Lang Policy (2018) 17:501–522
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9455-9

Language ideologies and (im)moral images of personhood in multilingual family language planning

Lydia Catedral[1] · **Madina Djuraeva**[2]

Received: 12 September 2017 / Accepted: 10 January 2018 / Published online: 6 February 2018
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V., part of Springer Nature 2018

Abstract Scholars have demonstrated that small-scale relatively private family decisions about language are intertwined with parental language ideologies. Using data from the context of multilingual Central Asian families—including those living in Central Asia and those living abroad—this study employs socially situated analysis of discourse and narrative inquiry to show *how* parents invoke language ideologies in justifying their decisions about their children's education and linguistic exposure. The notion of "chronotope" is used to demonstrate how parental ideologies are embedded in *images* of space, time and moral personhood. Focusing on these *images*, rather than only on language ideologies, allows an incorporation of the many social factors—both linguistic and non-linguistic—involved in bottom-up language planning, and facilitates increased attention to emic perspectives. This focus also illustrates how state discourses are internalized by participants through their understandings of morality relative to other issues such as language education.

Keywords Language ideologies · Bottom-up language planning · Chronotope · Language education · Multilingualism · Central Asia

✉ Lydia Catedral
medill2@illinois.edu

[1] Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 4080 Foreign Language Building, 707 S Mathews Avenue, MC-168, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

[2] Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 W. Johnson St. Ofc 1282L, Madison, WI 53706-1706, USA

Introduction

The recognition that language planning is engaged "in all societal domains" (Ricento 2006: 19), has led scholars in the field to move away from a strict focus on top-down processes and to emphasize the importance of bottom-up (Hornberger 2006) and micro language planning (Baldauf 2006) processes as well. This shift has resulted in descriptions of individual and communal decision making related to language use and education in less explored contexts (Baldauf 2006), such as the family unit. The subject of this paper is specifically how parental language ideologies are discursively represented in relation to "family language policy" (FLP) (King et al. 2008)—or the small-scale, relatively private family decisions involved in language planning. Scholars of FLP have pointed to the need for a better social and ideological contextualization of language attitudes, and their connection to parental intervention in child language acquisition (Curdt-Christiansen 2009; King 2000). This paper responds to these issues specifically.

In doing so, we draw from recent theorizations in socially oriented studies of language, which have used Bakhtin's (1981) notion of the "chronotope" as a way to conceptualize how social and linguistic phenomena—including language attitudes—are inseparable from images of time, space, and personhood (Agha 2007; Woolard 2013). Notably, these images are *moral* in nature, meaning that the social types being imagined relative to particular times, spaces and languages are defined by their acquiescence to or nonconformance with specific norms for behavior (Blommaert in press). We conceptualize morality as an ideological and social phenomenon, or as a type of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991) that may shift depending on the space and time made relevant by speakers. As we will show, learning or having proficiency in a given language may be understood as one of these norms for behavior, or as being associated with an (im)moral space or time, leading to various patterns in parents' language ideologies and their corresponding interventions in their children's language acquisition. In situating our analysis of parental language ideologies within this robust understanding of context, we are able to incorporate the many social factors—both linguistic and non-linguistic—involved in language planning, and we argue that it is these compiled *images* rather than solitary language attitudes that are invoked by parents in justifying decisions related to children's participation in language educational spaces. Additionally, given that morality is polynomic (Blommaert in press), there are often multiple images of moral personhood that are relevant to these decisions.

Using data from the multilingual context of post-soviet, Central Asian families—including those living in Central Asia and those living abroad—we demonstrate how family members invoke and orient to multiple relevant moralities and how these moralities are related to their language attitudes. The moral images that our participants invoke include the morality of the "educated" Russian school student, a national moral personhood associated with the titular language—that is, the language that is seen as representative of the linguistic identity of the ethnic majority of the nation state—a broader post-soviet Central Asian moral image linked to the non-Russian languages of Central Asia, and a "global" image of moral

personhood related to individual self-determination. We demonstrate how parents link (and unlink) moral personhood, time–space configurations, language attitudes, and decisions about their children's language education. Our participants invoke the various images of moral personhood to which they hope their children will conform, representing these images as central to their decisions regarding their children's education and linguistic exposure.

By integrating these images of moral time–space–personhood into our analysis of family language planning, we are able to decenter "language" itself and see the ways in which "language attitudes" are bound up with other broader attitudes and ideologies, thereby prioritizing emic perspectives. We emphasize that decisions about language education are often simultaneously, and perhaps more saliently, decisions about moral education (c.f. Moore 2016). Furthermore, this paper also responds to the call for greater attention to how family language policies are "impacted by forces of globalization" (King et al. 2008: 918; Curdt-Christiansen 2016). In particular, we show how our participants imagine these ideal moral types in relation to their national identities, which are shifting in response to globalizing ideologies and transnational migration (Castells 2010), as well as how the polynomic nature of morality becomes more salient in contexts of transnational movement and change (Blommaert in press). This work also responds to calls within FLP for work which attends to geographical areas with long histories of diverse multilingualism outside of western societies (Smith-Christmas 2017). Our focus on Central Asian communities, an understudied and undertheorized multilingual population, adds empirically to the scholarly work in family language policy.

We first review scholarship on bottom-up language planning and FLP, chronotopes and moral personhood, as well as specific background information on language planning and education in Central Asia. We then move on to a discussion of our methodology, followed by an analysis of data from participants in Central Asia, and then from those abroad. We conclude with some thoughts on the theoretical and practical implications of this research.

Literature review

Scholars who have advocated for analysis of bottom-up language planning have cited the importance of speaker agency in discussions of language change (Baldauf 2006), the certain failure of top-down policies that do not receive local support (Hornberger 2006), and the fact that language planning takes place at many different levels—and that each of these levels requires analytical attention in order to understand the system of language planning as a whole (Ferguson 1977; Ricento 2006). One aspect of bottom-up language planning that has received attention from scholars is "family language policy"—or the familial practices, ideologies, goals and outcomes related to language use (King et al. 2008). Parental ideologies and parental decisions regarding their children's language education are seen to play an important role in determining family language policies (e.g. Piller 2001). Some scholars present a more direct and causal relationship between parental language attitudes, intervention and the resulting language development of their children (e.g.

