversity and commonality in experiences, offer a valuable contribution to our understanding of the realities of being second-generation and South Asian in Britain.

11. Appendix I: Transcription style

The transcription convention I have adopted, adapted from Relano Pastor and de Fina's (2005), itself adapted from Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff (1974), is shown below. I use capital letters at the start of proper nouns:

↑	rising intonation
↓	falling intonation
?	question (evidenced by intonation and/or grammatical context)
CAPITALS	increase in volume/louder
(.)	pause
(5)	longer pause (5 seconds)
{}	non-verbal action
[ ]	overlapping speech
um er eh	hesitation noises
bold	retroflex used/ South Asian pronunciation (The parameters of this description will be discussed within the thesis)
South Asian	South Asian word/term used with Anglicised pronunciation
[italics]	explanatory comment made on the interview data

12. Bibliography

Abbas, T., 2002. A retrospective study of South Asian further education college students and their experiences of secondary school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32(1), pp.73-90.

Abbas, T., 2004. After 9/11: British South Asian Muslims, Islamophobia, multiculturalism, and the state. *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, 21(3), pp.26-38.

Ae Fond Kiss…2004. [Film] Directed by Ken Loach. UK: Icon Films.

Agha, A., 2003. The Social Life of Cultural Value. Theme issue, "Words and Beyond: Linguistic and Semiotic Studies of Sociocultural Order". *Language and Communication* 23 (3), pp.231–273.

Agha, A., 2005. Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), pp.38-59.

Agha, A., 2007. Recombinant selves in mass mediated spacetime. *Language & Communication,* 27(3), pp.320-335.

Ahmed, R., 2016. Typecast as a terrorist. In N.Shukla, ed., 2016. *The Good Immigrant.* London: Cornerstone.

Aitsiselmi, F., 2004. *Multilingualism and the use of English in the home environment* . Bradford: University of Bradford

Alam, F. and Stuart-Smith, J., 2014. Identity, ethnicity and fine phonetic detail: an acoustic phonetic analysis of syllable-initial/t/in Glaswegian girls of Pakistani heritage. In M. Hundt and D. Sharma, eds, *English in the Indian Diaspora.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Alba, R., 2004. Language assimilation today: Bilingualism persists more than in the past, but English still dominates, *Working Papers*, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, UC San Diego.

Alexander, C. and Kim, H., 2014. South Asian youth cultures in Britain. *Routledge Handbook of the South Asian Diaspora*. London: Routledge.

Alibhai-Brown, Y., 2011. A most delicate relationship, *The Independent*, [online] 4 July. Available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/yasmin-alibhai-brown/yasmin-alibhai-brown-a-most-delicate-relationship-2306304.html>
[Accessed September 2016]

Alladina, S. and Edwards, V. eds., 1991. *Multilingualism in the British Isles. 1. The older mother tongues and Europe* Vol. 1. London: Longman Publishing Group.

Alladina, S. and Edwards,V. eds.,1991. *Multilingualism in the English Isles* 2. *Africa, Asia and the Middle East* Vol. 2. London: Longman.

Althusser, L., 1970. « Idéologie et appareils idéologiques d'État, notes pour une recherche ». La pensée. *Revue du rationalisme moderne* 151, juin 1970. Paris: pp.3-38 écrit en 1969.

Alvesson, M., 2003. Beyond neopositivists, romantics and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), pp.13- 33.

Andrews, J. and Yee, W.C., 2006. Children's 'funds of knowledge' and their real life activities: two minority ethnic children learning in out-of-school contexts in the UK. *Educational Review*, 58(4), pp.435-449.

Androutsopolous, J., 2007. Bilingualism in the mass media and on the internet. In: M. Heller, ed. 2007*Bilingualism: A social approach*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Antaki, C. ed., 2011. *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arweck, E. and Nesbitt, E., 2010. Close encounters? The intersection of faith and ethnicity in mixed-faith families. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 31(1), pp. 39-52.

Au, T.K.F., Knightly, L.M., Jun, S.A. and Oh, J.S., 2002. Overhearing a language during childhood. *Psychological science*, 13(3), pp.238-243.

Back, L., 1996. *New ethnicities and urban culture: Racisms and multi-culture in young lives*, London: UCL Press.

Ballard, R., 1990. Migration and kinship: the differential effect of marriage rules on the processes

of Punjabi migration to Britain. *South Asians overseas: Migration and ethnicity*, pp.219-249.

Baker, C.D., 1982. Adolescent-adult talk as a practical interpretive problem. In G. Payne and E. Cuff eds., *Doing Teaching: The practical management of classrooms*. London: Batsford.

Baker, P., Hardie, A., McEnery, T., Cunningham, H. and Gaizauskas, R.J., 2002. EMILLE, A 67-Million Word Corpus of Indic Languages: Data Collection, Mark-up and Harmonisation. In *LREC*.

Baker, J.P., Hardie,A., McEnery, A.M., Xiao, R., 2004. Corpus Linguistics and South Asian Languages: Corpus Creation and Tool Development. *Literary and Linguistic computing,* 19(4), pp.509-524.

Bakhtin, M. M., 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. M.Holquist, ed. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M., 2004. Form and functions of 'slut bashing' in male identity constructions in15-year-olds. *Human development*, 47(6) , pp.331-353.

Bamberg, M., De Fina, A. and Schiffrin, D. eds., 2007. *Selves and identities in narrative and discourse* Vol. 9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Banerji, S. and Baumann, G., 1990. Bhangra 1984-8: Fusion and professionalization in a genre of South Asian dance music. In: P. Olover, ed. 1990. *Black Music in Britain: Essays on the Afro-Asian contribution to popular music*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Barkhuizen, G.P., 2013. *Narrative research in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Basso, K. H., 1972. "To give up on words": Silence in Western Apache culture. In: P. P. Giglioli ed. 1972. *Language in social context* pp. 67–86. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Bauer, E., 2016. Practising kinship care: Children as language brokers in migrant families. *Childhood*, *23*(1), pp.22-36.

