

**Family Language Policy in Three Circassian
Families in Jordan**

السياسة اللغوية الأسرية لثلاث عائلات شركسية في الأردن

Prepared by:

Leen Hussien Kassabi

Supervised by:

Dr. Mohammed Yousef Nofal

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Master's Degree in English Language and Literature**

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Middle East University

June, 2023

Authorization

I, **Leen Hussien Kassabi**, hereby authorize Middle East University to provide libraries, organizations, and even individuals with hard copies or soft copies of my thesis upon request.

Name: Leen Hussien Kassabi.

Date: 03 / 06 /2023

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Leen", with a large, sweeping flourish underneath.

Thesis Committee Decision

This thesis titled “**Family Language Policy in Three Circassian Families in Jordan**” was successfully defended and approved on 03 /06 / 2023.

Examination Committee Members:

Name	Workplace	Title	Signature
Dr. Mohammed Yousef Nofal	Middle East University	Supervisor	
Dr. Wajd Al-Ahmad	Middle East University	Internal Examiner – Committee head	
Dr. Abdelkarim Al-Lababneh	Middle East University	Internal Examiner	
Dr. Ayman Yasin	Princess Sumaya University for Technology	External Examiner	

Acknowledgements

First of all, I humbly thank Allah, the most Merciful, who blessed me and gave me power, strength and knowledge to complete this work.

I am delighted to express my sincere gratitude and deep appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Mohammed Nofal, for his kindness, support, encouragement, inspiration, enthusiasm, immense knowledge, and valuable suggestions to shape this thesis. His unconditional guidance and support throughout the research have given me and provided me with the knowledge I needed to be here today. I have been extremely lucky to have a supervisor who genuinely cared so much about my work, and who responded to every detail kindly. I am indebted to him, and I enjoyed working with him.

I would like to thank the instructors in the Department of English Language and Literature at the Middle East University, and special thanks go to the examination committee members, Dr. Ayman Yasin, Dr. Abdelkarim Allababneh and Dr. Wajed Al Ahmad for their insightful suggestions and constructive feedback.

This work would not have been completed without my beloved family and friends. I am forever grateful to my parents for their support, love and encouragement. Thank you for being the reason behind every success, as you always remind and inspire me to follow my dreams. Finally, my appreciation goes to the wonderful Circassian families who participated in this study for being part of this work.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to the closest to my heart, my father; who encourages me to seek what I deserve.

To my mother, the source of love, care, and giving.

To my brothers, whom I consider my backbone.

To my beloved friends, Yasmin, and Layla who have been a source of motivation, support and encouragement during my study. I am incredibly grateful for having you in my life.

To the dearest and closest one to me, Asma, who has been there since the first day of my journey and encourages me to take this step. Thank you for supporting me whenever it was needed and for believing in me achieving one of my goals.

Table of Contents

Subject	Page
Title	i
Authorization.....	ii
Thesis Committee Decision	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Appendices	viii
Abstract in English.....	ix
Abstract in Arabic	x
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1 The Circassians	2
1.2 Statement of the Problem	6
1.3 Significance of the Problem	7
1.4 Objectives of the Study	8
1.5 Questions of the Study	8
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	8
1.7 Limits of the Study.....	9
1.8 Definition of Terms	9
1.9 Summary	10
CHAPTER TWO: Review of Literature.....	11
2.0 Introduction	11
2.1 Review of Theoretical Literature	11
Spolsky’s Model of FLP	12
Language Ideologies	13
Language Practices.....	14
Language Management	17
Spolsky’s Model: Advantages and Disadvantages	19
2.2 Review of Previous Research on Family Language Policy	20
2.3 Summary	30
CHAPTER THREE: Methodology.....	31
3.0 Introduction	31
3.1 Research Design.....	31
3.2 Population of the Study	31
3.3 Sample of the Study	31
3.4 Instruments of the Study	33
3.4.1 Observation	33
3.4.2 Interviews	34

3.4 Procedures of the Study.....	35
3.5 Summary	35
CHAPTER FOUR: Results	36
4.0 Introduction	36
4.1 Results Related to Research Question One	36
4.1.1 Circassian Language Ideologies.....	37
4.1.1.1 Circassian as a marker of identity	37
4.1.1.2 The importance of the Circassian Language as a cultural aspect and value ..	40
4.1.1.3 The Circassian culture influence on language	41
4.1.2 Language Ideologies towards Arabic.....	42
4.1.2.1 The importance of the Arabic Language.....	42
4.1.2.2 Arabic as religion and culture	45
4.2 Results Related to Question Two	47
4.2.1 Language Practices.....	47
4.2.1.1 Connect heritage culture into language practices.....	49
4.2.1.2 Food as an interaction	51
4.2.1.3 Code- switching	52
4.2.1.4 Circassian language as a topic.....	56
4.2.1.5 Language policing.....	58
4.2 Results Related to Question Three	59
4.2.1 Language Management	59
4.2.1.1 Repetition	61
4.3 Summary	62
CHAPTER FIVE: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	64
5.0 Introduction	64
5.1 Discussion of the Results of Question One	64
5.2 Discussion of the Results of Question Two	67
5.3 Discussion of the Results of Question Three	68
5.4 Conclusion.....	70
5.5 Recommendations and Directions for Future Research.....	71
5.6 Summary	72
References	73
Appendix A	81

List of Appendices

Appendix	Title	Page
Appendix A	Semi-Structured Interview Guide	81

Family Language Policy in Three Circassian Families in Jordan

Prepared by: Leen Hussien Kassabi

Supervised by: Dr Mohammed Yousef Nofal

Abstract

This ethnographic study aims at investigating the dynamics of family language policy in three Jordanian-Circassian families in Jordan. It aims to uncover the language ideologies members of the three families hold towards the heritage and the majority languages. It explores the patterns of the language use within the family in terms of which languages are used and how caregivers respond to the use of these languages. It also attempts to explore how the family members manage the language in the frame of the home/family domain and what strategies and styles they follow.

To achieve the goals of the study, three Circassian families were selected. Data were collected by means of two instruments; observations (field notes and voice-recordings) and semi-structured interviews and the data were interpreted drawing upon Spolsky's (2004, 2009) model of FLP.

The results show that the Circassian families use the Circassian language in limited contexts. However, the results indicate that the families hold strong identities towards their language as the language is considered an identity marker and linked to traditions, cultures and values. The Arabic language is considered as a valuable language as it is the language of communication and religion in the families. Also, the families practice their language through maintaining the Circassian culture, meta-linguistic discussions, and specific heritage language policing. Additionally, the results show that the families tend to manage the language naturally, and only limited management strategies were used.

This thesis suggests conducting future research with other heritage language communities. Researchers can also focus more on language management efforts, and use recordings to rely on actual language use.

Keywords: Family Language Policy, Circassians, Language Ideology, Language Practices, Language Management.

السياسة اللغوية الأسرية لثلاث عائلات شركسية في الأردن

إعداد: لين حسين كسبي

إشراف الدكتور: محمد يوسف نوفل

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى استكشاف سياسة اللغة الأسرية لثلاث عائلات أردنية شركسية في الأردن، من خلال الكشف عن أيديولوجيات اللغة التي يعتنقها أفراد العائلات الثلاث تجاه اللغة الشركسية واللغة العربية. وتستكشف أنماط استخدام اللغة داخل الأسرة من حيث اللغات المستخدمة وكيفية استجابة أفراد الأسرة لاستخدام هذه اللغات. كما تحاول الدراسة استكشاف كيفية إدارة أفراد الأسرة للغتهم في المنزل.

لتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، تم اختيار ثلاث عائلات شركسية. جمعت البيانات بواسطة أداتين؛ الملاحظات (جزء منها التسجيلات الصوتية) والمقابلات مع أفراد العائلات.

فيما يتعلق بتحليل هذه الدراسة، تظهر النتائج أن العائلات الشركسية تستخدم اللغة الشركسية في سياقات محدودة. مع ذلك تشير النتائج إلى أن العائلات لديها هويات قوية تجاه لغتها لأن اللغة تعتبر علامة هوية وترتبط بالتقاليد والثقافات والقيم. كما أن اللغة العربية تعتبر لغة قيمة لأنها لغة التواصل والدين في العائلات. كما أن الممارسات اللغوية للأفراد تظهر من خلال الحفاظ على الثقافة الشركسية، والنقاش اللغوي، وسياسات اللغة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تظهر النتيجة أن العائلات تميل إلى إدارة اللغة بشكل طبيعي، ولا يُلاحظ سوى استراتيجيات إدارة محدودة.

تقترح هذه الدراسة إجراء أبحاث مستقبلية مع مجتمعات اللغات التراثية الأخرى. يمكن للباحثين أيضاً التركيز على جهود إدارة اللغة واستخدام التسجيل للاعتماد على الاستخدام الفعلي للغة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السياسة اللغوية الأسرية، الشركس، أيديولوجية اللغة، الممارسات اللغوية، إدارة اللغة.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.0 Introduction

The chapter presents the background, problem, objectives, significance, questions, definitions, limitations and limits of the study. Also, it presents an overview about the Circassians.

1.1 Background of the Study

Jordan is a Middle Eastern Arab country with a rich number of people and groups from diverse backgrounds and cultures. Jordan can be considered a multilingual country as it has a range of languages and dialects that are spoken by different communities, including but not limited to Arabic, Circassian, Chechen, Turkmen, and Armenian. The majority of the Jordanian population are Arabs, with a minority of groups whose heritage languages (HLs) are different from the majority language.

The official language in Jordan is Arabic. As stated in the Jordanian Constitution, Article 2 “Arabic is its official language.” (Constitutional Court, 2022). The Modern Standard Arabic is used in media, written documents, news and official announcements, whereas the Jordanian-Arabic dialect is spoken by all Jordanians, including the minority speakers. Alongside the Arabic language, English is also used in Jordan. It is used in social media, some radio programs, and is taught at schools as a foreign language.

Sociolinguistic studies have recently focused on an emerging area of study, i.e. family language policy. The field has been expanding in recent decades as it mainly concerns and centers on heritage language speakers and ethnic groups in various areas, contexts, and family types (Wright & Higgins, 2021). As previously mentioned, Jordan has a variety of ethnic minorities. They are considered and distinguished as groups of people

who share common features; language, traditions, history, and culture. The most well-known ethnic groups in the Middle East, more specifically in Jordan, are the Circassians, Chechens, and Armenians. The Circassians are one of the largest minority groups of Jordan (Al-Abbas, 2008).

Hypothetically, the country's official language will be considered the dominant language or the majority language as it is spoken and used daily, which is expected to impact the other heritage languages. However, speaking the heritage language will be limited to its speech communities and certain domains. As an example, Arabic is the one and only official language in Jordan that is taught in schools, and is the language used for communication, whereas Circassian is one of the heritage languages that can only be spoken among members of the Circassian community and is used in private domains, e.g. the home.

1.1.1 The Circassians

The Circassians are an ethnic group of people whose origins are from the Northwest Caucasus (Shami, 1994) and are the original inhabitants of the mountainous area between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea (Abu Assab, 2011). According to Rannut (2011), the Circassians live in a diaspora situation in many countries. The Circassians are non-Arab Muslims who were forced to leave their homeland due to oppression and injustice between them and Russia. (Abd-el-Jawad, 2006; Rannut, 2011).

The term "Circassians" has many variants that were used by foreigners such as Sharkass, Tcherkess and Jarkass. Circassians today, are known as Adygye or Circassians. The term also includes "people of the North-West Caucasus: Adigas, Kabardians, Abkhazians, Abazinians, and Ubykhs" (Rannut , 2011, p. 6). Circassians identify themselves as "Adyghe"; a name that has a historical background. The name was given

to the Circassians in the fifth century, suggesting that the Circassians have one language. The language has been divided into different dialects, and the name has been referred to as a self-identification of the Circassian people, as one group (Shami, 2009). Phenotypically, the Circassians are known for certain features. Colarusso (1994, p. 1) describes them as follows:

[i]n certain tribes, there is a high incidence of blue eyes and blond or red hair, while others have dark hair with light complexions. Some groups show a propensity toward long aquiline faces and dolichocephalic heads, whereas others tend toward round faces and brachycephalic. Many have almond shaped eyes and fine features. Epicanthic eye-folds are common.

As previously mentioned, Circassians left their homeland due to the War with Russia in the 18th century. According to Shami (1994), the Russian control increased, and many of the families in the west and the coastal regions were forced to move from to the east. Circassian religious beliefs were centered on polytheism, paganism and animism with some Christian and Muslim influence. In the Middle Ages, they switched their religion to either Islam or Christianity due to the struggle between Orthodox Russia and Muslim Turkey (Jaimoukha, 2001). The spread of Islam in the Ottomans' age led to the replacement of Christianity, and due to that, the Circassians were forced to leave their homeland by the Russian. In the past hundred years, the Circassians have been distinguished as Sunni Muslims (Colarusso, 1994).

Furthermore, Russian's conquest of the Caucasus and the oppression of the Muslim groups in the area (Abd-el-Jawad, 2006) along with the rest of Muslim groups in the western and northern Caucasus aimed to cleanse their lands and change the Caucasus land into a Christian one that is loyal to their Russian Empire (Abu Assab, 2011). As a result, the Circassians were deported and exiled to different areas of the world including Jordan. Their migration began in 1859 (Shami, 1994) and lasted until the year 1900 (Rannut, 2011). Emigration was encouraged and supported by the Ottoman Sultan, Abdel Hamid

(Abd-el-Jawad, 2006). The migration has been described as “genocide” due to the number of deaths, illnesses, hunger and fatigue where many of them lost their lives (Abu Assab, 2011; Omar & Dweik, 2015).

The Circassians settled in many countries in the Middle East. According to Jaimoukha (1998), the Circassians have arrived in Jordan as the first wave arrived in 1878, followed by settling in different areas; Wadi Seer, Jerash, Naur, Rusiafa and Sweileh (Abd-el-Jawad, 2006; Hamed-Troyansky, 2017; Rannut, 2011; Shami, 2009). Due to the absence of official records, the exact number of the Circassians in Jordan is hard to determine. Based on personal estimation, Colarusso (1994) suggests that the approximate number of Circassians in Jordan is 20,000-100,000, constituting 2% of the population of Jordan. A more recent estimation is offered by Rannut (2009) who reports the presence of around 40,000-50,000 Circassians in Jordan, comprising 0.75% of the total Jordanian population. Moreover, the minority rights group international website suggests that Circassians’ number in Jordan refers to 1 per cent of the population which includes 60,000 Circassians and Chechen together in 2020.

