

**Heritage Language Maintenance and Loss in an Iranian Community in Canada: Successes
and Challenges**

By

Naghmeh Babaee

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Faculty of Education

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Copyright ©2014 by Naghmeh Babaee

Abstract

Research shows that many immigrant children in Canada face challenges in maintaining their heritage languages, i.e., languages other than English and French or Indigenous languages. Public schools might not recognize or promote the use of heritage languages, many schools do not provide heritage language instruction, and in some instances, students and their parents are actively discouraged from using their heritage language at home. Heritage languages, however, should be maintained to help immigrant students succeed socially and academically and maintain stronger familial bonds. Language maintenance can also lead to multilingualism in a society, facilitating socioeconomic and international relations in the globalized world.

In light of these challenges and the importance of maintaining heritage languages, this qualitative case study, informed by the work of critical theorists in the field of additional language education, was undertaken to investigate language maintenance in a heritage language school in a major city in Canada. Issues under investigation included (1) students', parents', and teachers' perspectives on language maintenance, (2) the availability of language maintenance resources at home, school, and in the first language (L1) community, (3) successes and challenges of the students in maintaining their heritage language at home, school, and in the L1 community, and (4) the parents' and teachers' effort in facilitating heritage language learning opportunities for children. Data were collected through in-depth, semi-structured interviews, field-observations, descriptive and reflective field notes, and participants' journal writing. The emerging themes included (1) the importance of language maintenance, (2) language maintenance strategies, and (3) language maintenance challenges.

This study sought to raise awareness of language maintenance issues faced by immigrants, in this instance a particular Iranian immigrant population in Canada, within the

contexts of home, school, and L1 community. In documenting students' successes and challenges in maintaining their heritage language, heritage language teachers' experiences as non-mainstream educators, and parents' efforts to provide heritage language learning opportunities for their children, the research aimed to challenge immigrant students' education with regard to issues of equity. Results are intended to inform immigrant families and communities, and programming and policy to facilitate language maintenance opportunities for children in Canada and other immigrant-receiving contexts.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all those who provided me the possibility to complete this dissertation.

A special gratitude I give to my advisor, Dr Clea Schmidt, for the useful comments, remarks and engagement through the learning process of conducting this research. Without her guidance and help, this study would not have been possible. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge with much appreciation the role of my committee members, Dr Yi Li and Dr Jila Ghomeshi, who provided me with useful comments during the completion of this study.

I wish to thank my friends and classmates at the University of Manitoba, whose support, friendship, and encouragement kept me focused on my study.

Appreciation goes to the students, parents, teachers, and principal of the Farsi school where this study was undertaken. This accomplishment would have been impossible without their contribution.

I would like to thank my uncle, Dr Moe Famkar, my parents, Jahangir Babaee and Mahboubeh Famkar, and my sister, Hedieh Babaee, who supported me by their encouragements and positive energy.

I wish to thank my husband, Shahab Ghandhari, for the love and support he provided during the completion of this study.

A special thanks goes to the University of Manitoba Faculty of Graduate Studies and International Centre for Students for financial support through the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship, Manitoba Graduate Scholarship, International Graduate Students' Scholarship, and International Graduate Students' Entry Scholarship .

Dedication

این پایان نامه دکتر را به ایرانیان خارج از وطنی تقدیم می شود که با وجود مشکلات احتمالی ، جهت حفظ زبان فارسی و فرهنگ ایرانی نهایت کوشششان را می کنند.

This dissertation is dedicated to the Iranian people in the Diaspora who strive to preserve the Farsi language and Iranian culture despite potential challenges.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication.....	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	xiv
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Heritage Language Programming within Canada.....	3
Public schools.....	3
Community-based heritage language schools.....	16
Heritage Language Programming in Europe.....	16
Heritage Language Programming in Australia.....	19
Statement of the Problem	22
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....	26
The Significance of the Study.....	27
Conclusion	28
Chapter Two: Review of Literature	29
Important Factors in Language Maintenance and Loss.....	29
Family.	30
The L1 community.	35
Peers.	37
Schools	39
Identity.....	43

<i>Ethnic identity</i>	46
Language ideology.....	52
Challenges in Maintaining Heritage Languages in Canada.....	57
Resources.....	57
<i>Teachers</i>	57
<i>Materials</i>	58
A lack of teaching certificate and inadequate training.....	58
Multi-age, multi-level students.....	60
Insufficient funding.....	61
Challenges within a Broader Context: Canada, Europe, and Australia.....	63
Research on minority education in Canada, Europe and Australia.....	64
Conclusion	68
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	69
The Theoretical Framework of the Study	69
The Philosophical Assumptions of Critical Theory.	71
Research Design	77
Methodological framework.	78
Decolonizing Methodology.....	79
The Researcher.....	80
Personal background.	81
Academic background.	84
Professional background.	86

Method.....	88
Sampling procedure.	88
<i>The Iranian community in Canada.....</i>	89
<i>The Iranian community in the City</i>	89
Site.	91
<i>Resources and materials.....</i>	92
<i>Gaining access.</i>	94
Recruitment.	95
Participants.	97
<i>Student participants.</i>	97
<i>Dina.....</i>	98
<i>Elham.....</i>	98
<i>Kiana.....</i>	98
<i>Tandis.....</i>	99
<i>Delaram.....</i>	99
<i>Davoud.....</i>	99
<i>Parent participants.....</i>	100
<i>Nilou.....</i>	100
<i>Maryam.....</i>	100
<i>Azy.....</i>	101
<i>Bahar.....</i>	101
<i>Mahsa.....</i>	101
<i>Ali.....</i>	101

<i>Teacher participants</i>	102
<i>Sara</i>	102
<i>Mahnaz</i>	102
<i>Rosie</i>	102
<i>Mina</i>	102
<i>Behrouz</i>	103
Data Collection Procedure.	103
Semi-structured interviews.	104
The critical incident report	106
Field notes.	107
Field observations.	107
Data Analysis Procedure.	109
The Trustworthiness of the Study.....	110
Credibility.	110
Confirmability.	111
Dependability.	111
Transferability.	112
Ethical Considerations.....	112
Conclusion.....	114
Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion.....	115
The Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance	115
Maintaining familial and social ties.....	115
<i>The student participants</i>	115

<i>The parent participants</i>	118
<i>The teacher participants</i>	122
Protecting the privacy of conversations.....	124
<i>The student participants</i>	124
<i>The parent participants</i>	125
Ethnic identity negotiation.....	126
<i>The student participants</i>	126
<i>The parent participants</i>	127
<i>The teacher participants</i>	129
Heritage language as a language other than English.....	132
<i>The student participants</i>	132
<i>The parent participants</i>	134
<i>The teacher participants</i>	136
Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies.....	142
The student participants.....	142
<i>At home</i>	142
<i>At public schools</i>	144
<i>In the L1 community</i>	147
The parent participants.....	153
The teacher participants.....	159
Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges.....	165
The student participants.....	165
<i>At home</i>	165

<i>At public schools</i>	167
<i>In the L1 community</i>	174
The parent participants.....	181
The teacher participants.....	186
Conclusion.....	192
Chapter Five: Summary and Recommendations.....	193
The Participants' Perceptions of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	193
The student participants.....	193
The parent participants.....	194
The teacher participants.....	195
The students' Successes in Maintaining Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	195
At home.....	195
At public schools.....	196
In the L1 community.....	196
The Students' Challenges in Maintaining Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	196
At home.....	196
At public schools.....	197
In the L1 community.....	197
The parents' Successes in Providing Heritage Language Maintenance	
Opportunities for Children.....	198
The parents' Challenges in Providing Heritage Language Maintenance	
Opportunities for Children.....	198
The Teachers' Successes in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	198

The Teachers' Challenges in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	199
Recommendations.....	200
Recommendations for immigrant parents.....	200
Recommendations for community members.....	201
Recommendations for heritage language teachers.....	203
Recommendations for public school teachers.....	204
Recommendations for policy makers.....	205
Recommendations for further research.....	206
References.....	208
Appendices	
Appendix A: The Observation Protocol	232
Appendix B: The Students' Interview Protocol.....	233
Appendix C: The Parents' Interview Protocol.....	237
Appendix D: The Heritage Language Teachers' Interview Protocol.....	239
Appendix E: Critical Incident Report Guidelines	241
Appendix F: The Request Letter to the Principal of the Farsi School	244
Appendix G: The Consent Form for Classroom Observations for Teachers.....	249
Tables	
Table 1: Heritage Language Programs in Canadian Provinces and Territories.....	10
Table 2: Four Basic Assumptions of Critical Theory.....	75
Table 3: The Student Participants' Profile.....	100
Table 4: The Parent Participants' Profile.....	101
Table 5: The Teacher Participants' Profile.....	103

Table 6: The Student Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	137
Table 7: The Parent Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	138
Table 8: The Teacher Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	139
Table 9: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Perceptions of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	140
Table 10: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies and Resources Used by the Students.....	150
Table 11: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Parents.....	156
Table 12: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Teachers.....	163
Table 13: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Students, Parents, and Teachers.....	164
Table 14: The Students' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges.....	180
Table 15: The Parents' Challenges in Providing Heritage Language Maintenance Opportunities for Children.....	185
Table 16: The Teachers' Challenges in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	190
Table 17: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges.....	190

List of Tables

Table 1: Heritage Language Programs in Canadian Provinces and Territories.....	10
Table 2: Four Basic Assumptions of Critical Theory.....	75
Table 3: The Student Participants' Profile.....	100
Table 4: The Parent Participants' Profile.....	101
Table 5: The Teacher Participants' Profile.....	103
Table 6: The Student Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	137
Table 7: The Parent Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	138
Table 8: The Teacher Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	139
Table 9: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Perceptions of Heritage Language Maintenance.....	140
Table 10: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies and Resources Used by the Students.....	150
Table 11: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Parents.....	156
Table 12: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Teachers.....	163
Table 13: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Used by the Students, Parents, and Teachers.....	164
Table 14: The Students' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges.....	180

Table 15: The Parents' Challenges in Providing Heritage Language Maintenance Opportunities for Children.....	185
Table 16: The Teachers' Challenges in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language.....	190
Table 17: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges.....	190

Chapter One: Introduction

Many children who are born or raised outside their country of origin might face challenges in maintaining their heritage languages. Language maintenance refers to the situation where “an individual or group continues to use their language, particularly in a BILINGUAL or MULTILINGUAL area or among immigrant groups” (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992, p. 202, CAPS in original). Heritage languages in this study refer to immigrants’ first languages, which have non-official status in a host country. Research suggests that immigrant children tend to lose their heritage languages when they enter school (Wong Fillmore, 1991) because of the potential for assimilation into the dominant culture, friendship with dominant language-speaking peers (Wong Fillmore, 2000; Kouritzin, 1999), or the misconception that these children perform better at school if they abandon their heritage language (Cummins, 2005; Cummins, 2001). Language loss occurs when individuals lose “their ability to speak [and] write [in their mother tongues] or understand” it (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992, p. 202).

In the field of language maintenance and loss, some key questions that require an answer might include: (1) what is the importance of language maintenance from personal and social perspectives?, (2) what factors might support or impede language maintenance?, (3) what public and private heritage language learning opportunities exist for linguistic minority children in a given bilingual or multilingual context?, and finally, (4) what challenges and successes do linguistic minority children have in maintaining their heritage languages?

As a researcher and member of a linguistic minority group who lives in Canada, I have always been curious to find the answers to these questions. A linguistic minority refers to a group which is smaller in number than the rest of the population of a state, “whose members have ... linguistic features different from those of the rest of the population, and are guided, if

only implicitly, by the will to safeguard their ... language” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, p. 489-490). An example of a linguistic minority would be Iranian immigrants in Canada, where the official and dominant languages are English and French, and whose first (or heritage) language is Farsi.

During my interaction with other linguistic minorities here, I have noticed that some parents speak with each other in their heritage languages; however, when they interact with their child or children, they switch to English. I have also seen parents who use their heritage language at home all the time so that their child or children are exposed to it as much as possible. Sometimes, I see students from the same language background speak English although they all have sufficient command of their heritage language to communicate in it. My daily life in Canada and interactions with other linguistic minority individuals has inspired me to start a new journey as a researcher. I became interested in exploring the above questions by reading the literature on language maintenance and loss, and conducting research myself, focusing on various ethno-linguistic minority communities in Canada.

Many studies have been conducted on language maintenance, addressing some of the above-mentioned questions and other relevant issues, including potentially important factors in language maintenance (Guardado, 2010; Yu-Tung Carol, 2009; Kopke, 2004b), parents’ perspectives on language maintenance (Guardado, 2002), and pedagogical strategies which might facilitate it (Cummins, 2005). However, some issues, such as language maintenance within the Iranian community in Canada, or a thorough comparison of successes and challenges of children in maintaining their heritage language at home, school, or in the L1 community remain underexplored in language education research.

The results of my readings, research, daily interactions with other linguistic minority individuals, as well as the gaps in the literature on language maintenance all led to the questions that guided this study. By conducting this research, I was hoping to shed more light on language maintenance generally, and within the Iranian community in Canada specifically.

Heritage Language Programming within Canada

This section presents an overview of heritage language programming in public and community-based heritage language schools in Canada to establish a historical and contemporary context for this study.

Public schools. Depending on the provincial language policy, a number of heritage languages might be learned at Canadian public schools in dual track or transitional bilingual programs (Cummins, 1983) or as a subject (Cummins, 1998). In a bilingual program, language arts is delivered in both mediums of instruction, for example, English and a heritage language. Other subjects are taught in either the heritage language or English (The Common Curriculum Framework for Bilingual Programming in International Languages, 1999). In transitional early exit and late exit bilingual programs, linguistic minority children receive heritage language medium instruction for a few years (usually one to three years in early exit and five to six years in late exit programs) before transferring to the second language medium program. In dual track bilingual programs, a heritage language is used as a medium of instruction, alongside the second language for 40% or 50% of the class time (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarthy, 2008). The terms heritage language, second language, international language and a language/languages other than English have been used interchangeably in this section.

Because education in Canada is under provincial jurisdiction, heritage language programming at provincial and territorial schools needs to be investigated province by province and territory by territory. The heritage language programs in Canadian provinces and territories from east to west are presented below.

In Newfoundland and Labrador, the medium of instruction is English in the English program and French in French Immersion and Français Langue Première, that is, French First Language, programs. No heritage language classes are offered in Newfoundland and Labrador public schools (Department of Education Newfoundland and Labrador, 2011), implying that studying a second language, other than French, might not be a requirement at public schools in this province. Although Newfoundland and Labrador has recognized the rights of linguistic minority children to receive education in their own languages, this includes only official language minority, that is, Francophone, children (Action Plan 2000-01 to 2002-03). Therefore, heritage language learning at school is not a possibility for immigrant/refugee children.

In Nova Scotia, the medium of instruction is English in the English program and French in French immersion and French First Language programs. However, some heritage languages might be studied as subjects, including Gaelic (grades 3 to 12), Latin (grades 9 to 12), Spanish (grades 10 to 12), and German (grades 10 to 12). These courses are academic at high school (grades 10 to 12), which means they are designed for students who would like to enter a post-secondary institution such as a college or a university (Public School Programs, 2003-2004).

On Prince Edward Island, K-12 public schools offer English and French language education. French as a second language courses are offered in all schools, beginning in Grade 4. However, no legislative provision supports heritage language study (Filewych, 1997); therefore,

no heritage language courses are available at public schools (Prince Edward Island Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011).

In New Brunswick, provincial regulations permit, but do not require, teaching a heritage language in public schools with the consent of the local school board (Canadian Education Association, 1991). Although legislative provisions support heritage language study (Filewych, 1997), no heritage languages are taught at elementary, middle, or high schools in this province (New Brunswick Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011), perhaps because of a low demand (Filewych, 1997). The medium of instruction is English in the nine Anglophone school districts and French in the five Francophone school districts (New Brunswick Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011).

In Quebec, French must be the medium of instruction at public schools “except for certain conditions under the *French Language Charter (Chapter C-11, section 73, (a), (b), (c), (d))*, where English is to be the language of instruction” (Canadian Education Association, 1991, p. 6, italics in original). In other words, only children of English-speaking parents who had themselves received English medium instruction in Quebec may receive English medium instruction (Cummins, 1983). In 1978, the Quebec Ministry of Education launched the *Programme de l’enseignement des langues d’origine*, which involved teaching Portuguese, Greek, Italian, and Spanish to students of these backgrounds for half an hour per day during the school day (Cummins, 1983). Since 1989, however, this program might be offered to all students of the schools where it exists under these conditions: (a) a student may register in only one heritage language class, and (b) “the number of pupils who are not native speakers of the language must not be greater than 50% of the number of pupils of that ancestry, at whom this instruction is initially aimed” (Canadian Education Association, 1991, p. 7).

In Ontario, it is illegal to use a non-official language as the medium of instruction at public schools “except on a temporary basis to help children acquire English skills” (Cummins, 1983, p. 5). In Ontario, it is predominantly believed that the education of linguistic minority children should be focused on learning English and becoming Canadian citizens, rather than on creating cultural and linguistic barriers for them (Cummins, 1992).

Since 1977, however, school boards have been funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education to teach heritage languages for up to two and a half hours weekly outside of regular school days (Feuerverger, 1997; Filewych, 1997; Cummins, 1983). Under the Ontario Heritage Language Program, heritage language classes might be held “after school, on a non-school day, or where enrolments justify, the five-hour school day is extended by 30 minutes”. Classes might also be “offered in a location other than a school site, after the end of an instructional day” (Canadian Education Association, 1991, p. 8).

Ontario has the largest heritage language program in Canada (Cummins, 1998), in which 73 (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2011) international languages are taught in grades 9-12 (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10, 1999). Courses in international languages are available at two levels, Level 1 and 2, and students earn one credit per level for each course they pass. These courses might be offered as half-courses in which student earn a half-credit per level. Half-credit courses require at least fifty-five hours of instructional time (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10, 1999).

Latin and Greek are also taught in grades 9-10 (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10, 1999) and grades 11-12 (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 11 and 12, 2000). However, courses in these languages are mainly taught in English. The objectives of these courses are to familiarize students with grammar in English and other modern languages, to improve their spelling, and to

increase their vocabulary (The Ontario Curriculum Grades 11 and 12, 2000; The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10, 1999).

In Manitoba, the use of a heritage language as the medium of instruction for up to half of the school day has been legal since 1979 (Manitoba Education, 2011; Cummins, 1983). The Ukrainian/English dual track bilingual program was offered as the first bilingual program in the province in many primary schools in 1979 (Manitoba Education, 2011; Cummins, 1983). A variety of heritage languages might be studied in bilingual programs or as a subject. Some of these language programs, such as Ukrainian, have been offered for many years (Cummins, 1983) while others, such as Japanese, are more recent (Manitoba Education, 2011). The heritage language programs in Manitoba include Ukrainian, Portuguese, Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, Filipino, German, Japanese, and Hebrew (Manitoba Education, 2011). The bilingual programs in Manitoba include the Ukrainian/English, English/Hebrew, and English/German programs (Manitoba Education; Canadian Education Association, 1991).

In Saskatchewan, the use of a heritage language as the medium of instruction at public schools has been legalized by the School Act since 1974 (Heritage Language Education, 1994). The heritage languages offered as a subject in Saskatchewan public schools include Ukrainian (K-12), Mandarin Chinese, German (grades 9-12), and Russian (Government of Saskatchewan Education, 2007). The bilingual program includes the Ukrainian/English dual track bilingual program (Government of Saskatchewan Education, 2007; Cummins, 1983).