De Houwer 1999). Others, however, have argued that ideologies and behaviors do not always align neatly, and that an analysis of parental language attitudes as they relate to language planning must attend to their socially situated nature and to their connection to a broader system of beliefs (King 2000). Scholars have attempted to respond to these calls for a deeper investigation of parental language attitudes in a variety of ways. As an example, some have used quantitative analysis of sociocultural variables, linking parents' sociocultural backgrounds and language attitudes to their decisions about whether or not to send their children to bilingual schools (Schwartz et al. 2013; Moin et al. 2013). On the other hand, other scholars have focused more on issues of subjectivity and have investigated the ways in which parents justify their decisions by appealing to ethnolinguistic identity (Bezcioglu-Goktolga and Yagmur 2017) or to culturally mediated notions of what counts as 'good' or 'bad' parenting (King and Fogle 2006). There have also been calls for a deeper investigation into the influences on parental language attitudes, as well as the ways in which these processes are impacted by globalization (King et al. 2008). Curdt-Christiansen (2016) responds to this call, focusing on the Singaporean context, and demonstrates that family language policies are not decontextualized, but rather result from contested interactions between familial ideologies, national policies and global forces. Similar to these works, we also examine how the moral identities of our participants become relevant in their discursive justification of their decisions regarding their children's language education, and we put FLP research in dialog with issues of globalization and national ideologies. We further argue that by situating parental language attitudes within their moral images of time, place, and personhood, we are able to move beyond categorical notions of identity and static understandings of language ideology, towards a more comprehensive understanding of how the micro and macro factors involved in FLP intersect with, reinforce and contest one another.

Conceptualizations of language ideologies as intertwined with identity, morality, and context can be traced back to much earlier work in social approaches to language. Irvine describes language ideologies as "the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of *moral* and political interests" [emphasis added] highlighting the fact that these ideologies do not operate apart from perceptions of an ethical life or power relations (1989: 255). Similarly, Bourdieu's (1991) related notions of habitus, linguistic capital, and the linguistic marketplace demonstrate how language attitudes, individual practice and power dynamics are all mutually reinforcing. What we add to the work that has taken up these theories is an analysis of the structure that speakers' social imaginaries—their understanding of the social world and their place in it—take in relation to their language ideologies and ultimately, their decisions about their family language policies. To unpack the social imaginary we draw from the notion of chronotope, which while it originates from Bakhtin (1981) in reference to his study of the novel, has been taken up by sociocultural theorists to argue that in addition to time and space, chronotopes involve particular social types (Agha 2007) as well as "ideological and moral orders" (Blommaert in press), organizing various aspects of social life. Woolard's (2013) paper applies the chronotope to the study of language attitudes, showing how specific understandings

of time, place, and personhood in relation to one's personal development can account for differences in one's attitude towards Catalan. We follow Woolard in using chronotopes to analyze language attitudes, but in a different context related to family language planning and to specific images of moral personhood.

By moral personhood we are referring to an idealized social type often associated with what Blommaert (in press) refers to as 'moralized behavioral scripts', or prescriptive bundles of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior enacted and evaluated with respect to time–space frames. One of the relevant time–space frames for these images of moral personhood are schools or community centers. A number of studies show how educational spaces can become moral when "models of conduct are applied to models of personhood" (Lo 2009: 9), or when cultural models such as hospitality are invoked by teachers (Karrebæk and Ghandchi 2017). In her study of Tanzanian women, Billings (2013) highlights how educational spaces play a key role in cultivating particular gendered models of morality that encompass both linguistic and non-linguistic behavior, while Moore (2016) examines how religious educational spaces are conceptualized in relation to family beliefs and the value of language learning—bringing together these issues of moral education and family language policy. Another time–space frame relevant to these moral scripts is the nation state. National identity has become more salient in the era of globalization (Castells 2010), and in certain cases national discourse has promoted particular *moral* images of national identity. Kendzior (2014) for instance, demonstrates how in Uzbekistan the concept of *ma'naviyat*, which roughly translates as 'morality' is presented in state discourse as something which is neither Soviet nor Islamic, and is at the heart of what it means to be "acceptably authentically Uzbek" (225).This morality may manifest in a behavioral script that includes a variety of semiotic factors such as speaking modestly and deferentially, or dressing appropriately. Additionally, throughout Central Asia, the notion of "moral education"—or education that goes beyond head knowledge to encompass ethno-national identity and moral behaviors—is strongly emphasized in national discourse (Kozhakhmetova 2013). For example, in Kazakhstan, the goal of raising children to be hard workers, patriots and multi-faceted moral people who share the values thoughts and aspirations of their people is attributed to national hero and philosopher Abai Kunanbaev (1977). National identity is also often linked to language, as images of national personhood emphasize monolingualism in attempts to portray the nation as unified (Karimzad and Catedral 2017). Part of the goal of this paper is to uncover how language ideologies are mediated by national identity and their corresponding moral norms by focusing on the particular case of Central Asian nationals.

Background

Our first set of data comes from non-Russian Kazakh citizens living in Kazakhstan, and the second set comes from ethnic Uzbeks living in the United States. We choose to focus on these two groups because in both cases parents play active roles in determining children's educational and linguistic exposure, as will be discussed further below. Also, as noted above, national discourses which emphasize issues of

morality, education and language make these issues salient for citizens. The purpose of this paper is not to compare family language policies amongst Uzbeks vs. Kazakhs, but rather, focusing on communities with similar political and historical backgrounds, to emphasize the importance of moral images in language related decision making across a variety of contexts—including in-country and diasporic.

Both Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan gained independence with the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. While Russian was seen as being of primary importance in the republics during much of their soviet history, moves towards independence brought with them a greater focus on titular languages (i.e. Kazakh and Uzbek), as well as a focus on English for local and global purposes (Fierman 2009; Regan 2005). In Kazakhstan, Russian and Kazakh are co-official and a new trilingual policy states that by 2020 all citizens should be proficient in Kazakh, Russian and English.[1] In Uzbekistan, on the other hand, only Uzbek is official as the country took more intense steps towards de-russification (Pavlenko 2008). Given the strong association between Russian language and soviet rule, differentiation from Russian and Russian-ness was later invoked to assert national identity, and knowledge of the titular language is now strongly associated with patriotism for all citizens (Fierman 2009). A number of the examples discussed in the following analysis illustrate how differing images of the time, space, personhood and morality associated with Russian versus the titular languages influence parental decisions about their children's educational and linguistic development. However, given that both nation states are multiethnic and multilingual, with over 100 languages spoken in each (Schlyter 2012), other languages are also invoked in discussions of education and morality. For instance, in the examples from Kazakhstan, one participant mentions the Uyghur language—which is another Turkic language related to Kazakh.