Bauer, P., Stennes,L. and Haight,J., 2003. Representation of the inner self in autobiography: Women's and men's use of internal states language in personal narratives. *Memory* ,11(1), pp. 27-42.

Baumann, G., 1996. *Contesting culture: Discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London* Vol. 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baynham, M., 2003. Narratives in Space and Time: Beyond "Backdrop" Accounts of Narrative Orientation. *Narrative Inquiry*, 13(2), pp.347-366.

Baynham, M., 2005. Network and agency in the migration stories of Moroccan women. In M. Baynham and A. De Fina, eds., *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Baynham, M. and De Fina, A. eds. 2005. *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Beech, J.R. and Keys, A. ,1997. Reading, vocabulary and language preference in 7-to 8-year-old bilingual Asian children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67(4), pp.405-414.

Beishon, S., Modood, T. and Virdee, S., 1998. *Ethnic minority families*, No. 857. Policy Studies Institute.

Bejarano, C.L., 2005. *Que Onda? Urban youth culture and border identity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Bend it like Beckham, 2003. [Film] Directed by Gurindher Chadha. UK: Redbus Films

Benson, P., 2014. Narrative Inquiry in Applied Linguistics Research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, pp.154-170.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe,E., 2006. *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Berthoud, R., 2005. Family formation in multicultural Britain: diversity and change. In Loury,G.C., T.Modood and S.M.Seles, eds., *Ethnicity, social mobility and public policy: comparing the USA and UK*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bhabha, H. K., 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge

Bhaji on the beach, 1993. [Film] Directed by Gurindher Chadha. UK: Channel Four Films, Umbi Films

Bhatia,T.K. and Ritchie, W.C., eds. 2004. *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Billy Elliott (2000). [Film] Directed by Stephen Daldry. UK: BBC Films

Blackledge, A., 2004. Constructions of Identity in political discourse in multilingual Britain. In: A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge, eds. 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Blackledge, A., 2005. *Discourse and power in a multilingual world.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blackledge, A. and Creese, A., 2009. Meaning-making as dialogic process: Official and Carnival lives in the language classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 8, pp.236-253.

Blackledge, A. and Creese, A., 2010. *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London:Continuum.

Blackledge,A., 2014. *Beyond Multilingualism: Heteroglossia as pedagogy and practice.* 10 February 2014, University of Manchester, Manchester.

Blommaert, J., 2005. In and Out of Class, Codes and Control: Globalization, Discourse and Mobility. In M. Baynham and A. De Fina, eds., *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Blommaert, J., 2008. *Grassroots literacy: Writing, identity and voice in Central Africa*. London: Routledge.

Blommaert, J., 2013a. Complexity, accent, and conviviality: Concluding comments. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), pp.613-622.

Blommaert, J., 2013b. Citizenship, Language and Superdiversity: Towards Complexity. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 12, pp.193-196.

Blommaert, J., 2015. Chronotopes, scales, and complexity in the study of language in society. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44, pp.105-116.

Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B., 2011. Language and superdiversity, *Diversities*, 13(2), pp.1-21.

Blommaert, J. and Varis, P., 2011. Enough is enough: The heuristics of authenticity in Superdiversity, *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies 2*.

Blunkett, D., 2002. Integration with Diversity: Globalisation and the renewal of democracy and civil society. In P. Griffith and M. Leonard eds., *Reclaiming Britishness*. London: Foreign Policy Centre, pp.65-77.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. and Thompson, J.B., 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1999. *Social suffering in contemporary society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., 2003. `Participant Objectification'. *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*. 9(2), pp.281-94

Bourdieu, P., 2006. The forms of capital. In H.Lauder, P.Brown, J.-A Dillabough, and A. Halsey*, eds., Education, globalization and social change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 2011. The forms of capital (1986). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, pp.81-93.

Brah, A., 1996. *Categories of Diaspora: Contesting identities*. London: Routledge.

Brockmeier, J. and Carbaugh, D.A. eds., 2001. *Narrative and identity: Studies in autobiography, self and culture* Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Bruner, E.M., 1984. The opening up of anthropology. *Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society*. Longrove: Waveland Press.

Bruner, J.S., 1990. *Acts of meaning Vol. 3*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J., 1991. The narrative construction of reality. *Critical inquiry*, 18(1), pp.1-21.

Bucholz, M. and Hall, K., 2005. Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), pp. 585-614.

Bunnell, J.B. and Beutler, I.F., 1999. The domestic labor puzzle: Meaning and emotion. *Journal of Extension*, 37(5).

Bunting, M., 2005. Orphans of Islam. *The Guardian* [online], Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/18/july7.religion>
[Accessed 15 September 2016]

Bunyan, N., 2012. Rochdale grooming trial: Asian grooming gangs, the uncomfortable issue. *The Telegraph* [online] 8 May, Available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/9253016/Rochdale-grooming-trial-Asian-grooming-gangs-the-uncomfortable-issue.html>
[Accessed 15 September 2016]

Butt, M. and Ramchand, G., 2001. Complex aspectual structure in Hindi/Urdu. In M. Liakata, B. Jensen, & D. Maillat, eds., *Working Papers, in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics*, pp1-30.

Calhoun, C. 1998. Community without Propinquity Revisited: Communications Technology and the Transformation of the Urban Public Sphere. *Sociological Inquiry*, 68, pp. 373–397.

Cameron, D., 2001. *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.

Cameron, D., 2011. PM's speech at Munich Security Conference, 5 February, Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>
[Accessed 15 September 2016]

Carrington, V. and Luke, A., 1997. Literacy and Bourdieu's sociological theory; a reframing. *Language and Education*, 11(2), pp.99-112.

Casciani, D., 2003. Bilingual Asian children 'do better'*, BBC News*, [online] 25 November, Available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/3236188.stm>
[Accessed 15 September 2016]

Census 2001, Available at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2001census>

Census 2011, Available at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

Charsley, K., 2005. Unhappy husbands: Masculinity and migration in transnational Pakistani marriages. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 11(1), pp.85-105.