Alberta was the first province to allow the use of a language other than English or French as the medium of instruction at public schools in 1971 (Cummins, 1983). Currently, the provincial heritage language programs in Alberta include Punjabi, German, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, Ukrainian and Latin (Government of Alberta Education, 1995), which are

available at various levels (German and Ukrainian, grades 7 to 12; Italian, Japanese, Latin and Spanish, grades 10 to 12) (Enhancing Second Language Learning in Alberta, 2003). Based on community needs and available resources, school authorities decide which language programs to offer. They may either choose from the available programs developed by Alberta Education, or develop and authorize heritage language programs based on the needs of their local community. Some schools offer locally developed and authorized language and culture courses in languages such as Russian, Arabic, and Polish (Government of Alberta Education, 1995). The bilingual programs in Alberta include Arabic, American Sign Language (ASL), Chinese (Mandarin), German, Hebrew, Spanish and Ukrainian (Edmonton Public Schools, 2011).

In British Columbia, English or French are taught as a first language, and other languages might be taught as second languages (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011). The Government of British Columbia declares to promote heritage language learning for all students (Policy Document: Language Education Policy, 1997). Therefore, studying a second language is a requirement in grades 5 to 8 in British Columbia public schools, which usually continues until Grade 12. It is the responsibility of the school boards to choose which second language programs to offer (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011).

The available heritage language programs at public schools in British Columbia include Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, American Sign Language, Punjabi, Japanese, French, and German. However, the school boards may develop other second language curricula based on the needs of their communities (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011). Provincially approved second language curricula, excluding some Aboriginal languages, include Arabic (grades 5-12), Croatian (grades 5-12), Italian (grades 5-12), Korean (grades 5-12) and Russian (grades 5-12) (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011). Bilingual programs in British Columbia include

K-6 Russian/English program (School District No. 20 Kootenay-Columbia, n.d.) and Mandarin/English bilingual program in which the core curriculum is in English, with Mandarin taught through Mandarin Language Arts in grades 4 to 7 (Vancouver School Board, 2010).

Although the Mandarin/English program continues at a certain high school (Vancouver School Board, 2010), the course planning booklet of that high school explicitly states, ‘Mandarin courses are not intended to serve as “heritage language” courses. They are taught as a foreign language and students who already read and write Mandarin are not expected to enrol’ (Eric Hamber Secondary School Course Planning Booklet, 2010-2011).

With regard to the three territories in Canada, as of 2012, of the total population of Nunavut (33,697), the non-Inuit population was 5,477 and the Inuit population was 28,220 (Nunavut Bureau of Statistics and Statistics Canada, 2012). In the Northwest Territories, as of 2011, of the total population (43,485), almost half of the population was Aboriginal (Government of Northwest Territories, 2000). In Canada, Aboriginal refers to individuals “who reported identifying with at least one Aboriginal group, that is, North American Indian, Métis or Inuit” (Statistics Canada, 2010, para. 4). According to the most recent available census on population ethnicity in Yukon (Statistics Canada, 2006), of the total population (30,195), 7,810 individuals were Aboriginal. Perhaps due to a lower immigrant population, compared to the Aboriginal population in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories, and the endangered or struggling status of Aboriginal languages (McAlpine & Herodier, 1994), the language maintenance of Aboriginal children rather than immigrants is a priority for educational organizations in these territories. Therefore, bilingual programs include Aboriginal, rather than heritage, languages (see, for example, Nunavut Department of Education, 2009). No heritage language programs or courses are offered in Nunavut (Nunavut Approved Curriculum and

Teaching Resources, 2010), the Northwest Territories (Elementary and Junior Secondary School Handbook, 2006-2007) and Yukon (Yukon Education, 2011). The available heritage language programs in the Canadian provinces and territories are listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Heritage Language Programs in Canadian Provinces and Territories

Province	Bilingual Programs	Heritage Language Courses Offered
Newfoundland and Labrador	None	None (Department of Education Newfoundland and Labrador,. 2011)
Nova Scotia	None	Gaelic, German, Latin, and Spanish (Public school Programs, 2003-2004)
Prince Edward Island	None	None (Prince Edward Island Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011)
New Brunswick	None	None (New Brunswick Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011)
Quebec	None	Portuguese, Greek, Italian, and Spanish (Cummins, 1983)
Ontario	None	73 heritage languages (Ontario Ministry of Education Curriculum Documents, 2010)
Manitoba	Ukrainian/English, German/English, Hebrew/English (Canadian Education Association, 1991)	Ukrainian, Portuguese, Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, Filipino, German, Japanese, and Hebrew (Manitoba Education, 2011)
Saskatchewan	Ukrainian/English (Government of Saskatchewan Education, 2007; Cummins, 1983)	Ukrainian, Mandarin Chinese, German, and Russian (Government of Saskatchewan Education, 2007)
Alberta	Arabic, American Sign Language (ASL), Chinese (Mandarin), German, Hebrew, Spanish and Ukrainian (Edmonton Public Schools, 2011)	German, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, Punjabi and Latin (Government of Alberta Education, 1995)

British Columbia	Mandarin/English (Vancouver School Board, 2010); Russian/English (School District No. 20 Kootenay-Columbia, n.d.)	Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, American Sign Language, Punjabi, Japanese, German, Italian, Korean, Russian, and Arabic (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011)
Nunavut	None	None (Nunavut Approved Curriculum and Teaching Resources, 2010)
Northwest Territories	None	None (Elementary and Junior Secondary School Handbook, 2006-2007)
Yukon	None	None (Yukon Education, 2011)

Overall, heritage language learning opportunities in Canada vary from province to province. Bilingual programs at public schools exist only in western provinces in Canada, that is, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The instructional time allotted to heritage language instruction varies from program to program and province to province (The Common Curriculum Framework for Bilingual Programming in International Languages, 1999). While some bilingual programs spent 50% of instructional time in a heritage language (for example, Winnipeg School Division, n.d.), others deliver a heritage language only through Language Arts (for example, Vancouver School Board, 2010), rather than using it as a medium of instruction in other subject areas. Studying a heritage language through Language Arts might facilitate learning it. However, the limited exposure to it, through only one subject area, might be insufficient for developing communicative competence, which is an objective of these programs (Vancouver School Board, 2010; Kindergarten to Grade 6 Hebrew Language Arts, 2008; The Common Curriculum Framework for Bilingual Programming in International Languages, 1999). Therefore, other types of bilingual programs (transitional or dual track) could be designed to

expose students to a heritage language for a longer period of time (as in late transitional programs) or engage them in learning language and content at the same time (as in dual track programs), which has proven useful in meeting the needs of linguistic minority students (Genesee, 1993).

Various heritage language courses are offered in most provinces, most of which aim at developing communicative competence in a heritage language (for example, Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10, 1999). Although these programs expose students to heritage languages, instructional time for developing communicative competence in these languages might be insufficient because these languages are studied as a subject area in certain grades. In cases where additional learning opportunities are not provided outside the class, some students might not be able to use the heritage language communicatively.

British Columbia, after Ontario and Quebec, receives the third highest number of immigrants (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010). This leads to a highly diverse school population in this province (Diversity in B.C. Schools A Framework, 2008). The British Columbia school system might be making progress in addressing diversity by attempting “to create and maintain conditions that foster success for all students and that promote fair and equitable treatment for all” (Diversity in BC Schools A Framework, 2008, p. 4). However, with regard to heritage language learning, more measures might be required. The available heritage language courses and programs in British Columbia schools do not tend to represent the high ethno-linguistic diversity in this province. Although school boards have been authorized to decide on heritage language courses (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011), some heritage languages, such as Farsi, are not offered even in areas predominantly populated by certain ethno-linguistic communities, such as Iranian communities in North Vancouver and

Coquitlam. Therefore, a wider range of learning opportunities, including more bilingual programs and heritage language courses, should be designed and implemented to facilitate heritage language learning for a wider range of linguistic minority students.

Initiating heritage language programs at public schools also depends on the political and economic power of ethno-linguistic minority groups in society. For example, the Korean community in Vancouver financially supported a Korean heritage language program at public schools “because of the perceived importance of maintaining Korean language proficiency in the next generation” (Duff, 2008, p. 84). On the contrary, immigrant communities with relatively less political or economic power might not have the resources to initiate heritage language programs in public schools. For instance, Taiwanese-Chinese and Punjabi communities in Vancouver advocated for their heritage languages to be given priority in public schools. Soon after the release of the new language policy, many provincial government ministers were elected from the Punjabi community in the provincial election in British Columbia. Therefore, Punjabi was selected to be the first language with a new curriculum and instructional materials (Duff, 2008).

Although the province where this study was undertaken hosts one of the largest Iranian communities in Canada, no Farsi courses are taught at public schools. An Iranian immigrant teacher (personal communication, 28 July, 2013) informed me that he had asked a school district in the province to offer Farsi as an International Language courses at public schools ten years earlier. This, however, was not realized because of the lower than required number of students seeking Farsi education at public schools. According to the teacher, at least fifteen students within a single district need to seek heritage or international language education at public schools so that the school district will consider offering such courses. With a considerable growth in the

Iranian immigration population in that municipality ten years later, the school district agreed to provide educational spaces (three classrooms in a public school) for Farsi classes. According to the 2006 Census, 4,465 Farsi speakers (7.6%) reside in that municipality (Profile of Diversity in BC Communities, 2006). The teacher developed a Farsi curriculum based on the province's curriculum development guidelines, and organized a committee to develop materials for Farsi textbooks. According to him (personal communication, 20 September, 2013), Farsi classes have started on Wednesdays after the school hours and on Saturdays since September 2013, and will continue for two or three years to demonstrate to the school district the community's desire for Farsi education at public schools. The school district has agreed to provide Farsi courses as credit courses after this probationary period if the program is sustained.

The Mandarin/English bilingual program in British Columbia continues in a certain high school (Vancouver School Boards, 2010). However, "students who already read and write Mandarin are not expected to enrol" in Mandarin courses offered in that high school (Eric Hamber Secondary School Course Planning Booklet, 2010-2011, p. 41). Linguistic minority students who already read and write in their heritage languages, in this case, Mandarin, might seek heritage language education at higher levels at school to improve their heritage language proficiency. Moreover, they could bring their linguistic and cultural capital to heritage language classes and build on their previous background knowledge in their heritage languages. This could facilitate both maintaining heritage languages and learning English because the first and second language competences tend to reinforce each other (Cummins, 2001). Attending a heritage language class can also facilitate ethnic identity construction for linguistic minority students because they would realize that their heritage languages and cultures are affirmed by the school. Therefore, minority students with varying degrees of heritage language proficiency need to have

access to heritage language maintenance opportunities at school. Those who have already mastered reading and writing skills in their heritage language could study their heritage languages at a more advanced level.

Finally, in a broader context, priorities of a society are usually determined by a dominant group; therefore, education reflects power relations in the wider environment (Cummins, 2001). Dominant groups in Canada include English-speaking individuals in all provinces except Quebec. Cummins (2001) distinguishes between coercive and collaborative relations of power. Accordingly, coercive power relations are exercised by the dominant group, disadvantaging dominated ones, such as non-English speaking individuals in all provinces except Quebec in Canada. Collaborative power relations, on the other hand, refer to generating power “through interaction with others” (p. 44). Cummins (2001) states that these types of power relations impact educational structures such as policies and programs, curricula, and evaluation.

Discrimination and coercive power relationships in the wider society include a lack of recognizing minority groups’ unique ethno-linguistic backgrounds and the unequal distribution of opportunities, such as employment possibilities, based on linguistic differences among people. This is manifested in the school context through the lack of heritage language learning opportunities, which disadvantages many linguistic minority students academically. In other words, policies and practices in heritage language programming in Canada tend to reflect underlying unequal power relations between dominant and dominated groups in a broader context, which, according to Cummins (2003a), matter most in linguistic minority students’ education. To overcome academic barriers, coercive power relationships in the wider society should be challenged by the school (Cummins, 2001). This can be achieved through

acknowledging linguistic minority students' diverse linguistic backgrounds and including their heritage languages in the curricula.

Community-based heritage language schools. Linguistic minority students may learn their heritage languages in community-based heritage language schools. These schools are mainly organized by local community members, and most administrators and teachers are immigrant parents (You, in Chen, 2010, p. 13). Tuition, and at times, private donations, tend to be the major source of funding for many of these schools. Classes might be held in various locations, such as post-secondary institutions, K-12 public schools, and churches, after school or on the weekend. Generally, students attending these classes have a variety of linguistic skills in their heritage language. Some of them are fluent in it while others might know their heritage language a little. The instructional materials used in many heritage language schools might be published in the home country (Liu, Musica, Koscak, Vinogradova & Lopez, 2011).

Many heritage language schools exist in Canadian provinces, where linguistic minority children can learn their heritage languages. Examples include Farsi heritage language schools in the Greater Vancouver Area, British Columbia, and Winnipeg, Manitoba; and Korean and Chinese language schools in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Heritage Language Programming in Europe

Issues of linguistic diversity are not limited to Canada. In regions such as Europe, Asia, Africa, and Central and South America, these issues are also important. In this section, heritage language programming in Europe is investigated because of the considerable number of studies

conducted in this context, which tend to lay the foundation “for theoretical analysis” (Cummins, 1998, p. 441).

Twenty three official languages are spoken in the twenty seven member states in the EU (Kraus, 2008). However, politically and socio-economically motivated immigrations (Extra & Yagmur, 2002) have increased the linguistic diversity within this context. Today, more than 125 languages are spoken in the EU (Siguan, 1995). For example, in France, Algerian Arabic is spoken by over 600,000 individuals, Tunisian Arabic by over 200,000 individuals, and Kabyle, a language of the Algerian Berber family, by over 500,000 speakers (Marti, Ortega, Barrena, Idiazabal, Juaristi, Uranga & Amorrortu, 2005).

Immigration has increased the linguistic diversity in the EU school population as well. By the early 1990s, around ten percent of the school population in the EU were comprised of linguistic minority students (Reid & Reich, 1992). Over 350 languages were counted as important amongst the school students in London, and 150 languages, apart from German, were reported as spoken by the children in Hamburg schools (Buchel, Bühler-Otten, Fürstenau & Gogolin, 2001). In Sweden, about 20% of students speak a language other than Swedish (Directorate for Education, Education and Training Policy Division, 2010). Between 40 and 95 percent of the school population and 75 percent of the pre-school population in Botkyrka, Sweden, were of non-Swedish descent (Runfors & Sjogren, 1994).

In Europe, the policy context for linguistic minority education is based on “the European Community’s 1977 Directive to Member States of the education of children of migrant parents” (Cummins, 1998, p. 441). This directive placed emphasis on the right of linguistic minority children to learn the language of the country they reside in, as well as their heritage languages and culture (Council Conclusions on the Education of Children with a Migrant Background,

2009). Linguistic minority children in Europe might learn their heritage languages in heritage language classes or bilingual or trilingual programs at public schools (for example, Extra and Yagmur, 2002; Reid & Reich, 1992).

Extra and Yagmur (2002) claimed that the European Community's Directive "was very limited in its ambitions regarding minority language teaching and has meanwhile become completely outdated" (p. 44). Based on this Directive, a number of projects were launched; however, the assessment of the majority of them revealed that heritage language learning was marginalized, and changes in educational conditions were not a concern (Reid & Reich, 1992). This implies that heritage language maintenance was not among priorities of many educational organizations in Europe.

In spite of the availability of some heritage language classes and bilingual or trilingual programs in the EU (for example, Extra and Yagmur, 2002; Reid & Reich, 1992), mother tongue medium instruction has been opposed in contexts including, but not limited to, Sweden and France, for educational or political reasons (Helot & Young, 2002; Runfors & Sjogren, 1994).

In Sweden, the education of immigrant students has been based on the principles of freedom of choice, partnership, and equality since 1974 (Runfors & Sjogren, 1994). Freedom of choice highlights the right of immigrant families to choose to maintain their heritage languages and cultures. If so, policy allows heritage languages to be taught at school weekly (Runfors & Sjogren, 1994), depending on the availability of funding and teacher, and the number of students (five for most heritage language classes) (Kaplan & Baldouf, 2005). Some immigrant students perform well at Swedish school; however, students residing in predominantly immigrant areas tend to perform poorly. Some teachers and authorities consider ethno-linguistic diversity a barrier to succeeding in the dominant society and try to discourage the teaching of heritage

languages at school. As a result, more emphasis has been placed on the principle of equality, and learning (Standard) Swedish, rather than maintaining heritage languages (Runfors & Sjogren, 1994), and heritage language programs have tended to decline (Kaplan & Baldouf, 2005). Moreover, the majority of the EU members are reluctant to admit multiculturalism (Yagmur, n.d.), and tend to value only European languages, not immigrants' heritage languages (Helot & Young, 2002).

For example, the use of a single language, that is, Standard French, is believed to represent unity in France. Therefore, immigrants are forced to assimilate into the mainstream society and heritage languages tend to be viewed “as the main obstacle to the acquisition of the French language and as a source of learning difficulties” (Helot & Young, 2002, p. 97).

In general, the “ambivalent” orientation of some EU member states towards heritage language maintenance has resulted in some “isolated and often short-lived initiatives” that tend to have little influence on “the educational system as a whole” (Cummins, 1998, p. 444). Although heritage language programs in a variety of languages are available in the EU, dominant assimilationist ideologies in most of the member states (Yagmur, n.d.) and a potential devaluation of heritage languages (Helot & Young, 2002) might discourage language maintenance in linguistic minority children. Learning heritage languages, on the other hand, might be politically or economically motivated.

Heritage Language Programming in Australia

Heritage language programming in Australia is investigated in this section because similar to Canada and Europe, Australia is ethno-linguistically diverse. In this section, “languages other than English” and “heritage languages” are used interchangeably.

In addition to the Indigenous population, that is, first inhabitants in Australia before the arrival of Europeans, Australia has hosted various groups of immigrants. Each year, Australia receives over 120,000 immigrants and about 13,000 people for humanitarian reasons (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008) which has turned it into “one of the most diverse countries in the world” (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010, para. 1). In Australia, in addition to English as the national language, around 22 million people speak approximately 400 languages, “identifying with more than 270 ancestries and observing a variety of cultural and religious traditions” (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010, para. 1). More than 200 languages in Australia are languages other than English. According to the 2006 Census of Population and Housing, 3.1 million people (16% of the population) spoke a language other than English at home, which had increased since 2001. Moreover, 28% of the population who spoke a language other than English at home were Australian born. These data excluded Indigenous languages (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010). The school population in Australia is also highly diverse. 23.1% of female students and 20.4% of male students speak English and another language (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011).

Australia claims that it values ethno-linguistic diversity. That is why languages other than English are taught in the majority of elementary and high schools “and universities, as well as in community ethnic schools” (that is, community-based heritage language schools) (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008, para. 7). Over 14% of all students in Grade 12, that is, the last year of high school, study foreign languages, that is, languages other than English. The most common languages studied at this level include Japanese, Chinese, French, Italian, German, Indonesian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic and Latin (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008). Overall, 150 languages other than

English are taught at schools, “including 69 languages taught outside of school (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008, para. 21).

In addition to language courses and community language schools, a number of bilingual programs exist in Australia, which have received more attention in the past few years (de Courcy, 2005). Bilingual programs in Australia include Chinese, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, French and German (Jonhson & Swan, 1997), and Khmer (Barratt-Pugh & Rohl, 2001).