The following analysis focuses on parental reasons for choosing particular linguistic and educational opportunities for their children. In the case of those living in Kazakhstan, their discourses focus primarily on the choice of language school for their children—a phenomenon common across Central Asia. In Kazakhstan, parents can choose whether to send their children to "Russian school", "Kazakh school" or schools in a number of other minority languages. Notably, these schools differ both in terms of language of instruction, but also the focus and quality of education, as well as educational philosophies (Fierman 2006).[2] A survey conducted by Zakaeva and Sarsenbaeva in 1998 showed that the majority of Kazakhs opted to educate their children in Russian; however, Smagulova (2006) demonstrates that Kazakhs are now making an effort to reverse language shift by educating their children in Kazakh. We demonstrate how our participants who fall into this category of "Kazakhs educating their children in Kazakh" frame their decision in terms of their chronotopic images of morality and personhood, rather than in strictly linguistic terms.

[1] Source: http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/U1100000110/links. Accessed 12 September 2017.

[2] There are also mixed language schools where students can choose different tracks to determine the language in which they would be taught. In our data, our participants' references to "Russian school", "Kazakh school" and "Uyghur school" can be understood as the more prototypical understanding of schools which are taught in these languages.

In the case of data coming from Uzbeks living in the United States, they are not discussing their preferences for the language of education for their children, but rather, whether or not they feel that participation in the regional Uzbek community organizations is important for their children's cultural and linguistic development. There are a number of these regional Uzbek community organizations in the U.S.—especially in areas where there is a relatively large number of Uzbeks. The main events put on by these organizations were large cultural gatherings (usually picnics) for community members in that particular region of the United States. These gatherings involved the preparation and eating of traditional foods, speeches, cultural presentations and competitions, as well as activities for the children who attended. In addition to these large gatherings, some more active members also participated in smaller side-gatherings, and at least a few of the organizations hosted educational workshops and informal Uzbek language classes for children and young people in the community.

Methods

The data presented in this study come from two larger ethnographic projects examining the discourses of Central Asian people in regards to language and identity. The data set from which we draw in this paper amounts to over 90 h of recordings of semi-structured interviews, casual conversations, field notes, online data and participant observation in both Kazakhstan and in the United States. Notably, in the recordings, both authors participated in conversation to make it more naturalistic, but refrained from dominating the talk in order to allow participants to, as much as possible, choose the narratives they wanted to share, and to bring up topics that were relevant to them. While a number of themes come up across the data collected for these two studies, the topic of morality and education were well represented throughout the corpora, and the excerpts presented here are representative of larger trends in the data. The first author, as an American researcher was not seen as a member of the community she studied, while the second author is from Central Asia herself, and in this respect was seen as sharing particular life experiences with her participants with respect to multilingualism and language education. Both authors shared at least two languages with their participants, and interviews were conducted in the language participants felt most comfortable using with them.

The first two interviewees, who we refer to as Daler and Munisa were interviewed in Kazakhstan. Daler is a 32 year old man who graduated with his M.A. in Arabic Studies and speaks four languages: Russian, Kazakh, Arabic, and English. A father of two children (5 and 2 years old), he comes from a rural area of Kazakhstan and identifies himself as Kazakh. Munisa is a 25 year old woman who has recently graduated from the university with a specialty in Turkology. Coming from an "international family", as she describes it, she was born to an Uyghur mother and an Uzbek father. She identifies herself as being Uyghur, Uzbek, and Kazakh at different degrees throughout the interview and speaks all three of the languages in addition to Russian, Turkish, and English. Although Munisa did not

have children at the time of the interview, she speaks hypothetically about the educational choices she would make for her future children. The second two interviews come from women we refer to as Safogul and Lola. Both of the women identify as ethnic Uzbeks and speak Russian, Uzbek, and English, but the interviews with both were conducted primarily in English. These women live in the U.S. and in their interviews they discuss why they do or do not want to participate in Uzbek community events, and why they emphasize their children's learning of Uzbek or Russian, respectively. Safogul is a twenty-eight year old woman, with a four year old daughter, while Lola is a 38 year old woman who has a 12 year old son.

In analyzing the texts below we draw from a variety of analytic traditions including narrative inquiry and socially situated discourse analysis. We examine our participants' meta commentary about particular languages, educational spaces, and events in their life, paying attention to the discursive manifestation of particular chronotopes through their invocation of time, place, and personhood. We also attend to the evaluative language they employ to interpret or make sense of their experiences.

Analysis

Language is not a key factor, although it's an important one

In the following excerpts we demonstrate that when participants invoke memories of how and why their parents selected certain schools over others, and when they share their plans for their own children's education, they discuss the importance of linguistic spaces in cultivating a sense of morality. Within their narratives they raise the issues of morality in education and various desired images of personhood. In Daler's narrative in particular, he highlights the polynomic character of morality. In other words, his narrative shows how multiple images of moral personhood have been relevant to his life and how they change depending on what he considers to be symbolic capital within a particular context. These moral images also influence how he portrays his own decisions regarding the choice of language school for his children.

Excerpt 1[3] (Russian)

1. Interviewer: В какую школы вы ходили?
2. Daler: В русскую. Я думаю родители отправили меня в русскую школу по традиции, так как у нас в семье все поколения ходили в русскую школу. Но только мой братишка пошел в Казахский экспериментальный класс, который открылся в той же школе. Хотя я и мой брат настаивали на русский класс.
3. Interviewer: Почему?

[3] We have underlined words that were emphasized in conversation. If the conversation was not originally in English we have provided both the original text and the translation. Furthermore, in parentheses we have noted the main language of the interview.

4. Daler: Потому что мы думали он будет более образованным и была разница между теми кто ходил в русскую школу и в казахскую. Ну и еще, это было престижно.
5. Interviewer: А вы сказали что у вас есть дети. Они уже ходят в школу?
6. Daler: Пока нет. Но я хочу чтобы они пошли в Казахскую школу.
7. Interviewer: Как так?
8. Daler: У меня есть друзья, патриоты, которые изучали и выросли с казахским языком, историей и литературой. Я же изучал все через русскую призму. Я не думаю как истинный патриот, чистый Казах. Я думаю я должен передать ту духовность своим детям, без фанатизма конечно. … Теперь я замечаю негативные тенденции в русских школах, как алкоголь, курение, аморальные темы. В казахских школах это все-таки не на таком уровне. В вопросах поведения, этики, духовного образование, Казахские школы лучше. И конечно же я не хочу чтоб у них был вакуум в мышлении как у не патриотов. Я хочу чтобы мои дети были полилингуалами но с Казахской базой.
9. Interviewer: Понятно.
10. Daler: Мы должны учить наших детей быть независимыми, принимать собственные решения, выбирать свою специализацию, а не то что хотят их родители. Родители должны направлять, но не давить. Я так поменял свой взгляд после просмотра английского фильма "Звёзды"…
11. Interviewer: Что вы думаете о языковых реформах в вашей стране?
12. Daler: Я знаю по опыту преподавания языка что у нас считают, что истинный Казах должен говорить по Казахски. Я с этим согласен, но не полностью. Есть люди, которые говорят по Казахски идеально, но воруют у других. И есть русские, которые не учат Казахский, но они честные и любят свою страну. Язык не ключевой фактор, хоть и важный.