Circassians have been reported to have settled in Jordan for a variety of reasons, including agricultural purposes, security concerns and strategic purposes (Abd-el-Jawad, 2006). It is argued that upon the arrival of the first wave “Shapsough”, they built permanent houses in Amman. The Circassians introduced agriculture to the area, they established “large and well-kept farms and introduced large-wheeled carts to establish transport and commerce” (Jaimoukha, 2001, p.107). As a way to integrate into the Jordanian society and the language, throughout history, the Circassians have held various positions in Jordan, including “prime ministers, ministers, deputies, army and police chiefs, and have always seen themselves as co-founders of the country” (Abd-el-Jawad

, 2006, p. 53). Also, positions that are primarily in the government include bureaucracy and military with significant and major representations in the parliamentary and executive branches of government (Shami, 1994).

The Circassians have their own language, customs, traditions, culture, and history. The language has been reported to have been spoken for over than 100 years (Rannut, 2009), according to Jaimoukha (2001), claims that Circassian is one of the three main pillars of the Northwest group of Caucasian languages, and the rest of the languages are Abkhaz, Abaza and Ubykh. The three languages have been described as “mutually unintelligible, the lexical differences between them being quite substantial” (Jaimoukha, 2002, p. 245). Scholars believe that before separation, Northwest Caucasians spoke proto-West Caucasian. The original language is divided into three distinct entities; proto-Circassian, proto- Abkhaz and proto- Ubykh (Jaimoukha, 2001). It has been believed that Circassians spoke one language, but it split into different dialects (Shami, 1994).

The Northwest Caucasus has five recognized languages, including East Circassian (Kabardian), West Circassian (Adyge), Abkhaz, Abaza and Ubykh (Rannut, 2011).

The Circassians in Jordan are likely to speak four dialects. The dialects that are spoken in Amman are Kabardians and Shapsugh. In Wadi Seer and Naur, they speak Bzhedugh and Abzakhs . The Circassian families in Rusiafa speak Kabardians and a few Shapsugh, and Kabardians dialects are spoken in Sweileh and Jerash (Rannut, 2009).

According to Jaimoukha (2001), the Northwest Caucasian languages share certain characteristics. The phonological structure is characterized by “an extreme abundance of consonants and a scarcity of vowels” (Jaimoukha, 2001, p. 246). The Northwest Caucasian languages are described with a unique phonological structure and the Circassian language has a number of 49 alphabets (Dweik & Omar, 2016).

The Circassian language has a vowel system which is described as “simple and stable” (Jaimoukha, 2001, p. 246). The verbal forms are complex, and the lexical material is analyzed into a small number of short roots, and grammatical morphemes show semantic transparency (Jaimoukha, 2001). The languages are characterized by their complexity, similarly, Colarusso (1994) describes the complexity of the languages as “the verb can inflect for all persons in a sentence, and most of the vocabulary is formed from more basic roots by extensive processes of compounding and for their radical departure from the grammatical patterns that characterize the dominating Turkic and Indo-European languages of this region” (Colarusso, 1994, p. 3).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The existence of more than one language in society is considered a problem since one of these languages may dominate the others. This phenomenon is widely known as ‘language contact’. In the Jordanian context, the Circassian language, among others, appears to have language contact with the mainstream language, Arabic. This contact may cause the different language speakers to replace their heritage languages in certain domains.

One of the important domains in LMLS research is the family. Family is a critical domain in language maintenance (Spolsky, 2012) and is viewed as an important aspect as it refers to the first place of language input and socialization (Seals, 2017). This suggests that parents may find it difficult to raise a bilingual child. Against this backdrop, the study attempts to explore languages use within the Circassian family to address the aforementioned issues.

The study aims to investigate Spolsky’s model of FLP. It attempts to explore the Circassian language ideologies that the families had, how the family members practiced

and used their languages and how the family members managed their languages in the frame of the home/family domain.

1.3 Significance of the Problem

The significance of this is of twofold. First, the theoretical contribution which lies in responding to the international calls to shed light on under-researched contexts and populations. In this regard (Smith-Christmas, 2017) suggests that there is a lack of research in family language policy research in Africa and the Middle East. While LMLS studies have often focused on macro-level analyses of language attitudes and language use in different domains, there are still scarce of studies conducting micro-level analyses in the family domain especially in the Middle East.

Additionally, the studies of LMLS with the Circassians of Jordan have suggested different and contradictory results. For instance, many studies argue that the Circassians maintain their language either in certain domains or by certain generations (Abd-el-Jawad, 2006; Rannut, 2011; Dweik, 1999; Al-Majali, 1988). However, fewer studies argue that there is a language shift among the younger generation of the Circassians (Al-Momani & Al-Momani, 2013) and the Circassians are experiencing a language shift towards the dominant language (Arabic) (Abu-Shanab, 2020).

Second, the methodological contribution of the current study lies in the data collection methods and nature of data analysis. Much of the LMLS studies among Circassian relied on reported data, e.g. questionnaire and interviews. The current study draws upon naturally-occurring data (i.e. interactions in the home). This study gives room to future research by focusing on other samples, other ethnic/speech communities, and data collection instruments. Regarding data analysis, this study adopts the six-stage

thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) which operates within the grounded theory (Tie et al., 2019).

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study attempts to investigate the dynamics of family language policy in three Jordanian- Circassian families. Specifically, it aims to uncover the language ideologies members of the three families hold towards the languages used within the home. It also explores patterns of language use within the family in terms of which languages are used and how caregivers respond to the use of these languages.

1.5 Questions of the Study

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

- (1) What language ideologies do the Circassian families have?
- (2) How is language used and practiced in the Circassian families?
- (3) How do family members manage their language?

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The nature of this study as a multiple-case exploratory study places some restrictions on the generalizability of its findings. Thus, it is necessary to highlight the limitations of the study. First, as the sample of the study does not include all the population of the study, i.e. the Circassians of Jordan, the findings of the study are limited to the sample I selected for the study. Second, the findings reported in this study derive from the data available, therefore, they are restricted to the time, instruments and resources available during the course of the study. However, considering these limitation means that this study can give room to future research by focusing on other samples, other ethnic/speech communities and data collection instruments.

1.7 Limits of the Study

The current study was conducted in Amman in the first and second semesters of the academic year 2022/2023.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Circassians: Theoretically, Natho (2009) defines Circassians as “the aborigines of the Northwestern Caucasus, one of the oldest people of the world and one of the primary inhabitants of Europe with a unique language and a distinct culture of their own” (Natho, p. 17).

Operationally, Circassians can be defined as the Jordanians whose roots are from the Caucasus and they belong to the Circassian community and have their own traditions, culture and language.

Family Language Policy: Theoretically, King et al.(2008) define FLP “as the explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members” (King et al., 2008, p.907).

Operationally, family language policy is the patterns of language use within the family, and it is seen in how parents use, practice and manage the language.

Language Ideology: Theoretically, Spolsky (2009) defines language ideology as “the values assigned to named languages, varieties, and features. The status of a variant or variety derives from how many people use it and the importance of the users, and the social and economic benefits a speaker can expect by using it” (Spolsky, 2009, p.4).

Operationally, language ideology refers to how Circassians perceive the languages they use in the home.

Language Practice: Theoretically, Spolsky (2009) defines language practices “as the linguistic observable behaviors and choices; what people actually do” (Spolsky, 2009, p.4).

Operationally, language practices refer to how members of the Circassian families practice and use the language in the home.

Language Management: Theoretically, Spolsky (2009) defines language management as “the explicit and observable effort by someone or a group that has and claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices and beliefs” (Spolsky, 2009, p.4).

Operationally, language management refers to the strategies that caregivers in the family use in response to the use of a certain language within the home.

1.9 Summary

This chapter offered background information on the research and its context. It reported on the problem of study, the objectives, questions, limits and limitations. It ended with the definitions of the terms used in this study.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

2.0 Introduction

The chapter presents two sections; the first section includes a review of theoretical studies on family language policy. It begins with reviewing theoretical literature of Spolsky's model and describes the components in details and it ends by describing the advantages and disadvantages of the model. The second section presents and discusses previous empirical studies related to family language policy.

2.1 Review of Theoretical Literature

Family language policy (FLP) is a rapidly developing area of research in the field of sociolinguistics, which brings together interdisciplinary perspectives into the study of language maintenance and shift in the family domain in a variety of contexts, family types, and backgrounds (Wright & Higgins, 2021, Elkhaliq, 2018). Family language policy is described as "explicit and overt" (King et al, 2008, p. 907) and defined as "implicit and covert language planning by family members in relation to language choice and literacy practices within home domains and among family members" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2018, p.420). As a line of inquiry, FLP investigates heritage languages in migrant, immigrant, territorial, and transnational contexts. More specifically, most of the investigations include both, bilingual and multilingual families. The investigations focused on how the family members use the heritage language inside the private domain of the home and family. Fogle and King (2013) state that family language policy focused on both bilingual and multilingual families to offer a better understanding on how the families promote their heritage language maintenance in the home in an attempt to raise bilingual children.

Furthermore, in his seminal work, Spolsky (2004) points out that FLP is “language practices [...] the beliefs about language and language use; and any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning, or management” (p.20). This definition highlights three aspects of FLP, which become the focus of a plethora of studies as shown in the consequent sections. Moreover, King et al. (2008) emphasize the importance of family language policies in shaping children's cognitive development and educational achievement, and in laying foundations for language maintenance.

Spolsky's Model of FLP

As mentioned earlier, Spolsky's (2004a) views of FLP has informed much of FLP research (e.g. Hu & Ren, 2017; King et al., 2008; Ren & Hu, 2013). In Spolsky's (2004, 2009) model of family language policy, language policy involves and examines three components; (1) language ideology is “the beliefs about language and language use, (2) language practices are “the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire”, and (3) language management or planning refers to “any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language” (Spolsky, 2004, p.5).

Spolsky's model is chosen in this study because it examines language policy among different members in the frame of family or home domain and explores heritage language use in the family by investigating the three components.

Spolsky's framework for family language policy has historically been part of the development of language planning. The model analyzes the three interrelated components with respect to speech communities (Schwartz, 2010). The model allows “us to integrate the separate components within a structural, flexible, and expandable framework at the family level” (Schwartz & Verschik, 2013, p.4). Also, the division of the three component

allows “a systematic approach to the assessment of a sociolinguistic setting” (Burgess, 2017, p. 112). Spolsky’s model is described as “too rigid and overly simplistic” (Wilson, 2020, p.5). Since parents are seen as the makers of their language policy and children as the recipient of the FLP.

Following is a discussion of each of components of Spolsky’s FLP model.

Language Ideologies

The term language ideology or beliefs is defined as “the values assigned to named languages, varieties, and features. “The status of a variant or variety derives from how many people use it and the importance of the users, and the social and economic benefits a speaker can expect by using it” (Spolsky, 2009, p.4). Language ideologies are seen as a key to heritage language development, and contributes and justifies parental deliberate language practice and management efforts (Smith-Christmas, 2016). According to Canagarajah (2008), language ideologies are normally formed under the influence of not only the history of language within the home, but also the social, cultural, educational, and economic settings in the wider society.

Many studies include parental language ideologies in their investigations of language ideology. According to Zheng (2015), there are various factors that impact parents’ language ideologies; (1) the socio- cultural background of the parents, (2) parents’ faith background, (3) the environment in which the parents surround themselves with, and (4) the language experiences of children. Other studies investigate mothers’ language ideologies as an important influence on their children’s language acquisition and practice. Selleck (2022) highlights on the importance of mothers shaping the children’s family language policy and mothers are regarded as the key roles as “taking an active role in their children’s socialization, mothers become crucial to language maintenance or shift

within the family” (Selleck, 2022, p.4). Yet, fewer studies investigate and discuss grandparents’ language ideologies. These studies focus on the roles of grandparents in shaping family language policy. For example, Wenhan et al. (2022) present the grandparents’ roles and describe them as “grandparents are significant agents who insert their ideologies into the day-to-day linguistic practices of the young children” (Wenhan et al., 2022,p.22).

The importance of language ideology in FLP lies in the fact that it explains the values that help one’s choice of language according to the perceptions of the language, its use and users, which in turn leads to choose management decisions (Spolsky, 2009)

Language Practices

Language practices are defined as the *de facto* language policies, i.e. “the linguistic observable behaviors and choices; what people actually do” (Spolsky, 2009, p.4). Also, as the language choice’s patterns and preferences within the family in various contexts (Schwartz, 2010).Furthermore, Language practices refer to how the language is being used in the family’s daily interactions (Wilson, 2020).

A considerable number of research which examined language practices in bilingual and multilingual families. Language practices shift the focus to adoptive families. For instance, Nofal & Seals (2021) focus on language practices in an adoptive family, argue that language practices “play a crucial role in defining identity” (Nofal & Seals, 2021, p. 35).

Language practices, mostly depend on the parents’ preferences, patterns and interactions that are used in the home among the family members. Parents are said to be the main influencers on the language practices inside the home environment. A number of studies focus on using the heritage language inside the home, emphasizing on the home

language interactions as key aspect to practice the language. For instance, home language practices were discussed by Li (2021) through using different resources, the parents focus on home education to promote their Chinese heritage language on their children. The heritage language is encouraged in the home, and it is regarded as a communicative and cultural tool. Other studies focus on language practices in helping their children with doing homework, believing that it will help them to practice their language. (Seo, 2017). Furthermore, language practices were presented through different discourse moves, such as code-switching, parallel code patterns, move- on strategy and laissez-faire (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013)

Language practices are influenced by external and internal factors. According to Roberts (2021, pp. 159–160) the external-factors incorporate (1) parental employment status, (2) parental education level, (3) minority language social network, (4) place of habitation, (5) regular visits to the countries in which the minority language is spoken, (6) participation in minority language community groups, (7) citizenship and (8) parent's place of origin. Whereas, the internal-factors include (1) children's number in a family, (2) children's age, (3) the parents as minority language speakers, and (4) the father and mother's material status.

A number of studies have investigated patterns of language practices, such as One-parent-one-language (OPOL) and mixed-languages patterns appeared in several studies. Wilson (2019) presents the OPOL pattern, claiming that the pattern is used by children “depending on which parent they were addressing” (Wilson, 2019, p.7). Likewise, mixed-language were preferable in some studies. Ahmed (2021) states that the majority and the heritage languages are used in the home in different degrees as a way to communicate.