Charsley, K. and Shaw, A., 2006. South Asian transnational marriages in comparative perspective. *Global Networks*, 6(4), pp.331-344.

Cheng, K., 2003. 'Language shift and language maintenance in mixed-marriages: a case study of a Malaysian- Chinese family'. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 161, pp.81-90.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M., 1995. *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M., 1996. Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Teacher Stories-Stories of Teachers-School Stories-Stories of Schools. *Educational Researcher,* 25(3), pp.24-30.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M., 1998. Personal Experience Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln. Eds., *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London: Sage Publications.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M., 2000. *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, H. H., & Gerrig, R. J., 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language*, 66, pp.764–805.

Cohen, A., 1985. *The symbolic construction of community*. London: Tavistock.

Cohen, R., 1996. Disaporas and the nation-state: from victims to challengers. *International Affairs*, 72, pp.507-20.

Conteh, J. ed., 2006. *Promoting learning for bilingual pupils 3-11: opening doors to success*. London: Sage.

Cramer, J., 2013. Styles, Stereotypes and the South: Constructing Identities at the Linguistic Border, *American Speech*, 88(2), pp.144-167.

Creese, A., 2002. The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), pp.597-616.

Creese, A., Bhatt,A., & Martin,P., 2006. Multicultural, heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education*, 20(1), pp. 23-44.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A., 2010. *Multiilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Creese, A and Blackledge, A. 2011. Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5) , pp. 1196–1208.

Crozier, G., 2005. Parents, Children and the School Experience: Asian Families' Perspective, End of Award Report. *Economic and Social Research Council grant ref*, *239671*.

Cummins, J., 1991. The development of bilingual proficiency from home to school: A longitudinal study of Portuguese-speaking children. *Journal of Education*, 17(3), pp.85-98.

Cummins, J., 2005. A proposal for action: Strategies for recognising Heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal,* 89(4) *,* pp.585-592.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L., 2009. Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8(4), pp.351-375.

Dale, A. and Ahmed, S., 2011. Marriage and employment patterns amongst UK-raised Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi women. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(6), pp.902-924.

Davidson, D., 2007. East spaces in West times: Deitic reference and political self-positioning in a post-socialist East German chronotope. *Language & Communication,* 27(3), pp.212-226.

Davies, B. and Harré, R., 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 20(1) , pp.43-63.

De Fina, A., 2013. Top-down and bottom-up strategies of identity construction in ethnic media. *Applied Linguistics*. 34(5), pp.554-573.

De Fina, A. and Georgakopolou, A., 2012. *Analyzing Narrative: Discourse and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Fina, A. and Georgakopolou,A., eds 2015. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

De Fina, A. and Perrino, S., 2013. Transnational identities. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), pp.509-515.

De Houwer, A., 2007. Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28, pp.411-424.

Delanty, G., 2003. *Community*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Demie, F. and Strand, S., 2006. English language acquisition and educational attainment at the end of secondary school. *Educational Studies*, 32(2), pp.215-231.

Denzin, N.K., 2008. The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(4), pp.315-325.

Department for Education, 2004. *Every children matters: Change for children*. London: Department for Education. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationdetail/page1/dfes/1081/2004>

Dhanjal, S. and Bhatia, S.S., 2013. Development of a standard text and speech corpus for the Punjabi language. In *Oriental COCOSDA held jointly with 2013 Conference on Asian Spoken Language Research and Evaluation O-COCOSDA/CASLRE , 2013 International Conference* pp. 1-6. IEEE.

Douglas, J., 1976. *Investigative social research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dudley , J. and Harvey , P., 2001. *Control of Immigration Statistics: United Kingdom 2000*. London: Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate.

Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C., eds., 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dustmann,C. and Fabbri,F., 2003, Language Proficiency and labour market performance of

immigrants in the UK, *The Economic Journal*, 11(3), pp.695-717.

Eakin, P.J., 2001. Breaking rules: The consequences of self-narration. *Biography*, 24(1), pp.113-127.

East is East, 1999. [Film] Directed by O'Donnell 1999. UK: BBC/Film Four.

Eckert, P., 1989. Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school In S. Goodman, T.Lillis, J. Maybin and N.Mercer, eds., 2003. *Language, Literacy and Education a Reader,* Stoke-on-Trent : Trentham Books in association with The Open University.

Eckert, P., 2000. *Language variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S., 1992. Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-based Practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, pp.461-490.

Edwards, C.P., Gandini, L. and Forman, G.E., 1998. *The hundred languages of children: The Reggio Emilia approach--advanced reflections*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Edwards, D., 1997. *Discourse and cognition*. London:Sage.

Edwards, D. and Stokoe, E.H., 2004. Discursive psychology, focus group interviews and participants' categories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(4), pp.499-507.

Edwards, J. and Chisholm, J., 1987. Language, multiculturalism and identity: A Canadian study. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 8(5), pp.391-408.

Elan, P., 2014. Desi Rascals: Why British Asians fare best on reality TV. *The Guardian* [online], 11 September, Available at < http://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/tvandradioblog/2014/sep/11/desi-rascals-why-british-asians-fare-best-on-reality-tv> [Accessed 31 May 2015]

Elliott, J., 2005 *Using Narrative in Social Research*. London: Sage.

Elliot, J. 2001 Making evidence-based practice educational. In: M. Hammersley, ed. 2009. *Educational Research and Evidence-based practice*. London: Sage in association with The Open University the Course Reader.

Fabian, J., 1996. *Remembering the present: painting and popular history in Zaire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Farouqui, A., 1994. Urdu education in India: Four representative states, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 29(14) , pp782-785.

Ferguson, C.A., 1984. Repertoire universals, markedness, and second language acquisition. *Language Universals and Second Language Acquisition. Typological Studies in Language*, 5, pp.247-258.

Fishman, J.A., 1989. *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J., 2006. A decalogue of basic theoretical perspectives for a sociology of language and religion. *Explorations in the Sociology of Language and Religion*, 20.