1. Interviewer: What school did you go to?
2. Daler: Russian. I think my parents sent me to Russian school as a tradition since every generation in our family went to Russian school, except for my little brother. He went to an experimental Kazakh class in the same school. Even though I and my elder brother insisted on him going to the Russian class.
3. Interviewer: Why so?
4. Daler: Because we thought he'd be more educated, and there was a difference between those who went to Russian schools and Kazakh schools. And also, it was prestigious….
5. Interviewer: You said you had children. Do they go to school already?
6. Daler: Not yet. But I want them to go to Kazakh school.
7. Interviewer: How so?
8. Daler: I have friends, patriots, who studied and grew up with Kazakh language, history, and literature. In my case, I studied everything through the Russian prism. I don't think like a true patriot, pure Kazakh. I think I need to pass that morality to my children, without fanaticism of course…. I notice

negative tendencies in Russian schools, such as alcohol, smoking, immoral topics, which are not spread in Kazakh schools to the same degree. In terms of behavior and ethics, Kazakh schools are certainly better. And of course I don't want them to have a vacuum in their thinking like the non-patriots. I want my kids to be polylingual but with a Kazakh foundation….

9. Interviewer: I see.
10. Daler: We have to teach our children to be independent, make their own decisions, choose their major for themselves, not for their parents. Parents should guide but not put pressure. I changed my thinking about this after watching the English movie "Stars"….
11. Interviewer: What do you think about language reforms in your country?
12. Daler: From my language teaching experience I know that here it's considered that a true Kazakh should speak Kazakh. I agree with it, but partially. There are people who speak Kazakh perfectly, but they steal from others. I know Russians who are not learning Kazakh but they are honest people who love their country [referring to Kazakhstan]. Language is not a key factor, although it's an important one.

With respect to parental choice of educational institution the main tension for Daler is between the moral images associated with Russian vs. Kazakh schools; however, there is also a secondary moral image related to global and western notions of individual choice that emerges as relevant. The moral image associated with Russian school involves prestige and education (line 4). Based on other participants' references throughout our data, we claim that in linking Russian schools to being "educated" and being "prestigious" Daler is not only invoking notions of social status, but also a type of personhood characterized by moral norms and related to hard work, intelligence, appropriate social behavior, enlightened thinking and comportment. Daler also mentions that the majority of his family members had gone to Russian school. This linkage between an educated family and (soviet) Russian school, also contributes to the image of morality associated with this particular place and time and plays directly into Daler's earlier thoughts that his brother should attend Russian school (line 2).

When talking about education for his children, however, Daler gives his preference to Kazakh schools, noting that he wants his children to be more patriotic than he was, and believes that attendance at a Kazakh school will achieve this (line 6, 8). This decision on Daler's part, points to shifts in the cultural and linguistic capital in Kazakhstan after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Now in an independent Kazakhstan, Daler feels that one needs to be and to think like a patriot. He invokes the moral personhood of his friends who enact their patriotic morality through language, but also through knowledge of Kazakh history and literature (line 8). It is this image of moral Kazakh personhood, and its strong association with Kazakh school, that leads Daler to the decision that he should enroll his children in Kazakh school—assuming that being in this environment will make them true patriots. Furthermore, his image of Russian schools in the contemporary moment has also shifted, and the behaviors he associates with these spaces are undesirable: smoking, drinking and talking about immoral topics (line 8). Daler's shift from seeing

Russian schools as places of morality and prestige through education to places of immoral behavior and a lack of patriotism may be in part his response to national discourses. These discourses have promoted a particular type of Kazakh patriot who knows and speaks his language, and understands the cultural capital relevant to the current chronotope of the Kazakh nation-state.

It should be noted, however, that Daler does not limit his understanding of moral personhood to national images. For instance, we see the impact of supranational discourses when he talks about the English movie "Stars" through which he learned about 'other values' related to individual choice and raising independent children (line 10). Thus, while Daler justifies his previous opinion that his brother should have attended Russian school through soviet chronotopes of morality and prestigious education, and justifies his own decisions about his children's language of education through chronotopes of national patriotic morality, he also leaves room for the possibility of his children making decisions for themselves on the basis of a different image of morality, which emphasizes individual choice. These examples from Daler point to the fact that moralized behavioral scripts are always polynomic—with multiple moral images operating simultaneously in decisions about school.

Throughout the excerpt Daler links morality and language: linking Russian to images of morality through prestige, and Kazakh to images of national morality. However, at the end of the excerpt Daler states that while speaking the language is important, being honest and loving one's country are more important. In this way, while images of morality determine language choice, other moral behaviors may take precedence over linguistic competence. This acts as a reminder, that as scholars of language in social life, we should not always assume that language is the most salient factor in parental decisions about child language acquisition, but rather should investigate the other factors that together with language create certain strongly held ideals.

Fix the mistake

The following excerpt is from the interview with Munisa, who similar to Daler raises the Russian versus non-Russian dichotomy, but also invokes Central Asian images of personhood not discussed by Daler. As the child of Uyghur and Uzbek parents, born and raised in Kazakhstan, she discusses her beliefs about Kazakh, Russian, and Uyghur language education.

Excerpt 2 (Russian)

1. Interviewer: Почему вас в уйгурскую школу отправили?
2. Munisa: Она была рядом, мне не надо было переходить дорогу. У нас старшие 2 брата и сестра учились в русской школе, и были очень <u>обрусевшие</u>. В основном общались на русском, не желали вести себя как принято у нас. Это сейчас они знают уйгурский и соблюдают культуру, потому что женились на наших, уйгурках. Но тогда мама по-видимому решила исправить эту ошибку на нас ((laughter)). Мы трое уже ходили в

уйгурскую школу. Она наверное хотела чтобы мы говорили на своем языке и не были обрусевшими.