Furthermore, language practices among siblings have gained a great focus in the field of FLP. For instance, Kendrick & Namazzi (2017) suggest several language practices among siblings, such as sing songs, create stories and riddles, retell traditional stories, play sportscaster, adapt sign language as communicative resource, support the completion of homework, and rehearse family history through photographs.

Much of the research focuses on the parents' roles in shaping language practices, recently the focus shifts to children and their agentive roles. Fogle & King (2013) emphasize on the children's roles to shape the language practices within families, described children as "agents". As noted, children with diversity of backgrounds and ages have impacted both; parental explicit policy-making and parents' implicit strategies in communication. Fogle and King (2013) highlight the role of children noting that "children in a wide variety of familial contexts establish agency in everyday interactions" (Fogle & King, 2013, p.21). Tamang (2020) also notes that "children can play a vital role to give a good shape of family language practices in their family" (Tamang, 2020, p.87). And claims that without children's roles in shaping the language practices, the families would be meaningless in the multilingual societies.

Language practices offer models of language, which help to explain language learning and establish the necessary conditions for language choice. According to Spolsky (2009) "[language practice] sets a necessary limit for language choice and provides a strong instrument for implicit language management" (Spolsky, 2009, p.6). Language practices provide linguistics contexts for language learners, and language acquisition depends on the explosion of language practice. (Spolsky, 2009).

Language Management

Language management is defined as “the explicit and observable effort by someone or a group that has and claims authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices and beliefs” (Spolsky 2009, p.4). According to Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza (2018), family language management can be viewed as “the implicit/explicit and subconscious/deliberate parental involvement and investment in providing linguistic conditions and context for language learning and literacy development” (Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza, 2018, p.124). In other words, language management depends on the parents by providing linguistics conditions and context to learn and develop the language.

Language management is typically referred to the parents’ management strategies. (Wilson, 2020). It begins when a member of family who has an authority to decide to correct the unsatisfying language performance of another family member, and persuades them to modify their language practices (Spolsky,2009)

The aim of language management is” to account for the language choice and to impose, modify or confirm language practices and ideologies in the lower domain” (Maseko, 2016, p. 82). To choose which language to speak at home and between the family members, language management needs efforts. According to Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza (2018), the efforts include; the past and future experiences of parents aspiration for the development of their children’s language. Furthermore, language needs to be managed. “Language is rather managed, learned and negotiated within families” (Fogle & King, 2008, p.907).

The study of language management involves parental language management as a strategy used in the home. Wilson (2019) argues that “the parental language strategies

used at home can have an emotional impact on them” (Wilson, 2019, p. 15). Also, it is stated that parental language management seems to impact the children’s future language choices. Language management strategies differ from one family to another, depending on the language beliefs and attitudes of parents toward their heritage and majority languages. It has been noted that there are two types of data in family language management; (1) seek a supportive socio-linguistic environment to provide external control for FLP and (2) control the environment of the home (Schwartz, 2010). For example, three major strategies are used by the family to control the language environment; speak the heritage language and then switch to OPOL strategy, change to the local language when there are local guests, and discipline the house’s rules (Zheng, 2015).

Spolsky (2009) suggests a list of language management strategies/ activities to manage the language inside the home, involving (1) determine which language one’s speak, (2) control the language environment at home, (3) bring a speaker who is targeted in the language into the household, (4) plan young children to play with other children for the purpose for their language knowledge, (5) seek outside support, and (5) choose a proper environment for children. Much of the studies have addressed and focused on language strategies among the family members. The most common management strategies include one-parent, one-language, use the minority language at home, and mixed language strategies (Yousef, 2016). As previously mentioned by Spolsky (2009) language management influences the speakers to modify their practices and beliefs which help their language choice.

Spolsky's Model: Advantages and Disadvantages

Spolsky's model offers studying and investigating the three components in different speech communities, suggesting that speech communities share a set of beliefs and ideologies about a language which in turn shape their language practices and affect their language management. (Spolsky, 2009). Spolsky's model appears to support other researcher's findings, as an example, language maintenance within the home (Macalister & Mirvahedi, 2017).

The study of Spolsky's model seems to apply to different levels, such as the individual's linguistic unit, either micro-unit or macro-variety as well as the model covers a variety of domains such as workplace, school, neighborhood, army, business and national domain (Spolsky, 2009). Additionally, Spolsky's model gives the opportunity to focus on diversity of areas. For instance, the focus shifts and improves from sociology into applied linguistics (King et al., 2008).

The components are seen as one unit; they influence and impact one another. However, certain factors may influence them as well. Spolsky (2009) argues that language policy is influenced by "the sociolinguistic ecology inside and outside the home and by the parents' beliefs about the best strategy" (Spolsky, 2009, p. 18). A number of research papers address the complexity in the relationship between the components suggesting that the components cannot be separated and they are likely to impact and interact with each other in a complicated and dynamic ways (Hollebeke et al., 2022; Burgess, 2017; Hu & Ren, 2017).

Much of the research using Spolsky's model has focused on investigation macro-levels and focused on public and certain institutions such as the state, workplace and school. Fogle et al., (2008) suggest that the focus needs to shift to micro-levels such as

the home and the parents' interactions. Also, the investigation gives little attention to the parent's language learning goals, intentions and attitudes.

2.2 Review of Previous Research on Family Language Policy

Ramonienė (2013) analyzed linguistic behavior of Russian speakers in Lithuania. The study objectives attempted to focus on the language used in the private domain, which is the home. Also, it examined specific aspects of FLP. The study was based on Spolsky's model (2004b, 2009b) and provided both quantitative and qualitative analyses involving surveys and semi-structured interviews. The data were collected in urban areas of Lithuania, more specifically, in four multilingual cities. Findings revealed that non-Lithuanian inhabitants held positive language attitudes toward the majority language and the state language (Lithuanian). The study suggested that the language that was used in the private domain was the language used to communicate at home by mixed and mono-ethnic families. Additionally, language choice at home was based on the age of respondents. Lithuania was spoken by ethnic-minorities aged from 26-40 and by primary school pupils who identified themselves as Russians. Moreover, the findings suggested that language practices were used in various domains and revealed a relationship between the language which was spoken at home and school. Family language management was achieved through using and speaking their heritage language at home frequently.

Seals (2017) investigated how interactions in the home influence their child's use of the heritage language, and how the parents speak and position different languages in the frame of FLP. Seals selected two families as participants with the use of the ethnography to get deep insights on how language is used. Naturally-occurring interactions were recorded during the children's' interactions with others and among themselves. The data showed that there were two languages spoken in the selected families. The English

language was used between the children and their siblings whereas Russian and Ukrainian were used when the children interact with their parents. Seals concluded that the participating families adopted dynamic family language policies in which the speaker used either the heritage language or the majority language according to the interactant.

Revis (2017) studied the impact of religion on family language policy. The study aimed at investigating the impact of religion on the family language policies of Ethiopian and Colombian families in New Zealand. The study focused on their language ideologies and practices as a way to shape their religious identifications. The collection of data consisted of ethnographic observations, semi-structured interviews, and home interactional recordings. The study showed that the church influenced and motivated the parents to continue using language management in the home. Additionally, the church affected home language practices and skills.

Xiaomei (2017) explored language management of Hakka families in Penang, Malaysia. The study adopted Spolsky's (2004) model of FLP that examined language ideologies, practices, and management. The sample of the study included 14 families, and the main method was structured interviews. The findings revealed that three languages were spoken in the family domain; Hakka, Hokkien and Mandarin considering Hakka as the heritage language, whereas, Hokkien and Mandarin as the dominant languages. The three varieties were spoken and used in different contexts and by different generations. Management activities were related to the Mandarin language rather than Hakka due to the fact that Mandarin was used and influenced by their children's schools. Moreover, the study indicated that the parents had perceptions on the different varieties of languages in terms of their usage and importance.

Yazan and Ali (2018) examined FLP among a Libyan family living in the US. In particular, the study explored how parents' language ideology impacted their language planning choices for their daughter's Arabic language. Data collection included a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. In addition to extending the analysis, audio-recorded conversations were provided as well. The findings indicated that the daughter's use of Arabic and her acquisition of the language were influenced by her parents' language ideology. The results showed that there is a link between the language, identity and religion as the parents practice the Arabic language in many cases, such as "praying, communicating with Arab Muslims and accessing religious texts." The parents claimed that using Arabic and acquiring it was a response to the dominant ideologies in the US. Also, the parents noticed a link between using the language in home settings and social dynamics.

Gharibi and Seals (2019) studied immigrant family language policy toward maintaining and acquiring their heritage language literacy in New Zealand. The study aimed at exploring the strategies used by Iranian families to develop and maintain the Persian language for their children. The sample of the study consisted of twenty-four Iranian parents. The instruments that were used to accomplish the study's questions were; semi-structured interviews, a sociolinguistic questionnaire, and non-participant observation in the home. The findings showed that the participating Iranian families developed their children's oral language through using Persian at home. Also, heritage speakers who speak the language inside the home tended to have opportunities to develop their conversational proficiency in the HL. Moreover, the results showed that parents decided to use and speak the language at home as it was a part of their identity, in particular, the conversational fluency and cultural knowledge. On the other hand, the

parents assumed that literacy was not a part of their children's identity as heritage language speakers.

Stacey and Soler (2019) investigated the strategies that parents use in the home to promote the minority language. The study used mixed method; quantitative and qualitative methods. The instruments that were used to conduct the study were a questionnaire and semi- structured interviews. Stacey and Soler received 233 responses to the questionnaires and they selected two families to be interviewed. The findings indicated that families preferred to use English in the home and multilingual parents preferred to use and speak the minority language with their children. The study showed that most of the families held positive ideologies towards both languages as they were raising their children bilingually. Certain strategies were found to use the minority language at home, for instance, watching TV and reading books in the minority language and depending on their relatives to use the language with them.

Reay (2020) investigated language ideologies and practices in Chinese/ English families in the UK and China. Participant and semi-structured interview methods were used. The interviewees were asked questions about their attitudes towards bilingualism. The second part consisted of language practice, and the last part focused on cultural and social influence and experiences. The study findings about language management suggested that their children developed language management naturally. Cultural values were noticed as an important role in language management and the parents' beliefs. Moreover, country residence was powerful to influence the parents' attitudes and practices. There needed to be a balance between the use of languages within the families.

Kumpulainen (2020) explored FLP among Finnish multilingual family in Southern Finland. Semi-structured interviews and interactional conversation records were used.

The study adopted Spolsky's model. (2004). The participants of the study consisted of four members who considered themselves multilingual. Three languages were spoken by the family members; Finnish, English and Portuguese. The findings revealed that the family's child was able to separate Finnish and English from each other according to specific contexts. The child was able to speak the majority language (Finnish) more than speaking the minority language (English). Moreover, positive feelings toward English as opposed to Finnish were noted by the parents. They considered English the most important language in the world. Also, language management activities were noticed such as reading books and watching English cartoons.

Shen et al. (2020) explored family language policy and practice among Miao families in China. The research addressed Spolsky's framework. The study was based on a mixed approach involving quantitative and qualitative analyses. The instruments consisted of a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire included FLP components, and received 900 responses. Interview data was collected by interviewing 20 parents in order to supplement the questionnaire findings. The findings of the study suggested that other factors influenced language practices among Miao families, the factors included different policies, such as national language, local language and school language policies. Language management efforts were influenced by the parents' ideological orientation and money which affected language practice within the family. On the other hand, parents were encouraged to use and maintain the Miao language in their family settings after realizing its value through low-level positions in local government. Furthermore, the findings revealed that across the different generations, the use of Miao has decreased. Miao was regarded as a marker of ethnic identity, however some parents emphasized on learning Putonghua.

Ahmed (2021) investigated the main features of family language policy within Nubian families in Egypt. Furthermore, the study examined the relationship between the demographic characteristics of Nubian parents and the family language policy they tend to follow with their children. The study used mixed methods where the data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Online questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were selected as instruments. The study's main findings which referred to language ideology, practices and management indicated that most of the Nubian families used Arabic and Nubian at home on different levels, claiming that the use of their heritage language did not change and they used both languages at home to communicate. Nubian families were convinced that maintaining the HL did not affect their proficiency in the majority language (Arabic). Nubian parents had equal beliefs in both languages, claiming that both languages were important as the Arabic language was the language of the society and Nubian was the language of their culture, history and identity. Nubian parents used various strategies to manage their children's native language, convincing them it was a part of their identity to protect their native language.

Gharibi and Mirvahedi (2021) examined family language policy among Iranian families in the UK. The study was based on King, Fogle and Logan-Terry's (2008) framework. The methodology was based on qualitative method and a sociolinguist investigation. The instrument that was used to collect and analyze the data was; semi-structured interviews. The interviews were based on a questionnaire which included psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives with providing thematic analysis. The results of the study suggested that the parents had a strong identity as they were able to communicate in their language at home, although they lived in a host country. Also, the results revealed that using the dynamics of language practices was not an easy task to

accomplish. Families were influenced by the home language practice in addition to sociolinguist, socio-political, and geographical realities. The parents' ideology and management of their heritage language impacted their children's early acquisition of the language.

Mirvahedi (2021) examined parents' linguistic ideologies and practices in Singapore. An ethnographic method was used to collect data for the study, which included observations, interviews, and naturally-occurring interactions at home. The selected family consisted of four members. The father and mother considered themselves bilingual. The findings of the study revealed that the families used three languages inside the home based on different frames such as religion, education, and the family's home domain. Malay families used different strategies to use the language inside the home as it was a part of their identity and they were afraid to fade the language away. The parents adopted one-parent –one- language policy at home believing that all languages were important and it was important to know the basis of them, referring to English as the language they communicate with most of the time. They reported that Malay would never fade away as long as they were providing their children with a balance between using English and Malay in the home. Additionally, they claimed that they sent their children to Madrasah schools where they focused on learning Malay. The parents held strong attachments to Malay and identity, claiming that they would raise their children bilingually by using a balance between the two languages.