Foucault, M., 1971 Orders of discourse, *Social science information*, 10(2), pp7-30.

Foucault, M., 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge*. Translated from the French by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York City: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M., 1981. The hermeneutics of the subject. *Lectures at the College de France*, 1982, pp.25-43. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser Gupta, A., 2000. Bilingualism in the cosmopolis. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 143(1), pp.107-120.

Fuchs,R., 2016. *Speech rhythms in varieties of English*. Singapore: Springer.

Gal, S. and Irvine, J.T., 1995. The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62(4), pp.967-1001.

Garfinkel, H., 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gargesh, R., 2004. The phonology of English in India. *Varieties of English: Africa/Southeast Asia/India*, pp.187-197.

Gee, J. P., 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J.P., 2005. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.

Geertz, C., 1995. *After the fact: two countries, four decades, one anthropologist*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Georgakopolou, A. and Goutsos, D., 2004. *Discourse analysis: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ghuman, P.A.S., 1991. Have they passed the cricket test? A 'qualitative' study of Asian adolescents. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 12(5), pp.327-346.

Ghuman, P.A.S., 1994. Canadian or Indo-Canadian: a study of South Asian adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 4(3-4), pp.229-243.

Ghuman, P.A.S., 1995. *Asian teachers in British schools: A study of two generations, Vol. 105*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Gilbert, G.N. and Mulkay, M., 1984. *Opening Pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Archive.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R.Y. and Taylor, D.M., 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*, 307348.

Gillham, B. 2005. *Research interviewing: The range of techniques*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Gilroy, P., 2002. *Ain't no black in the Union Jack*. London: Routledge.

Godson, L., 2004. Vowel production in the speech of Western Armenian heritage speakers. *Heritage Language Journal*, 2(1), pp.44-69.

Goldbart,J and Hustler, D. 2005 Ethnography in Somekh, B. and Lewin, C. eds., 2005. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences,* London: Sage.

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M.H., 1990. Interstitial talk. In: A. Grimshaw ed. 1990. *Conflict Talk*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., 2015. Narrative as Talk-in-Interaction 10. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*, p.197.

Gravelle, M., 2000. *Planning for Bilingual Learners: An Inclusive Curriculum*. Hernden, VA : Stylus.

Gregory, E. and Williams, A., 1998. Family literacy history and children's learning strategies at home and at school: Perspectives from ethnography and ethnomethodology. *Children Learning in Context: Studies in Educational Ethnography*, 1, pp.19-46.

Gregory, E. and Williams, A., 2003. Investigating family literacy histories and children's reading practices in London's East End. In S. Goodman, T. Lillis, J. Maybin and N. Mercer Eds. *Language and Literacy and Education: A reader*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Grice, H. P., 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan eds., *Studies in Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Grosjean, F., 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S., 2005. Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging Confluences. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, eds., *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J., 1997. The active interview. In D. Silverman, ed. 1997. *Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Günther, S., 1998. Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: an analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, 3.

Gutiérrez, K.D. and Rogoff, B., 2003. Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational researcher*, 32(5), pp.19-25.

Habermas, J., 1998. *The inclusion of the other: Studies in Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hall, S., 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. In: J. Rutherford, ed. 1990. *Identity, community, culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence on Wishart.

Hall, S., 1991. The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In *Culture, globalization and the world-system*. London: Macmillan Education UK.

Hall, S., 1996. Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In P. du Guy, ed. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Hall, C., Sarangi, S. and Slembrouck, S., 1997. Narrative transformation in child abuse reporting. *Child Abuse Review*, 6(4), pp.272-282.

Hall, C., Sarangi, S. and Slembrouck, S., 1999. Speech representation and the categorization of the client in social work discourse, *Text*, 19(4), pp. 539-570.

Harding, E. and Riley, P., 1986. *The bilingual family : A handbook for parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, R. and Langenhove, L.V., 1991. Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 21(4) , pp.393-407.

Harris, R., 2006. *New ethnicities and language use*. New York: Springer.

Harris, R. and Rampton, B. eds., 2003. *The Language, Ethnicity and Race Reader*. London : Routledge.

Hatoss, A., Starks, D., Van Rensburg, H.J., 2011. Afrikaans language maintenance in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34(1), p.4-23.

Heller, M. and Lévy, L., 1992. Mixed marriages: Life on the linguistic frontier. *Multilingua*, 11(1), pp.11-43.

Heller, M. and Lévy L., 1994. Les contradictions des mariages linguistiquement mixtes : stratégies des femmes francoontariennes, *Langage et société,* 67, pp.53-88.

Heller, M. 2003. Globalization, the new economy and the commodification of language and identity, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, pp.473-92.

Hirschkop, K., 1989. Introduction: Bakhtin and cultural theory in K. Hirschkop and D. Shepherd eds., *Bakhtin and cultural theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hirson, A. and Sohail, N., 2007. Variability of rhotics in Punjabi-English bilinguals. In ICPHS, 6-10 August, Saarbrücken. London: City University of London.

Holt, E., 1999. Just gassing: An analysis of direct reported speech in a conversation between employees of a gas supply company, *Text*, 19(4) , pp.505-537.

Holt, E., 2000. Reporting and reacting: Concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), pp.425-454.

Home Office, 2008. *Control of Immigration Statistics, United Kingdom.* London: Home Office.

Jaspal, R. and Coyle, A., 2010a. My language, my people: language and ethnic identity among British-born South Asians, *South Asian Diaspora*, 2(2), pp.201-218.

Jaspal, R. and Coyle, A., 2010b. "Arabic is the language of the Muslims – that's how it was supposed to be": Exploring language and religious identity through reflective accounts from young British-born South Asians, *Mental Health*, *Religion & Culture*, 13(1), pp.17-36.

Johansen, M., 2011. Agency and responsibility in reported speech*, Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, pp.2845-2860.