3. Interviewer: Аха
4. Munisa: Но тогда был советский союз и у мамы на работе говорили: Товарищи казахи говорите на русском. Вот мама и решила отдать старших детей в русскую школу. Вы понимаете, дело ведь не только в языке, хотя и в нем тоже. А в том что в уйгурской школе мы изучали историю наших предков, наши обычаи, а мои братья этого не изучали.
5. Interviewer: А вы бы хотели отдать своих детей в уйгурскую школу?
6. Munisa: Ну вообще я планирую отдать своих детей в казахскую школу. Меня дали в уйгурскую, спасибо конечно, но я и сама могу уйгурскому научить. А они пусть знают казахский лучше меня в <u>совершенстве</u>. Когда ты растешь в этой среде, в тебя все с потом труда вживается.
7. Interviewer: А как же история предков?
8. Munisa: Так уйгуры, казахи, узбеки, это один народ. У нас ценности одинаковые, и <u>это</u> главное. А вот в русских школах ценности уже другие. Там они будут обрусевшие. Тем более мы живем в Казахстане. К нам, к группе студентов из Казахстана как-то подошел турок и говорит: У вас же есть свой язык почему вы говорите на русском? Тогда нам было <u>очень</u> стыдно.
9. Interviewer: Да?
10. Munisa: У нас все таки центральноазиатское воспитание. Мы уважаем старших, уступаем место в автобусе, девушки помогают по дому родителям до замужества. Это все еще называлось хорошим воспитанием в советское время. Мама говорит тогда было хорошо, люди уважали друг друга. Сейчас все по другому, и такому воспитанию придерживаются в основном не обрусевшие семьи. Ну и естественно что это воспитание прививается и в наших казахских школах.

1. Interviewer: Why did your parents send you to Uyghur school?
2. Munisa: It was close to home. I didn’t have to cross the street. My older brothers and sister went to the Russian school, and they were very <u>russified</u>. They spoke mainly in Russian, and they didn’t want to behave the way it’s acceptable to behave in our culture. Now they know Uyghur and follow the culture, because they married our own, Uyghurs. But back then, my mom I guess decided to fix the mistake ((laughter)) through us, and I and my two younger siblings went to Uyghur school. I guess she wanted us to speak in our language and not be as Russified.
3. Interviewer: Aha
4. Munisa: But back then it was the Soviet Union. And at my mom’s workplace they’d say: Comrade Kazakhs, speak Russian. So, my mom decided to send her elder children to Russian school. But you see it’s not only about language, but it’s about language too. In fact, in Uyghur school we studied the history of our ancestors, our customs, but my brothers did not.

5. Interviewer: Would you like to send your children to Uygur school?
6. Munisa: Well, I plan to send them to Kazakh schools. Thanks to my parents for sending me to Uyghur schools, but I can teach them [my children] Uyghur myself. And my kids should know Kazakh better than me, perfectly. When you grow up in this environment, it thrives in you through the sweat of labor [meaning that once exposed to Kazakh within the Kazakh school environment, the language will be acquired naturally through the hard work]
7. Interviewer: What about the ancestors' history?
8. Munisa: So, Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, they are all one people. We have the same values and that's what's important. However in Russian schools the values are different. There they will be Russified. Especially, since we live in Kazakhstan. Once when we were in Turkey, there was a Turkish man who came up to us, a group of students and said: Why are you speaking Russian when you have your own language? We felt quite ashamed then.
9. Interviewer: Really?
10. Munisa: We nevertheless have a Central Asian upbringing. We respect elders, vacate the seat on the bus for another, girls help around the house until they get married. This was also considered a good upbringing during Soviet times. Mom says it was nice back then, people respected each other. Now it's all different and only non-Russified families follow that upbringing. And of course, that type of upbringing is instilled in our Kazakh schools.

Munisa's narrative reveals tensions between three languages: Russian, Kazakh and Uyghur, and two major moral types related to national identity and Central Asian identity more broadly. The tensions in some ways mirror what we saw in the excerpt from Daler. First, Munisa juggles the dichotomy of Russian versus non-Russian through her interview. When prompted to tell about the reasons why she attended Uyghur school (line 1), she tells about her older siblings' schooling and the fact that they were sent to Russian school because of the cultural capital of Russian at that time, during the Soviet Union, as exemplified in her mother's co-worker's comment that she should speak Russian, not Kazakh (line 4). However, unlike Daler's image of Russian soviet schools, Munisa's image of these schools is not one of morality through education and prestige. Instead, she emphasizes the russification (line 2), or acculturation to the Russian language, culture, behavior and values, of her older siblings as a negative result of their attending Russian school. She refers to her mother's decision as "a mistake," noting that her siblings "didn't want to behave the way it's accepted to behave in our culture" (line 2). This evaluative language, and the use of the us vs. them distinction points to the negative moral image associated with Russian educational and linguistic spaces. In contrast, Munisa's image of Uyghur school is associated with moral behavior. In line 4, Munisa justifies her mother's decision of sending her to Uyghur school by discussing the subjects taught there. She says that besides the Uyghur language, she studied the history of Uyghurs and their customs, again contrasting this with the negatively evaluated behavior of her older siblings. She notes explicitly that "it's not only about language" (line 6), pointing again to the fact that her image of Uyghur schools goes beyond language, and is connected to the moral personhood that is associated

with ethnonational identity, through for example, acquiring historical and cultural knowledge.

When Munisa discusses her desired education for her future children, she notes that she hopes to send them to Kazakh school. This decision is framed by two types of morality in her narrative. First, Munisa situates her decision of selecting Kazakh school for her future children within the image of moral patriotism, noting that her children should learn Kazakh better than her, emphasizing in particular the word "perfectly" (line 6) and linking the importance of this proficiency to the fact that they live in Kazakhstan (line 8). To support the validity of this image, she recalls her trip to Turkey, where she and her group of Kazakhstani friends were criticized for speaking Russian instead of Kazakh. She describes her emotions of feeling "ashamed" and the use of this word in particular, points to the moral nature of the criticism and its uptake. This is similar to the image of patriotic morality linked to both language and extralinguistic factors outlined by Daler as the criticism emphasizes the link between the nation-state, its citizens and speaking the titular language. She secondarily justifies her choice of Kazakh schools through an image of Central Asian morality as she claims that due to a similarity of values among these nations and due to the fact that they live in Kazakhstan. She says, "We have the same values, and THAT's what's important. However in Russian schools the values are different. There they will be Russified" (line 8). Her use of the first person plural to describe the Central Asian ethnicities demonstrates the ways in which she is positioning these groups together, while her use of the deictic "there" to refer to Russian schools, distances herself and her preferred morality from that space. Furthermore, she puts emphasis on the word "that" in claiming that the shared values are what matters—rather than the particular language.

In line 10, Munisa explains the kinds of values she thinks unite Central Asian nations, most of which she relates to one's upbringing. These values are models of conduct, e.g. respect towards elders or vacating one's seat in the bus for another. Surprisingly, while Munisa associates Russian schools with values that do not align with her images of moral personhood, she associates soviet times in Central Asia with the images of morality that she hopes her children will imitate. She brings up the soviet era as she defines a good upbringing in line 10, and notes that the moral norms that are valued by Central Asians (i.e. non-Russians) today, were also valued during Soviet times. She refers to her mother's nostalgia of the good times in which there was a respect for one another. Munisa thus links the chronotopic image of modern morality in Central Asia with the image of morality in the soviet era. However, she does not link this image of morality to the small-scale chronotope of contemporary Russian schools or contemporary Russians living in Central Asia, but only to non-Russified families and non-Russian language schools in contemporary Kazakhstan, thus justifying her decision about where to send her future children to school.