Although the Australian Government expresses explicitly that it values diversity by offering a variety of language courses at schools and universities (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008), some of these languages are taught in few schools, and have small enrolments. Moreover, “[l]anguages other than English remain an unpopular option at senior secondary school level with no more than 10–20% of students taking them as university entrance subjects” (Smolicz, Nical & Secombe, 2000, p. 246).

. The Australian Government appears to consider bilingualism as a resource to serve the country, rather than linguistic minority groups. Such an orientation might be evident in this government statement: “Young Australians with skills in languages other than English and an understanding of international cultures are vital to the nation’s future in a global community” (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008, para. 17). Moreover, the primary goal of a new language program at schools was “to increase the number of secondary school students learning these languages [that is, Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, and Mandarin], and provide the best opportunity for school students to become proficient at learning and understanding the languages and cultures of *Australia’s main trading partners*” (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2008, para. 23, italics added). While

learning the languages of the country's partners is the primary goal of this program, no reference is made to supporting linguistic minority speakers who live in Australia.

This orientation towards learning languages other than English tends to exist towards bilingual programs, as well. Many federal and state policies highlight the importance of these programs in developing a communicative proficiency in languages other than English. However, the needs of children in maintaining their heritage languages appears to be less emphasized (de Courcy, 2005).

Therefore, in spite of the availability of courses and programs in languages other than English, learning a language other than English tends to be seen as a societal asset, serving Australia in the globalized world, rather than an opportunity for linguistic minority groups to maintain their heritage languages and cultures.

Statement of the Problem

Language maintenance is significant to linguistic minorities from personal (Babae, 2010b), familial (Wong Fillmore, 2000; Kouritzin, 1999), and human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002a) perspectives. It can also serve host societies for socio-economic and political reasons (Brecht & Rivers, 2000).

From a personal perspective, language and identity seem to be interrelated (see, for example, Li, 1995). According to Fishman (1977, as cited in Chow, 2001, p. 4),

Language is the recorder of paternity, the expressor of matrimony and the carrier of phenomenology. Any vehicle carrying such precious freight, indeed, as precious in and of itself...Anything can become symbolic of ethnicity, but since language is the prime symbol system to begin with and since it is commonly

relied upon so heavily (even if not exclusively) to enact, celebrate and ‘call forth’ all ethnic activity, the likelihood that it will be recognized and singled out as symbolic of ethnicity is great indeed. (p. 25)

Heritage language and ethnic identity, therefore, tend to be interwoven. In her study on Aboriginal language and culture maintenance, Babaee (2010b) discovered that if an individual loses his or her heritage language, it could be as if part of his or her identity is lost. Moreover, some individuals who had lost their heritage languages reported feeling shameful and guilty because of it (Kouritzin, 2006; Kouritzin, 1999). Finally, in an attempt to examine the role of cultural identity and heritage language maintenance, Lee (2002) administered a questionnaire to 40 second-generation Korean-American university students in the United States. He found that although most participants achieved some level of their heritage language proficiency, they believed that it was insufficient. The respondents also maintained that because the importance of language maintenance was not socially recognized, they were not motivated enough to maintain their heritage language. However, the participants tended to have formed a unique bicultural identity including the characteristics of both American and Korean cultures. Finally, a regression analysis revealed that heritage language proficiency was correlated with the strength of bicultural identification (Lee, 2002).

From a familial perspective, research shows that some children who had lost their heritage languages faced challenges in communicating with their parents and community members who could not speak the dominant language (Wong Fillmore, 2000; Kouritzin, 1999). Moreover, in some instances, the family structure changes as children and parents talk less and less (Rodriguez, 1982), and a greater generation gap might be created (Wong Fillmore, 2000).

Revisiting his childhood, Rodriguez (1982) recalled how his own parents reacted after they were encouraged to stop speaking in their heritage language, Spanish, at home. He stated,

My mother and father, for their part, responded differently as their children spoke to them less. She grew restless, seemed anxious at the scarcity of words exchanged in the house. It was she who would question me when I came home from school. She smiled at the small talk. She pried at the edges of my sentences to get me to say something more. (What?) She'd join conversations she overheard, but her intrusions often stopped her children's talking. By contrast, my father seemed reconciled to the new quiet. Though his English improved somewhat, he retired into silence. At dinner he spoke very little. (p. 24)

From a human rights' perspective, Monolingual (dominant language medium) education can lead to linguicide because the dominant language often morphs into a killer language, which is consistent with the UN definition of linguistic genocide (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002a). Linguicide, or linguistic genocide, refers to “[t]he deliberate elimination of a language, without killing its speakers” (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty, 2008, p. 6). According to Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty (2008), linguicide can occur by “forcibly transferring children of [a minority] group to another group”(United Nations International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948, E 793, Articles 2e); or “prohibiting the use of the [mother tongue] in daily intercourse, or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group (from the 1948 Final Draft of the above, not part of the Convention)” (p. 8). Skutnabb-Kangas (2002a) states, “[P]rohibition can be direct or indirect” (p. 182). The use of minority languages is indirectly prohibited in daily intercourse in schools if no minority teachers exist in the preschools or schools and the minority languages are not used as

the main media of instruction. In such cases, “[I]t is a question of linguistic genocide” (p. 182). Heritage language maintenance can prevent from linguiscide through, for example, using heritage languages as a medium of instruction and providing heritage language courses to linguistic minority students.

Finally, using languages other than English, or heritage languages, benefits a country for socio-economic and political reasons (Brecht & Rivers, 2000). For example, western countries such as Canada and the United States follow closely political circumstances in the Middle-East and they also have diplomatic and socioeconomic relations with many Middle-Eastern countries. Knowing “strategically important language[s]” (Ricento, 2005, p. 349) such as Farsi and Arabic can facilitate socioeconomic and political relations among these countries.

In sum, heritage languages should be maintained to prevent individuals from potential personal (Babae, 2010b) and familial (Wong Fillmore, 2000; Kouritzin, 1999) challenges, prevent from linguiscide (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002a), and facilitate socio-economic and political (Brecht & Rivers, 2000) relations among countries. Although many studies have been conducted on language maintenance and loss (see, for example, Babae, 2011; Babae, 2010a; Babae, 2010b; Chen, 2010; Guardado, 2006; Kouritzin, 2006; Kouritzin, 1999), few seem to focus on students’, parents’, and teachers’ perspectives at the same time. Moreover, research in this area has tended to focus on individual contexts such as home (See for example, Guardado, 2006) and school/university (Babae, 2010a; Babae, 2010b), rather than closely examining each setting and then comparing and contrasting them with each other. Finally, a general search revealed that no specific research has been conducted on the language maintenance and loss of Iranian immigrants although Iranian communities exist in many countries such as Canada. This study attempted to bridge these gaps in the literature by including Iranian students’, parents’, and

teachers' perspectives on language maintenance and examining this issue within the contexts of home, school, and L1, that is, first language, community.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Overall, the purpose of this study was to explore the language maintenance of Iranian children in a private heritage language institute in a major Canadian city. The name of the city and the community school where the research was conducted will not be revealed to maintain anonymity since the Farsi-speaking community is not very large. Particularly, the study sought the students', parents', and heritage language teachers' perspectives on the importance of language maintenance. Additionally, it examined the students' successes and challenges in maintaining their heritage language at home, school, and in the first language community. Finally, this study attempted to discover available resources for the students to help them maintain Farsi within these contexts. The research questions that guided this study are as follows:

1. How do Farsi-speaking students, parents, and heritage language teachers perceive heritage language maintenance?
2. What successes and challenges do students meet in maintaining Farsi as a heritage language within the contexts of home, school and first language community?
3. What successes and challenges do parents meet in facilitating heritage language maintenance opportunities for their children?
4. What successes and challenges do heritage language teachers meet in teaching Farsi as a heritage language to students at a community school?

The Significance of the Study

In this study, I explored language maintenance among selected members of the Iranian community at home, school, and in the L1 community in a major Canadian city. This study is significant for several reasons. First, the findings of this study have important implications for the education of newcomer children who have languages other than English. The results of the research will be disseminated in ways that are meaningful to children, such as illustrated story books which will be distributed among all heritage language students. Success stories of language maintenance might motivate other students who are interested in maintaining their heritage language, and provide them with useful language maintenance strategies. Second, because this study highlights the role of the L1 community as an important factor in language maintenance, the findings have suggestions for community members to further facilitate heritage language learning for children. Third, although this study was conducted at a community-based heritage language school, it also has implications for parents, policy makers and mainstream educators. Recommendations stemming from the study offer each of these parties suggestions to facilitate heritage language learning for children. Finally, as mentioned earlier, language maintenance research tends to focus on children's, parents', and heritage language teachers' perspectives separately, and investigates this issue in separate contexts such as home, school, or the L1 community. Findings of this study might strengthen the case for language maintenance and provide a deeper understanding of language maintenance from children's, parents' and teachers' perspectives across home, school, and L1 community contexts. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing literature on language maintenance by addressing these gaps.

Conclusion

This chapter provided background information on language maintenance and presented a description of heritage language programming in Canada, Europe, and Australia. It also highlighted the significance of language maintenance research from various viewpoints and outlined the direction of this study. To further understand language maintenance and heritage language programming inside and outside Canada, Chapter Two will provide a review of literature in these areas and compares and contrasts heritage language programming in Canada, Australia and Europe.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

This chapter presents the historical and contemporary contexts upon which this study is based. This study explored students', parents', and heritage language teachers' perspectives on the importance of language maintenance in an Iranian community in a major Canadian city. It also delved into the successes and challenges of the students in learning their heritage language, that is, Farsi, at home, school, and in the L1 community. Additionally, this study investigated the available heritage language resources within these contexts. Finally, it examined the efforts that the parents and heritage language teachers make to facilitate Farsi learning opportunities for children. This chapter will present (a) factors that can contribute to language maintenance and loss, (b) research on heritage language programming in Canada, and (c) research on heritage language programming in Europe and Australia because of the considerable number of relevant studies performed in Europe (Cummins, 1998) and similarities between Canada and Australia in terms of ethno-linguistic diversity and immigration trends. Moreover, comparing and contrasting heritage language programming in Canada, Australia, and Europe sheds light on minority education in general. A discussion of these major issues lays the foundation for a better understanding of language maintenance from the students', parents', and teachers' perspectives within home, school, and the L1 community in Canada.

Important Factors in Language Maintenance and Loss

Important factors in language maintenance and loss include family (Guardado, 2010; Yu-Tung Carol, 2009; Cooper, 2007; Torres, 2006; Garcia, 2003; Guardado, 2002), L1 community (Kopke, 2004b), peers (Harris, 2009; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999), school (see, for example,

Kouritzin, 2006; Cummins, 2005; Garcia, 2003), identity (Norton, 2000) and language ideology (Mogaddam, 2005). Each of these factors will be elaborated on below.

Family. The role of family in language maintenance and loss has been investigated in many studies in Canada, the United States, Europe and Australia (see, for instance, Babaee, 2013; Park & Sarkar, 2007; Gibbons & Ramirez, 2004; Guardado, 2002; Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard & Freire, 2001; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999). They all highlight the potential influence of family on children's language maintenance and loss, which will be examined in more detail below.

Parents' educational (Babaee, 2013; Guardado, 2002; Wong-Fillmore, 1991) and socio-economic status (Babaee, 2013; Guardado, 2002) can influence their children's language maintenance. In an attempt to investigate factors important in language maintenance, Babaee (2013) conducted a qualitative, single-case study with an Iranian-Canadian man who had spent his pre-school and elementary school years in England. The participant came from a middle-class family in which both parents were educated and had teaching careers back home. Results revealed that one of the most important reasons why he maintained his heritage language, that is, Farsi, was that his parents, especially his mother, taught him Farsi at home. In addition, his parents' financial status afforded annual visits to Iran, which provided the participant with the opportunity to socialize with his relatives and use Farsi back home.

Parents' language choice at home can also influence children's language maintenance and loss (Babaee, 2013; Guardado, 2002; Hakuta & D'Andrea, 1992). In the above-mentioned research on the language maintenance of an Iranian individual in England, Babaee (2013) discovered that one of the greatest contributing factors to language maintenance in his case was

his parents' choice of speaking Farsi at home. His parents had chosen to speak to each other and their children in Farsi all the time as a way of maximizing their children's exposure to Farsi and motivating them to use it.

In a relevant, larger scale study with Spanish participants in Vancouver, Guardado (2002) conducted semi-structured interviews with four parents. Two of them had children bilingual in Spanish and English while the other two had children monolingual only in English. Data analysis revealed that the participants "firmly placed most of the responsibility on the parents" (p. 359) in the children's language maintenance or loss. In the families where the children maintained their heritage language, the parents used a variety of ways to encourage them to speak Spanish. A parent, for instance, said to his child, "I know that you're an English speaker, but I like to speak Spanish. Let's speak Spanish at home at least" (p. 353). On the other hand, in the families where the children had lost Spanish, the parents tended to be more authoritative by, for example, "demanding" or "forcing" their children to speak Spanish (p. 353). The researcher concluded that "the nature and tone of discourse" (p. 359) used to encourage children to use their heritage language might facilitate or impede language maintenance.

Drawing on her linguistic minority students' autobiographies, Hinton (1999) explored their language shift towards English in the States. Many students in her research highlighted their parents' role in their language maintenance or loss. In families where English was spoken at home, the children tended to lose their heritage language while in families where parents spoke little or no English, the children maintained their heritage language. One student in her study recalled, "Chinese was still the dominant language in our household; English was a forbidden taboo. My parents had wanted to ensure the fact that I would never forget my language and culture" (para. 16).

Hinton's (1999) study seems to contradict Guardado's (2002) with regard to the impact of authoritarian parents on language maintenance. Children who had lost their heritage language in Guardado's (2002) study tended to be raised by authoritarian parents who demanded that they speak their heritage language. On the contrary, a participant in Hinton's (1999) study reported that in her or his household, English, that is, the additional language, was forbidden. Hinton did not provide more details on this participant's language maintenance experience. However, it might be argued that in Guardado's (2002) study, language loss in children was a reaction to their parents' authoritative behaviour. As previously mentioned, these parents reported demanding that their children speak Spanish. However, in Hinton's (1999) study, the authoritative parents might have used a variety of incentives to encourage their children to use Chinese at home. The tone and nature of discourse they used to motivate their children to use the heritage language could also be another contributing factor to language maintenance, as concluded by Guardado (2002). Given that the participants in Hinton's and Guardado's studies came from different ethnic backgrounds, families' culture might have influenced the children's heritage language maintenance. For example, in a culture where devotion to parents are highly valued and recommended, such as the Chinese culture (Chiu, 2011), children may obey the heritage language policy set by parents at home to show respect to them. This might have been a reason for the heritage language maintenance of the Chinese participants in Joen's research.

Sohrabi (1997) conducted a study on heritage language maintenance and loss in an Iranian immigrant community in Sweden. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire and subsequent non-structured interviews with forty Iranian immigrant students in Grade 9. Results indicated that the majority of the participants spoke their mother tongues (Farsi and minority languages in Iran) with their parents. The students born in Sweden or having migrated

there below the age of six, however, had a tendency to mix Swedish and Farsi or switch to Swedish when they were in a hurry or excited to say something, compared to those who had immigrated to Sweden after age ten. The researcher related the use of Farsi to parents' choice and insistence and their potential lack of Swedish. However, no firsthand data from parents on their language preference and use were available in this study.

Hakuta and D'Andrea (1992) investigated language attitudes and experiences of more than 300 Mexican-American high school students in the United States by utilizing a questionnaire and various assessments to measure language proficiency. They found that these students tended to shift to English rapidly, and that the family's choice to speak English had the greatest impact on the children's language shift.

Parents' language choice seems to depend on their attitudes towards their heritage language (Park & Sarkar, 2007) and bilingualism (Hinton, 1999). Examining Korean immigrant parents' attitude towards language maintenance in a Canadian city, Park and Sarkar (2007) used interviews and a questionnaire, and found that the participants were positive towards their children's language maintenance. The parents also believed that their children's heritage language proficiency would positively influence their identity as Korean, enable them to communicate with their grandparents more effectively, and lead to better economic opportunities.

Additionally, parents who have a positive attitude towards bilingualism tend to raise bilingual children (Hinton, 1999). In a study on language loss and maintenance, a student who had maintained her or his heritage language mentioned that at home, she or he would talk to her or his mother in Punjabi and to his or her father in English (Hinton, 1999). In other words, these parents were using the "one parent-one language" principle to promote bilingualism in their

child. According to this principle, each parent chooses to speak to the child in a different language so that he or she will be exposed to both languages, and eventually develop bilingualism (Dopke, 1992).

The influence of parents in children's language maintenance has been investigated in many studies on language maintenance, including those reviewed above. Extensive studies examined the role of Spanish-speaking (Guardado, 2002; Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2001; Hakuta & D'Andrea, 1992), Chinese (Hinton, 1999), and Korean (Park & Sarkar, 2007) parents in their children's language maintenance, to name a few. However, in a general search, no language maintenance research has thus far sought the perspectives of Iranian parents on language maintenance and the potential effort they make to facilitate Farsi learning opportunities for their children in Canada. Previous studies provide avenues for an understanding of heritage language maintenance. However, considering the fact that after the United States (1,400,000) and the United Arab Emirates (some 800,000), Canada and the United Kingdom host the third largest Iranian immigrant population (some 410,000 each) (Iran's Deputy Head of Organization for Civil Registration, cited in TREND, 2012), further research on language maintenance with Iranian parents in Canada is required. Furthermore, previous studies with parents on heritage language maintenance tend to lack educational and policy implications. The current study made an attempt to bridge these gaps in the literature by investigating Iranian immigrant parents' perspectives on language maintenance and the attempt they make to help their children maintain Farsi in Canada, and by offering educational and policy implications to facilitate heritage language maintenance for immigrant children.

The L1 community. The role of the L1 community in language maintenance and loss has been investigated in several studies (see, for example, Babaei, 2013; Guardado, 2010; King, 2000; Kravin, 1992). Some researchers tend to agree that the L1 community can facilitate language maintenance (King, 2000; Kravin, 1992), stressing that it can play a more important role, compared to, for example, family in language maintenance (Kravin, 1992). In a study with two Indigenous communities in the Ecuadorian Andes, King (2000) discovered that the community which included more educated and politically active members had more positive attitudes towards the heritage language, and was more successful at revitalizing it. On the other hand, the community which consisted of less educated and politically uninvolved members tended to take their heritage language for granted, and did not support efforts to revitalize their endangered language. Therefore, the socioeconomic and educational status, political involvement, and language ideology, or attitude, of community members can impact language maintenance and loss of their children and language revitalizations efforts to save threatened languages.

In a mixed-method study, Gogonas (2007) investigated the language maintenance of second-generation Egyptian and Albanian children in Greece, and found that the Egyptian students “fare[d] better” than the Albanian ones (para. 2). One reason, according to Gogonas, was the higher social status of the Egyptian community in Greece, “compared to the Albanians who have been suffering stigmatisation” (para. 2). In other words, the social status of the L1 community and discrimination based on perceived hierarchy can contribute to language maintenance or loss.

On the other hand, other researchers placed more emphasis on factors such as family, claiming that in some circumstances, the L1 community can have less of an influence on

language maintenance (Babae, 2013; Guardado, 2010). In an attempt to investigate language maintenance and loss in Spanish children from the parents' perspectives, Guardado (2010) drew on the data from one of his earlier studies cited above (Guardado, 2002). All of the participants agreed that a small L1 community was an important obstacle for language maintenance.