Jones Diaz, C., 2003. Latino/a voices in Australia: negotiating bilingual identity, *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 4(3), pp.314-336.

Joshi, V., 2000. *Indian daughters abroad: growing up in Australia Vol. 13*. New York City: Sterling Publishers.

Kachru, B.B., 1978. English in South Asia. *Advances in the study of societal multilingualism*, 9, p.477.

Kalantzis, M. and Cope, B., 1999. Multicultural education: Transforming the mainstream. In: S.May, ed. 1999. *Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education*. London: Falmer Press.

Kanno, Y., 2000. Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(1), pp.1-18.

Kenner, C., 2000. Biliteracy in a monolingual school system? English and Gujarati in South London. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 13(1), pp.13-30.

Kenner, C., 2004. *Becoming biliterate: Young children learning different writing systems*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Kenner, C. and Kress, G., 2003. The multisemiotic resources of biliterate children. *Journal of early childhood literacy*, 3(2) , pp.179-202.

Kenner, C., Gregory, Eve., Ruby, M. and Al-Azami,S., 2008.Bilingual Learning for Second and Third Generation Children, Language, *Culture and Curriculum*, 21(2), pp120-137.

Khattab, N., Johnston, R., Modood, T. and Sirkeci, I., 2011. Economic activity in the South-Asian population in Britain: The impact of ethnicity, religion, and class. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(9), pp.1466-1481.

King, K. and Fogle, L., 2006. Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), pp.695-712.

King, K.A., 2013. A tale of three sisters: Language ideologies, identities, and negotiations in a bilingual, transnational family. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7(1), pp.49-65.

Kirkham, S., 2011. The acoustics of coronal stops in British Asian English. *Proceedings from the 17th International Congress of Phonetic Science*.17-21 August 2011. Hong Kong.

Kondo–Brown, K., 2005. Differences in language skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), pp.563-581.

Koven, M.E., 1998. Two Languages in the Self/The Self in Two Languages: French-Portuguese Bilinguals' Verbal Enactments and Experiences of Self in Narrative Discourse. *Ethos*, 26(4), pp.410-455.

Koven, M., 2004. Getting 'emotional' in two languages: Bilinguals' verbal performance of affect in narratives of personal experience. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 24(4), pp.471-515.

Kvale, S., 1996. *InterViews*. London: Sage.

Lahiri, J., 2006. My Two Lives, *Newsweek*, [online] Available at <http://europe.newsweek.com/my-two-lives-106355?rm=eu> [Accessed 10 Sept 2013]

Laakso, J. and Sarhimaa, A., 2016. *Towards Openly Multilingual Policies and Practices: Assessing Minority Language Maintenance Across Europe Vol. 11*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Labov, W. and Waltesky, D. , 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In: J.Helm, ed. 1967. *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lam, H., 2011. *Raising Children Bilingually in Mixed Marriages: Stories of Four Vietnamese-Caucasian Families*. Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

Lambert, K., Alam, F. and Stuart-Smith, J., 2007. Investigating British Asian accents: Studies from Glasgow. In: *Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*. pp1509–1511. Saarbrucken 6-10 August, 2007.

Lavanya, P., Kishore, P. and Madhavi, G.T., 2005. A simple approach for building transliteration editors for Indian languages. *Journal of Zhejiang University Science A*, 6(11), pp.1354-1361.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E., 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge,UK: Cambridge University Press.

Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B., 1997. The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(3), pp.543-560.

Leung, G. and Uchikoshi, Y., 2012. Relationships among language ideologies, family language

policies, and children's language achievement: a look at Cantonese-English bilinguals in the US. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(3), pp.294-313.

Li, C.N., 1986. Direct speech and indirect speech: A functional study. In: F. Coulmas, ed. 1986. *Direct and indirect speech*. Amsterdam: De Gruyter.

Lindley, J., 2002. Race or religion? The impact of religion on the employment and earnings of Britain's ethnic communities. *Journal of ethnic and Migration Studies*, 28(3) , pp.427-442.

Llamas, C., 2000. Middlesborough English: Convergent and Divergent Trends in a 'Part of Britain with No Identity'. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8, pp.123-48.

Looking for Eric, 2009. [Film] Directed by Ken Loach. UK: Icon Films.

Linguistics Minorities Project, 1986. *The other Languages of England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Martin-Jones, M. and Saxena, M., 2003. Bilingual resources and 'funds of knowledge' for teaching and learning in multi-ethnic classrooms in Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6(3-4), pp.267-282.

Malik, N., 2014. Why is there still so little diversity in British media? *The Guardian* [online] 14 October. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/oct/14/diversity-british-media-black-ethnic-minority>
[Accessed on 15 September 2016]

Mann, S., 2011 A critical review of qualitative interviews in Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1),pp.6-24.

Mayes, P., 1990. Quotation in spoken English. *Studies in Language*, 14, pp 325–363.

Maynard, D.W., Schaeffer, N.C. and Freese, J., 2011. Improving response rates in telephone Interviews. In: C. Antaki, ed. 2011. *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. New York:Springer.

McCabe, S. and Stokoe, E.H. 2004. Place and identity in "day visitor" narratives, *Annals of*

Tourism Research, 31(3), pp.601-22.

McCarty, T.L., Romero-Little, M.E., Warhol, L. and Zepeda, O., 2009. Indigenous youth as language policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(5), pp.291-306.

Measor,L. and Woods, P. 1984. *Changing Schools: Pupil perspectives on transfer to a comprehensive*. Milton Keynes:Open University Press

Mesthrie, R., 1991. Syntactic variation in South African Indian English: the relative clause. In: J. Cheshire , ed. 1991. *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mind your Language, 2010. [Radio]. UK: BBC Asian Network, Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00tp2zd [Accessed 15 September 2016]

Miller, J. and Glassner, B., 1997. The 'inside' and the 'outside': finding realities in research interviews. In: D. Silverman, ed. 1997. *Qualitative research: theory method and practice*. London, Sage.