And hopefully she will learn Uzbek

The following excerpts, which come from Uzbeks living in the United States, are not about where to send children to school, but rather about whether or not parents

want their children to participate in the regional Uzbek community organizations. In the first excerpt, Safogul describes moral types by emphasizing linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors such as speaking Uzbek, speaking respectfully to elders, and dressing and behaving modestly. She links this moral personhood to the image of the Uzbek nation state and also to the small scale chronotopic image of the Uzbek community organization. The link between moral personhood, the Uzbek nation, and the community organization validates and authorizes her participation there. In this way, participation in this educational and linguistic space is a result of the invocation of morally laden chronotopes and images of particular types of people who speak in particular languages.

Excerpt 3 (English)

1. Interviewer: For you like what do you feel like is the value that you get from from that kind of connection?
2. Safogul: Okay from that kind of connection I feel like the my primary purpose of meeting Uzbek community is for my daughter because I really want her to be involved like to see who are the real Uzbek people and I want her to socialize with Uzbek kids a lot. And hopefully she will learn Uzbek. Because you know she doesn't speak Uzbek. So I think that that's the priority for me.
3. Interviewer: and what about what about um that is important. Like for her to speak Uzbek like what is yea
4. Safogul: Uh like to see um to see our mentality to see ((daughter interrupts)) to see uh to see to be familiar with our traditions, to get familiarize her with our traditions, with our people and everything, to see that atmosphere so that when she knows her identity in the future. I wanna make sure she knows that she's Uzbek. Like yea she was born here and right now she speaks only English, but I want her to know that. And I think it's a great chance for us. Because since I mean you know in X there were no Uzbek families,
5. Interviewer: Right
6. Safogul: But here I know there are plenty of them so that's why we really want her to be there
7. Interviewer: To have that chance…((Interviewer's extended question)) Like what does it mean for her to know that she's Uzbek or to be…
8. Safogul: That's interesting question because for me it just comes naturally but I feel like…It's a hard question because yea again for me it just comes naturally because I was born in Uzbekistan I was raised in that Uzbek family, but for her it's different. And I really want her to- we we have some sort of traditions and the manners like how you act and you have to be like even like dressing culture like how you dress up or anything like this. And also like y'know these kind of things it just the manners how you talk right?
9. Interviewer: Can you give me any examples of like how you talk? Or like how you dress? That- not you specifically, but yea in general that
10. Safogul: Like in terms of dressing it should be modest, right. I know even like in Uzbekistan it's changing right now, but still like I was raised like that. And then when it comes to your manners you have to be more polite respectful right even when you sit you cannot simply just put your legs on your table. It's

not acceptable in my culture. Or when even when you like if you have guests right how you welcome them. Being hospitable right. Just minor things. Even in communication. How you respect. When you talk to adults it's one thing, right. If you know that the person is older than you have to respect him you have to talk to him in a different way. With friend's it's different you can play with them and everything. So you know we have this. You've been to Uzbekistan

11. Interviewer: yea yea yea
12. Safogul: so you know how it goes. And I think here. I dunno I don't wanna say anything about like Americans. Americans they don't do this or not. But it's just a part of our culture. And maybe it coincides with American culture but I wanna make sure that she sees it from if there's a if there's an opportunity to show us like Uzbek families. Like more Uzbek families and to to show it to her than it would be great.

Safogul begins by noting that she wants to participate in the community events because she hopes that her daughter will learn Uzbek. She refers to this as "the priority for me" (line 2). When the first author asks her why she wants her daughter to learn Uzbek, Safogul links the knowledge of Uzbek to an Uzbek mentality, traditions, people and identity (line 4) emphasizing the plural possessive "our" to underscore the collective nature of this identity. The moral norms attached to this collective national personhood become more clear in Safogul's response to the first author asking for examples of the types of behaviors that would relate to Uzbekness. Safogul highlights dressing modestly, sitting correctly, being hospitable to guests, and speaking respectfully to elders (line 10) as key. She thus creates links between Uzbek language proficiency, Uzbek mentality and traditions, and norms for moral behavior to establish an image of moral personhood.

Examining other parts of the excerpt we see how this personhood is attached to the time and space of the Uzbek American community organization, and of Safogul's past life in Uzbekistan. In lines 4–6 she notes that in the U.S. city where they had lived previously there were no other Uzbeks, but now that they live in a city with a larger number of Uzbeks her daughter has a chance to be exposed to this type of moral personhood—linking her daughter's moral education to the chronotopic context of the regional Uzbek community organization. She also notes that she herself never had to think about these issues given that she was "born in Uzbekistan" and "raised in an Uzbek family" (line 18) spatially locating this image of morality in the nation-state of Uzbekistan. The temporal aspect of this moral image can be seen in line 10 where she notes that things are changing in Uzbekistan, that children are not necessarily educated according to the same set of morals these days, and that the moral personhood she wants her daughter to embody is the one that she herself was raised with in the past (line 10). Safogul thus links this particular type of moral personhood to the chronotopes of national identity, the time–space frames of the past in Uzbekistan, and to the particular context of the Uzbek community organization events. Interestingly, near the end of the excerpt she notes that while these morals may also be shared with Americans, she wants her

daughter to see this behavior among Uzbeks specifically, and this is what motivates her to participate in the community organization (line 12).

In many ways the links Safogul discursively represents here are similar to the images of national morality articulated by Daler, and to the images of Central Asian morality expressed by Munisa. The difference is that, being located outside of Central Asia she is forced to create new links to the various times and spaces she encounters along her migration trajectory, which leads her to attribute value to the community organization.That is, because she sees these moral images of personhood and the associated knowledge of Uzbek as important to raising her daughter, and because she sees these organizations as one of the few spaces to which she has access, and which embody this type of morality and linguistic proficiency, she wants to engage with these spaces. In this way, decisions about communal engagement and about morality are also decisions about language, and Safogul's narrative illustrates the intersection of these complex factors involved in family language policies.

The whole family spoke Russian

The next excerpt comes from a semi-structured interview with a woman we refer to as Lola. Lola lived in a different geographic area than Safogul; however, there was another Uzbek community organization in her area. Unlike Safogul, Lola decides to teach her son Russian rather than Uzbek, and not to engage in the community organization. Although her decisions are different, we illustrate that these decisions are still based in her particular images of moral personhood and the (dis)connection of these images to/from particular time–space frames. In this excerpt, she is responding to a question from the first author regarding which languages she decided to teach her son.