Melgani (2021) investigated dynamics of family language policy among Chaoui and Kabyle families in Algeria. The study explored language ideologies, practices and planning in private and informal contexts. The sample of the study included Berber families which consisted of both Chaoui and Kabyle. The data were collected through a

paper survey and a questionnaire. Findings indicated that Kabyle was the language that most of the Kabyle participants use, as they claimed it was the most used at home between the family members. Kabyle was the most dominant language choice in all their social situations. On the other hand, Chaoui parents used Chaoui and Dariga in various codes when interacting with their children. More specifically, when there was an interaction between Chaoui's parents, children and siblings, Dariga was favored. Kabyle were highly exposed to their heritage language. Both ethnics used different linguistic codes and encouraged their children to use different languages at home, in particular, to use the heritage and foreign languages at home. The parents believed that learning Kabyle and Chaoui would affect their sense of belongingness with the Berber identity. Also, the parents believed that learning the HL would play a role in their children's success and achievements. Berber parents-controlled language choice in their children's speech at home. The parents focused on potential choices to enhance their children's multilingual education and development. Furthermore, it was proven that the parents adopted HL varieties when there was an interaction with their children at home.

Nofal and Seals (2021) explored family language practices in an adoptive family in New Zealand. The study aimed to investigate language practices of a family that consisted of girl of an Indian descent who was adopted and brought to New Zealand and English-speaking parents. The research focused on language practice as a part of the girl's identity. The data collect for the study included home recordings and feedback from parents. The interactional data was qualitatively analyzed into themes and an interactional sociolinguistics approach to discourse analysis was adopted. The findings revealed that the child's linguistic, national and cultural identities were negotiated by a complex and conflicting discourse of belonging. The parents were committed to connect the girl with her Indian identity. The Hindi language did not occur in the family due to the fact that

parents did not speak the language, rather it was limited to isolated lexical items. Furthermore, the parents used language practice as an act of identity in different contexts. They provided their daughter with different acts of identity in the home by introducing aspects of her Indian culture. The findings suggested that the child accepted her linguistic identity as Hindi, yet she refused and rejected her Indian identity at times when she felt it would cause her problems in other communities.

Said (2021) studied language ideologies among Arabic-speaking multilingual families in the UK and Saudi Arabia. More specifically, Said addressed the gap of how the families formed and negotiated their FLPs. Also, she explored the concept of “family” as an entity that shapes how FLPs were formed. The methodology was based on a data-driven project conducted by an ethical framework. The collection of the data included a survey, audio-recorded home interactions, audio-recorded interviews, and monthly diary entries. The investigation consisted of four families; one single-parent family, one sojourning family, and two- parent families. The findings of the study indicated that more than two languages were spoken in the families. Arabic and English were the dominant languages in the home. The use of technology was presented to practice the Arabic language inside the home, the parents agreed that the language practices played a role in learning and maintaining the Arabic language among the family members. Besides, the children attended Arabic evening classes. Also, the findings revealed that the mothers related the dynamics and relationship with the family as a part of their duties as mothers. The children learned their HL (Arabic) at a young age as the parents involved learning and using the language as a part of their family system practices. The study illustrated how family ideologies, religion, gender, ethnotheories, and core values created a distinct FLPs.

Bezcioglu-Goktolga and Yagmur (2022) studied family language policy of Turkish parents in the Netherlands. The study investigated language ideologies, practices, and management in two generations. First generation included 116 parents and the second generation included 184 parents. The methodology was based on a quantitative approach. The instruments used to conduct the study were observations, interviews, and questionnaires. The conclusion of the study revealed three results; language ideology, practice, and management. Turkish language was spoken in the families and the language was important for many reasons, such as maintaining identity, culture, and contact within the same group. Family practices and management were influenced by children's language practices and various linguistic domains. First generation parents became more involved in language management activities as they put their efforts into bilingual activities. The study suggested that first generation moved to Netherlands as grown-ups, and they brought their language, identity and culture. On the other hand, second generation parents had a better understating of the majority language (Dutch) and culture. As a result, they chose to speak less in Turkish whenever there was an interaction. Both generations assumed they had and reflected pluralistic ideologies as they held strong attachment to their culture and identity.

Family language policy research has gained popularity in recent years, as it investigates and explores how family members use, practice and manage their languages. Previous studies shed light on how FLP components practiced in different communities by different families. These studies showed more or less similar results and opinions. For instance, language ideology was highly presented and studied among different families. It was noted that there was a link between each family's ideology and their use of language as a part of their identities and beliefs towards the heritage language and the majority language. Also, the studies suggested that multiple languages were spoken,

whether the heritage or the majority language, at different levels and frames within the same family. Moreover, management activities were noticed across the families, focusing on various strategies to maintain and use their heritage language inside the home, believing it was a part of their identity and culture. Different factors influenced the use of language management as well. Furthermore, the studies revealed that the selected families held strong attachments and feelings to their heritage language, which caused them to choose to use different strategies and practices to speak and use the language inside the home.

2.3 Summary

This chapter provided a brief review of the theoretical underpinnings of family language policy research. It also summarized previous research conducted in the field from different contexts that have helped formulate research questions for the current study.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used in the study. The chapter describes the population and sample of the study. Also, it describes the instrument that will be used in the study. Finally, the chapter ends with describing and listing the procedures of the study.

3.1 Research Design

The research is based on a qualitative research method to collect and analyze the data. As the study is a multiple-case study, the qualitative method allows to use different methods to gain in-depth and naturally-occurring data.

This study adopted an ethnographic approach which is a useful tool to work with small groups including heritage language communities (Nofal, 2020; Best, 2014). Ethnography also provides deep insights and access to the dynamics and meanings of social actions when interpreted in natural settings (Best, 2014).

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of the study included the Circassians of Jordan, who arrived and settled in Jordan around 150 years ago. Circassian families from different tribes arrived in Amman in 1868 and then settled in different sites in Jordan (Rannut, 2011).

3.3 Sample of the Study

The sample of the study comprised three Jordanian-Circassian families, who live in Jordan, Amman. Spolsky's model of family language policy was used (2004, 2009). The participants of the study were selected upon availability. That is, participants were selected upon their availability and willingness to take part in the study.

All the families' members are Circassians- Jordanians who live in Amman. The parents in each family are speakers of both languages, Circassian and Arabic. However, their children are only fluent in the Arabic language.

The following is a description of the participated families.

Family one consists of five members. The parents, Hussien and Montaha, are Circassians, and they are fluent in both languages. The daughter and their sons, Leen, Abdullah, and Saeed are only fluent in the Arabic language, and the Arabic language was their first language. The mother in this family has a different Circassian dialect, "Kabardy" than the father. The language that is spoken at home is the Arabic language.

Family two comprises of three sisters, Sinamees, Barina and Mirna, and one brother, Hussien. The four siblings are fluent in the Circassian and the Arabic language. All the members' first language was Circassian and later they learned Arabic at school. Sinamees and Barina have always communicated with each other using the Circassian language and have been more fluent in the Circassian language. Hussien and Mirna are less likely to use the Circassian language with the other family members.

Family three consists of five members. The parents, Simaza and Bater, are Circassians with two daughters, Sidesha and Disana, and one son, Anzor. The parents are fluent in both languages, Circassian and Arabic. The mother has a different Circassian dialect, "Abzakh" than the father. The daughters and the son are fluent in the Arabic language and their first language was Arabic. However, during the observations, one of the daughters (Sidesha) was taking Circassian classes weekly. The languages that they reported to use in the home are Arabic and Circassian between the parents and children and the siblings' language is Arabic and sometimes they tend to use English between each other. The parents use both dialects to speak with their children "Bzhedugh and Abzakh".

3.4 Instruments of the Study

The research is based on two instruments; observations (field notes and audio-recorded) and interviews. Observation sessions were conducted based on naturally-occurring interactions in the home. Parts of the observation sessions were audio-recorded to enhance and provide in-depth insights into the data.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with caregivers, seeking to cover the three components of family language policy. The interviews were chosen to gain a good understanding of the families' ideologies, practices and management towards the languages inside the home by highlighting when and how the members use, practice, and manage the languages inside the home.

3.4.1 Observation

Observation was the primary instrument in this study. I observed naturally-occurring interactions in the home among the family members. I have taken the field notes on scheduled dates with the participants over several weeks. Moreover, the study was based on participant observation between me and the families I investigated for the purpose of understanding, gaining, and offering detailed interactions about the use of the languages inside the home among the families in a natural context and environment. The observations lasted an hour and a half for each session. I participated with the three families in their activities, observed them, and engaged in their conversations as well. Additionally, audio-recordings of the families' spontaneous conversations and interactions in the home were recorded to enhance and provide more in-depth data. The instrument was chosen as it provided an actual use of the languages inside the home. The recordings were part of the observation sessions. I interpreted and analyzed when and how the members use, practice, and manage the languages inside the home. The used

instrument for the audio-recording was my smartphone, and the recording's length in each session varied from half an hour to an hour. The recordings lasted for 129.32 minutes for the three families.

Subsequently, the observations were interpreted and analyzed based on Spolsky's model (2004, 2009) on FLP using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2004). In addition, transliteration was used in the analysis when the participants use the Circassian language in the observations and voice-recording. The scheduled observation sessions are shown in Table 3.1 below:

Table 3.1 Schedule of Observational Sessions

Week	Family 1	Family 2	Family 3
1	Dec 26 th , 2022	Dec 28 th , 2022	--
2	Jan 1 st / Jan 4 th , 2023	Jan 4 th , 2023	--
3	Jan 7 th , 2023	Jan 10 th , 2023	--
4	--	Jan 15 th / Jan 17th / Jan 19th , 2023	--
5	--	Jan 26th , 2023	Feb 3rd , 2023
6	Feb 7th , 2023	--	
7	--	--	Feb 18th , 2023
8	--	--	Feb 21 st , 2023

Key: -- = no observation sessions held

Bolded dates are recorded sessions

3.4.2 Interviews

In order to obtain in-depth data about the family members' ideologies, practices, and management, semi-structured interviews were conducted. The interviews aimed to delve into language practices and management strategies within the participating families. The interview questions were chosen specifically to achieve the research aims. As for

language ideology and identity, the interview guide was based on previous FLP studies (Revis, 2015; Ahmed, 2021) (See Appendix A, for the interview guide).

The interviews were conducted in Arabic, more specifically, in Jordanian spoken Arabic as all the interviewees speak Jordanian Arabic. Then, they were translated to English for the purpose of analysis. The interviews were face-to-face, located in the families' homes and lasted for about one hour for each family.

3.4 Procedures of the Study

The following procedures is used to achieve the goals of the study;

1. General reading about the topic
2. Reading and collecting theoretical and empirical studies that are related to family language policy
3. Setting up the research questions and objectives
4. Setting up the instruments of the study
5. Contacting the families to be a part of the investigation
6. Observing, interviewing and recording the family members
7. Analyzing, interpreting and presenting the findings of the study and suggesting recommendations for future research.
8. Listing the references (APA style) and adding appendices.

3.5 Summary

This chapter served as an explanation of the methodology adopted in this study. It elaborated on the population and sample of the study as well as the data collection and analysis procedures.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

4.0 Introduction

This chapter provides answers to the questions of the study in light of the data collected from the selected families. This study aims to investigate the dynamics of family language policy in three Jordanian-Circassian families and attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What language ideologies do the Circassian families have?
2. How is the language used and practised in the Circassian families?
3. How do family members manage their language?

4.1 Results Related to Research Question One

The first research question focuses on the language ideologies that the Circassian families hold towards both their heritage language and the majority language (Arabic). To answer this question, data from semi-structured interviews and observation sessions (whether recorded or by means of field notes) were analyzed to fully understand how members of these families perceive these languages.

Language ideologies can be viewed as how users of a language evaluate using their language drawing upon their perception of the societal values and the power given to this language (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). Thus, such subjective evaluation of language contributes to shaping language practices and management efforts within bilingual families. In the selected families, I interviewed the family members to gain a deep understanding of their ideologies towards the heritage language and the majority language that constructed and shaped their language practices and management. I first begin with

providing language ideologies towards Circassian, followed by ideologies held towards Arabic.

4.1.1 Circassian Language Ideologies

Circassian is viewed and considered as the heritage language. The language ideology in the families is represented in the data as a marker of identity, a cultural aspect and value and the Circassian cultural influence on the language. I begin with a discussion of the Circassian as a marker of identity, followed by cultural aspects and values. In addition, the Circassian cultural influence on the language ideologies will be highlighted in the discussion.

4.1.1.1 Circassian as a marker of identity

Interestingly, all the participants from all the ages in the three families strongly and directly confirm that Circassian is their “*mother tongue*” without any hesitation. The majority of the participants report that Circassian language “is a marker of their identity”. For example, the mother of the first family reports that “*the Circassian language is a reflection of our identity*”. The parents and the children significantly connect their heritage language to their identity, and although they are not fully fluent in the language, they seem to hold positive and strong affiliation with their Circassian identity. Additionally, the parents from the third family comment that “we are proud of being Circassians” which suggests that the family have strong ideologies about their identity. In the same vein, the sisters from the second family describe Circassian as “*our language*”. Furthermore, the mother from the second family comments that “using Circassian is important to pass it on to the new generation; to keep and remind them of their Circassian identity.” The Circassian language is highly connected to the Circassian

identity as the participants foreground the desire to and importance of language transmission to their children.

More specifically, the Circassian language is seen as an identity marker in the three families as noted from the observations. During my observations, I have noticed that the Circassian identity appears mostly among members of the younger generation, as shown in the following comment (field note, January 13th, 2023):

There is a discussion between Saeed and his mother about his lecture, explaining that they played the whispering game and asked him to choose a word. He claimed that he chose a Circassian phrase “shdo shet” (how are you), claiming that nobody got it and his colleague asked him to choose an Arabic word instead, when I asked him why did you choose this one, he replied “*so nobody can get it*” and “*to represent I am Circassian*”.

The above comment shows that the participant’s choice of using a Circassian phrase suggests that Saeed wants to discursively show his identity to others and marks his ethnicity as a Circassian. This suggests that the participant identified himself through using certain linguistics features to distinguish himself from others and to show his ethnicity among the other community members. A similar example from the third family illustrates and marks the Circassian identity, as shown in the following comment (field notes, February 3rd, 2023):

A conversation starts between Sidesha and Simaza; Sidesha is explaining that at work they asked her how many languages she speaks, and she answers ‘four’: *Circassian, Arabic, English, and German*”. Simaza emphasized that but since her daughter speaks only two languages fluently, the mother wondered why the daughter included Circassian, saying “You’re not fluent”. The daughter replies that “to let her colleagues know that she is *Circassian*”.