However, they admitted "that the availability of Latin American friends does not guarantee Spanish practice, as children tend to prefer English use among themselves" (Guardado, 2010; p. 67). Carmen, a parent whose daughter, Fay, maintained Spanish, attributed her language maintenance to "frequent visits to places associated with the Latin American culture (i.e., Montreal, where Carmen's brother lived with his family; Miami, where they had other relatives)" (p. 60). In addition, Carmen sang children's songs, told stories and read books to her daughter in Spanish. Therefore, in spite of the lack of a large Spanish community in Vancouver, Fay maintained Spanish through communication with her mother, frequent contact with family members, listening to stories, and singing children's songs.

Guardado's (2010) study is reinforced by Babae's (2013) with respect to the role of the L1 community in language maintenance. Interviewing an Iranian adult who had maintained his heritage language, Babae found that the participant and his family had socialized with some Iranian families, and had participated in cultural events such as Nowrouz- the Iranian New Year- during their stay in England. However, the Iranian community in that city had a minor role in facilitating language maintenance for the participant. The reasons were the small size of the community and the frequent use of English by the children.

Finally, in a study in British Columbia, Iqbal (2005) sought to examine language loss among eight francophone mothers, the potential influence of motherhood on their attitude towards their heritage language, French, and their attempts to regain it. The interview results

revealed that the participants, who had partially lost French, tried to improve it so that they could pass it on to their children. However, they faced challenges because of “the minority language status of French in British Columbia, the demands placed on mothers, and the lack of existing educational opportunities specifically geared toward this adult population” (p. 307). Particularly, the “lack of resources in the community” was frequently mentioned as an important obstacle in their language maintenance. Many of the participants stated that the available services in the wider community such as “French story time at one public library ... did not provide a strong support base due to infrequent programs, unsuitable times, and inconvenient locations” (p. 317).

The potential influence of the L1 community in language maintenance and loss seems to be controversial. In some studies, its role in language maintenance was highlighted (Gogonas, 2007; Kravin, 1992) while in others, the L1 community tended to play a minor role (Babae, 2013; Guardado, 2010). All in all, the mere existence of an L1 community can be insufficient for language maintenance (Guardado, 2010). The language attitude (King, 2000) and social status (Gogonas, 2007) of community members, the availability of resources such as books and movies in the heritage language, cultural activities, and heritage language use opportunities within the L1 community (Babae, 2013) also facilitate language maintenance.

Peers. Research shows that peers have a potentially great influence on each other (Harris, 2009). Harris (2009) explains that children tend to identify with their peers, that is, their playmates and classmates, and modify their behaviour so that they fit into their peer group. This, Harris continued, helps to shape the children’s character. With regard to language maintenance and loss, some researchers have argued that children can lose their heritage language because many of their peers, including classmates, speak in another language. Children, therefore, tend to

speak their heritage language less often to fit into their peer group (Kouritzin, 1999). Sometimes, when linguistic minority children speak their heritage language at school, their heritage language or accent might be ridiculed, or they might be “made to feel different” (Hinton, 1999; para. 18). These all could lead some children to abandon their heritage languages and replace them with the dominant one(s).

Although peer pressure tends to bring about language loss in many cases (see, for example, Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999), in some, perhaps less frequent, cases, it can lead to language maintenance (Babaei, 2013). In her single-case study on the language maintenance of an Iranian individual in England, Babaei (2013) discovered that one factor which had led to language maintenance in his case was peers. The participant was an adult who offered his perspectives on his childhood experiences of language maintenance. As a child, he, similar to many linguistic minority children mentioned in larger studies (Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999), had faced racism and discrimination at school, and had been ridiculed by his schoolmates because of his different looks. However, instead of giving up on his heritage language (Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999), he decided to develop it so that he could maintain ties with his own family members. In other words, rejected by his peers because of the “differences” in language and culture, the participant sought the acceptance of those similar to him in terms of language and culture through maintaining his heritage language.

Peers, in short, tend to influence individuals’ behaviours and characters (Harris, 2009). The desire to be accepted by classmates and playmates can inspire linguistic minority children to use their heritage language less, and gradually replace it with the dominant language (Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999). However, sometimes, rejection by peers can motivate these children to

turn to their own families and seek acceptance through a common heritage language and culture (Babaei, 2013).

Schools. Another factor that can impact language maintenance and loss pertains to the educational context where linguistic minority children study (see, for example, Cummins, 2005). One way schools can contribute to language maintenance and loss is through their language policy (Cooper, 2007; Torres, 2006). For example, in the Canadian provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, bilingual programming is available for some languages, potentially affording children the opportunity to study in both their heritage language and English (Cummins, 1998). Examples are the English-Ukrainian bilingual program in Alberta and Manitoba (Cummins, 1983). Studying in their heritage languages can facilitate language maintenance for these students. In Ontario and Quebec, however, heritage languages can be studied only as subjects outside regular school hours (Cummins, 1998). In other words, bilingual education is outlawed in these provinces. Therefore, linguistic minority students have less chance of studying their heritage languages at public schools .

In schools where a strict language policy exists, using a minority language might be discouraged or even prohibited (MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000). Some individuals who had lost their heritage languages recalled how their school experiences led to heritage language loss (MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999). For instance, the majority of the participants in a study conducted in the United States stated that they lost their heritage language, that is, Spanish, because they had been strictly forbidden to use it at school. These participants also mentioned that later on, they taught their own children only English, the dominant language, because they felt it was what their children required to succeed (MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000).

In a study on language loss conducted in Canada (Kouritzin, 2006), a French-Canadian participant recalled how her low English proficiency in writing and French-accented English was not tolerated at school. The researcher highlighted the influence of school in the language loss of the participants as it did not recognize languages other than English. As a result, the participants had to hide their ethnic identities at school and shift to English, a decision they regretted later on because “familial connections, ... roots [and] ancestry” became more important to them as they grew older” (p. 20).

In Canada, one way to promote multilingualism in linguistic minority children is placing them in French immersion programs, provided heritage language maintenance strategies are also in place. Immigrant parents in Dagenais and Day’s (1999) study mentioned that they had opted for French immersion education for their children because of the important role of French-English bilingualism in their children’s national integration and access to powerful official language communities. Additionally, the parents connected international markets to their language communities in Canada and abroad, attributing symbolic and economic values to their children’s language repertoires. In another study (Dagenais & Berron, 2001), immigrant parents reported valuing English and French as Canada’s official languages and important languages in the world. They facilitated multilingual development for their children by placing them in French immersion programs and employing various heritage language maintenance strategies (Dagenais & Berron, 2001).

Interviews with immigrant parents of students in a French immersion program in Vancouver indicated that these parents acknowledged the importance of English-French bilingualism in the Canadian context (Dagenais & Berron, 2001). At the same time, it was found that these parents had a broader perspective, referring to international markets and their

connections to their L1 community in Canada and overseas. To these parents, choosing a French immersion program was a strategy to make sure their children would develop multilingualism; therefore, they could succeed “in the global economy” (p. 153). In addition to placing their children in a French immersion program, these parents tried to facilitate language maintenance for their children by using the heritage language at home, and in some cases, registering their children in a community-based heritage language school.

In addition to promoting bi/multilingualism, immersion programs tend to facilitate second language acquisition for students. In these programs, the focus is on teaching both the second language and content, and teachers employ a variety of teaching strategies, such as the use of gestures and pictures, to teach the language (Taylor, 1998; Taylor, 1992). The positive learning experiences of many of these students in French immersion programs have been reported (Dagenais & Day, 1999). In contrast, in submersion programs where linguistic minority students study subject areas mainly in an additional language, the focus is on the content, not language (Taylor, 1998); therefore, many of these students face language related challenges (Duff, 2001) or eventually lose their heritage languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009).

In addition to the language policy of the school (Cooper, 2007), teachers’ attitudes towards linguistic minority students’ heritage languages (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2001) can contribute to language maintenance or loss. In a study on the experiences of Spanish students and families in Canadian public schools, it was discovered that some school personnel and teachers believed that speaking a heritage language could prevent linguistic minority students from succeeding at school. Therefore, they discouraged the use of a heritage language at home (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2001).

In a critical ethnographic study conducted in a linguistically diverse high school in Toronto, Goldstein (2003a) reported that some teachers discouraged the use of linguistic minority students' heritage language at school. The reason was that those teachers believed that students' academic success depended on using only English in the classroom. Some related their preference for English to the fact that English-speaking students might feel excluded when non English-speaking ones used a language other than English in the classroom.

Teachers can consciously or unconsciously contribute to language loss by not allowing students to negotiate a subject in their heritage languages, and not responding to their language maintenance needs (Ruiz-de-Velasco, Fix & Clewell, 2000). In other words, teachers' reluctance to engage with linguistic minority students' plurilingual competence can impede heritage language maintenance. Plurilingual competence refers to

the ability to use languages for the purpose of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social actor has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures. This is not seen as the superposition or juxtaposition of distinct competences, but rather as the existence of a complex or even composite competence on which the social actor may draw. (Coste, De Pietro, & Moore, 2009, p. 11)

In situations where linguistic minority students' plurilingual competence are ignored and dominant language monolingualism are promoted by teachers, many linguistic minority children give up on their heritage languages to avoid marginalization and to maximize their chance of classroom participation. Abandoning their heritage languages to speak a dominant language in class might facilitate gaining access to a socio-linguistically dominant group for linguistic

minority students. However, this can ultimately disempower them because their heritage languages are not acknowledged and valued. The disempowerment that many linguistic minority students experience in the classroom reflects unequal power relations that exist in a broader context in which speakers of a socially dominant language are advantaged over minority language speakers (Cummins, 2001a). By being neutral about minority students' heritage language maintenance, teachers contribute to not only language loss, but also unequal power relations in society.

Research results on the role of education in language maintenance and loss suggest language maintenance can be facilitated if linguistic minority students have the opportunity to study in their heritage languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009) or use them at school, together with the language of instruction (Cummins, 2005). On the contrary, as research shows, if heritage language use is discouraged or prohibited at school, many linguistic minority students find it difficult to maintain their heritage languages (Kouritzin, 1999; Kouritzin, 2006; Hinton, 1999).

Identity. Identity refers to “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (Norton, 2000, p. 5). Educational researchers argue that identity formation needs to be understood in light of power relations between language learners and target language speakers (Norton, 2000). Norton (2000, p. 7) defines power as “the socially constructed relations among individuals, institutions and communities through which symbolic and material resources in a society are produced, distributed and validated”. Accordingly, symbolic resources include “language, education, and friendship” while material resources refer to “capital goods, real estate, and money”. Norton notes that at a macro level, power operates at

the level of institutions such as educational systems while at a micro level, it exists in everyday social interactions among people who have different access to material and symbolic resources.

Identity theories “offer ways to see the individual language learner situated in a larger social world”, and identity theorists “highlight the diverse positions from which language learners are able to participate in social life, ... [demonstrating] how learners can, but sometimes cannot, appropriate more desirable identities with respect to the target language community”. (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 414). While previous researchers perceived language learners’ identities as decontextualized and fixed personalities, recent studies have demonstrated that identities are in fact context-based and fluid (Norton & Toohey, 2011).

Related to the construct of identity are imagined communities and imagined identities. Anderson (1991) points out, “ [T]he members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (p. 6). Therefore, according to him, nations are imagined communities. Norton and Toohey (2011) state,

There is a focus on the future when learners imagine who they might be, and who their communities might be, when they learn a language. ... Such communities include affiliations, such as nationhood or even transnational communities, which extend beyond local sets of relationships. (p. 422)

In other words, imagined communities and imagined identities that language learners construct influence their language learning process.

Educational researchers have examined how student and teacher identities are constructed and negotiated in educational contexts (see, for example, Harklau, 2000; Reeves, 2009). Harklau

(2000) found that subject area teachers assigned different identities, that is, “good kids” and “the worst kids”, to English as a Second Language (ESL) learners at different times. Those identity positions were accepted by the learners when positioned as good kids, and rejected when positioned as the worst kids. Reeves (2009) examined how a secondary English teacher constructed and negotiated his identity in relation to ESL students and discovered that the teacher positioned those students like any other (English speaking) student to strengthen self-positioning as a highly competent and natural teacher. In a recent study, Babaei and Mohammadian Haghighi (2012) argue that teachers’ self and other positioning could influence their teaching performance, particularly in relation to responding to ESL students’ language needs. Positioning ESL students like any other student and positioning themselves as only a subject area teacher can lead teachers to ignore ESL students’ potential language needs. On the other hand, positioning themselves as a teacher responsible for ESL students’ language needs, teachers might incorporate various pedagogical strategies into their teaching to address these students’ potential language challenges.

In addition to student and teacher identity, educational research on identity has focused on the relationship between identity categories such as gender and race and second language learning (Gal, 1991; McKinny, 2007). For example, in a study with black South African students in a school in the United States, McKinny (2007) found that the participants were criticized for learning a prestigious variety of English to “become white” and identify with white English as a first language speakers. Rejecting this positioning, however, the students demonstrated that they were learning English for their own uses.

The above-mentioned studies provide insights into the interplay between identity positioning and second language learning in public school contexts. However, little has been

documented about students' identity negotiations, particularly their imagined identities, in a community-based heritage language school. This study attempted to investigate the students' imagined identities in the process of heritage language maintenance at a community school.

Within the field of heritage language maintenance and loss, many studies have investigated the relationship between ethnic identity and language maintenance. This will be examined more closely in the following section.

Ethnic identity. Ethnic identity refers to a sense of membership in an ethnic group and the feelings and attitudes associated with that membership (Phinney, 1990). Phinney (1996) maintains that ethnic identity “is not a categorical variable, something that one does or does not have. Rather, it is a complex, multidimensional construct that, like culture, varies across members of a group” (p. 922). According to Tse (1998), ethnic identity develops during four stages. At the first stage, Unawareness, ethnic minorities are unaware of their minority and ethnic status. This stage usually occurs before minority children start school. At the second stage, Ethnic Ambivalence/Evasion, minority children develop ambivalent and negative feelings towards their ethnic identity and culture because of the desire to assimilate into the dominant society. This stage can last long, for example, from childhood to adolescence or adulthood. At the third stage, Ethnic Emergence, children realize a connection to their ethnic group, beginning to explore their ethnic origin. At the same time, they might face a conflict between belonging to their ethnic group and belonging to the dominant group. At the fourth stage, Ethnic Identity Incorporation, children feel a strong connection with their ethnic group and might become proud of their ethnic identity.

Several researchers have investigated the potential interplay between ethnic identity and language maintenance and loss (Babae, 2010b; Liu, 2008; Prescher, 2007; Potowski, 2004; Baez, 2002; Cho, 2000; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999; Pease-Alvarez, 1993; Wong Fillmore, 1991; Lopez, 1978). In an earlier study on the language maintenance and loss of Spanish speakers in the United States, Lopez (1978) found, “shifting to English [did] not imply anything about loosening ethnic bonds” (p. 275). The researcher also maintained that language maintenance was not required for maintaining ethnic identity.

Pease-Alvarez (1993) conducted a longitudinal study on bilingualism among Mexican-American adolescents in the United States. The researcher discovered that a strong link between Spanish language use and Mexican identity existed. However, in line with Lopez (1978), Pease-Alvarez found that the shift towards English did not mean that the participants had abandoned their ethnic identity. The participants mentioned that they were interested in using and learning Spanish. Nevertheless, they believed that the ethnic identity was not solely linked to the heritage language.

More recently, however, researchers (Babae, 2010b; Baez, 2002; Cho, 2000; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999; Liu, 2008; Potowski, 2004; Prescher, 2007) have highlighted the interplay between ethnic identity and language maintenance. In Babae’s (2010b) study on Aboriginal language maintenance and university life in Canada, the Aboriginal participant who had lost her heritage language mentioned that it was as if a part of her identity was missing.

German migrants’ perception of language loss and identity was investigated by Prescher (2007) in the Netherlands. Using both qualitative and quantitative data, the researcher found a close relation between identity and language loss. Some participants who had experienced varying degrees of language loss ‘described their linguistic and cultural position as “in-between”,

“living in no man’s land” (p. 198), stating that they did not feel at home in Germany, their country of origin. The researcher argued that some immigrants tend to assimilate into the mainstream culture quickly during the first initial years of immigration. They, however, might begin to struggle with their identity and heritage language later on. Prescher concluded that the participants of her study, both those who tried to adjust quickly and those who preferred to adjust gradually, tended to appreciate their ethnic background and heritage language, and to criticize the culture and language of the host society over time.

Potowski (2004) conducted a study with more than 800 linguistic minority high school and college students in the United States and discovered a shift towards English among them. However, the researcher found that ethnic identity, typically in the form of the appreciation of the heritage language of musical artists, was a factor which prevented from a complete shift to English.

Conducting an auto-ethnography on the relation between heritage language and ethnic identity, Baez (2002) drew on his personal experiences as a linguistic minority child growing up in an English-dominant context. The researcher stated how English gradually replaced his heritage language, leading to the loss of attachment to his family and past. He also argued that language loss could potentially lead individuals to lose a sense of their ethnic identity due to the power of the [dominant] language.

To explore Korean immigrants’ perspectives on language maintenance in the United States, Cho (2000) used in-depth interviews and a questionnaire. Data analysis revealed that language maintenance had a positive influence on the relationship among heritage language speakers and their ethnic identity. The individuals who had developed a weaker competence in their heritage language, that is, Korean, tended to participate in cultural activities less, and to

avoid contact with other Korean immigrants. Contrarily, those who had maintained Korean tended to understand their ethnicity better, were strongly connected to their L1 community, and participated fully in cultural activities. In other words, knowledge of the heritage language tended to reinforce the ethnic identity of the participants who were competent in Korean. Hence, they were motivated to participate in cultural activities to affirm their membership to the Korean community. On the other hand, those with a weaker Korean proficiency did not participate in cultural activities as much as the more competent ones did, perhaps because they linked ethnic identity with heritage language, feeling less motivated to join their community members.

Finally, commenting on language loss, a Canadian Aboriginal man in Kouritzin's (1999) research on language loss stated,

It's like losing half the man you are, you know... not to lose the language makes me twice the man, so the loss of the language is the loss of the soul I think for an Indian person. It's a loss of the essence of the soul, not to know the language, because you never know how beautiful you are until you know the language. Because you can only be described in a foreign tongue. (p. 181)

What might be inferred from his statements is the emphasis that this individual placed on language maintenance, and the link between ethnic identity and heritage language. This participant seemed to perceive his Aboriginal language as an essential part of his being, or identity, as an Aboriginal person. Without that language, he seemed to experience a great loss.

An issue related to minority people's ethnic identity and language maintenance is the extent to which their heritage language is a core value for them (Smolicz, 1981). Core values are considered highly significant by group members and include language, family structure and

religion, to name a few (Smolicz, 1981). Other values might be modified “or shed altogether without the danger of rupturing the whole cultural fabric of the group” (Smolicz, 1999, p. 27). However, the removal of core values would lead to the fragmentation of a culture, taking away its uniqueness. It could be argued that if immigrant groups consider their heritage language as a core value, they would try to pass it on to the next generation. In Australia, for example, immigrants from Latvian, Greek, Spanish, Hungarian, Polish and Lithuanian backgrounds often demonstrate great devotion to their heritage languages, and their children often try to maintain these languages alongside learning English, which tends to enable them to connect with their past (Smolicz & Secombe, 1989).