Excerpt 4 (English)

1. Lola: He maintains <u>some</u> Russian.
2. Interviewer: Do you speak Russian at home or?
3. Lola: We speak mostly Russian. Even though we are ethnically Uzbeks. It's just the whole family starting from my grandparents they all went to Russian y'know school, Russian y'know universities and my parents my uncles aunts, y'know all of them
4. Interviewer: everybody ((laughing))
5. Lola: Everybody so someone just recently said and that was the one of the expats who used to live in Uzbekistan said that his understanding was that more educated families spoke mostly Russian. I'm not sure how much of that is true, but it could be. But I grew up in which is a rural area ((laughing)) and so, but we, I don't know the whole family spoke Russian. I thought it's <u>normal</u> at that point
6. Interviewer: ((laughing))
7. Lola: Because I went to Russian school, I went to Russian daycare, y'know and my the language we speak, the Uzbek dialect that we speak is a <u>little</u> different from the dialect that's spoken in Z and when we moved to Z. It was

difficult to adjust to that new dialect and I was more comfortable speaking Russian.

8. Lola: And that's why we that's why the whole family speaks Russian and that's why my son also y'know is his second language is Russian But he grew up and he learned reading and writing in English.
9. … ((Interviewer asks her why she wants him to learn Russian))
10. Lola: Well we have family members who don't speak English and I really wanted him to be able to communicate with them. I think learning a language is just at least beneficial in developing cognitive skills, I mean I think it it's beneficial that way. I also believe—y'know and and that will contradict the fact that he doesn't know Uzbek, but I also think that he needs to speak the language of his ethnicity, of his origins, I think its y'know it's important.

In response to the first author's question about what language she decided to teach her son, Lola notes that he "maintains some Russian" (line 1). She links the behavior of speaking Russian to a variety of time–space frames: Russian at home (line 2), Russian in her family's educational experiences (line 3), and her own experience of Russian in school settings in Uzbekistan (line 7). Russian is linked to her overall image of her educated family in Uzbekistan. Specifically with regards to education, she comments in line 5 that "Someone just recently said…that his understanding was that more educated families spoke mostly Russian. I'm not sure how much of that is true, but it could be". She articulates this claim about Russian language being linked to being educated through the voice of a third party and in this way distances herself from directly prioritizing Russian over Uzbek. However, her comment that "it could be [true]", seems to highlight the fact that she too views Russian language proficiency as part of "being educated". As mentioned in the analysis of Daler's interview, the notion of "being educated" can also be understood as a type of morality. Furthermore, she notes that she wants her son to learn Russian because "we have uh family members who don't speak English and I really wanted him to be able to communicate with them" (line 10). In this way, Russian is seen as linked to moral behaviors such as staying connected with one's family through maintaining communication with them.

Lola's linking of Russian with knowing the language of your origins also has a moral quality to it, similar to the moral national identity seen in the examples above. She notes that she wants her son to maintain Russian because "he needs to speak the language of his ethnicity, of his origins" (line 10). However, because post-soviet national discourses in Uzbekistan emphasize de-russified Uzbek, we see that Lola is somewhat tentative in her claim that her son needs to know Russian for the sake of speaking the language of his ethnicity, as in her comment that "that will contradict the the fact that he doesn't know Uzbek" (line 10). Nevertheless, since she has noted all of the ways in which speaking Russian is tied to her family's particular experience in Uzbekistan, she is still able to claim that maintaining this language relates to her son maintaining the language of his origins. While the moralized behavioral script outlined by Safogul more strongly emphasizes Uzbek traditions, gendered behaviors and Uzbek proficiency, Lola emphasizes "being educated", family responsibility, and Russian proficiency.

Lola's social imaginary also differs from Safogul's in terms of how she conceptualizes moral personhood in relation to the regional Uzbek community organization. Lola does not link her images of morality to the chronotope of the Uzbek American organization, but instead links a different set of undesirable behaviors to that space and time. Earlier in the conversation, Lola had mentioned that she did not participate much in the organization and was not sure why. Right before excerpt 4 she had noted that in some ways she was happy to leave Uzbekistan and be in the U.S., because there was much less gossip in the U.S. and more respect for privacy. This led the first author to ask her if this was one of the reasons she did not want to participate in the community organization and she responded affirmatively.

> Yea people are - a lot of people are interested in materialistic aspects y'know…where you work, what you earn, what you have, what you own. You know it's like eh there's a little bit of that I can't say that's the only reason I'm not um related to that but at the same time um there is a little bit of that that um that um I guess um prevents me from… being a part of that community.

When she discusses the Uzbek community events she highlights what she sees as undesirable behaviors, such as the materialistic focus of community members and their interest in monetary issues "where you work, what you earn, what you have, what you own", all of which stands in contrast to her own interests and to her unwillingness to discuss those aspects of her life. This in turn leads to her lack of interest in being a part of the community. In this way we can see how attention to speaker's understandings of linguistic proficiency, moralized behavioral scripts and their association with various chronotopes are useful in unpacking the different ways in which they justify their decisions regarding the educational and linguistic spaces they want their children to be part of, as well as the languages they focus on having their children learn.

Conclusion

Our aim in this paper has been to show how family decisions about linguistic education are based in part on language attitudes and how language attitudes are embedded in images of space, time and moral personhood, i.e. as a member of a soviet state, in an newly independent nation-state, or as an immigrant in a new country. The excerpts we have presented here illustrate that there is never only one moral image influencing decisions, but rather that participants are dealing with multiple and shifting chronotopes. For example, in the first two excerpts we see participants move away from the language planning decisions that their parents made, because of their new experiences and new understandings of moral personhood. Similarly, in the immigrant context, we see how prioritizing different moral values can lead to different decisions about community engagement, which also impacts children's linguistic exposure. Our participants' comments that there is a need to "fix the mistake" of past language planning decisions, to have their children "speak the language of their ethnicity" or "hopefully learn Uzbek", as well

as their acknowledgement that while language is important, it is not the only “key factor” nicely illustrate the ways in which they view these private language planning decisions.

This paper contributes to the study of language planning by demonstrating how the theoretical notions of chronotope and personhood provide new insight into bottom-up language planning processes. While language planning theories in general have introduced a number of categories to distinguish among different processes, goals and outcomes, such as bottom-up versus top-down language planning (Hornberger 2006), status versus corpus planning (Kloss 1969) and covert versus overt planning (Schiffman 1998), we demonstrate how factors across these various categories get bundled together in ways that are personally meaningful for speakers through images of personhood. This focus on personally meaningful images is not meant to negate the influence of top-down factors and state discourses, but rather to show the ways in which these discourses are internalized by participants through their understandings of morality relative to other issues such as education and language ideology. In the case of the multilingual families we examine, we see how they struggle to prioritize one language over another depending on contemporary state discourses, for instance. The fact that we see participants saying that they want their children to know multiple languages could be interpreted as an openness to multiple complementary moralities, and illustrates the impact of history on personal choice; i.e. independence bringing about a preference for moralities associated with the titular language, but a soviet past resulting in a continued value for moralities associated with soviet times.