This comment offers an example of how Sidesha foregrounds her Circassian identity through language, suggesting the Circassian linguistic identity is viewed as an emblem of the Circassian ethnic identity. In so doing, the daughter positions herself as a speaker of Circassian as an expression of her desire to be positioned as Circassian by others. She also shows awareness of that others would distinguish her identity based on the languages

she speaks. Although it has been previously mentioned by Sidesha that she always wears clothes with Circassian symbols, she emphasized on introducing herself as a speaker of Circassian in front of others.

The observation within the selected families revealed that the members of these families not only show their Circassian identity by using the language but also include other non-linguistic symbols to identify themselves, including the use of the Circassian symbols as a way to distinguish themselves among others. The Circassian identity is represented in the families in different degrees and contexts, it has been noticed that it serves certain functions as shown in the comment (field notes, January 4th, 2023):

Saeed asked his mother about his jacket (a jacket with a Circassian flag on it). His mother told him to wear anything else because she could not find it. He insisted to wear it and said “it is my first time going to that place and I need the jacket because I want to impress them, elaborating that he wants to show his flag to others and by doing so, they will be impressed.”

In the following comment, Saeed seems to show a strong attachment with his Circassian identity which shapes his Circassian ideology. The way he wants to impress others by showing pieces of his heritage identity suggests that his identity is not only represented in the language itself but also in symbols. This shows that Saeed values his identity, which seems to be expressed through showing the Circassian symbols to others. Besides, the results indicated that the male participants seem to value and connect Circassian to their identities as shown in the comment (field notes, January 4th, 2023):

Hussien is asking the family members if they have the "Circassian flag," but as a bigger sticker, as he wants to stick it on his car. When I asked him why he wanted a bigger one, when he already has one on his car, he responds saying "*So people can see the flag more clearly and make sure that the driver is Circassian.*"

In the comment, Hussien’s act indicates that he wants to show his ethnic identity to others and to mark himself as a Circassian. The strong connection between identity and the different symbols that are associated with being Circassian highly reflects the

participant's choice to identify himself. In the next comment, the Circassian identity is represented through certain features that are associated with the Circassian identity, particularly the phenotype (field notes, January 10th, 2023):

Mirna asks about a girl that she sees every time in a specific place. Montaha commented "I thought she is one of us; **she looks like us**".

This comment indicates that the Circassian identity could be identified by some physical features such as the person's appearance. Montaha is aware that the Circassian identity is distinguished through the person's phenotype. Identifying an individual's ethnic identity seems to be possible from their physical appearance which in turn allows for including them as members of the Circassian community.

4.1.1.2 The importance of the Circassian Language as a cultural aspect and value

One of the emerging themes in the data collected from the three families pertains to the cultural value that the Circassian language enjoys in the community. This is clear among the participants who emphasize that Circassian is important to be used in certain contexts and domains including the home domain and among the family members. The home is a significant domain in which the interplay between the different forces help form and develop the language ideologies which shape and reshape the members' FLP (Othman, 2022).

My participants explained that the importance of language use at home relies on keeping and reviving the Circassian identity, culture and values. Firstly, the mother from the second family comments that "it is important to be used in the home to pass it to our grandchildren, to apply the values we've learned and applied for years". Secondly, the parents from the third family report that the importance of the Circassian language refers to that it is "our mother tongue and it is used in our home". Lastly, the parents from the first family refer to the importance of using Circassian among members of the Circassian

community as a way “to keep the Circassian culture as it is”. In so doing, the heritage language is viewed as a significant aspect to keep alive the Circassian culture and values.

Furthermore, the Circassian language is considered of high importance in comparison with other languages and perceived as a source of pride. This is explicitly expressed by one female participant who claims that “Circassian is more important than any other language and we are proud and honored that we can speak it.” The other female participants have similar views on the importance of the language as they believe that the language will remain as long as people still use it in the home settings, and they emphasized that everyone should use it in the home due to the fact it might be lost one day unless it is habitually used.

Additionally, the participants are aware of the importance of the Circassian language as a proper cultural practice when dealing with the elderly. For them, the language is seen as a language that shows respect and values. For example, the father from the first family emphasizes that “it is important to use the language with the elderly people as it shows respect to them, especially in social occasions”. He elaborates that there are certain names that cannot be said in the Arabic language and it is rather said in the Circassian language which reflects the importance of the Circassian language.

4.1.1.3 The Circassian culture influence on language

During the interviews, the participants confirm that their Circassian identity is an important aspect to keep their culture. They report that “it is more important to involve and teach the Circassian culture in the home”. The father from the first family comments that “it is important to involve the culture as much as we can, to apply the Circassian traditions and the “Adiga Xabza” in our homes.” Also, the mother from the second family reports that “we teach the Circassian culture to our grandchildren so they can apply the

values and the traditions in the correct way”. The participants position themselves in two categories based on the cultural groups. The first category refers to “Circassians-Jordanians” and the second category refers to “Only Circassians”. Without any hesitation, in both answers, they position themselves as Circassians in the first place followed by the Jordanian identity. Only a few participants position themselves as “only Circassians”, as one participant answers “Circassian for sure”. The mother from the second family adds that “it is important to practice the Circassian culture, explaining that they like to mention their culture so their children will be able to know their true identity, traditions and values. She also reported that they try their best to go to the Circassian occasions and socialize, encourage and engage their grandchildren in it. Based on the participants’ views about the Circassian language and identity, it is clear that the Circassian culture connects and influences their language ideologies through the Circassian traditions and values which necessitate using the heritage language.

Having discussed the Circassian language ideologies, now I turn to the language ideologies that the participants hold towards Arabic.

4.1.2 Language Ideologies towards Arabic

Arabic is not only considered the majority language which enjoys official status and institutional support, but also viewed as the language required for the practice of religious rituals. Such views are reflected in the data showing the importance of Arabic to members of the selected families. Following is a discussion of the language ideologies towards Arabic among members of the Circassian community.

4.1.2.1 The importance of the Arabic Language

The majority of family members show a positive attitude towards the Arabic language, and its uses in the different contexts as they confirm that it is used in every day

interactions. The parents of the first family have confirmed that Arabic is “the official language” of the country and it is the “medium of communication among all Jordanians”. The father comments that “the Arabic language is the most important language in Jordan and we should use it as we live in an Arab country and it has become the language we speak as well”. In saying so, the participants refer to the status accorded to Arabic in the country they live in. They also refer to their status as an integral part of the wider Jordanian society and the need to communicate with their fellow citizens on daily basis. The mother from the second family reports that: “our grandparents have been here long time ago and we all grew up here”.

This theme is also offered by another female participant who reports the importance of Arabic as “we are Jordanian citizens and we speak Arabic fluently and most of the time”. She also refers to the politics of language use by considering how sensitive language use is when people feel ‘othered’ or excluded if a language incomprehensible to them is used in interactions. In this regard, she comments that “it is important to use the Arabic language in front of others as they may feel offended and uncomfortable around us”. Moreover, some participants shed light on the linguistic characteristics of Arabic, describing it as “a rich language”, which indicates that the Arabic language is valuable to the families.

In addition, the sisters from the second family comment “it is important to use Arabic to communicate with other ethnicities” as well as the parents from the third family have similar views and report that “it is important so we can communicate effectively with others.” The Arabic language is seen as a language that focuses on communicating with the other community members and its importance relies on its communicative goal. Similarly, the second family members comment that “Arabic is the “*medium of*

communication” the parents and the children confirmed that the Arabic language is important as it is the official language that is taught in schools and without it, it would be hard to communicate with others emphasizing on its importance in work and social life. The parents of the third family comment on the importance of Arabic as it is the “common language”. The way it is described as the common language suggests that it is the official language of the country. The language is also seen as a communicative language between the Circassian themselves from the different tribes, interestingly, the mother from the second family says that “we use Arabic with our Circassian peers as well whenever we do not understand their dialects as there are different dialects and vocabulary from the different tribes”. The attitudes of the participants include the importance of the Arabic language in the future, some male participants comment that “Arabic will remain as the main and official language even in the homes”

The majority of the participants label themselves as “Circassians- Jordanians” due to the fact that they live in Jordan and they speak Arabic most of the time. One participant comments that “we appreciate it here and it became our homeland as well.” The comments suggest that the participants appreciate and hold positive beliefs about the Arabic language. Since Arabic is the language that is spoken in everyday interactions among family members, it is expected to be used fluently. This is shown in the comment below (field notes on February 10th, 2023):

Hussien was watching TV and wondered what the name of the series is. The name is written in English, Leen translated the title to Arabic with incorrect use of plural. He wonders and corrects it directly and unconsciously, mentions that we speak Arabic fluently and we should know how to use appropriately.

Remarkably, Hussien is aware that it is important to know how to use the Arabic language appropriately. His expectations are represented by using the language in its correct form as they are a part of the Jordanian community and are mostly fluent in the

language. Hussien accepts the fact that the Arabic language is the official language of the country, as mentioned earlier in the interview, which suggests that the language is dominant in the daily interactions between the family members and has a high value among them due to the fact that it is important to know it as it is the official language.

4.1.2.2 Arabic as religion and culture

In addition to being the official language of the country, Arabic is reported to be part of the Jordanian culture. The Arabic culture plays a vivid role in daily life of the participating families. They show a need for incorporating the Arabic culture in their homes, in particular to learn and practise the Islamic values and rituals. The observation data have revealed positive attitudes towards the majority language as shown in the comment (field notes, January 4th, 2023):

A conversation starts between Sinamees and Leen. Sinamees mentions her cousin, who once went to Spain, explaining that there, he found people who spoke and used Arabic. She mentions how happy he was, implying that Arabic is one of "the most beautiful languages" and that it represents Islam, commenting that "in those days, if you knew how to speak it, you were highly educated".

Sinamees is highly influenced by the prestigious and religious value of the Arabic language. In addition, she connects the Arabic language to a high level of education which suggests that Arabic is seen as a valuable language in the educational and professional contexts. In excerpt 4.1, the religious value of the language is presented.

The recorded data has given evidence that the Arabic language is used by the participants in religious contexts in which they use the language to talk about religious topics. The interaction among members of the family is presented in Excerpt 4.1 in which two members are sitting at the home and discussing topics that are related to religion. Furthermore, one of the participants gives an example from the Holy Quran to start the discussion.

Excerpt 4.1. Arabic in religious topics

1	Sinamees	هسه بالقرآن (وَحَمَلْنَاهُ عَلَىٰ ذَاتِ الْأَوَّاحِ وَدُسْرٍ) In the Holy Quran (reciting a surah)
2	Sinamees	الدرس شو معناتو؟ What is the meaning of ‘dusar’?
3	Leen	شو؟ What?
4	Sinamees	مسامير Its nails
5	Leen	مسامير؟ Nails?
6	Sinamees	يعني عجيب ما عرفت لهسه انو معناه مسامير It’s strange that I did not know what it means until now

In the excerpt, Sinamees recites a verse from the Holy Quran in Arabic and asks about a meaning of a word indicates that the Arabic language is used among the members to discuss religious topics and the discussion suggest as an interaction based on a religion perspective. In line (5), Sinamees wonders how she is not familiar with the meaning of the expression although she masters the language in the religion domain. Besides, the Arabic culture is a significant representation in the families as shown in excerpt 4.2 where the three sisters Sinamees, Barina and Mirna are sitting, watching and discussing the prayers on TV at home. The discussion revolves around the prayers and it turns on how they, as Circassians, do it differently which suggests that the Arabic culture influences the members.

Excerpt 4.2 Arabic culture influence

1	Barina	خلصت الصلاة the prayer is over
2	Sinamees	اه هم ما بعملو كثير مش زينا Yeah they don’t do as much we do
3	Barina	السنه كل واحد لخالو بصلي The sunnah is.....
4	Sinamees	احنا بنعمل 5 هم 3 We do 5 they do 3

In excerpt 4.2, the members' discussion about the prayers suggests that they are highly influenced by the Arabic culture and connect it to religion. The interactions between the sisters suggest that they may mark Arabic as a religious language, but at the same time, they differentiate between their identity as Circassians and the Arabic culture. In line (2) the participant starts differentiating herself as a Circassian by explaining that they pray the whole prayers; required and the sunnah in their family. Furthermore, she emphasizes on the same information in line (4) which suggested that she identifies herself as a Circassian with the cultural influence of Arabic.

The previous examples demonstrated that the Arabic language and culture are present in the families in their daily interactions. The influence of the Arabic language and culture relies on its religious value as well as the positive beliefs and attitudes that family members possess towards Arabic.

4.2 Results Related to Question Two

This question aims to explore how the families practice and use their languages, "*How is the language used and practised in the Circassian families?*" In order to provide an answer to this question, I analyzed audio-recorded naturally occurring interactions between family members to get deeper insights into the actual language use inside the home. Additionally, I interviewed the participant to gain a more in-depth understanding of their language practices.

4.2.1 Language Practices

The data have shown that the three families varied in their actual language practices. The data have also shown that language practices are not limited to speaking the heritage language. Rather, members of the families connect with their heritage culture and hold discussions about the heritage language as a daily practice.

The interview data have indicated that the parents of the first family confirm that they speak Arabic fluently with little and limited use of Circassian in the home, and they are the only ones who are fluent in their heritage language. Yet, their children are fluent in Arabic only. Also, both the mother and the father have referred to their strategic use of Circassian as when they do not want the other family members to understand the topic.

The parents from the second and third families confirm that they speak Arabic and Circassian fluently to varying degrees and in different contexts among different members. Similarly, they have reported that their children speak Circassian to various degrees of fluency. Some children have reported that they use both languages and mix between them while others have noted that they only use Arabic. The families have reported using the Arabic language in their daily interactions while Circassian language use is limited due to the limited language working ability of the children.

Moreover, the three families have touched upon the influence of attending public schools on their heritage language. For example, one participant has comments that "we were not allowed to speak Arabic inside the home, but when we go to school the situation changes." Another participant has explained that they do not want their children to mix the three languages (i.e. Arabic, English, and Circassian) at home as Arabic and English are the languages taught in schools and they are more important to be used in the community.

The participants have indicated that they use the heritage language in certain discussions and activities such as social events including family gatherings, weddings, in particular, when talking with the elderly people. The HL is also used when they talk about serious and private issues in front of non-Circassian speakers, and when using it to set codes between each other. For example, the participants mention that they set codes when

they are at certain places such as banks, restaurants, and shops to discuss different topics among each other. Also, they confirm that they use the heritage language in their daily routines, including greetings, asking about health, giving compliments. For them, such language functions are “more beautiful” when said in their heritage language.