To investigate Iranian immigrants’ heritage language maintenance in the Diaspora, Namie (2012) conducted a study with 100 Iranian immigrant students and 100 parents in Sweden. Results revealed that 45% of the student participants were learning Farsi because of what the researcher called “sentimental motivation” (p. 195), that is, because they were from Iran. In other words, a strong ethnic identity motivated the children to study Farsi in Sweden. Although the researcher discusses core values as a potentially important factor in a minority group’s heritage language maintenance and loss, no discussion of whether Farsi is a core value of the Iranian community under study is offered. Focusing on an Iranian immigrant community in Diaspora, the present study attempted to investigate whether heritage language was a core value of the participants.

The above-reviewed studies investigated the relationship between ethnic identity and language maintenance and loss. Some earlier studies reviewed above found no potential relation between heritage language and identity (Lopez, 1978; Pease-Alvarez, 1993). However, later studies concluded that these two could be related (Babaei, 2010a; Liu, 2008; Prescher, 2007;

Potowski, 2004; Cho, 2000; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999). Some individuals who had lost their heritage languages linked heritage language to ethnic identity, stating that losing their heritage languages was like losing a part of their identity (Babae, 2010a; Kouritzin, 1999). On the other hand, appreciation of ethnic identity facilitated heritage language maintenance in some settings where other contributing factors such as the appreciation of the heritage language of musical artists were also evident (Potowski, 2004). These studies indicate that different people interpret ethnic identity differently.

A contribution of these studies to the field of language maintenance and loss might be the fact that they included participants from a variety of different ethnic backgrounds such as Mexican (Lopez, 1978; Pease-Alvarez, 1993), Canadian Aboriginal (Babae, 2010a; Kouritzin, 1999), German (Prescher, 2007), Korean (Cho, 2000) and Iranian (Namei, 2012). A comparison of the findings of some of these studies revealed that ethnic identity influenced language maintenance regardless of the ethnic background of the individuals, as the participants of various ethnic backgrounds linked ethnic identity to language maintenance (Babae, 2010a; Cho, 2000; Namei, 2012; Prescher, 2007).

Although the studies reviewed above shed light on the interplay between heritage language maintenance and ethnic identity formation, they tend to lack a critical examination of ethnic identity development. In other words, ethnic identity construction associated with heritage language use has yet to be studied in contexts where inequitable relations of power exist between minority people and those belonging to a socially dominant group. To address this gap in the literature, this critical case study sought to investigate the potential impacts of unequal power relations on heritage language use and ethnic identity construction of an Iranian immigrant community in Canada.

Language ideology. Another factor which can influence language maintenance and loss is individuals' language ideology, that is, their attitudes towards their own heritage language and the dominant language (Mugaddam, 2005). This section reviews how language ideologies held by school boards and linguistic minority groups influenced schools' language policy and linguistic minority children's heritage language maintenance and loss.

Jeon (2008) sought to investigate the relationship between language ideology and language maintenance in Korean-American children and parents in the United States. Drawing on ethnographic data from Korean and English classroom observations and interviews, Jeon discovered that many participants had a pluralistic language ideology. This ideology affirms that multiple languages in society are resources which should be nurtured, and grants equal rights to all individuals and ethnic groups to maintain their heritage languages (Schmid, in Jeon, 2008, p. 62-63). The participants who had the pluralistic language ideology acknowledged the value of bilingualism and maintaining Korean. However, some participants had an assimilationist language ideology, equating being an American citizen with knowing English. The author concluded that the participants' language ideologies could shift due to various personal and familial circumstances.

In her critical ethnographic study cited earlier, Goldestein (2003a) investigated language choices and dilemmas created for Cantonese-speaking immigrant students at an ethnolinguistically diverse high school in Toronto. The high percentage (86%) of immigrant students at that school resulted in the frequent use of languages other than English in the hallways, cafeteria, and classrooms although the medium of instruction was English. This was a matter of concern to some people involved with the school, such as the school-review team, some teachers, and some parents who favoured English monolingualism over bilingualism or multilingualism.

The school board, however, desired students' multilingualism by recognizing and respecting linguistic minority students' heritage languages. Goldstein (2003a) interpreted these contradictory ideas in light of Bourdieu's (1991) theory. Accordingly, people choose what languages to use in special markets, that is, places where various resources are distributed. They evaluate the market conditions (or different contexts), which can limit the way they speak or the way they think they should speak. In that high school, English was more valued and was "endowed with ... a legitimacy that other linguistic products ... [we]re not" (p. 252).

The different ideas held by the school-review team, and some parents and teachers on the one hand, and the perceptions of the school board on the other hand, might also represent their language ideologies as discussed by Jeon (2008). In Jeon's study, some participants equated being an American citizen with knowing English. Similarly, in Goldstein's (2003a), some teachers tended to equate being a successful student with using only English at school. On the other hand, in Jeon's research, the participants who had the pluralistic language ideology acknowledged the value of bilingualism and maintaining their heritage language. In a similar way, the school board in Goldstein's study seemed to have a pluralistic language ideology by acknowledging and valuing languages other than English at school.

Mugaddam (2005) conducted a study to investigate the language attitude and preference of parents and children in Khartoum, Sudan. Administering a questionnaire, the researcher found that positive attitude played an important role in learning the dominant language, that is, Arabic, among some participants. However, it did not tend to contribute to minority language maintenance. The reason was that Arabic was considered to be very important for religious, educational, social, and economic activities while minority languages were perceived as having only symbolic functions, that is, they symbolized individuals' ethnic background.

In a study with Chinese immigrants in the United States, Chen (1992) explored the process of Chinese maintenance and loss, emphasising language attitude and language use. Results suggested that the perceived value of Chinese and the amount of its functional use were different across the two generations, indicating a shift from Chinese to English in the Chinese immigrant community. However, both generations shared the attitude of “English first, Chinese always” (para. 1). The positive attitude and frequent use of English were related to its domination in society, and the positive attitude towards Chinese as an additive language was ascribed to economic and socio-cultural advantages.

Elaborating on language attitudes and minority languages in Africa, Adegbija (1994) stated that some African people view their heritage languages as unsuitable for use in official contexts. Therefore, these languages were excluded from official settings, leading to the creation of a negative attitude towards them. The author believed that neglect and negative attitudes towards these languages could ultimately lead to their loss.

Sometimes, negative language ideologies leading to language loss can be the result of multiple factors. Studies on language loss reviewed above indicated how schools (Kouritzin, 2006) and peers (Hinton, 1999) can contribute to language loss in linguistic minority children. However, what actually leads to language loss could be the negative language ideologies caused by school practices and peers. Wong Fillmore (2000) reported the story of a Chinese immigrant family in the United States whose children had lost their heritage language, Cantonese. One of the children, Ken, had been scolded at school because of his looks and ethnic clothes and had experienced injustice because he could not speak English. He eventually shifted to English, changed his looks and clothes to appear less distinctive, and began to socialize with African-American students at school. His negative attitudes towards his heritage language can be inferred

from resisting speaking it at home as soon as he learned a little English, ignoring his grandmother who spoke to him only in Cantonese, or responding to her briefly in English, knowing that she would not understand it. In other words, Ken might have associated his negative experiences at school with his heritage language and ethnicity, believing that shifting to English would mean an end to his challenges.

Additionally, Ken's negative attitudes towards his heritage language might have been a result of internalized racism. Similar to many immigrant children (Pyke & Dang, 2003), Ken attempted to demonstrate that negative images of Asian immigrants existing in the mainstream American society did not apply to him by distancing himself from his ethnic culture and abandoning his heritage language. This might have facilitated his assimilation into the mainstream society; however, Ken's refusal to speak Cantonese and wear traditional clothes perpetuated "racial stereotypes and a belief in essential racial and ethnic differences between whites and Asians" (Pyke & Dang, 2003, p. 168).

Language ideologies, in summary, tend to influence language maintenance and loss (Jeon, 2008; Mugaddam, 2005). A positive attitude towards the heritage language can contribute to language maintenance (Chen, 1992) while a negative attitude towards it could lead to language loss (Adegbija, 1994).

The potentially important factors in heritage language maintenance and loss reviewed in this chapter included the family, the L1 community, peers, public schools, identity, ethnic identity, and language ideology. These factors also revealed immigrant parents', children's, and teachers' perspectives on heritage language maintenance and how these perspectives could facilitate or hamper heritage language maintenance for immigrant children.

Previous research has revealed that parents' positive attitudes towards their heritage languages (Park & Sarkar, 2007) and bilingualism (Hinton, 1999) can facilitate children's heritage language maintenance. Parents used various strategies such as heritage language use at home to facilitate heritage language maintenance for their children (Babaei, 2013; Guardado, 2002; Hinton, 1999).

Several studies have documented immigrant individuals' perspectives on the importance of heritage language maintenance in ethnic identity construction (Babaei, 2010b; Baez, 2002; Cho, 2000; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999; Liu, 2008; Potowski, 2004; Prescher, 2007). For instance, in Prescher's (2007) study, individuals who had experienced varying degrees of language loss 'described their linguistic and cultural position as "in-between", "living in no man's land"' (p. 198), stating that they did not feel at home in Germany, their country of origin. On the other hand, Cho's study (2000) revealed that those who had maintained Korean as a heritage language tended to understand their ethnicity better, were strongly connected to their L1 community, and participated fully in cultural activities.

Individuals' attitudes towards their heritage languages and bilingualism can also influence their heritage language maintenance and loss. Adegbija's study (1994) showed that African people's negative attitudes towards their heritage languages resulted in their exclusion from official settings. The author believed that neglect and negative attitudes towards these languages could ultimately lead to their loss. While negative language attitudes can result in language loss in immigrant individuals and communities (Adegbija, 1994), positive language ideologies can facilitate heritage language maintenance (Jeon, 2008). Also, the individuals' positive attitudes towards their heritage languages can be ascribed to potential socio-economic and cultural advantages of heritage language maintenance (Chen, 1992).

Past research has highlighted the potential role of teachers in immigrant students' heritage language maintenance and loss. Teachers' attitudes towards students' heritage languages can facilitate or impede heritage language maintenance and loss (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2001). While previous studies investigated public school teachers' perspectives on heritage languages, no study has tended to reflect heritage language teachers' perspectives on the importance of heritage language maintenance. This study attempted to bridge this gap by seeking heritage language teachers' perspectives on the importance of heritage language maintenance.

Challenges in Maintaining Heritage Languages in Canada

Public and community-based heritage language programs in Canada tend to face challenges with regard to resources (Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995), teacher certification and training (Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995), the diverse proficiency level and age of students (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995) and funding (Cummins, 2005; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). These challenges are elaborated on below.

Resources.

Teachers. A challenge facing heritage language programs in Canada pertains to heritage language teachers (Coelho, 2008; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997). Most heritage language teachers are first- or second-generation immigrants who have been marginalized in the educational system (Coelho, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997). Elaborating on the marginalization of heritage language teachers in Toronto, Feuerverger (1997) points out that some have been treated badly or “like second-class citizens” at school “just because they teach heritage languages” (Feuerverger, 1997, p. 50, quotes in original). Moreover, many heritage language teachers lack

sufficient networking opportunities (Coelho, 2008; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997), which leaves them feeling displaced (Feuerverger, 1997). The interaction between heritage language and mainstream teachers would provide both with the opportunity to share their perspectives and experiences, and learn from each other. As a heritage language teacher in Feuerverger's (1997) study stated, heritage language teachers can explain about linguistic minority students' culture and reactions (at school).

Materials. A lack of appropriate instructional materials is another potential challenge of heritage language programs in Canada (Babaei, 2012; Chiu, 2011; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995; Canadian Education Association, 1991). In some cases, instructional materials are either scarce or come from immigrants' countries of origin, which might be irrelevant to immigrant students in Canada (Babaei, 2012; Chiu, 2011; Feuerverger, 1997). While some larger school boards have a resource center for different languages, smaller boards might lack professionally designed materials because of a lack of funding and financial support. In such cases, heritage language teachers have to produce the materials or buy them themselves. This could further marginalize heritage language teaching because many students do not find professionally made materials in their heritage language classes (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995).

A lack of teaching certification and inadequate training. Many heritage language teachers in Canada are not certified (Coelho, 2008) while a teaching certification would add credibility to heritage language programs. In addition, certified heritage language teachers would feel valued and connected to mainstream teachers (Feuerverger, 1997). Some heritage language

teachers, however, are reluctant to obtain a teaching certificate because of the part time nature of their job. To them, it would be unrealistic to expect a heritage language teacher to go to university while she or he teaches only three hours per week (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). Many heritage language teachers lack the prerequisites to enter Bachelor of Education programs because of their previous education in other countries (Duff, 2008).

Although heritage language teachers might have many years of teaching experience in their home country, they might be unfamiliar with the Canadian education system (Coelho, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). Moreover, many heritage language teachers might know little about classroom management although they know the heritage language well. Some “come from repressive regimes and have ... been taught in that fashion”; however, they must use different approaches with children in Canada (Feuerverger, 1997, p. 50). Finally, some heritage language teachers either are not informed of available professional development opportunities, or might require further training. Sometimes, professional development sessions are in English, which can make it difficult for teachers less proficient in it (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). Professional development opportunities in their heritage languages would help heritage language teachers prepare for teaching heritage languages in the Canadian context better.

This challenge also exists in some community-based heritage language programs. Because funding largely comes from donations and tuition, many of these programs recruit parents to teach a heritage language voluntarily or with a low rate of pay. Some of these parents, however, have no educational training (Liu, Musica, Koscak, Vinogradova & Lopez, 2011). An illustrative case would be the community-based heritage language school where this study was

undertaken. While heritage language teachers at that school had no teaching certificates or teacher education in Canada, some lacked literacy teaching experience in Canada and Iran.

Multi-age, multi-level students. Students' proficiency in their heritage languages, especially in smaller school boards (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995) or community-based heritage language schools (Liu et al., 2011), is usually diverse. While some of them are already fluent in their heritage language and can read and write in it, others might not be as proficient. Some heritage language learners speak different varieties of a heritage language, which might be considered as non-prestigious or non-academic (Valdes, 2001). Students' diverse heritage language proficiency and background in a class can pose a challenge for selecting methodology, curriculum design (Liu et al., 2011) and instructional materials. Moreover, most of the class time might be spent on linguistic activities such as grammar and translation, rather than cultural activities. Although linguistic activities are important, over-emphasis on them would turn heritage language classes into second-language ones (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995), instead of maintaining both heritage languages and cultures.

Sometimes, in addition to heritage language proficiency, students' ages in a class vary considerably. For example, in the community-based heritage language class where this study was performed, elementary and high school students studied together in some levels. That is, the students in Canadian elementary schools and high schools both learn their heritage language in the same class. Such a class might present similar challenges to a teacher in terms of selecting appropriate methodology, curriculum design and instructional materials.

Insufficient funding. Heritage language programs at public schools are provincially funded by ministries of education (Canadian Education Association, 1991) “on a per child basis” (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995, p. 26). In some provinces, certain conditions must be met so that these programs are funded. For example, in Manitoba, in bilingual programs, heritage languages should be used in 50% of the instruction time. In heritage language courses, these languages should be used at least 30 minutes per day, five days a week (Canadian Education Association, 1991). Another source of funding is immigrant communities which might financially support heritage language programs (Duff, 2008; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995).

Tuition is the primary source of funding for many community-based heritage language programs (Liu et al., 2011). Other potential financial resources would include certain organizations (for example, Victoria Japanese Heritage Language School Society, n.d.), fundraisings and donations, ethno-linguistic communities, and immigrants’ country of origin (Victoria German School, n. d.).

In spite of the availability of some financial resources, a lack of funding is a potential challenge faced by heritage language programs (Cummins, 2005), especially those offered in smaller school boards (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). While larger school boards receive more provincial funds, smaller boards receive less because of a lower number of students in heritage language programs. Moreover, smaller immigrant communities in some areas mean school boards are unable to rely on their financial support (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995).

In sum, a general review of literature on potential challenges of heritage language programs in Canada (for example, Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995) indicates that many of these challenges exist both in publically funded programs and in community-based heritage language schools. Issues such as the diversity of students’ heritage language proficiency

and age, a lack of funding, the scarcity of context-related and well-designed materials, and inadequately trained teaching force are common in both contexts.

The availability of heritage language programs in public schools or immigrant communities can facilitate heritage language learning for linguistic minority students. However, the challenges reviewed above could put the quality and continuity of these programs at risk.

Although all of the reviewed challenges are important per se, the lack of funding might overshadow others. The reviewed literature implies that many of the challenges of heritage language programs, such as the scarcity of professionally produced textbooks and inadequately trained teachers (Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995), are a result of a lack of funding. Therefore, if more funds were allocated for these programs, many issues, including the ones already mentioned, could be avoided.

Potential issues faced by heritage language teachers, including marginalization, unfamiliarity with the Canadian educational system, and insufficient teacher training (for example, Feuerverger, 1997) could discourage some of them from continuing in their roles or might impede their job performance. Therefore, provincial governments, school boards, and ethno-linguistic communities should attempt to respond to these challenges. An increase in funding and the availability of more professional development opportunities, as well as the production of more context-based instructional materials, could ultimately improve the quality of heritage language programs. Linguistic minority learners who receive quality heritage language education can contribute to multilingualism in the host society, facilitating socio-political, economic, and international relations in the globalized world.

Challenges such as a scarcity of professionally made materials or inadequately trained teachers (Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995) might negatively influence

linguistic minority students as well. Contextually inappropriate and poorly designed materials, as well as insufficiently trained teachers could send the message to students that heritage language courses are not as important as other courses. Moreover, the fact that many heritage language classes are offered outside the school day can create the impression that they are less important than subject areas studied within the school day. Therefore, the students might be less interested in learning heritage languages or even discontinue studying them. Suggestions offered above might improve the quality of heritage language programs, leaving a better impression on students.

Challenges within a Broader Context: Canada, Europe, and Australia

Linguistic diversity in Canada can be comparable to that in Europe and Australia. Similar to these contexts, Canada is ethno-linguistically diverse. While two official languages, French and English, exist in Canada, many heritage languages are often spoken at home (Statistics Canada, 2006). Of the total population (31,241,030 people), 17,882,775 individuals speak English, 6,817,655 people speak French, and 6,147,840 individuals speak a non-official language as a first language (Statistic Canada, 2006). In addition, 3,472,130 individuals speak a non-official language at home (Statistics Canada, 2006).

The immigration rate has been increasing steadily in recent decades in Canada. While the immigrant population accounted for 17.4% of the total population in 1991, it increased to 18.4% in 1996, and reached 19.8% in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006). As the immigration rate is increasing (Statistics Canada, 2006), the total population is becoming more diverse as well. 16.1% of the Canadian population had a non-official language as a first language in 1996. This percentage increased to 17.6% in 2001, and reached 19.7% in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006).

Similar to the EU (Reid & Reich, 1992) and Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011), the school population in Canada is highly diverse (Duff, 2001). For example, 25% of the K-12 school population in Vancouver School Board are designated English as a second language and 60% speak a heritage language at home (Vancouver School Board, 2010).

Research on minority education in Canada, Europe, and Australia. Some studies on minority education in various immigrant-receiving contexts, including Canada, the EU, and Australia, have resulted in comparable findings. In contexts where heritage languages are not recognized as a medium of instruction, monolingual instructional assumptions tend to be predominant in the education of linguistic minority students (Cummins, 2005; Phillipson, 1992). These assumptions assert that (1) instruction should only be in the additional language, (2) translation between a heritage language and the additional language “has no place” in teaching literacy and language, and (3) in bilingual programs, the two mediums of instruction “should be kept rigidly separate” (Cummins, 2005, p. 588).