This work also has practical implications for educational practices and heritage language maintenance programs. Specifically, it may be worthwhile to further investigate the possibilities of framing language maintenance programs as spaces of moral education and to create language curriculum that is in line with the multiple moral values that may be held by parents. Further research is needed to investigate the ways in which the multiple, and perhaps conflicting moral values of parents versus children should be taken into account in these contexts; and, the notion of chronotope may offer a helpful theoretical approach in these further studies. Additionally, we want to acknowledge that decisions about children’s linguistic exposure are constrained and influenced by factors other than morality. For example, while all of our participants have some agency in making decisions about their children’s linguistic exposure, those living in Central Asia are participating in a built-in system of choice in which making decisions about where to send their children to school is a necessary and normal part of daily life. On the other hand, in choosing to participate in Uzbek community events, those abroad are making an effort that goes above and beyond the demands of daily life, and for this reason, it is also possible that some choose not to participate simply because of the extra effort that is required. While the examples we have focused on here illustrate the importance of moral images to parental decisions, we also recognize that other systemic factors and instrumental concerns undoubtedly constrain these decisions as well.

Acknowledgements We express our gratitude to our study participants. This paper has benefited from Farzad Karimzad's valuable feedback and conversations with Rakesh Batt.

References

Agha, A. (2007). Recombinant selves in mass mediated spacetime. *Language & Communication, 27,* 320–335.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(2–3), 147–170.

Bezcioglu-Goktolga, I., & Yagmur, K. (2017). Home language policy of second-generation Turkish families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1310216.

Billings, S. (2013). *Language, globalization and the making of a Tanzanian beauty queen*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, J. (in press). *Durkheim and the internet: On sociolinguistics and the sociological imagination*. London: Bloomsbury.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Castells, Manuel. (2010). *The power of identity: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (2nd ed.). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy, 8*(4), 351–375.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2016). Conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices in Singaporean multilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 694–709. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1127926.

De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and migration* (pp. 75–95). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ferguson, C. A. (1977). Sociolinguistic settings of language planning. In J. Rubin, H. B. Jernudd, J. DasGupta, J. A. Fishman & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Language planning processes* (pp. 9–29). Mouton De Gruyter.

Fierman, W. (2006). Language and education in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: Kazakh-medium instruction in urban schools. *The Russian Review, 65*(1), 98–116.

Fierman, W. (2009). Identity, symbolism, and the politics of language in Central Asia. *Europe-Asia Studies, 61*(7), 1207–1228.

Hornberger, N. (2006). Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning Research. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 24–41). Oxford: Blackwell.

Irvine, J. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist, 16*(2), 248–267.

Karimzad, F., & Catedral, L. (2017). 'No, we don't mix languages': Ideological power and the chronotopic organization of ethnolinguistic identities. *Language in Society,* 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000781

Karrebæk, M. S., & Ghandchi, N. (2017). Guests and hosts: What hospitality may reveal in the heritage language classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 39,* 37–47.

Kendzior, S. (2014). *Reclaiming Ma'naviyat: Morality, criminality, and dissident politics in Uzbekistan* (pp. 223–247). Ethnographies of the State in Central Asia: Performing Politics.

King, K. A. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 167–184.

King, K., & 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), 695–712. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb362.0.

King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 2*(5), 907–922.

Kloss, H. (1969). Research possibilities on group bilingualism: a report. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED037728.pdf Accessed 12 September 2017.

Kozhakhmetova, K. (2013). Development of the basic directions of education in Kazakhstan and mechanisms of their realization. *Bulletin of Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Kazakhstan, 3,* 25–32.

Kunanbaev, A. (1977). *Полное собрание сочинений*. Алма-Ата: Галым.

Lo, A. (2009). Lessons about respect and affect in a Korean heritage language school. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(3), 217–234.

Moin, V., Protassova, E., Lukkari, V., & Schwartz, M. (2013). The role of family background in early bilingual education: The Finnish-Russian experience. In A. Verschik & M. Schwartz (Eds.), *Successful family language policy* (pp. 53–82). Dordrecht: Springer.

Moore, L. C. (2016). Change and variation in family religious language policy in a West African Muslim community. *Language Policy, 15*(2), 125–139.

Pavlenko, A. (2008). Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: Language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(3–4), 275–314.

Piller, I. (2001). Private language planning: The best of both worlds. *Estudios de Sociolingüística, 2*(1), 61–80.

Regan, T. (2005). *Critical theory, globalization and international language education*. Paper presented in the University Lecture Series, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 10–23). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffman, H. (1998). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.

Schlyter, B. (2012). Language policy and Language Development in Multilingual Uzbekistan. In H. Schiffman (Ed.), *Language policy and language conflict in Afghanistan and its neighbors: The changing politics of language choice* (pp. 176–207). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Schwartz, M., Moin, V., & Klayle, M. (2013). Parents' Choice of a Bilingual Hebrew-Arabic Kindergarten for the Children. In A. Verschik & M. Schwartz (Eds.), *Successful family language policy* (pp. 23-51). Dordrecht: Springer.

Smagulova, J. (2006). Kazakhstan: Language, identity and conflict. *Innovation, 19*(3–4), 303–320.

Smith-Christmas, C. (2017). Family Language Policy: New Directions. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world opportunities, challenges, and consequences*. London: Routledge.

Woolard, K. A. (2013). Is the personal political? Chronotopes and changing stances toward Catalan language and identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(2), 210–224.

Zakaeva, Z., & Sarsenbayeva, S. (1998). Межэтнические отношения в современном казахстане: опыт комплексного социологического анализа. *Центральная Азия, 15*(1), 46–59.

Lydia Catedral is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her focus is in sociolinguistics, applied linguistics and discourse analysis, and her research examines language in relation to identity and power in contexts of transnational migration. Her empirical data come primarily from multilingual Central Asian communities and her dissertation focuses on the moral discourses and identities of Uzbek women living in the United States. She has published in *Discourse and Society* on issues of morality in migrant contexts in the article "Discursive Scaling".

Madina Djuraeva is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction with a concentration on World Language Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Employing narrative inquiry in her work, she focuses primarily on language education and language policy, identity and translanguaging in multilingual communities. Her empirical data come from Central Asia and her dissertation examines narratives of becoming and being multilingual in the Central Asian context. She is an editor of the forthcoming volume "*Language policy and politics of language: Re-imagining the role of language in neoliberal society".*