4.2.1.1 Connect heritage culture into language practices

The observational and the recorded data have indicated that the dominant language in the three families is Arabic and that the Circassian language has been observed in certain uses and practices including using the language as way to maintain the heritage culture and describing lexical items that are related to the culture in the heritage language. In addition, certain activities are noted including listening to Circassian songs and lessons on a daily basis. Also, they tend to speak with other Circassians from the homeland, either written or spoken. Moreover, the observational data included many examples with reference to the heritage culture.

In the first family, the parents appear to direct the other family members to maintain the heritage culture as shown in the following comment (field notes, January 1st, 2023):

A discussion starts between Saeed and Montaha, she asks him a question “*when are you going to the Circassian charity?*” Later, Saeed mentioned someone from his friends who went to New Jersey. Montaha commented that “there are many Circassians and your cousin lives there as well”. Hussien adds that one of his cousins lived there and he had many Circassians around. Lastly, Saeed mentions again his friend is working at the Circassian charity there.

Seemingly, the parents are trying to encourage Saeed to attend the Circassian event which refers to a way to maintain their heritage culture. Both parents appear to connect and maintain the heritage culture to their son by mentioning the experiences of others. The interaction seems to develop a sense of identity to promote the use and maintain the heritage culture in the home setting. Moreover, in excerpt 4.3, all the family members are sitting and having a daily discussion. Montaha begins to focus on maintaining their

heritage culture by mentioning the Circassian communities outside Jordan with their children.

Excerpt 4.3 Talking about the Circassian community

1	Saeed	ما <pause> ضرب ب هاتاي
		It >pause<hits Hatai
2	Leen	وين هاتاي؟
		Where is it?
3	Saeed	هاي قريبه على سوريا عشان هيك
		It is close to Syria, that is why
4	Montaha	في امم <pause> محل قريه كلها شركس
5		قال لسه في مليون شركس
		There is umm <pause> a place (village) and its full of Circassian
		Said, there are a lot of Circassians
6	Saeed	في وحدة شركسيه ب فتحية برضو
		Also there is one Circassian in fathyie
7	Montaha	كل الشركس مشترين ب فتحية
		All the Circassian bought houses there

In the excerpt, as discussed in the previous comment, the parents seem to mention the Circassian communities in Jordan and in other countries as a way to maintain and connect to the heritage culture. In lines (4) and (5), the mother starts connecting the Circassian identity and conversely in line (6) her son continues and follows the same interaction for the purpose of keeping the communication. The interaction suggests that the parents maintain the practices and link the Circassian culture to the family's practices.

In addition, it is noted that the family members include the heritage culture and identity inside their home through a discourse that is related to the Circassian items as shown in the following comment (field notes, January 1st, 2023):

There is a discussion between Hussien and Montaha, she explains that there is a need to get a new table. Hussien suggests that to bring a *Circassian table* like the ones they used to have, saying its name in the HL.

Clearly, Hussien prefers to include the heritage culture in the home items. Hussien straightforwardly and without hesitation suggests bringing a Circassian table, using the

Circassian name. This suggests that there is a clear connection between their culture and the topics that they discuss among each other in their home settings.

Moreover, the mother's role in the family is clearly significant, as she does different acts to connect the heritage culture and identity to the practices and interactions as shown in the comment (field notes, January 4th, 2023):

A conversation starts between Montaha and Leen. The mother tells the daughter that she has got her stickers that are associated with *Circassian symbols*, so she can use them in the *Circassian Costume Day*.

The mother plays a role in connecting and passing the identity to the other family members. The mother's emphasis on using the Circassian symbols suggests that she highly values the heritage culture and tries to connect the daughter with her ethnic identity.

4.2.1.2 Food as an interaction

FLP research has focused on certain topics that gained and formed language practice among family members including food topics. The use of the food vocabulary is seen in everyday interaction of the participating families through the limited use to HL lexical items (Nofal, 2020). For instance, in the first family, it has been observed that they tend to have such topics in their daily interactions and practices as shown in the following two from the field notes on January 4th and January 7th, 2023 respectively:

A discussion starts between Saeed and Montaha on lunch. The son tells his mother that he tasted the Circassian dish “Chips and Pasta” in one of his friends’ house, asking his mother why it tastes different from the one she prepares.

There is a discussion between Hussien and Montaha over food. He reminds her of a famous Circassian dessert called Agawa that they used to do when he was a child, commenting that it is similar to an Arabic dish.

In the previous comments, the discussions are centered on food related topics. Such discussions are associated with Circassian food and the use of the Circassian names of

the food items is part of the daily practices among family members. Regarding the first comment, the mother later explains the difference in the taste is due to tribe-related food traditions, adding that each family prepares it in a certain way. On the other hand, in the other comment, the father compares the dish with an Arabic dish. This suggests that Circassian is minimally used to talk about and to refer to food items to draw lines between the Circassian culture and the Arabic one.

Language practices are viewed as the language choices in the various contexts by the different family members. It has been noted from the observations, voice-recordings and the interviews that the family members use their HL in different contexts to serve a specific function, mostly through certain discourse moves such as code-switching.

4.2.1.3 Code- switching

Code-switching has been observed in the families within the frame of a planned, unconscious and unintentional code-switching. Code-switching appears either as a switch to one word or a whole utterance or a phrase. Code-switching has been used strategically to accomplish certain functions including the function to request, accepting offers and invitations.

The code-switching appears and is being used by certain participants and for certain purposes and functions. The purposes and functions are presented mainly to function a request as shown in the comment below (field notes, January 15th, 2023):

There is a discussion between Barina and one of her relatives. Barina, using Arabic, asks her relative to come and sit but her relative refuses. Then, Barina directly switches to her HL, using a full utterance to repeat the request. The relative responds in the HL negatively, ending with a sentence containing a Circassian word asking for repeating the request one more time.

The above comment suggests that Barina's choice of the heritage language relies on the fact that her relative does not listen to her and take her seriously in the first time. As

a result, she strategically switches to her heritage language to make the request clearer. Seemingly, the participant resorts to Circassian in this particular interaction because she believes that her relative might respond positively to her request when using the heritage language. Interestingly, although the relative offers a negative response to the Circassian request, she asks for repetition since she likes to hear the language (as she explained later).

During the observations, I have noticed that the sisters of second family members use a certain expression for requesting in different degrees and contexts. In excerpt 4.4, the participants are sitting at evening, and Sinamees offers me some biscuits. She strategically uses a Circassian phrase “yahou” which is used among Circassian to express negativity such as rejecting on what has been said to them as shown in the excerpt.

Excerpt 4.4 Sinamees’s strategic use of “yahou”

1	Sinamees	كلي من هاد البسكوت زاكي Have some of this biscuit, it’s delicious
2	Leen	لا بعدين No, later
3	Sinamees	دوقي " ياهو " Taste it, “ <u>yahou</u> ”

The recording suggests that the use of the specific expression in the heritage language indicated another form of a request. The expression seems to be used by the participant for two reasons. As an insider of the Circassian community, it is clear the expression is used to deny the disapproval that is shown in line (2) and the second reason refers to repeat and emphasize on same request as shown in line (3). Moreover, in line (3), the participant’s tone indicated a clear request which eventually led in accepting her request.

In the same vein, another comment shows another request with the use of the same expression as shown in the comment (filed notes, January 4th, 2023):

A discussion starts between Sinamees and Barina. Sinamees suggests that the window is broken and her sister, Barina does not agree with her, directly the sister uses the expression “yahou” and repeats that the window is broken again. Her sister agrees with her.

The comment suggests that the expression is being used for two purposes. The first is to emphasize the information as the participant does not agree with Sinamees in the first time, which in fact has led to the other function. That is to repeat the same sentence and use the expression at the end of it. This suggests that the choice of this particular expression relies on the fact it might affect the other person. This certain code-switch seems to be powerful over the speaker’s choices from their HL lexical items due to the fact that Sinamees only agrees with her sister when she uses the expression in the heritage language.

Similarly, the mother from the third family uses code-switch to the heritage language for the purpose of requesting. In excerpt 4.5 from the recorded data, a discussion starts between Simaza, me, and Sidesha at the participants’ home. Simaza’s way of using the heritage language indicates that code-switching to the heritage language appears to deny requests and offer the others to accept what has been offered.

Excerpt 4.5 Using Circassian to accept invitations

1	Simaza	We have a delicious carrot cake	في عنا كيك جزر زاكي
2	Leen	Umm no	امم لا
3	Simaza	“ <u>qwa qah</u> ” (go and bring)	"قوا قح"
4	Sidesha	Would you like to drink something with it? Juice?	تشربي اشي معاه عصير؟
5	Simaza	Tea " <u>qefsah</u> “ (to bring)	شاي "قيسفاح"
6	Leen	Ok, I will accept it	او ك رح اقبل بس عشان خالتو

In the excerpt, Simaza's use of her heritage language seems to be a part of the code-switching. In particular, code-switching happens as a result of me rejecting her offer in the first time as seen in line (2). Again, despite the fact that Simaza is aware that I will reject again, she uses the heritage language to request her daughter to bring the tea as seen in line (5). The use of the heritage language is seen as powerful, and it requires the other speaker to accept what has been offered or said as seen in line (6) when I accepted her invitation.

The observational data indicated that the family members use their heritage language whenever there is a need to show emotions such as showing sympathy and giving compliments which may be referred to negative and positive emotions. Using the heritage language to show emotions is significant in the families. The family members' choice of switch to the HL are noticed when discussing sensitive and emotional topics as shown in the comment (field notes, January, 2023):

There is a conversation between Sinamees and Montaha, Montaha mentions someone who is ill and the participant unconsciously used a Circassian expression “alahah” (it is used to respond to something serious or bad) which may indicates being sympathetic with the person that Montaha mentioned.

In the comment, Sinamees unintentionally uses her HL to express the sympathy and sadness, which suggests that the heritage language is used in such contexts as it feels more comfortable and appropriated to use the HL. This suggests that the heritage lexical items are unintentionally and directly connected and linked to emotions.

Also, the following comment (field note, January 10th, 2023) illustrates the same point:

Sinamees got a phone call from a relative. They greet each other using Circassian “wee bshahash'a sh'oo” (it means good evening) and then switched to the Arabic language. Again, a switch to Circassian appears when they start talking about a person who has recently passed away. All the given details about this person have been said in the HL.

In the above comment, Sinamees's choice of using their heritage language to keep the interaction reveals that the language is being used in serious and emotional topics. Apparently, as the language is used in the home settings and the home is the first place where people may experience the different kinds of emotions, the speakers tend to use their first language to describe such situations. Likewise, positive emotions including compliments are noted to be expressed with the HL. This is illustrated in my comment (field notes, December 28th, 2022):

The family members are sitting together, and there is a baby girl. Whenever she opens her eyes, they start giving her compliments using HL expressions. The expressions are “pshasha dakha” (it means beautiful girl) and “dakha dad shhas” (it means your hair is very beautiful)

As the participants have reported in the interviews, they tend to use their HL as it is more beautiful and comfortable when describing something or giving compliments.

4.2.1.4 Circassian language as a topic

Language practices are viewed as meta-linguistic discussions which refers to talking about the language in the daily interactions and the use of the language is concerned to how the speakers talk about their heritage language. The practices are noted by certain participants, in particular, the older generations tend to use the heritage language as an interaction, as shown in the following comment (field notes, February 3rd, 2023):

A discussion between Simaza and Sidesha, as the mother explains that when she was at a specific place, some boys come to her and start speaking Circassian (she describes the words that the kids have said) and adds that “the way they speak is wrong” (says the pronunciation they have said) and the mother comments that “I told them to repeat the words to give them the correct pronunciation” emphasizing that maybe the language has been changed over the generations.

In this comment, the way Simaza and Sidesha interact with each other using their heritage language as a major topic suggests that the practices are seen in certain topics as an interaction between the family members. Moreover, the topic is centered on the

mother's comment on the Circassian language which indicates that the practices rely on talking about the HL in the daily interactions.

The next comment also offers that the language is being used as a topic (field notes, February 3rd, 2023):

Simaza explains that a certain family member (a child) knows how to say the Circassian words (gives an example of a word) adding that but sometimes she prefers to use the English equivalents as it is easier.

The interaction between Sidesha and Simaza is based on Sidesha's experience of the Circassian classes, which suggests that it is a regular discussion between the family members. Consequently, the mother starts the discussion by giving another experience and an example from a member of their family. The practices are seen in involving the experiences and connecting them to their heritage language to make it the main topic in the interaction. The interaction using the heritage language as a topic indicates that it is another way to perform the Circassian linguistic identity.

As noted, such discussions are significant in the family's topics, and the way they interact with them reveals that they accept talking about their heritage language as a part of their familial discussions.

In the following comment, the daughter's confirmation and acceptance of her mother's conversation is seen as she continues with the same topic. This suggests that the topics become a part of the family's interaction and socialization. The following comment comes from the field notes on February 3rd, 2023:

A conversation starts between Sidesha and Simaza, the daughter suggests that there is a new language and it spoken in Nalchik, as it refers to a Circassian standard language (the daughter links the Standard English to the Standard Circassian), her mother adds that she heard about that and commented " this is nice, we can have a standard variety.

Additionally, the same kind of discourse is noted in the second family as shown in the comment (field notes, January 4th, 2023):

The participants are watching TV, Sinamees mentions that the Circassian language in one of the countries is different, as the Circassian speakers tend to speak and omit certain sounds like the country they live in (she gives examples from the Circassian words and sounds).

In the comment, the interaction is based on the Circassian pronunciation of certain words, explaining that it is different among the Circassians around the world. The way that Sinamees decides to socialize using the heritage language and gives examples suggests that she considers talking about her heritage language to carry out the discussions.

The previous observational data have offered that the family interactions tend to involve talking about their language in different situations as a practice among the family members. The data indicate that although the participants do not use the heritage language frequently, they tend to practice the language in topics related to talk about the HL. The choice of the topics indicated that the members try to practice their heritage language frequently in different contexts.

4.2.1.5 Language policing

Another theme that has been observed in limited context is language policing, where the parents use different policies to highlight the language practices in the family.