Advocates of monolingual instruction believe that bilingual education impedes linguistic minority students from excelling at school (Hakuta & Moran, 1995). They attribute these students’ underachievement (Esser, 2006), and poor literacy to education in a heritage language rather than in the additional one (Cummins, 2001). That is why heritage languages might be excluded from the curricula, and many linguistic minority students study in an additional language, which they might not know well (Duff, 2001).

The language challenges of linguistic minority students potentially caused by receiving instruction only in the additional language (Duff, 2001) tend to have a similar consequence in Canada (Watt & Roessingh, 1994), the EU and Australia (for example, Tagoma, Kim, Brink &

Telteman, 2010): lower educational achievement of these students, compared to their native peers. In all of these contexts, immigrant students performed lower than their native peers in mathematics, reading, and science (Tagoma et al., 2010).

A large body of research suggests that the development of both a heritage language and an additional language brings educational benefits to linguistic minority students (for example, Cummins, 1995). Studies conducted in Canada (Swain & Lapkin, 1991) and Australia (Barratt-Pugh & Rohl, 2001) reported the positive impact of bilingual programs on the development of literacy skills in both heritage and additional languages, concluding that certain knowledge and processes are transferred between the two languages. This is manifested in Cummins' (1981) Common Underlying Proficiency, according to which a common underlying cognitive/academic proficiency makes the transfer of cognitive/academic skills across languages possible. A study conducted in some pre-school and primary schools in Alsace, the EU, also discovered that French linguistic minority students in a French/German bilingual program outperformed their peers in French-only classes in the French course. Furthermore, these students' German proficiency was almost equal to that of German native speakers (Bister-Broosen & Willemyns, 1998).

Additionally, learners' background knowledge is potentially fundamental in all subsequent learning (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000). Since linguistic minority learners' pre-existing knowledge is encoded in their first languages, English knowledge and concepts should be linked with their mother tongues (Cummins, 2001, cited in Cummins, 2009, p. 318). This cannot be realized if these learners receive instruction only in an additional language (Cummins, 2009). Moreover, in a monolingual setting, the use of a bilingual dictionary and mother tongue, and translation tend to be discouraged. Therefore, linguistic minority students

might not be able to enhance their linguistic awareness (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991) and critical and higher order thinking (Cummins, 2007), and to increase their knowledge about the additional language vocabulary (Cummins, 2007).

A reason for a lower educational achievement of some linguistic minority students can stem from issues of power at school (Cummins, 1998). Critical educational scholars have drawn attention to potential disadvantages of having only teachers monolingual in an additional language for linguistic minority students (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009). Having only monolingual teachers belonging to the dominant group and receiving dominant language medium instruction all through their education potentially leads linguistic minority students to believe that their heritage languages are of less value (Cummins, 1994), and discourages them from learning or using these languages. Bilingual development, however, can facilitate educational achievements for linguistic minority students (Cummins, 1995).

Moreover, linguistic minority students need to learn the dominant language or at least one of them as an additional language to find a job in the future and communicate with individuals in the dominant society, to name a few. A monolingual teacher, especially one who does not know a minority language, “cannot compare the languages and explore with the child what is common to the languages and what needs to be learned separately for each”. She or he “cannot help the child develop the metalinguistic awareness that is the main factor behind the benefits that high-level bilingual or multilingual children have as compared with monolingual children” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009, n.p.). On the contrary, knowing already at least two languages, that is, the minority children’s heritage language and a/the dominant language, a bilingual or multilingual teacher might facilitate both dominant language learning and heritage language maintenance for linguistic minority children.

Cummins (1994) emphasized the importance of teacher-student interaction in students' learning in light of Vygotsky's notion of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Elaborating on ZPD, Cummins (1994) explained,

Vygotsky viewed the ZPD as the distance between children's developmental level as determined by individual problem solving without adult guidance and the level of potential development as determined by children's problem solving as determined under the influence of, or in collaboration with, more capable adults or peers. Expressed simply, the ZPD is the interpersonal space where minds meet and new understandings can arise through collaborative interaction and inquiry. (p. 45)

Teachers' low expectation of minority students, their insensitivity to race and difference (Cummins, 1997), and interactions in the form of dominant-subordinate dichotomy lead to constricting the ZPD (Cummins, 1994), and eventually poor educational performance. It occurs because linguistic minority students may give up on their own cultural values, and "celebrate as 'truth' the 'cultural literacy' of the dominant group" (Cummins, 1994, p. 46, quotes in original). As a result, they have less chance to "develop their own power over self and to define and interpret their own realities" (p. 46).

Under the conditions reviewed above, linguistic minority students might not feel sufficiently empowered by the school system, and as Cummins (1994) stated, question "the value of their own cultural identity as a result of interactions with the dominant group" (p. 45). Moreover, through what Battiste (1986) called "cognitive imperialism" (p. 23), linguistic minority students might be led to believe that only Western science is valid, and their own

traditional knowledge is not valued by school. They might eventually attribute their weakness to their race, and the feeling of shame tends to prevent them from excelling at school.

In summary, although various heritage language programs are available in Canada, the EU, and Australia, linguistic minority learners might still face challenges in learning their heritage languages because of assimilationist ideologies (for example, Helot & Young, 2002) or monolingual instructional assumptions (for example, Cummins, 2005).

Well-designed heritage language programs tend to (a) facilitate language maintenance for linguistic minority children, (b) improve their educational achievements, and (c) empower them to value their heritage languages and cultures. Studies on bilingual education have emphasized the importance of language maintenance in the identity development (for instance, Cummins, 1994) and educational achievement (Cummins, 1995) of linguistic minority students. Therefore, instead of assuming that heritage languages should be excluded from the curriculum (Cummins, 2005), policy makers in bilingual or multilingual contexts should acknowledge these languages and promote their use in the classroom.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the factors which tend to influence language maintenance and loss, including family (Guardado, 2010), the L1 community (Kopke, 2004b), peers (Harris, 2009), schools (Cummins, 2005), identity (Norton, 2000), ethnic identity (Cho, 2000), and language ideology (Mogaddam, 2005). Moreover, in this chapter, research on minority education in Canada, Europe, and Australia was reviewed to help frame the current research. Chapter Three will present the theoretical framework of this study and methodology.

Chapter Three: Methodology

In this chapter, the theoretical framework and methodology used in this study, including the context, participant recruitment, and data collection and analysis, are discussed. Moreover, the ethical considerations are explored and issues pertaining to the trustworthiness of the study and researcher's positionality within the research are elaborated on.

The Theoretical Framework of the Study

In spite of varieties in critical theory, all critical theorists agree that a transition from the current condition of society to another one is theoretically possible. Moreover, they all believe that such a transition is necessary, and will occur provided that the agents take this theory as their “‘self consciousness’ and act on it” (Guess, 1981, p. 76, quote original). As Huckel (1993) put it,

[Critical theory] starts from a critique of ideology or distorted knowledge, believing that self- conscious awareness of knowledge distortion, or enlightenment, is a necessary precondition for individual freedom and self-determination. People become free or emancipated when, on the basis of their enlightenment, they take action that changes the social system in ways which allow the realisation of their unique human potential. Such emancipation is possible through *praxis* or a process of reflection and action. (p. 48, emphasis in original)

Critical theory, simply put, challenges the status quo (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002) in society by making efforts to understand why the world is the way it is, and by critical evaluation, tries to find out how it should actually be (Huckle, 1993). Critical researchers, therefore, seek “to

expose the forces that prevent individuals and groups from shaping the decisions that crucially affect their lives. This way, greater degrees of autonomy and human agency can be achieved” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002, p. 91). In other words, critical research unveils patterns of oppression and social dominance in society by posing questions to the oppressed and oppressor (Hart, 1990).

As Adler and Goodman (1986) frame it, a feature of critical theory is focusing on power relationships in society and the role of schools in creating a social reality by serving only majority students’ interest, not minority ones’. Majority students are those who speak a dominant language in terms of power and/or number in a territory unit. Minority students are those who speak a minority language, that is, a language not dominant in a territory unit because it has fewer speakers or its speakers have less power (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarthy, 2008).

A critical reflection on educational policies and practices in Canada reveals that public schools tend to marginalize many linguistic minority students by, for instance, limiting heritage language maintenance opportunities, imposing culturally irrelevant or even sometimes inappropriate materials on them to study, and having them study in a language (English or French) they might not know well.

This research, from a critical lens, critiques the unequal distribution of linguistic resources and heritage language learning opportunities in Canadian public schools and problematizes minority education by documenting students’ successes and challenges in maintaining their heritage language, heritage language teachers’ experiences as non-mainstream educators, and parents’ efforts to provide heritage language learning opportunities for their children.

Moreover, by seeking students', parents' and heritage language teachers' perspectives on the importance of language maintenance, this study attempts to examine the potential influence of a dominant language ideology (that is, the superiority of English over other languages in Canada) on participants.

Finally, as goals for the potential transformation of minority education, the results are intended to inform programming and policy to facilitate heritage language learning opportunities for children in Canada and comparable contexts.

The Philosophical Assumptions of Critical Theory

A qualitative researcher starts his or her inquiry with making four basic philosophical assumptions. They include assumptions about the nature of reality and social beings (ontology), how the researcher knows what she or he knows (epistemology), the research process (methodology), and the role of value (axiology) (Creswell, 2007). Within the critical theory framework, ontological, epistemological, methodological, and axiological assumptions are presented below.

Critical theory views reality (ontology) in terms of “historical realism”, that is, an “apprehendable” reality

that was once plastic, but ... was, over time, shaped by a congeries of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors. [It was] then crystallized (reified) into a series of structures that are now (inappropriately) taken as “real”, that is natural and immutable. For all practical purposes the structures *are* real, a virtual and historical reality. (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110, emphasis original)

In other words, critical theory assumes that reality is apprehendable, consists of “historically situated structures”, can be limiting without “insight” (p. 111), and “will be transformed over time” (p. 113). Putting it this way, Murray and Ozenn (1991) state that reality is socially constructed; however, sometimes “these social structures become stubborn, resist social change, and thus become constraining. Unless reflection occurs, the meaning people attribute to social structures change more slowly than the structures themselves” (p. 133). From the ontological point of view, Gramsci’s hegemony is fundamental in critical research. Accordingly, “dominant power ... is not always exercised simply by physical force but via social-psychological attempts to win people’s consent to domination through cultural institutions such as the media, the school, the family, and the church” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002, p. 93). Therefore, differences that exist among people in terms of, for instance, color, race, and gender are not “real” differences. They are, on the contrary, historically constructed over time, and assumed to be fact.

Such an assumption about the nature of reality is in sharp contrast with positivistic ontology “that one can perceive the world without making assumptions about the nature of the phenomena under investigation”, and “knowledge can simply reflect the world” (Agger, 1990, p. 109). Conversely, “critical theorists attempt to develop a mode of consciousness and cognition that breaks the identity of reality and rationality, viewing social facts not as inevitable constraints on human freedom ... but as pieces of history that can be changed” (Agger, 1990, p. 109).

Additionally, from critical theory’s point of view, human beings “are neither completely reactive ... nor completely proactive”. They are, instead, “able to affect their social world” (Murray & Ozenn, 1991, p. 133) and can potentially become anything they would like to because one can never know the nature of human being (Fuhrman, cited in Murray & Ozenn, 1991, p. 133).

The ontological assumptions of critical theory, however, have been challenged by some researchers. Murray and Ozenn (1991), for instance, argued that if knowledge is historical, as critical theory claims, then, “how can a researcher step out of this historicity and offer a critique of society by a transcendent rational standard? It is difficult to defend the existence of historical knowledge while at the same time suggesting that an ahistorical basis for critique exists” (p. 141). The main point of such critique, therefore, is the incompatibility of the nature of knowledge and the standard of critiquing society from the critical theory standpoint.

From the epistemological perspective, in critical theory, knowledge is seen as “[t]ransactional and subjectivist” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Accordingly,

The investigator and the investigated object are assumed to be interactively linked, with the values of the investigator (and of situated “others”) inevitably influencing the inquiry. Findings are therefore *value mediated*. ... [T]his posture effectively challenges the traditional distinction between ontology and epistemology; what can be known is inextricably intertwined with the interaction between a *particular* investigator and a *particular* object or group. (p. 110, emphasis original)

In other words, “the social organization of knowledge production” and “the knowledge itself” cannot be separate from each other (Murray & Ozenn, 1991). In critical inquiry, researchers first attempt to understand the current “historical formation, then strive to move beyond this understanding to reveal avenues of change that are imminent in the present order” (Murray & Ozenn, 1991, p. 134-135). Therefore, knowledge is “forward-looking”, “imaginative”, “critical and unmasking”, “and practical” (p. 135).

Methodology in critical theory is “[d]iologic and dialectical” because of the nature of the research so that “ignorance and misapprehensions (accepting historically mediated structures as immutable)” can be transformed “into more informed consciousness (seeing how the structures might be changed and comprehending the actions required to effect change)” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110). In other words, “[k]nowledge does not accumulate in an absolute sense; rather, it grows and changes through a dialectical process of historical revision that continuously erodes ignorance and enlarges more informed insight” (p. 114). Critical researchers, therefore, attempt to reconstruct “the previously held constructions” (p. 112).

Finally, from the axiological perspective, in critical theory, values are viewed “as ineluctable in shaping ... inquiry outcomes”. Excluding values ‘would be inimical to the interests of the powerless and of “at-risk” audiences, whose original (emic) constructions deserve equal consideration with those of other, more powerful audiences and of the inquirer (etic)’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 114, quotes in original). Similarly, ethics is inherent in critical theory because the ultimate goal is “to erode ignorance and misapprehensions, and to take full account of values and historical situatedness in the inquiry process” (p. 115). Based on axiological assumptions, a critical study must make an individual aware that social structures exist within his or her control, instead of seeing them separate from control or human construction (Handelman, 1999).

The four basic philosophical assumptions in critical theory are briefly listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Four Basic Assumptions of Critical Theory

Ontology	Reality: Historical realism (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110) Human beings: Capable of affecting their world (Murray & Ozenn, 1991)
Epistemology	<i>“Transactional and subjectivist”</i> (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110, italics original)
Methodology	<i>“Dialogic and dialectical”</i> (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110, italics original)
Axiology	<i>“[I]neluctable in shaping ... inquiry outcomes”</i> (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 114)

This research was also informed by Bourdieu’s (1986) concepts of capital. According to him, the system of dispositions people gain depends on the position they occupy in society, that is, on their particular endowment in capital. A capital includes any resource which enables individuals to appropriate the specific profits which result from participation and contest in a particular social context. Capital, Bourdieu states, includes three species: economic, such as material and financial assets; cultural, such as skills; and social, such as resources accumulated as a result of membership in a group. The fourth species, symbolic capital, designates the impacts of any form of capital when individuals do not perceive them as such, for example, when lofty moral qualities are ascribed to members of the upper class as a result of their donating money and time to charities.

From an ontological perspective, this research views the superiority of English over heritage languages in Canada as a “reality” constructed over time and motivated by socio-political and economical interests of the dominant group (White, Anglo-Celtic majority) and social structures such as public schools. This taken-for-granted reality has privileged one group of people (White, Anglo-Celtic) at the cost of marginalizing others (non-White, non-English speaking, non-Anglo-Celtic) based on their cultural (linguistic) capital. This occurs by, for example, offering mother tongue medium instruction only to students in the dominant group. This, however, has to change as critical research promotes justice and equity in society and for marginalized groups including immigrants as linguistic minorities.

From an epistemological perspective, this study encourages reflection on the part of participants by seeking their perspectives on the importance of language maintenance. Moreover, by investigating students’ successes in language maintenance and parents’ efforts in this process, this study intended to encourage participants to free themselves from potentially dominant language ideologies in Canadian society, that is, the superiority of English over heritage languages. In this sense, the knowledge gained from this study might also be forward looking.

Since methodology in critical research is “[d]iologic and dialectical” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110), this study relied on methods which fostered reflection and conversation. To this end, semi-structured interviews and field observations were chosen. Moreover, participants had the option to record their thoughts and experiences orally in reporting critical incidents.

This research began with the assumption about the potential benefits of mother tongue medium instruction for linguistic minority students. Then, it asked students, parents, and heritage language teachers at a community-based heritage language school to reflect on the importance of heritage language maintenance, and reflect on their experience: students were asked to reflect on

their successes and challenges in maintaining Farsi, and parents and teachers were asked to reflect on their attempts to facilitate Farsi learning opportunities for children. Finally, this research aimed not only to describe and analyze perspectives on language maintenance in an Iranian community but also to offer pathways for changing the situation by informing policy and practice in minority education in Canada and comparable contexts.

Finally, from an axiological view, this study aimed to make the participants aware of the potentially constraining role of schools in their language rights, that is, their rights to mother tongue medium instruction and studying their heritage languages at school. This was achieved by investigating students' challenges in maintaining Farsi at school. Results of the study are intended to inform policy and practice in minority education, indicating participants' potential engagement in social structures such as schools.

Research Design

In the qualitative research tradition, phenomena in natural settings are investigated to uncover participants' experiences from their own perspectives (Merriam, 2001) through open-ended data collection methods (Jupp, 2006) such as in-depth semi-structured interviews. Through inductive inquiry, descriptions, concepts, and abstractions emerge from the collected data, and researchers are concerned with a rich description of the event under study and the research process, rather than focusing merely on the results, deductively supporting a theory, or testing a hypothesis (Merriam, 2001). The qualitative approach, therefore, is consistent with the aim of this research, that is, seeking a deeper understanding of language maintenance from students', parents', and teachers' perspectives, investigating the students' successes and

challenges in language maintenance within the contexts of home, school and the L1 community, and exploring available language maintenance resources in these contexts.

Methodological Framework

In this study, among different approaches in qualitative research, case study was used, [I]n which the investigator explores a bounded system (a **case**) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving **multiple sources of information** (e.g. observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and document analysis), and reports a case **description** and case-based themes. (Creswell, 2007, p. 73, italics and bold in original)

Cases can be individual people, groups, organizations, neighborhoods, cultures, and programs (Patton, 2002). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), a case study includes four key elements. First, the researcher considers the natural setting where the phenomenon under study occurs. Then, actors, participants, are interviewed, or observed. Next, there are events that are performed by the actors during the observation, or reported by them. Finally, the processes that surround the actors or the events under study are investigated. Case study is used when the researcher seeks to gain in-depth knowledge of an issue and what it means to people that are involved in it (Merriam, 1998). It also allows the researcher to describe people, their surroundings and activities they do from the participants' viewpoint (Patton, 1990).

The rationale for choosing the case study methodology in this research was that it conformed to the overall purpose of the study, that is, gaining a deeper understanding of realities experienced by participants with the event limited in time or space (Creswell, 1994). In this

study, the issue was heritage language maintenance, and the cases were the Iranian students, parents, and teachers in a community-based heritage language school. The case study methodology allowed me to investigate language maintenance deeply, and gain first-hand experiences of the participants as actors that are involved in the issue.

Decolonizing Methodology

According to Maori scholar Smith (1999), from an imperial perspective, research Describes an approach which assumes that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only ideas which can make sense of the world, of reality, of social life, and of human beings. ... It is research which is imbued with an “attitude” and “spirit” which assumes a certain ownership of the entire world, and which has established systems and forms of governance which embed that attitude in institutional practices. These practices determine what counts as legitimate research and who counts as legitimate researcher. (p. 56)

Research through a Western imperialistic perspective “on/with non-Western participants and packaged and represented in the Western academic world carries within it some inherent impossibilities of capturing the voices of people” (Bhattacharya, 2009, p. 107). Therefore, research and theory should be understood from participants’ views and for participants’ purposes (Smith, 1999).