Miller, J. and White, N.A., 2004. Situational effects of gender inequality on girls' participation in violence. In: C.Alder and A. Worrall, eds. 2004. *Girls' violence: Myths and realities*. Albany: State University of New York.

Mishler, E.G., 1995. Models of narrative analysis: a typology. *Journal of Narrative & Life History*.

Moag, R., 1995. Semi-native speakers: How to hold and mold them. In: V. Gambhir, ed. 1995. *The teaching and acquisition of South Asian languages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Model, S. and Lin, L., 2002. The cost of not being Christian: Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims in Britain and Canada. *International Migration Review*, 36(4), pp.1061-1092.

Montrul, S., 2006. On the bilingual competence of Spanish heritage speakers: Syntax, lexical-semantics and processing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 10(1), pp.37-69.

Montrul, S., 2010. Current issues in Heritage Language Acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 30, pp.3-23.

Morgan, C., 2012. Toward a more nuanced understanding of intercoupling: Second-generation mixed couples in Southern California. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(11), pp.1423-1449.

Moss, S., 2012. What does Britishness mean to you? *The Guardian* [online] 5 February. Available at < https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/feb/05/what-does-britishness-mean> [Accessed on 15 September 2016]

Mills, J., 2001. Being bilingual: perspectives of third generation Asian children on language culture and identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(6), pp.383–402.

Mills, J., 2004. Mothers and mother tongue: Perspectives of self-construction by mothers of Pakistani heritage. In: A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge, eds. 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Myers, G., 2000. Unspoken speech: Hypothetical reported discourse and the rhetoric of everyday talk, *Text*, 19(4) , pp.571-590.

Multilingual Manchester, 2016. Available at <http://mlm.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/> [Accessed on 15 September 2016]

Nagra, D., 2011. The Balcony song of Raju and Jaswinder in *Tippos Sultan's incredible white-man-eating tiger toy machine!!!.* London: Faber and Faber.

Nambiar, M.K., 2008. The learning of endangered mother tongue languages of minority, immigrant communities in multilingual contexts: The case of Malayalam in Malaysia. In: Conference on Foundation for Endangered Languages, 24-27 September 2008, Leeuwarden: The Netherlands.

Nao, M., 2016. Book Review of 'Marked identities: creating self narratives between social labels and individual biographies' by R. Piazza and A. Fasulo, 2015. *Discourse & Communication*, 10(3), pp.314-316.

Nunan, D. and Choi, J. eds., 2010. *Language and culture: Reflective narratives and the emergence of identity*. London: Routledge.

Oakley, A. 2001. Evidence-informed policy and practice: challenges for social science. In:

M. Hammersley, ed. 2009. *Educational Research and Evidence-based practice*. London: Sage in association with The Open University.

Ochs, E. and Capps, L., 2001. *Living narrative: creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B., 2008. Language socialization: An historical overview. In: *Encyclopedia of language and education* , pp.2580-2594. New York:Springer.

O'Donnell, P.E., 2000. Crossing the Line in Quebec and Catalonia: The Consequences of the Linguistically "Mixed" Marriage. *Language problems & language planning*, 24(3), pp.233-247.

Orellana, M.F. and Phoenix, A., 2016. Re-interpreting: Narratives of childhood language brokering over time. *Childhood*, p.0907568216671178.

Özyıldırım, I., 2009. Narrative analysis: An analysis of oral and written strategies in personal experience narratives. *Journal of pragmatics*, 41(6), pp.1209-1222.

Pagett, L., 2006. Mum and Dad prefer me to speak Bengali at home: code switching and parallel speech in a primary school setting, *Literacy,* 40(3), pp.137-145.

Panico, L. and Nazroo, J.Y., 2011. The social and economic circumstances of mixed ethnicity children in the UK: Findings from the Millennium Cohort Study. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(9), pp.1421-1444.

Parekh, B., 2002. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press

Pavlenko, A., 1998. Second Language Learning by Adults: Testimonies of Bilingual Writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), pp.3-19.

Pavlenko, A., 2001. Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre. *Applied linguistics*, 22(2), pp.213-240.

Pavlenko, A. 2004a 'The making of an American': Negotiation of identities at the turn of the twentieth century. In: A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge, eds. 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. 2004b 'Stop doing that, ia komu skazala!': Language choice and emotions in parent-child communication, *Journal of Mulitilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2-3) , pp.179-203.

Pavlenko, A. 2008 Narrative analysis. In: L.Wei and M. Moyer eds. 2008 *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford:Blackwell.

Peach, C. 2006. South Asian migration and settlement in Great Britain, 1951-2001, *Contemporary South Asia*, 15(2), pp.133-146.

Perrino, S., 2015. Chronotopes: Time and Space in Oral Narrative. In: A. De Fina and A. Georgakopolou eds, 2015. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Piazza, R. and Fasulo, A. 2015. *Marked identities: creating self narratives between social labels and individual biographies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pillai, S., Soh, W-Y. and Kajita, A., 2014. Family language policy and heritage language maintenance of Malacca Portuguese Creole. *Language & Communication*, 37, p.75.

Piller,I., 2001. Private language planning: the best of both worlds? *Estudios de Sociolinguistica*, 2(1), pp.61-80

Piller, I., 2002. *Bilingual couples talk: The discursive construction of hybridity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Piller, I. and Pavlenko, A., 2004. Bilingualism and gender. In: T.K.Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie, eds. 2004. *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Polinsky, M., 1997. American Russian: Language loss meets language acquisition. In W. Browne et al. eds. 1995. *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic 19 Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publishers.

Plattner, S., and Bruner, E.M. Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society. American Ethnological Society, 1984.

Polinsky, M. and Kagan, O., 2007. Heritage languages: In the 'wild 'and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(5), pp.368-395.

Polkinghorne, D.E., 1995. Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 8(1), pp.5-23.

Polkinghorne, D.E., 1988. *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M., 1987. *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M., 1992. *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage.

Rakić, T., Steffens, M.C. and Mummendey, A. 2011. Blinded by the accent! The minor role of looks in ethnic categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(1), pp.16-29.