The policing is used by the father as noted in the following comment (December 26th, 2023):

I called the family for lunch, and used the Circassian expression “qebلاغha” (it means come and join us). Hussien directly corrected the form by repeating the word in its correct form “ fi qebلاغha” and, in turn, I repeated the correct form again.

Hussien's way to correct and repeat the expression seems to be a part of the language policing he is trying to achieve. Moreover, the correction is based on two levels; pronunciation and grammar. The policing appears as a direct correction to affect the other speaker and as a result I adopt the correct pronunciation and grammar.

In addition, heritage language literacy has been observed in the family and it is adopted by the mother as shown in the comment (field notes on February 7th, 2023):

Saeed is reading the words from a Circassian book, and he starts talking and let his mom to guess what these words are. His mother starts repeating the words in the correct form (she emphasized on saying the pronunciation of the accent they know) as well as the mother gives a feedback on the pronunciation.

The mother's way to teach the heritage language depends on two ways, the first way is to repeat the words and emphasize on the pronunciation they are familiar with and the second way is by giving a feedback on how to pronounce the words after hearing the correct forms. The ways that the mother wants to develop are regarded as heritage language literacy.

Having presented language practices of the participating families, now I turn to the language management efforts.

4.2 Results Related to Question Three

4.2.1 Language Management

This question examines how the participants try to manage language practices within the family "*How do family members manage their language?*" I have drawn upon not only reported data from the interviews, but also the observed and audio-recorded interactional data to get deeper insights into how language is managed in the selected households.

The results from the interviews pertinent to language ideologies and practices indicate that the members of the three families hold positive attitudes towards both the HL and the

majority language (Arabic). Nonetheless, Arabic is used way more frequently when compared to the limited HL expressions. The use of the HL is found in certain contexts.

Language management is seen as a reflection of the members' language beliefs and practices. The interviews data reveal that the parents encourage other members of the families to speak the HL in three ways. The first way in practicing the language in front of them even if the language is used in limited contexts. The second way is rewarding and the third refers to encouraging them to attend classes in the different Circassian institutions with an emphasis on attending to the Circassian social and cultural events. These ways of encouragement can be viewed as management styles and strategies that have emerged in the three families.

The results suggest that each family has different views on the way they manage the language inside the home. Although the majority of the members hold strong beliefs about their heritage language and culture and that there was a noticeable connection between them and the Circassian language and culture, language management strategies were not strictly used. The results of the interview with the father and mother in first family have revealed that they do not follow a certain strategy, and the father comments, "Each one is freely to talk in any language he/she likes as long as they can deliver the meaning", elaborating that if one chooses using Arabic, other members of the family may use repetition and/or rewarding to encourage using the HL. The fact that the parents do not follow any strategy can be viewed as Laissez-faire policy due to the fact that they do not follow a management strategy and the language are managed naturally in the family.

On the other hand, the results of the interview with the sisters of the second family have revealed that they tend to use a mixed-language strategy and code-switch, as previously discussed in the previous section. The participants from this family have

reported that they use “Arabic mostly when talking to other family members (the children) and Circassian when we talk to each other, mostly with siblings and relatives”. Furthermore, I have noted and observed that the sisters of the second family tend to use certain strategies to manage the language. In the same vein, the parents in the third family have reported that they use both languages as the mixed-language strategy and the repetition strategy with other family members. The parents use the mixed-languages strategy. In other words, Circassian is limited to the use between the parents as they elaborated, and Arabic with their daughters. Moreover, one of the daughters attends Circassian classes once a week, while the other daughter seems to interact with her parents and be exposed to the language more frequently.

Although the families do not seem to set strict rules to the use of the HL and it is obvious that Arabic is being spoken in every day interactions, the observational data indicate that they tend to use certain strategies like the one they previously mentioned and preferred, i.e. (repetition)

4.2.1.1 Repetition

Repetition is the prevailing management strategies in the three families. This strategy is mainly adopted by the parents and the elderly. I have observed the strategy in the first and second families, while the third family has reported that they use repetition in the interview. For instance, the mother from the third family has commented that “my daughters always tell me to repeat the words in Circassian and I expect that” which suggests that the strategy is being used by the parents and the mother expects that the daughters need to repeat due to the fact that her daughters lack the heritage language and they are not used to it. Repetition as a management strategy has been noticed in different

contexts and for different purposes. The following comment explains the strategy (field notes, December 28th, 2022):

One of the participants was leaving and her niece told her goodnight in Arabic. She told him “and what do we say?” and repeated the expression in the HL.

In the above comment, the participant appears to have a strict management towards the use of the HL. Her repetition of the greeting in the Circassian language indicates that it is a part of her management, emphasizing and insisting on speaking the heritage language as it is expected from her niece. The participant’s expectations rely on the fact that family members use certain expressions in their daily interactions. As a result, she rejects the Arabic word and directs her niece to repeat the greeting in the HL.

Interestingly, the repetition strategy is not only used by the parents. Other family members use it as noted in the following comment (field notes, December 26th, 2022):

The family are having their lunch, and Montaha asks Saeed if he wants red pepper (in Arabic). Interestingly, the son repeats the same word using the Circassian word.

Interestingly, this comment shows that not only parents try to control language use within the family, but also children have a similar tendency. In this comment, the way that the participant repeated the word in the HL indicates that the Arabic expression for red pepper is not commonly used by the family members (this is verified also by the parents in the data). The participant’s rejection of the Arabic expression from the part of a young family member reveals that even less powerful members have their say heard in keeping the language practices within the home.

4.3 Summary

The chapter presented the language ideologies, practices and management that the Circassian families have. Drawing upon the data (observations, home-recordings and interviews), the analysis revealed that the three families considered the Circassian

language as the heritage language, in which the language ideology is referred to Circassian as an identity marker, Circassian viewed as a cultural aspect and value and the Circassian language is influenced by the Circassian culture. The Arabic language is considered as the majority language and it is represented in religion and culture.

The three families revealed various language practices. The data suggest that the families connect their heritage culture to the practicing by encouraging to maintain the Circassian culture. In addition, language practices are seen in limited Circassian vocabulary which are related to food topics. The families also offer code-switching for certain functions and purposes e.g. (to request, accept invitations and emotions code-switch). The families tend to use language policing as a practice including HL literacy and correction the use of the language. Moreover, the practices are represented in certain discussions that are related to meta-linguistic discussion about the Circassian language among the family members. The language practices patterns in the families have been noted from the observational and recorded data in which natural interactions occur among the family members to get in-depth data about the use of the Circassian language.

The data from the three families revealed that language management is used in the families in different degrees including using some strategies such as repetition, mixed-language strategies and Laissez-faire policy.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the findings of the study which are related to language ideologies, language practices, and language management. The findings are discussed with reference to previous research in the field. The chapter ends with a brief conclusion of the research findings followed by directions for future research.

5.1 Discussion of the Results of Question One

The first question aimed at investigating the language ideologies towards both languages (Circassian and Arabic) in the three Circassian families. The Circassian language is viewed and considered as an ethnic identity marker and plays a significant role in shaping the members' ideologies as they consider Circassian an integral part of their identity and culture. The Circassian language is represented as an ethnic identity marker in the three families. This result supports the findings of Shen et al. (2021) who suggest that some Miao parents in China identify Miao language as an ethnic identity marker, although it was replaced by learning Putonghua (aka Mandarin) and Miao was not used at home.

Additionally, the results indicate that the family members view Circassian language as part of their identity and culture, which matches Gharibi and Seals (2019) findings that the language was being used at home due to the fact that it was a part of their identity as a part of the Iranian community in New Zealand. The results show that the Circassians use their heritage language as they tend to connect their culture through the traditions and values which in fact shape their Circassian ideologies. Moreover, the results reveal that there is a connection between the language and the identity that corresponds to the findings of Yazan and Ali (2018) that show a connection between their minority language

(Arabic) and the Arabic identity of the Libyan community in the US. Also, the results uncover that the families have strong attachment and appreciation to their Circassian identity among the different generations. Such a finding is similar to Mirvahedi's (2021) findings that the Malay parents in Singapore are deeply committed and attached to Malay language and identity. Likewise, this result is in line with Bezcioglu-Goktolga and Yagmur's (2022) findings that stated that first and second Turkish generations in Netherlands had strong attachments to their culture and identity. This study shows the members of the Circassian families have strong identities as the Circassian language is a link to the Circassian identity, and it is rather represented in the Circassian values and culture rather than speaking the language. This result is comparable with the findings of Gharibi and Mirvahedi (2021) that show that the Iranian parents in the UK had a strong identity and it was represented through communicating with Persian language effectively at home.

The results regarding language ideologies towards the majority language (Arabic) reveal that the Arabic language is the dominant language in the participating families and it is regarded as the language that is habitually used for communication. This result supports Ahmed's (2021) findings that the majority language (Arabic) is the language of society and communication of the Nubian community in Egypt. The Arabic language is the dominant language in the families and the importance of the Arabic language depends on its communicational and religious value. The Arabic language is highly valued and widely used in religious discourse in the wider Muslim society (Nofal, 2023). Members of the families communicate using the dominant language, which is similar to Mirvahedi's (2021) results who stated that English is one of the languages that was spoken among Malay family members in Singapore to communicate. In addition, Arabic language is an important language in the three families, and the importance of it is viewed

through the wider use of it which agrees with Spolsky's (2009) suggestion that the importance of the language depends on various benefits, such as the social and economic benefits of speaking that language. In addition, this result is similar to Kumpulainen's (2020) finding that the Finnish parents in Southern Finland consider the majority language (English) as an important language according to its importance in various contexts, such as the educational and occupational contexts, and Ahmed's (2021) results that indicate that the majority language (Arabic) is an important language in the social level of the Nubian community in Egypt due to the fact that it is the language of daily life, study, and work.

To recap, the results of the current study regarding language ideologies reveal that members of the participating families regard both languages are equally important. That is, the Circassian language is important due to the fact that it is the language of their culture and identity, and the Arabic language is the language of communication, religion and the wider Jordanian society. This result agrees with Ahmed's (2021) findings of the Nubian community in Egypt that Nubian was the language of culture, history and identity, and Arabic was the language of the society. Moreover, the majority of the family members hold and show positive attitudes towards the Arabic language. This is similar to Ramonienė's (2013) finding that non-Lithuania inhabitants hold positive language attitudes toward the majority language (Lithuanian). Also, the findings agree with Stacey and Soler's (2019) result that most of the multilingual families participating in their study (who belong to different backgrounds including Dutch, Italian and Finnish) show positive ideologies to the majority language (English) in the UK. The findings also reveal that the parents in the families show positive feelings to the majority language which matches with Kumpulainen's (2020) result that the Finish parents in Southern Finland had positive feelings to the majority language (English).

5.2 Discussion of the Results of Question Two

The second question aimed at exploring how the families practice and use their Circassian language in their daily interactions. The observation and voice-recordings provide a detailed practice and use of the heritage language in different contexts, and it is not limited to the language itself; the language has been used as a way to show and maintain the Circassian identity. The way the families maintain their Circassian identity is viewed as encouraging the family members to maintain the Circassian culture. This result is in contrast to the findings of Shen et. al (2021) that reveal the Miao parents in China were encouraged to use and maintain the Miao language in their family due to its low-level positions in local government.

The results indicate that language practices are seen in the families to serve certain functions strategically. For instance, code switching appears in the form of requests for certain purposes. Also, code switching appears when talking about sensitive and serious issues. This result agrees with Curdt-Christiansen's (2013) that language practices are presented in different discourse moves such as code-switching. In contrast to other studies that focused on practicing the language according to the interactions among the participants, such as Seals's (2017) findings that the speakers used either the heritage (Russian and Ukrainian) or the majority language (English) in the United States depending on the person he/she interacts with and Said's (2021) findings that reveal the Arabic language was presented in the Arabic-speaking multilingual families in the US and Saudi Arabia as a practice through the use of technology. Furthermore, language practices are formed through meta-linguistic discussions, where the participants use the heritage language in their daily discussions and interactions. This result supports the findings of Nofal and Seals (2021) that explore how the English-speaking parents used

meta- linguistic discussion to link the Indian identity to their adopted daughter in New Zealand. In addition, the results reveal that the families maintain the Circassian identity through connecting the culture to the identity, similar to Li's (2021) findings that suggest the heritage language (Chinese) in New Zealand was maintained in the families through integrating the cultural identity and Nofal and Seals's (2021) findings that the English-speaking parents provided their daughter with acts of identity in the home through introducing aspects of her culture.

The findings of the current study suggest that the Circassian language is being spoken and used limitedly among the siblings and relatives while the children use the Arabic language, as opposed to the study of Seals (2017) that elaborate the English as the majority language was used between the children and their siblings, whereas the minority languages (Russian and Ukrainian) were used when there was an interaction between the children and the parents in the United States.

The results also show that the parents tend to use certain language policing strategies to practice and control the Circassian language such as heritage language literacy, which corresponds with Gharibi and Seals (2019) findings that show how the Iranian families in New Zealand developed their children's oral language through using Persian at home for the purpose of developing their conversational proficiency in the heritage language.

5.3 Discussion of the Results of Question Three

The third question aimed at exploring and investigating the language management strategies and styles that the families adopt to manage the language inside the home and among its members. The results of the current study show that the families use the Circassian language and expressions in limited contexts, and as a result, the members tend to use and manage the Circassian language naturally most of the time as the language

management strategies are not strictly used among the family members. The results of the study show that the members' way to manage the Circassian language is viewed through encouraging the other family members to use the language in front of the children, attending Circassian classes and cultural events. This result is similar to the finding of Stacey and Soler (2019) who argued that one of the strategies that the multilingual speaking parents in the UK adopted to manage the heritage language at home was depending on their relatives to use the language in front of the family members.

The results of the current study are comparable with such as the results of Stacey and Soler (2019) and Kumpulainen's (2020) regarding language management strategies in the home. For instance, Stacey and Soler (2019) and Kumpulainen's (2020) show certain strategies and activities to manage the language including watching TV and reading books in the minority language. Also, other studies suggest opposite results, including using the heritage language regularly in the home, such as the results of Ramonienė (2013) that show the language management of the Russian speaker in the urban areas of Lithuania was achieved through using and speaking their heritage language (Russian) at home frequently and Xiaomei's (2017) results of Hakka families in Malaysia that indicate that language management was represented in speaking the Mandarin language at home for purposes including that the Mandarin language was influenced by the use of the language in the schools.