The first point a researcher should keep in mind is thinking “beyond the goal of producing knowledge by aiming at producing moral research through methodologies that come

from the heart” (Pelias, cited in Vannini & Gladue, 2008, p. 140). It means “recognising [one’s] own emotions and moral obligations to [oneself], others, and the value of respectful research” (p. 141).

This study investigated a minority issue (language maintenance), and participants were members of an ethno-linguistic community in Canada. Respectful research should incorporate a methodology conforming to participants’ values and cultures to gain a rich and accurate description of the phenomenon under study.

Reflecting on my moral obligations and reviewing literature on research performed on minority people such as Indigenous peoples (for example, Smith, 1999) led me to decolonize the methodology of this study. I was also inspired by my critical stance, that is, performing research to make the silenced voices of the oppressed heard. In any research project, methodology is significant in that it affects the research questions, data collection instruments and data analysis (Smith, 1999). Therefore, decolonization should affect this aspect of the research, which means that it should involve procedures that are ethnically and ethically appropriate for all participants. The following sections (data collection procedures and ethical considerations) present the attempts made to decolonize the methodology of this study to suit Iranian values and traditions.

The Researcher

Researchers in qualitative studies play various roles. According to Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach and Richardson (2005), they find an issue to investigate and identify a conceptual framework. Then, they decide on data collection instruments, which typically include field observation, document analysis and interviews. Researchers also analyze data by reading the transcripts and field notes. They finally disseminate the result of their study. Because of my

extensive role in this qualitative study, especially in data collection and analysis, it is crucial that I examine my positionality, beliefs and values which might influence my observations (Merriam, 2001). In this section, I provide my personal, academic, and professional background related to this study.

Personal background. I am an immigrant in Canada, originally from Iran. My first language is Farsi, and my additional (or second) language is English. Farsi, the official language of Iran, is translated into English as Persian. Many Iranian immigrants use Persian while others use Farsi. In this dissertation, I used the term Persian when this was mentioned by a participant. Otherwise, I used the term Farsi.

I use English to communicate with my non-Iranian friends and other non-Farsi speakers in Canada; however, our home language is Farsi since my husband (an Iranian-Canadian Farsi native speaker) and I always speak it at home.

I view first language as an essential means of cultural transmission without which traditions cannot be passed on to subsequent generations successfully. Moreover, it is part of one's ethnic identity (Babaei, 2010b); therefore, first languages should be maintained. Language maintenance matters particularly in the case of those who are born either outside their country of origin, as in the case of immigrants, or in places where their heritage language is not spoken by the majority of people in society, as in the case of national minorities. In such contexts, linguistic minority children might have access to fewer resources and native speakers of their heritage languages, especially peers and playmates whom they interact with.

As an immigrant who most probably will raise children in Canadian society, it is important for me to investigate issues pertaining to linguistic minorities' heritage languages in

this context. This will occur through, for example, investigating the extent and quality of heritage language learning opportunities and resources for linguistic minority children.

My beliefs and values about language maintenance, and status as a linguistic minority in Canada, have had their share in shaping my academic practices, and inspired me to focus my research on minority language maintenance and loss and potential challenges that linguistic minorities might face in learning or using their heritage languages in a multicultural context such as Canada. I consider my personal background a great motivator for me to conduct this study, and an asset in helping me build rapport with the participants, who belong to the same ethno-linguistic minority group.

Insider research involves researchers conducting studies with populations of which they are also members (Kanuha, 2000); often this means sharing a language, identity, and experiential base with the participants (Asselin, 2003). According to Adler and Adler (1987), the complete membership role gives researchers a certain amount of legitimacy and/or stigma. The insider positionality can allow researchers more rapid and more complete acceptance by participants. As a result, participants are typically more open with insider researchers and richer data may be collected. On the other hand, outsiders might perceive the insider role as creating a heightened level of researcher subjectivity potentially detrimental to data collection and analysis (Adler & Adler, 1987). That is, “questions about objectivity, reflexivity, and authenticity of a research project are raised because perhaps one knows too much or is too close to the project and may be too similar to those being studied” (Kanuha, 2000, p. 444). Additionally, participants “might make assumptions of similarity and therefore fail to explain their individual experience fully” (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 5).

At the beginning of the study, my membership in the Iranian immigrant community afforded access into the group and a common ground from which to start the study perhaps because of “an assumption of understanding and an assumption of shared distinctiveness” (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 5) between the participants and myself. I tried to reduce the potential concerns associated with the insider positionality regarding the objectivity of the research through an awareness of my personal perspectives and biases and bracketing them.

However, to gain a deeper understanding of the participants’ perspectives, I attempted to create distance with them by positioning myself as an outsider by, for example, avoiding the pronoun “we” to refer to Iranian immigrants during the interviews. I asked, “Why do you think Iranian immigrants should maintain Farsi?”, rather than, “Why do you think we, Iranian immigrants, should maintain Farsi?”. This outsider position was claimed because participants might be so trapped in their own experience that the adequate distance required to know their experience is non-existent. Therefore, someone external to an experience, in this case, heritage language maintenance, might be able to see through it in ways that individuals involved in it, that is, the participants, cannot (Fay, 1996). In other words, claiming an outsider positionality during the interviews allowed me to gain insights into the participants’ perspectives and experiences in heritage language maintenance, identifying connections, causal patterns and influences, probably better than one internal to the experience (Fay, 1996).

The insider/outsider dichotomy “in reality is a boundary that is not only highly unstable but also one that ignores the dynamism of positionalities in time and through space” (Mullings, 1999). My positionality within this research, however, was not a fixed attribute. Coming from the same ethno-linguistic background facilitated accessing the research site and building rapport with the participants. This common background, however, did not imply complete sameness with

the participants. Because I was unaware of the subculture, I attempted to bracket my assumptions and biases (Asselin, 2003). At the same time, by positioning myself as an outsider and creating distance with the participants during the interviews, I attempted to gain a deeper understanding of their perspectives on heritage language maintenance and their lived experiences.

Academic background. My initial engagement in the area of minority language and culture maintenance goes back to when I came to Canada to pursue a doctoral degree in Second Language Education. Encountering Aboriginal peoples in the city (and less often at university) sparked my interest to find more about their lives and history because I had never encountered Aboriginal groups before coming to Canada. Reading about Canadian history, colonization, and Aboriginal peoples' social, linguistic, and cultural challenges inspired me as a researcher to find what effort, if any, was made in society to help Aboriginal peoples maintain their Indigenous languages and cultures.

My curiosity later on resulted in a qualitative study I conducted for a course I took on qualitative research in education. In that study, I investigated the role of the university in Aboriginal language and culture maintenance, and explored some Aboriginal students' expectations of university in that regard. That paper was accepted for presentation at a conference, and I found out that almost half of the audience were Aboriginal. At the end of the presentation, the audience and I were engaged in discussions on Aboriginal language loss and related issues. To my surprise, an Aboriginal young girl suddenly expressed her lack of interest in learning her heritage, that is, an Aboriginal language, although her parents already knew it. According to her, the reason was she did not like to produce those "strange" sounds existing in

that language, which would make her feel “ashamed”. What that Aboriginal girl expressed likely represents the internalized colonization which has become widespread among many Aboriginal peoples (Weaver, 2001). According to Battiste (1997), Eurocentric research has constructed the cultural and physical inferiority of Aboriginal peoples. This has “led to the loss of cultural identity and internalized colonization resulting in self-hatred among many Aboriginal people living in a dominant white society” (Neegan, 2005, p. 9). Internalized colonization was demonstrated through that young girl’s negative attitude towards her heritage language as she saw it as a cause of shame in front of non-Aboriginal people. The Aboriginal girl’s attitude towards her heritage language and resistance to learning it was very interesting to me as a critical researcher, and inspired me to read and conduct more studies on issues related to heritage language maintenance.

During my doctoral coursework, I took a course on Critical Applied Linguistics in May–June 2010. Topics such as the globalization of English and minority language loss were discussed in the course, which inspired me to work on Aboriginal language rights, maintenance, and loss in Canada for the final paper. Language rights refer to the “rules that public institutions adopt with respect to language use in a variety of different domains” (Arzoz, 2007, p. 4). Reviewing the relevant literature for that assignment and subsequent readings on social justice and power imbalance in society manifested in linguistic discrimination at schools created more questions for me about language maintenance and loss and challenges of minority language speakers in learning their heritage languages in Canada. Later, in Fall 2010, I took a course on the Theories of Second Language Acquisition in which I focused my research on language loss, and did a thorough literature review on important factors in language loss and maintenance.

Having become interested in the field of language rights, maintenance and loss, and social justice, I decided to investigate language maintenance and loss among selected members of an Iranian community in Canada for my doctoral dissertation. By documenting students' successes and challenges in maintaining their heritage language, heritage language teachers' experiences as non-mainstream educators, and parents' efforts to provide heritage language learning opportunities for their children, this research attempted to challenge immigrant students' education with regard to issues of equity, contributing to social justice efforts.

Professional background. I was a research assistant to my advisor in the first two years of my PhD studies at the University of Manitoba, and as a part of my job, I contacted immigrants from various ethno-linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Frequent conversations with them and other immigrant friends I made later inspired me to find out more about immigrant life. I realized that their children's language maintenance was an important issue for many immigrants, especially those who came from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. An Iranian immigrant man once told me that he and his wife spoke Farsi to each other and to their two year old daughter because they would like their child to learn it. He was also concerned that she might shift to English at home when she entered kindergarten. Similar concerns have been expressed by other immigrant families I know in Canada.

At a deeper and more personal level, I saw my future life reflected in the immigrants' stories. Since I intended to become a Canadian citizen in the future, I could connect to those whose concern, among other things, was their children's language maintenance in the host society.

My personal, academic, and professional backgrounds are all interrelated. My personal life in Canada as a minority language speaker and perspectives on language maintenance tie well into my academic and professional background, which are focused on minority language rights, language maintenance and loss, and immigrant life. They inspired me to conduct this study, and prepared me to engage meaningfully in a research topic that could not only shed more light on minority language maintenance and loss, but also influence my own personal life as a member of this group.

As mentioned earlier, my insider positionality in this research facilitated building rapport with the participants. However, complications in data collection arose as the study proceeded. Because I taught at the Farsi school, I was positioned as a teacher, among other things, by the participants. That might have been the reason why I failed to gather rich data on the challenges of learning Farsi at the community school in the first interview with parents and students. In other words, some participants might have felt uncomfortable sharing educational challenges they were facing at the Farsi school, if any, with a teacher although it was mentioned in the consent form and the information letter that their participation in the research would not influence children's education at the Farsi school, and that their identities would remain hidden. To obtain more meaningful data, I asked them more specific questions on Farsi education at that school in the second interview. Additionally, I framed my questions based on the literature on the challenges of heritage language programs in Canada and the themes emerging from the first interviews.

Another challenge pertaining to my insider positionality within this research arose while interviewing the participants. The school principal asked me to conduct interviews at school because he preferred teachers not contact students and parents outside school. However, because

I taught at the Farsi school, I had to conduct the interviews before and after my classes on Saturdays, which limited the duration of the interviews in some cases. That is, I had to interrupt the interviews and ask the participants to continue next week while the interview was still going on to go to my class. This might have affected the depth and breadth of data.

Additionally, because of my teaching schedule, I failed to conduct all of the follow-up interviews within the initial timeline, spring 2012, and postponed them to the following semester, fall 2012. However, three students discontinued heritage language education at the Farsi school, which means I lost touch with two parent participants (a mother and a father) and three student participants (two female and one male student); therefore, I obtained the Ethics Board's approval to extend the data collection period. Although I recruited two new participants, I used data from the father and the male student participant to obtain male perspectives on heritage language education as well.

Another challenge pertaining to my insider positionality arose with regard to classroom observations. Initially, I had planned to observe a Level 1 and a Level 2 class; however, because my classes coincided with the Level 2, I could observe the Level 1 fully, that is, for two hours, and the Level 2 for an hour each session.

Method

Sampling procedure. In this study, the sampling procedure for selecting the site and participants was purposeful, which “is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). Creswell (2007) states that in purposeful sampling, the researcher “selects individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an

understanding of the research problem and [central] phenomenon in the study” (p. 125). Criteria for the site and population selection in this study are presented below.

The Iranian community in Canada. Canada is home to the third largest Iranian immigrant population with 410,000 and ties with the United Kingdom (Iran’s Deputy Head of Organization for Civil Registration, 2012). Iranian immigration to Canada increased after the Islamic Revolution in 1979, and the Iran-Iraq war, which occurred shortly after that in 1981. Within the past thirty years, the number of Iranian immigrants in Canada has steadily increased. According to the 2006 Census, the Iranian immigrant population in Canada between 1991 and 1995 was 15,535, which suddenly increased to 24,665 between 1996 and 2000. The Iranian immigrant population reached 27,600 between 2001 and 2006, indicating a steady progress.

The Iranian community in the City. This study was conducted in a major city in Canada with 34,420 Farsi speakers (Languages in BC, 2011 Census Fact Sheet). The name of the city was not revealed to protect the identity of the school and participants, and is referred to as the City in this dissertation. Many Iranian immigrants choose to land in or ultimately reside in the City probably because of better educational or job opportunities, compared to other cities in Canada. Moreover, the interviews in this study revealed that many Iranian immigrants reside in the City because of having family and community support. Most Iranian immigrants in the City reside downtown and in a few surrounding municipalities. Community members have found private institutes where religion (Islam), spiritual and cultural ceremonies, art and Iranian traditional music are taught. Some of these institutes teach Farsi alongside religion or culture.

Community members publish various Farsi weekly and biweekly newspapers and magazines in the City. Some Iranian businessmen/women have established their own businesses in the City, including, but not limited to, translation offices, rug shops, exchange offices, Iranian restaurants, hair salons, grocery stores, and bakeries, offering services in Farsi and English.

Similar to other major cities in Canada, in the areas highly populated by Iranian immigrants in the City, Farsi is frequently spoken on streets, buses, and in malls and shops. In these neighbourhoods, Iranian shop signs and restaurant menus are in Farsi and English. Cultural, religious and social events are organized by the Iranian community in the City to maintain the Iranian culture and facilitate networking among the Iranian community members. For instance, once in a month, Iranian community members are invited via Facebook to gather together in a restaurant, bring their business cards, and socialize. This event has been organized by some community members interested in bringing Iranian people together. Religious ceremonies are also organized by a mosque in the City. Iranian traditional and pop concerts, stage performance, traditional festivals and cultural events such as *Nowrouz* (the New Year), *Yalda Night*, *Chaharshanbe Soury*, and *Mehrgan Festival* are also organized by the Iranian community in the City.

Despite the existence of a strong community presence, a political presence of the Iranian community in the City is missing. Community members tend to become involved in socioeconomic and cultural, rather than political, activities and are not represented in the provincial and municipal governments.

The rationale for choosing the City as the site for this study was the relatively higher Iranian immigrant population compared to other cities and a lack of heritage language

maintenance studies with Iranian immigrants and investigation of Farsi language programs in Canada.

Site. This study investigated heritage language maintenance from Iranian students', parents', and teachers' perspectives. It also explored students' successes and challenges in maintaining their heritage language at home, school, and in the L1 community. Therefore, the recruitment criteria for the site selection were the existence of heritage language classes and the ethnicity of the students, parents, and teachers there. For this purpose, a private heritage language institute in the City was selected. The Farsi school and the community school are used interchangeably to refer to Talash (a pseudonym referring to the heritage language school).

Talash was founded in 2010 as a non-profit organization in the City because of the perceived need of the Iranian community to facilitate learning Farsi for second generation Iranian immigrant children (the principal, personal communication, August 2011). This institute held both Farsi as a Heritage Language (FHL) and Farsi as a Second Language (FSL) classes. FHL classes were for Iranian students who knew no or little Farsi while FSL classes were for non-Iranian people. In both classes, speaking, listening, reading, writing, and vocabulary were taught. FHL classes at the time of this research included pre-school, Level 1, Level 2, and Level 4 and students were placed based on their Farsi proficiency, rather than their age or level at Canadian schools. Therefore, some classes, for instance, a Level 2, were multi-age classes where students' ages ranged between eight and twelve. All students attending FHL classes were school-aged.

Resources and materials. Literacy resources included the textbooks designed and taught by the Ministry of Education in Iran for Iranian students. Those textbooks were selected because the principal believed that they were designed by “experts”, that is, material developers in Iran. The interviews revealed that the teachers developed or used available supplementary materials such as Farsi news papers and magazines, in addition to the textbooks. Storytelling resources included Farsi story books in the library of the school. Additionally, storytelling teachers were asked by the principal to develop supplementary materials on Farsi proverbs and Iranian traditions.

To develop the FHL students’ Farsi proficiency further, painting and storytelling classes were also offered. In painting classes, the students learned how to draw pictures while they practiced Farsi further and learned new words. In storytelling classes, based on teachers’ initiatives, the students learned Iranian traditional stories and new vocabulary, and practiced structures and writing, among other language domains.

Literacy classes took two hours and art and storytelling classes took an hour each on Saturdays from morning to afternoon in the fall (September to December), winter (January to March), and spring (March-June). Students paid a tuition fee of \$190 to register. Class sizes were usually small and the number of students ranged anywhere between two to ten in FHL classes. The number of students was four to eight in storytelling and painting classes. Two students registered in the FSL class at the beginning of the research in Spring 2012 and discontinued learning Farsi in the subsequent semester.

I started teaching in Talash in fall 2011, and taught storytelling to pre-school and elementary school children for two years. I volunteered there as a way of giving back during the research and establishing relationships with students, parents, teachers, the principal and the

office assistant; however, the participants were not recruited from among my own students to avoid ethical concerns.

I attempted to obtain students' demographic profiles, such as the number of boys and girls, from the vice-principal; however, I was only told that around seventy five students studied at school. Therefore, I will provide the demographic profile of my classes as examples below.

I taught an average of three storytelling classes each semester between Fall 2011 and Winter 2013. Each class took an hour, opening with a review of what students had learned in the literacy class. Then, students would do Farsi homework for around ten minutes. This was suggested by the principal because he, the vice-principal and the literacy teachers received numerous complaints from parents and students with the volume of Farsi homework. After homework, I told a story to the students, engaged them in personalized and critical activities, told them dictation, and played a vocabulary game with them. At the beginning, I chose online English stories and translated them into Farsi; however, I realized that the students already knew some of the stories. Therefore, I chose a book containing an Iranian traditional story from the library, and retold it to the students in a simplified, grade-appropriate language. While telling a story, I provided cultural and religious background information necessary for understanding the story because story books were produced in Iran for Iranian children, including cultural and religious assumptions and presuppositions unfamiliar to many Iranian immigrant children in Diaspora contexts.

As mentioned earlier, some literacy classes in the Farsi school were multi-age and co-ed. Some storytelling and art classes were multi-age, multi-level because often two literacy classes, a Level 1 and a Level 2 for instance, attended the same storytelling and art class. That was perhaps due to inadequate classrooms and a lack of tendency on the part of the school to hire more

storytelling and art teachers for budgetary reasons. Each of my classes generally included four to seven Levels 1 and 2 female and male students. Female students in Level 1 and 2 outnumbered male students in my classes and at the Farsi school. Because placement at the Farsi school was based on students' Farsi proficiency reported by parents, students' ages might have varied in a classroom. In each of my classes, the majority of students were at the same age and level; however, I occasionally had a student in a higher level and older, compared to other students in a class. The multi-age, multi-level nature of the class posed a challenge to me as a story might have been too simple for some students and too difficult for others. Moreover, some students knew how to write a word which others did not at dictation time. To respond to these challenges, I chose stories based on the average age of the students and assigned personalized, age and level appropriate activities to individual students. For example, I asked the Level 2 students to write a sentence with new words while asking the Level 1 students to make a sentence orally.