Ramanathan, V. 1999. "English is here to stay": A critical look at institutional and educational practices in India. In S. Goodman, T. Lillis, J. Maybin and N.Mercer,. eds 2003 .*Language, Literacy and Education : a Reader*. Stoke-on-Trent:Trentham Books in association with The Open University.

Rampton, B., 1996. Language crossing, New Ethnicities and School. *English in Education*, 30(2), pp.14-26.

Rampton, B., 2006. *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, B., 2010. Speech community. In J.Jaspers, J-O. Östman and J. Verschueren, eds. *Society and language use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rampton, B., 2012. *Superdiversity and social class: An interactional perspective* [pdf]. Centre for Language Discourse & Communication, King's College London. Available at < http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/iris/2013/rampton-superdiversity-social-class.pdf> [Accessed 15 September 2016]

Rampton, B., 2013a. Styling in a language learned later in life. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), pp.360-382.

Rampton, B. 2013b. *Drilling Down to the Grain in Superdiversit* [pdf]. Centre for Language, Discourse and Communication, King's College London. Available at < https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/drilling-down-to-the-grain-in-superdiversity(0b72e4fe-a561-4b47-873d-32a4b06be55c)/export.html> [Accessed 15 September 2016]

Rampton, B., Harris, R. and Leung, C., 1997. Multilingualism in England. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 17, pp.224-241.

Rasinger, S.M., 2013. Language shift and vitality perceptions amongst London's second-generation Bangladeshis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 34(1), pp.46-60.

Rassool, N., 2000. Contested and contesting identities: Conceptualising linguistic minority rights within the global cultural economy. *Journal of Multilingual and multicultural development*, 21(5), pp.386-398.

Reid, E., 1988. Linguistic minorities and language education—The English experience. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 9(1-2*),* pp.181-191.

Reissman, C., K., 2002a. Narrative analysis. In: A.M. Huberman and M.B. Miles, eds. 2002. *The qualitative researchers companion*. London:Sage.

Riessman, C.K. 1993. *Narrative analysis*. London: Sage.

Riessman, C.K. 2002b. Analysis of Personal Narratives. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein eds., *Handbook of Interview Research, Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks and London: Sage.

Reissman, C.K., 2015. Entering the hall of mirrors: Reflexivity and narrative research. In: A. De Fina and A. Georgakopolou, eds., 2015. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Relaño Pastor, A.M. and De Fina, A., 2005. Contesting Social Place: Narratives of Language Conflict. In: M. Baynham. And A. De Fina eds. 2005. *Dislocations/Relocations: Narratives of Displacement*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Rich, S. And Davis, L., 2007. Insights into the strategic ways in which two bilingual children in the early years seek to negotiate the competing demands on their identity in their home and school worlds. *International Journal of Early Years Education,* 15(1), pp.35-57.

Ritchie, W.C. and Bhatia, T.K., 2006. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Romaine, S., 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Roulston, K., 2010. Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), pp. 199-228.

Ruby, M., 2012. The role of a grandmother in maintaining Bangla with her granddaughter in East London. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), pp.67-83.

Runnymede Trust, 2016. Submission to the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination with regard to the UK Government's 21st to 23rd Periodic Reports Available at <www.runnymedetrust.org/.../CERD%20Civil%20Society%20Report%20GB.%20V3..doc> [Accessed 17 September 2016]

Saeed, A., 2007. Media, racism and Islamophobia: The representation of Islam and Muslims in the media. *Sociology Compass*, 1(2), pp443-462.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G., 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, pp.696-735.

Sailaja, P., 2009. *Indian English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sailaja, P., 2012. Indian English: Features and sociolinguistic aspects. *Languages and Linguistics Compass*, 6(6), pp.359-370.

Samuel, L., 2010. Mating, Dating and marriage: intergenerational cultural retention and the construction of diasporic identities among South Asian immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Intercultural studies*, 31(1), pp.95-110.

Schiffrin, D., 1994 *Approaches to discourse.* Oxford: Blackwell

Schiffrin, D., 2009. Crossing boundaries: The nexus of time, space, person, and place in

narrative. *Language in Society*, 38(4), pp.421-445.

Schofield, J., 1990. Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In: M.Hammersley, ed. 2009. *Educational Research and Evidence-based practice*. London: Sage in association with The Open University.

Schüpbach, D., 2009. Language transmission revisited: family type, linguistic environment and language attitudes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1), pp.15-30.

Sebba, M., 1992. Book Review of S. Alladina and V.Edwards, eds. 1991. *Multilingualism in the British Isles: Volume 2. Africa, the Middle East, and Asia*. London: Longman, 1991. Pp. xii+ 278. *Language in Society*, 21(2), pp.328-331.

Sebba, M., 2007. Identity and language construction in an online community: The case of 'Ali G'. *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.361-92.

Sebba, M. and Tate, S., 2002. "Global" and "Local" identities in the discourses of British-born Caribbeans. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6, pp.75-89.

Sebba, M. and Wootton, T., 1998. We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In: P.Auer ed., 1998 *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Schaberg, H. and Barkhuizen, G.P., 1998. German maintenance and shift in linguistically mixed marriages: Three case studies. *South African Journal of Linguistics*,16(4), pp.136-142.

Scholte, J.A., 2005. *Globalization: A critical introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schwartz, M., 2008. Exploring the relationship between family language policy and heritage language knowledge among second generation Russian–Jewish immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(5) , pp.400-418.

Sharma, D., 2011 Style repertoire and social change in British Asian English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(4), pp.464-492.

Sharma, D. and Rampton, B., 2011. Lectal focusing in interaction, Queen Mary's Occasional

Papers Advancing Linguistics, Number 22 [pdf]. Available at < http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/research/ldc/publications/workingpapers/abstracts/WP079-Lectal-focusing-in-interaction-A-new-methodology-for-the-study-of-superdiverse-speech-.aspx>
[Accessed on 20 September 2016]

Sharma, S., Hutnyk,J. and Sharma, A. eds 1996. *DisOrienting Rhythms: The politics of new Asian dance music*. London: Zed Books.