However, the results of the study show that there are certain and limited strategies that the members tend to use to manage the language inside the home, such as repetition, suggesting that these families adopt mixed-language policy and a *laissez-faire* policy. This result is similar to the findings of Reay (2020) that show children of Chinese/ English parents in China developed language management naturally through socializing with

Chinese peers, and the parents established language environment that included a Chinese environment for their children, and Ahmed's (2021) findings that the majority of the Nubian parents in Egypt did not use any management strategy to use the Nubian language at home. In addition, the results of this study correspond with Yousef's (2016) who stated that the most common strategy in FLP research is the mixed-languages strategy as a part of language management and Ahmed's (2021) findings who found that the fewer Nubian parents in Egypt preferred to use a mix-language strategy to balance between the mainstream language (Arabic) and the minority language (Nubian). On the other hand, the results of this study reveal that the parents do not follow the OPOL style and strategy, which is opposed to other studies that explained how the parents used and preferred the OPOL style in the families, such as the results of Mirvahedi (2021) who shows that Malay families in Singapore used the OPOL policy at home to achieve language management and Ahmed's (2021) who explored the management strategies that some of the Nubian parents in Egypt adopted, including OPOL where the Nubian language was spoken by one parent and the Arabic language was spoken by the other parent.

5.4 Conclusion

The thesis aimed to investigate the dynamics of family language policy in three Circassian- Jordanian families using Spolsky's (2004, 2009) model. It examined the language ideologies towards the minority and the majority languages, investigated the patterns of the Circassian language in the home and uncovered the language management strategies and styles of the Circassian language. The analysis using Spolsky's model offered an understanding towards the language that is being used in the home among the family members. The observations, voice-recordings and interviews indicate that the Circassians of Jordan use their heritage language in limited domains, i.e. at the home. The

results show that the Circassians hold strong identities towards their language and they consider the Circassian language as an identity marker and the Circassian language is linked to the culture and identity. Also, the results reveal that the Circassians do not use the heritage language regularly, rather they maintain the language through using limited lexical items in the daily interactions such as greetings, compliments, and food vocabulary. Moreover, the Circassians use their language in meta- linguistic discussions as a way to practice the language and certain heritage language policies.

The results regarding the majority language (Arabic) indicate that the families use the Arabic language in communication and religion. The Arabic language is a valuable language as the members consider the language as the language of the country and the members hold positive attitudes towards the Arabic language.

Also, the results reveal that the Circassian language is managed naturally, and only certain and limited strategies are used by the parents to manage the Circassian language inside the home.

5.5 Recommendations and Directions for Future Research

This thesis shed light on the dynamics of family language policy in three Jordanian families of Circassian background, drawing upon Spolsky's (2004) Model of FLP. Based on the results of the analysis and the discussion, the following are recommended for future research:

1. Doing further research with other Circassian communities as well as other heritage language communities in the Middle East such as Palestine and Syria.
2. Relying on actual data using recordings to gain in-depth data and analyzing the natural and spontaneous use of the language.
3. Further studies are recommended to focus on language management efforts.

4. Future research drawing upon other models of FLP such as King et al. (2008) is recommended to get deeper insights into the complexity of FLP.

5.6 Summary

This chapter reviewed the main findings of the current research with reference to the previous research on FLP. It also included a conclusion and directions for future research.

References

- Abd-el-Jawad, H. R. (2006). Why Do Minority Languages Persist? The Case of Circassian in Jordan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(1), 51–74.
- Abu Assab, N. (2011). *Narratives of Ethnicity and Nationalism A Case Study of Circassians in Jordan*. University of Warwick.
- Abu-Shanab, M. (2020). *Factors Determining the Linguistic and Cultural Outcomes of Language Contact among Two Caucasian Ethnic Communities in Jordan: A Comparative Sociolinguistic Study*. Middle East University.
- Ahmed, R. E. (2021). *Family Language Policy within Nubian Families in Egypt: Parents' Perspectives of Their Children's Prospective Bilingualism*. The American University in Cairo.
- Al-Abbas, S. (2008). *Linguistic Human Rights and the Language of Minorities with Specific Reference to the Language of Circassians in Jordan*. 51–58.
- Al-Majali, A. (1988). Language maintenance and language shift among Circassians in Jordan. *Unpublished MA Thesis, the University of Jordan: Amman*.
- Al-Momani, D., & Al-Momani, S. (2013). The Language situation among the Circassians of Jordan. *Educational Research*, 4(8), 612–617.
- Best, S. (2014). *Understanding and doing successful research: Data collection and analysis for the social sciences*. Routledge.
- Bezioglu-Goktolga, I., & Yagmur, K. (2022). Intergenerational differences in family language policy of Turkish families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2036746>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Burgess, E. A. (2017). *Investigating Current Language Policy in Alicante: A case Study*. The University of Liverpool (United Kingdom).
- Canagarajah, S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(2), 143–176.
- Colarusso, J. (1994). Circassians. *Paul Friedrich and Norma Diamond (Volume Eds.) Encyclopedia of World Cultures*, 6, 1–16.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2013). Negotiating Family Language Policy: Doing Homework. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy* (pp. 277–295). Springer.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2018). Family Language Policy. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 420–441). Oxford University Press.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Lanza, E. (2018). Language management in multilingual families: Efforts, measures and challenges. *Multilingua*, 37(2), 123–130.
- Dweik, B. (1999). The Language Situation among the Circassians of Jordan. *Al-Basaaer Journal*, 3(2), 10–28.
- Dweik, B., & Omar, R. (2016). Preserving the Circassian cultural heritage in America. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(2), 140–148.
- Elkhalik, D. A. (2018). *Family Language Policies in Five Syrian Families in the UK*. 11, 1–18.
- Fogle, L. W., & King, K. A. (2013). Child Agency and Language Policy in Transnational Families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19, 1–25.

- Gharibi, K., & Mirvahedi, S. H. (2021). ‘You are Iranian even if you were born on the moon’: Family language policies of the Iranian diaspora in the UK. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1935974>
- Gharibi, K., & Seals, C. (2019). Family Language Policy towards Heritage Language Literacy Acquisition and Maintenance: Iranians in New Zealand. In S. H. Mirvahedi (Ed.), *The Sociolinguistics of Iran’s Languages at Home and Abroad: The Case of Persian, Azerbaijani, and Kurdish* (pp. 109–135). Springer.
- Hamed-Troyansky, V. (2017). Circassian Refugees and the Making of Amman, 1878–1914. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 49(4), 605–623.
- Hollebeke, I., Van Oss, V., Struys, E., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2022). An empirical investigation of Spolsky’s framework applied to family language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–14.
- Hu, G., & Ren, L. (2017). Language ideologies, social capital and interaction strategies: An ethnographic case study of family language policy in Singapore. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world: Opportunities, challenges, and consequences* (pp. 195–216). Routledge.
- Jaimoukha, A. (2001). *The Circassians a handbook*. Curzon Press.
- Jaimoukha, A. (1998). *The Circassians in Jordan*. An Internet Website: Silver Lining (a Serial Guide to the Circassians and Their Culture).
- Kendrick, M., & Namazzi, E. (2017). Family Language Practices As emergent Policies in Child-Headed Households in Rural Uganda. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World* (pp. 56–73). Routledge.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907–922.

- Kumpulainen, H. (2020). *Family Language Policy: A Qualitative Case Study on the Implicit and Explicit Practices in a Finnish Multilingual Family*. University of Turku.
- Li, L. (2021). *Family Language Policy and Immigrant Chinese Children's Bilingual Development in New Zealand Context*. 63–75.
- Macalister, J., & Mirvahedi, S. H. (2017). Beginnings. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World* (pp. 1–10). Routledge.
- Maseko, B. (2016). *The Impact of Family Language Policy (FLP) on the Conservation of Minority Languages in Zimbabwe*. University of South Africa.
- Melgani, H. (2021). *Family Language Policy and Home Language Maintenance: Linguistic Choices, Ideologies, and Management Efforts among Berber Families in Algeria*. 5(2), 442–462.
- Mirvahedi, S. H. (2021). What can interactional sociolinguistics bring to the family language policy research table? The case of a Malay family in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1879089>
- Natho, K. I. (2009). *Circassian History*. Xlibris Corporation.
- Nofal, M. (2020). *Multilingual Practices and Identity Negotiation among Multilingual Heritage Language Learners in New Zealand*.
- Nofal, M. (2023). A Corpus-Driven Exploration of Language Use in Religious Discourse. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 41–60.
<https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2023.18067>
- Nofal, M., & Seals, C. A. (2021). Family Language Practices of a New Zealand Adoptive Family. In L. Wright & C. Higgins (Eds.), *Diversifying Family Language Policy* (pp. 33–58). Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Omar, R. M., & Dweik, B. S. (2015). *The Linguistic and Cultural Situation in a Multilingual Circassian Community in New Jersey/ U.S.A.* Middle East University.
- Othman, M. (2022). *Family language policies of Saudi student families in the UK: parental language beliefs, practices and management.* University of York.
- Ramonienė, M. (2013). Family Language Policy and Management in a Changed Socio-political Situation: Russian and Russian Speakers in Lithuania. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (Vol. 7, pp. 127–143). Springer.
- Rannut, U. (2009). Circassian language maintenance in Jordan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(4), 297–310.
- Rannut, U. (2011). *Maintenance of the Circassian Language in Jordan Self-identification, attitudes, policies and practices as indicators of linguistic vitality.* Amman.
- Reay, J. (2020). Family Language Policy: The importance of national and family context. *Josai International University Bulletin*, 28(2), 121–133.
- Ren, L., & Hu, G. (2013). Prolepsis, syncretism, and synergy in early language and literacy practices: A case study of family language policy in Singapore. *Language Policy*, 12(1), 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9260-9>
- Revis, M. (2017). How Religious Ideologies and Practices Impact on Family Language Policy: Ethiopians in Wellington. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World: Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences* (pp. 136–153). New York: Routledge.
- Roberts, T. (2021). The Social Underpinnings of Language Practices in Swedish-English Families. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 20(1), 155–193.

- Said, F. F. S. (2021). Family as a System: Values and Ideologies behind Family Language Policies of Diverse Arabic-Speaking Multilingual Families. In L. Wright & C. Higgins (Eds.), *Diversifying Family Language Policy* (pp. 213–236). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Schwartz, M. (2010). Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics Review 1* (Vol. 1, pp. 171–192).
- Seals, C. A. (2017). Dynamic Family Language Policy: Heritage Language Socialization and Strategic Accommodation in the Home. In J. Macalister & S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World: Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences* (pp. 176–194). Routledge.
- Selleck, C. (2022). The gendered migrant experience: A study of family language policy (FLP) amongst mothers and daughters in the Somali community, Bristol. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1–20.
- Seo, Y. (2017). *Early Bilingual Development: Expanding Our Understanding of Family Language Policy in Heritage Language Maintenance*. University of Washington.
- Shami, S. (1994). Displacement, Historical Memory, and Identity: The Circassians in Jordan. *Center for Migration Studies Special Issues*, 11(4), 189–201.
- Shami, S. (2009). Historical Processes of Identity Formation: Displacement, Settlement, and Self-Representations of the Circassians in Jordan. *Iran and the Caucasus*, 13(1), 141–159.
- Shen, Q., Wang, L., & Gao, X. A. (2021). An ecological approach to family language policy research: The case of Miao families in China. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 22(4), 1–19.
- 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* (pp. 13–29). New York: Routledge.
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2016). *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language in the Home*. Palgrave Macmillan UK: London.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137521811>
- Spolsky, B. (2004a). *Language Policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2004b). *Language Policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2009a). *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2009b). *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 3–11.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638072>
- Stacey, B., & Soler, J. (2019). *Family language policy in the UK: Identity building and language maintenance at home*. 165–191.
- Tamang, D. (2020). Language policy and multilingual practices in the family. *Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1, 84–93.
- Tie, Y. C., Birks, M., & Francis, K. (2019). Grounded theory research: A design framework for novice researchers. *Sage Open Med*, 7, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312118822927>
- Wenhan, X., Chin, N. B., & Cavallaro, F. (2022). Living in harmony: The negotiation of intergenerational family language policy in Singapore. *Language & Communication*, 82, 8–27.
- Wilson, S. (2019). Family language policy through the eyes of bilingual children: The case of French heritage speakers in the UK. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(2), 121–139.

- Wilson, S. (2020). *Family Language Policy: Children's Perspectives*. Springer Nature.
- Wright, L., & Higgins, C. (Eds.). (2022). *Diversifying family language policy*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Xiaomei, W. (2017). Family language policy by Hakkas in Balik Pulau, Penang. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2017(244), 87–118.
- Yazan, B., & Ali, I. (2018). Family Language Policies in a Libyan Immigrant Family in the US: Language and Religious Identity. *Heritage Language Journal*, 15(3), 369–388.
- Yousef, A. (2016). *Exploring Family Language Policies: A Study of Australian Families of Arabic-Speaking Background*. Griffith University.
- Zheng, Y. (2015). *Family Language Policy of an English-Turkish Bilingual Family in Northern Cyprus: A Case Study*. Eastern Mediterranean University EMU.

Appendix A

Semi –Structured Interview Guide

- **Language Ideology**

- 1) What are your feelings about Circassian? What are your feelings about Arabic?
- 2) How important do you think it is to speak Arabic when you live in Jordan? And for Circassians to speak Circassian in Jordan?
- 3) Do you think Circassian will survive in Jordan? How?
- 4) Which language is the most important for your children at the moment?
- 5) How about in the future? Do you think your child will still use Circassian then?
- 6) How important is it to you that your children continue speaking Circassian?
- 7) Do you think your children should attend official Circassian classes?
- 8) Do you find it important that your children learn Arabic?
- 9) Which languages would you like your family to speak in the future?
- 10) Which cultural group do you feel you belong to?
- 11) With which language do you identify yourself?
- 12) Do you want this to change in the future? Why/why not?
- 13) Is it important for you which culture you practice in your home with your family?
Examples?
- 14) Is Circassian important for keeping up your cultural identity?

- **Language Practices**

- 15) What languages do you speak at home?
- 16) What language do you use the majority of the time?
- 17) Do you use the language(s) for different things or activities?
- 18) Do you find it challenging to speak two languages at home/one language at home and one outside home?
- 19) Did going to school affect native language use at your home?

- **Language Management**

20) Do you have a “language strategy” at home?

21) How do you encourage your children to speak Circassian at home?

22) How do you react when your children refuse to speak Circassian at home?