Sharma, D., and Sankaran, L., 2011. Cognitive and social forces in dialect shift: Gradual change in London Asian speech. *Language Variation and Change,* 23, pp.*399–42*8.

Silverman, D., 1993. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Silverman, D., 2014 *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction* 5th ed , London: Sage.

Singh, R.R., 2006. *Bhakti and philosophy*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Sirén, U., 1991. *Minority language transmission in early childhood: Parental intention and language use*. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press.

Slembrouck, S., 2015. The role of the researcher in interview narratives. In: A. De Fina and A. Georgakopolou eds, 2015. *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Slembrouck, S., 2005. 'Discourse, critique and ethnography: Class-oriented coding in accounts of child protection'. In: G.Cook and S.North eds., 2010. *Applied Linguistics Methods A Reader*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Smolicz, J.J., Secombe, M.J. and Hudson, D.M., 2001. Family collectivism and minority languages as core values of culture among ethnic groups in Australia. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 22(2), pp.152-172.

Smyth, J., 1989. *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* Vol. 3. Psychology Press.

Sneddon, R., 2000. Language and literacy: Children's experiences in multilingual

environments. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(4), pp.265-282.

Sorace, A. 2016. Referring expressions and executive functions in bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, DOI: 10.1075/lab.15055 (Published online, John Benjamins)

Spolsky, B., 2004. *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, M., 1982. Proteus in quotation-land: Mimesis and the forms of reported discourse. *Poetics today*, 3(2), pp.107-156.

Stopes-Roe, M. and Cochrane, R., 1988. Marriage in two cultures. *British journal of social psychology*, 27(2) , pp.159-169.

Stopes-Roe, M. and Cochrane, R., 1990. *Citizens of this country: the Asian-British* Vol. 68. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Surana, H. and Singh, A.K., 2008, January. A More Discerning and Adaptable Multilingual Transliteration Mechanism for Indian Languages. In *IJCNLP*, pp. 64-71.

Tagore, R., 1910. *Gora.* Centenary Edition, Vol 9, Calcutta, 1961.

Takeuchi, M., 2008. Japanese-English child-rearing practices in Australia. In A. M. Stoke ed. 2008. *JALT 2008 conference proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Talmy,S., 2004. Forever FOB: The cultural production of ESL in a high school. *Pragmatics*, 14(2-3), pp.149-172.

Tannen, D., 1980. A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Tennant,A.B., 20016. Book review: Roberta Piazza and Alessandro Fasulo eds. 2015. Marked Identities:Narrating lives between social labels and individual biographies, *Discourse & Society*, 2016. 27(4), pp.472-474.

Touraine, A., 2000. *Can we live together? Equal and different*. Cambridge :Polity Press.

Tracy, S.J., 2010. Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research.

Qualitative Inquiry, 16(10), pp.837-851.

Tuominen, A., 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 140(1), pp.59-76.

Upadhya, C., 2002. The concept of community in Indian social sciences: an anthropological perspective'. In: S.Jodhka, ed, 2002. *Community and Identities: Contemporary discourses on culture and politics in India.* New Delhi and London: Sage.

Urban Dictionary, 2003. Available at <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=gora> [Accessed on 20 September 2016]

Van Dijk, T.A., 1998. *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.

Van Gennep, A., 1960. *The Rites of passage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Varro, G., 1998. Does bilingualism survive the second generation? Three generations of French-American families in France. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*. 133(1), pp.105-128.

Veltman, C.J., 1981. Anglicization in the United States: The importance of parental nativity and language practice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 32, pp.65-84.

Vertovec, S., 1997. Three meanings of" diaspora," exemplified among South Asian religions. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 6(3) pp.277-299.

Vertovec, S., 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 30(6), pp.1024-1054.

Voas, D., 2009. The maintenance and transformation of Ethnicity: Evidence on Mixed Partnerships in Britain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(9), pp.1497-1513.

Volosinov, V. N., 1929. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik, 1973. New York: Seminar Press.

Vygotsky, L.S., 1986. *Thought and Language* (rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S., 1987. *The collected works of LS Vygotsky: Vol. 1, Problems of general Psychology*. R.W. Rieber and A.S. Carton, eds., 1987. New York: Plenum Press.

Walford, G., 2007. Classification and Framing of Interviews in Ethnographic Interviewing. *Ethnography and Education*, 2(2), pp.145-57.

Wallerstein, I., 1983. *Historical Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Walters, K., 1996. Gender, identity, and the political economy of language: Anglophone wives in Tunisia. *Language in society*, 25(4), pp.515-555.

Weedon, C., 2000. Goodness Gracious Me: Comedy as a Tool for Contesting Racism and Ethnocentrism. In: M.J.Coperías Aguilar, ed. 2000. *Culture and power: Challenging discourses*. Valencia: Servei de Publicaciones.

Wei, L., 2011. Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43, pp.1222–1235.

Wei, L., 1994. *Three Generations Two Language One Family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Weick, K.E., 2007. The generative properties of richness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, pp.14-19.

Wilkinson, R., 2011 Changing interactional behaviour: Using Conversational Analysis in intervention programmes for aphasic conversation. In C. Antaki, ed. 2011. *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. New York: Springer.

Winter, G., 2000. A comparative discussion of the notion of 'validity' in qualitative and quantitative research. *The qualitative report*, 4(3), pp.1-14.

Wong-Fillmore, L., 1991. When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6, pp.323-346.

Wooffitt, R., 1992. *Telling tales of the unexpected: The organization of factual discourse*. Washington D.C.: Rowman and Littlefield.

Wooffitt, R., 2005. *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*, London: Sage

Wortham, S., 2006. *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wu, L.Y., 2007. *Transformation and orientation of self: a narrative inquiry into the lived experiences of literacy and mobility of Taiwanese migrants in England.* Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University.