Gaining access. Access to the heritage language institute was sought after obtaining permission from the university's Education and Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB) to collect data. First, the school principal was informed of the general purpose of the study in Farsi, and a meeting with him was requested to obtain permission to conduct the research there. At the meeting, he was provided with more detailed information about the study (that is, purpose, the reason for site selection, the activities that would occur during the research, approximate time to be spent there to observe the heritage language classes, participants, data collection procedures, dissemination of the results, and ethical issues). Moreover, the anonymity of the school and participants were ensured. Finally, he was ensured that my presence as the researcher would not disturb regular activities in the school since I would be mainly a non-participant observer of the

heritage language classes. Once his approval was obtained, the office assistant was requested to distribute an information package including an information letter, the interview questions and the Critical Incident Report guidelines (Appendix E) among teachers, parents and students. The principal's, office assistant's and teachers', students' and parents' approval was obtained before data collection began (see Appendices F and G for sample consent forms).

Recruitment. To recruit teacher, student and parent participants, the office assistant was asked to distribute an information package among teachers, the students nine years and older, and parents. The package, as mentioned earlier, contained an information letter, the Critical Incident Report guideline and the interview questions for teachers, students and parents. The information letter provided an outline of the study, participation requirement, and potential benefit of the study for minority language speaking communities in Canada, including the Iranian community in the City. Moreover, the information letter introduced me as the researcher, asking interested teachers, students, and parents to contact me at my cell phone number or email address. It was also clearly pointed out that their identities would be kept confidential, and they could withdraw from the study at any point with no penalty. The information letter, the Critical Incident Report guideline and interview questions were in English and Farsi so participants could choose the language through which they accessed the project information.

After the teachers, students and parents who were interested in participating contacted me, I made arrangements for obtaining their informed consent and collecting data. I was asked by the school principal to conduct interviews at the Farsi school during school time. The participants agreed to be interviewed at the school as it was more convenient for them to participate in the interviews when they dropped their children off at the school or attended the

school on Saturdays. One teacher, however, was interviewed at her place with the permission of the school principal because her classes coincided with mine. Moreover, I asked the participants to let me know if any interview question seemed unclear, or needed further explanation prior to data collection. The participants also had the opportunity to seek clarification when we met for the interview.

I initially planned to collect data during the spring semester (April-June 2012). I finished teacher interviews and classroom observations as scheduled; however, I needed to conduct follow-up interviews with the teachers. Moreover, only two parents and three Level 2 students agreed to participate in the study by the end of the semester, mid-June 2012. Therefore, I obtained the ENREB's approval to extend data collection to the fall semester (September-December 2012). Moreover, I intended to recruit parents and students from the same family to investigate intergenerational language transmission. However, only three parents and students from the same family agreed to participate in the study. Therefore, I recruited parents of children from different age groups, including the pre-school students, in the second round of recruitment.

I planned to recruit five students, five parents and five heritage language teachers because I determined this number was adequate "to identify themes of the cases [in each group] as well as conduct cross-case theme analysis" (Creswell, 2007, p. 128). I recruited five students and five parents at first; however, as mentioned before, I was unable to conduct follow-up interviews with a male student and a father because the student and the parent's children discontinued heritage language education at the Farsi school. I recruited two new participants; however, I used data from those who withdrew from the study to include male perspectives, as well. Therefore, in the end my study involved six student participants, six parent participants and five teacher participants.

Participants. The participants of this study included Iranian immigrant students, parents and heritage language teachers living in the City, agreeing to participate in the research and share their ideas about language maintenance. Students nine years and older were invited to participate in the study because they seemed adequately mature to participate in interviews and reflect on their language maintenance experiences, compared to the pre-school children aged three to five. Moreover, FHL teachers and parents were invited to participate in this study.

To protect the participants' anonymity, all participants have been identified by pseudonyms. Non-participating individuals identified by the participants were mentioned as they emerged in the perspectives of the participants. However, to protect their anonymity, their real names and any identifying information about them, such as their jobs, were excluded.

The participants chose to be interviewed in Farsi; however, some mixed Farsi with English. English words in the participants' responses were transcribed and presented in this dissertation as such.

Student participants. Six heritage language learners at the Farsi school participated in this study. Initially a male participant and four female students were recruited; however, the male participant did not participate in the second interview because of discontinuing heritage language education in the following semester. Because of the incompleteness of the data collected from this participant, another participant (female) was recruited in the following semester. His data, however, were used in the study to represent male perspectives.

All but one participant were born and raised in Canada. The male participant was born in Iran and immigrated to Europe and then Canada. They were in Level 1 and 2 and their ages

ranged from nine to twelve at the time of the first interview, that is, spring 2012. Two participants had not visited Iran while the rest traveled to Iran to visit their extended families.

Interviews with the student participants were conducted at the community school in Farsi. Difficult Farsi words in the interview questions were translated into English for the participants by the researcher during the interviews. The Farsi transcripts were then translated into English by the researcher.

Dina. Dina was ten years old in Level 1 at the Farsi school and in Grade 5 in a French immersion public school. She was born and raised in Canada, visiting Iran three times when she was a child. Dina lived with her parents and younger sister in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. She quit heritage language education in the middle of Level 2, a semester after this research was conducted, because of the coincidence of the Farsi class with her swimming class. She participated in two interviews and was observed in the heritage language class.

Elham. Elham was twelve years old in Level 1 in the Farsi school and Grade 7 in a French immersion school. She was born and raised in Canada and lived with her parents and sister in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. Her grandmother was visiting them from Iran at the time of the study. She quit heritage language education in fall 2012 while this research was going on, and participated in one interview.

Kiana. Kiana was twelve years old in Level 1 in the Farsi school and in Grade 7 in a French immersion school. She was born and raised in Canada and lived with her parents and brother in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. She quit heritage language education in the middle of Level 2, a semester after this research was conducted, because the

Farsi class coincided with her swimming class. She participated in two interviews and was observed in the heritage language class.

Tandis. Tandis was eleven years old in Level 2 at the Farsi school and in Grade 6 in a French immersion school. She was born and raised in Canada and had not visited Iran. Tandis lived with her parents and sister in a municipality less populated by Iranian immigrants and farther away from the Farsi school, compared to where other participants lived. Tandis quit heritage language education at the Farsi school in the second semester while this research was being conducted because of her mother's objection to the religious ideologies in the content of the textbooks. She participated in two interviews and was observed in the heritage language class.

Delaram. Delaram was nine years old in Level 2 at the Farsi school and in Grade 4 in the Canadian school. She was born and raised in Canada and frequently traveled to Iran to visit her extended family. Delaram lived with her parents in a municipality farther away from the Farsi school, compared to other participants. She participated in two interviews and was observed in the heritage language class.

Davoud. Davoud was twelve years old in Level 1 at the Farsi school and in Grade 6 at the Canadian school. He was born in Iran and immigrated to Europe and Canada. Davoud lived with his parents and sister in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. He quit heritage language education at the Farsi school in fall 2012 while this research was going on, and participated in one interview.

The student participants' profiles are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: The Student Participants' Profiles

Pseudonym	Gender	Age	Farsi Level	Canadian Grade	Birth Place	Immigration Age
Dina	Female	10	1	5	Canada	N/A
Elham	Female	12	1	7	Canada	N/A
Kiana	Female	12	1	7	Canada	N/A
Tandis	Female	10	2	6	Canada	N/A
Delaram	Female	9	2	4	Canada	N/A
Davoud	Male	12	1	6	Iran	3

Parent Participants. The parent participants included five females and one male. Time in Canada ranged between six to twenty years. They worked in English dominant contexts and most of them lived in municipalities highly populated by Iranian immigrants.

Nilou. Nilou, Delaram's mother, immigrated to Canada with her husband ten years before the study. They lived in an area with a low Iranian immigrant population and remote from the Farsi school, compared to other participants. She and another parent living in the same area took turns taking their children to the Farsi school. Nilou worked in an English dominant environment and participated in one interview.

Maryam. Maryam, Tandis' mother, immigrated to Canada with her parents when she was a teenager. She had two children and lived in an area with a lower concentration of Iranian immigrants, compared to municipalities where other participants resided. She worked in an English dominant context and participated in one interview. Her children quit heritage language education at the Farsi school while this research was going on; therefore, a follow-up interview with her could not be conducted. I ran into her on the street after data collection was completed and asked her the reason for her children's discontinuing heritage language education. She mentioned that because of religious ideologies transmitted through textbooks, she decided to take

her children out of the Farsi school. Maryam added that her mother taught her children Farsi, instead.

Azy. Azy immigrated to Canada six years before the study and worked in an English dominant context with many bilingual speakers. Her four year old son, Arash, was in pre-school at the Farsi school. They lived in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. She participated in one interview.

Bahar. Bahar immigrated to Canada with her husband and daughter seven years before. They lived in an Iranian dominant area in the City. Bahar worked in an English dominant context. Her daughter, Nina, was in Grade 5 at the time of the study. She participated in one interview.

Mahsa. Mahsa immigrated to Canada with her husband and daughter, Mona, seven years before this study. They lived in a municipality highly populated by Iranian immigrants. Her daughter was in Grade 4 at the community school. Mahsa worked in an English dominant context and participated in one interview.

Ali. Ali was Elham's father. He immigrated to Canada twenty years before, and lived with his wife and children in an area highly populated by Iranian immigrants. Ali participated in one interview.

Table 4 below summarizes the parent participants' profiles.

Table 4: The Parent Participants' Profiles

Pseudonym	Gender	Child's/Children's Farsi Level	Length of Time in Canada
Nilou	Female	2	10 years

Maryam	Female	1,2	19 years
Azy	Female	Pre-school	6 years
Bahar	Female	5	7 years
Mahsa	Female	4	7 years
Ali	Male	1,1	20 years

Teacher Participants. Teacher participants in this study included a Level 1 teacher, two Level 2 teachers and two storytelling teachers. One of the storytelling teachers also taught the pre-school level.

Sara. Sara immigrated to Canada ten years before the study. She was a retired Grade 1 teacher in Iran and taught Grade 1 at the Farsi school. She had no teacher training or teaching experience in Canada. Sara participated in two interviews and was observed in her class.

Mahnaz. Mahnaz immigrated to Canada with her family fifteen years before. She had taught at primary (Grades 1-5) and guidance (Grades 6-8) schools in Iran over fifteen years, and taught Levels 2 and 4 at the Farsi school. Mahnaz had no teacher training or teaching experience at public schools in Canada and had a non-teaching job on weekdays. She participated in two interviews.

Rosie. Rosie immigrated to Canada with her family fourteen years before this study. She taught pre-school and storytelling classes at the Farsi school and taught at a Canadian daycare on weekdays. She was Azy's son's teacher and participated in two interviews.

Mina. Mina immigrated with her family to Canada twelve years before. She was a kindergarten principal in Iran and had a non-teaching job on week days in Canada. She taught

storytelling at the Farsi school and had no teaching certificate and experience in Canada. Mina participated in two interviews.

Behrouz. Behrouz immigrated to Canada with his family a year before this study. He had taught chemistry and run a private high school in Iran. Behrouz had no teacher training, teaching certificate and teaching experience in Canada and had a non-teaching job on weekdays. He taught Grade 2 and 4 at the Farsi school and was Delaram's and Tandis' teacher. Behrouz participated in two interviews and was observed in his Level 2 class.

Table 5 below summarizes the teacher participants' profiles.

Table 5: The Teacher Participants' Profiles

Pseudonym	Gender	Level Taught at the Farsi School	Canadian Teaching Experience	Iranian Teaching Experience	Length of Time in Canada	Canadian Teaching Certificate
Sara	Female	1	No	Grades 1 and 2	10	No
Mahnaz	Female	2,4	No	Elementary (Grades 1-5) and Guidance School (Grades 6-8) (Math)	15	No
Rosie	Female	Pre-school, Storytelling	Yes	No	15	Yes
Mina	Female	Storytelling	No	Kindergarten	12	No
Behrouz	Male	1,4	No	High school (Chemistry)	1	No

Data Collection Procedure

Because this study aimed at gaining in-depth knowledge of the participants' understanding of language maintenance, as well as a rich description of the heritage language classrooms, a variety of data collection methods were employed, including (a) two semi-

structured interviews with each student, parent, and teacher (Appendices B, C, D) (b) a Critical Incident Report by each participant (Appendix E), (c) field notes from the interviews, and (d) field notes from heritage language classroom observations in the Farsi school. Details of the procedure are presented below.

Semi-structured interviews. In this study, semi-structured interview was used to elicit data from Iranian student, parent, and teacher participants because this is a valid and frequent data collection technique (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 1994). The rationale for using the semi-structured interview was that these interviews “[attempt] to understand the world from the subjects’ points of view, to unfold the meaning of peoples’ experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations” (Kvale, 1996, p. 1). Therefore, semi-structured interviews allowed me “to enter into the other person’s perspective” (Patton, 1990, p. 196), which was the main goal of this research. Initially, I had planned to interview each participant twice. However, because two student participants discontinued heritage language education at the Farsi school while this research was going on, I interviewed them once. I also interviewed the parents once because two parents’ children discontinued Farsi education at the community school, and I did not see the parents afterwards. I failed to conduct a second interview with the remaining parents because of their busy schedules. Other student and teacher participants participated in two in-depth semi-structured interviews to provide their perspectives on language maintenance. The students and parents of the same family were interviewed separately to allow for confidential and reliable data collection. Interviews were semi-structured in that an interview guide, or as Creswell (2007, p. 135) calls it, “protocol”, was prepared, seeking the participants’ perspectives on the issues under study, still allowing for other related issues to emerge (Patton, 1990).

At the beginning of each interview, I asked whether the participant would prefer to have the interview in Farsi or English. As a decolonized methodology, this was an attempt to value participants' heritage language. Moreover, language choice especially mattered in the case of students who might not have been as competent in Farsi as they were in English or vice versa. Then, I explained the purpose of the study briefly again, and obtained the informed consent and permission to audio record the interview. Parents' informed consent was also obtained regarding their children's participation in the study. A copy of the consent form was left with participants, and they were asked to choose a pseudonym for themselves to ensure their anonymity.

Respect for elders is highly valued and recommended in Iranian culture. This can be shown linguistically and non-linguistically. From a linguistic perspective, respectful speech contains formal style and plural verbs and pronouns although the address might be a single person. Using singular verbs and pronouns and informal language to talk to an elder or younger person indicates closeness and reduces the formality and sometimes politeness of the conversation. From a non-linguistic perspective, respectful face to face communication with an elder requires sitting or standing straight and putting feet together, among other things. Partly because the parent and teacher participants were older than me, I attempted to show respect through using plural verbs and pronouns and a formal style, sitting straight and putting my feet together in the interviews. I used a less formal language and single verbs and pronouns to interview the students because they were younger. Moreover, my positionality as a teacher vis-à-vis the students required a less formal linguistic and non-linguistic behavior.

Additionally, gift giving is highly valued in the Iranian tradition. Gifts are given to congratulate someone on his or her achievement, wedding, birthday, and moving into a new place. Moreover, guests usually bring in a gift the first time they visit a person at his or her place

in Iranian culture. As I mentioned before, I conducted two interviews with a teacher participant at her place. In an attempt to decolonize the methodology of the study and to follow the gift giving tradition, I took Iranian traditional sweets to her place the first time I visited her.

During the interview, when necessary, probing questions were posed to delve more deeply into responses, elicit richer information, and notify the participants of the desired level of response (Patton, 1990). Moreover, quick descriptive and reflective field notes were taken on a copy of the interview protocol during the interview and, in more detail, as soon as/soon after it finished. The interview was recorded and immediately transcribed by me. Then, each participant was provided with a copy of the transcript to edit for accuracy. They were also informed that they could modify their responses if they would like to. Moreover, in line with a decolonized methodology and as a way of increasing the participants' involvement in the study (Vannini & Gladue, 2008), they were provided with the emerging themes of their own responses, and asked to provide feedback on them.

The second in-depth, semi-structured interview with the participants followed in a fashion similar to the first one based on the results of the first interview to ask more detailed questions, and ensured rich and accurate answers to the research questions were obtained. Each interview took thirty minutes on average.

The critical incident report. The student, parent and teacher participants were asked to document one of their experiences of using Farsi in an English dominant environment in Canada. They were provided with a guideline for how to report that critical incident (Appendix E), which included detailed information about the context (location, place, incident), the thoughts/feelings they had about the incident, and whether it inspired them to take any related measures. The

participants were asked to write down their thoughts because writing is a common practice in the Iranian culture. However, they were given the option to audio record their ideas if they would prefer to document their thoughts orally, rather than in the written form. All participants but one teacher chose to document the critical incident orally, which was recorded and transcribed by me. The participants had the option to write/audio record their ideas and reflections in Farsi or English, and they chose Farsi. The critical incident reports were analyzed and linked to the emerging themes of the study.

Field notes. Field notes on the interviews were taken during and immediately/ soon after they finished. Descriptive field notes included a detailed description of the event (time, date and duration of the interview, and the physical description of the place), reactions and non-verbal behaviour of the participants, and any other related activity. Reflective field notes included my own reflections on and interpretation of each interview. I typed my descriptive and reflective notes in a word processing program, and later on, organized them in separate files on my personal computer based on emerging themes. This method of data collection enabled me to keep an accurate record of each interview and facilitated the interpretation of the results and analysis of the emerging themes.

Field observation. Field observation is a frequently used data collection method in qualitative research, including case studies, “to help researcher [build] an in-depth picture of the case” (Creswell, 2007, p. 132). In this study, I conducted field observations of two heritage language classrooms at Talash to gain more insights into heritage language learning. Of the two Level 1, two Level 2 and a Level 4, I observed a Level 1 and a Level 2 during the spring

semester (April-June 2012). I selected those classes for observation because they did not coincide with my classes, and that children in those classes, aged nine and above, would be among the potential participants. That way, I could triangulate data from teacher and student participants by conducting interviews and field observations, among other means. Four student participants, Dina, Kiana, Delaram, and Tandis, a Level 1 teacher, Sara, and a Level 2 teacher, Behrouz, were observed and participated in the interviews. Teachers, students and parents in those classes agreed that their class be observed and signed a consent form.

Since I taught at the Farsi school, I already knew the teachers and many students and parents. However, because I was quite new to this institute at the time of the study, more rapport with the teachers and students needed to be established. I had already started informal conversations with the teachers, parents and students so that establishing a relationship between us would be facilitated by the time of the research.

One session before the start of classroom observations, the teachers, students, and parents' consent was obtained by having the teachers and students read and sign the consent form. The students took home another copy of the consent form to their parents to read and sign.

In each classroom, my role as the observer was initially a non-participant observer, that is, I just took field notes, without participating in any classroom activities. However, as time went by and more rapport was established between the teacher, students, and me, my role changed to a participant observer, which involved me in classroom interactions and activities (Creswell, 2007). Still, I attempted not to disturb the regular activities of the classroom, and participate in activities only when asked by the teacher or students. I found a seat where I could have a good view of the teacher and students while not distracting them. My observations focused on the materials the students studied and teaching and learning activities. To this end, I

developed an observation protocol (Appendix A) in which I recorded my field notes during the classroom observation and after leaving the field. Descriptive field notes included accurate physical description of the field, time, date, location of each observation, and activities done in the classrooms. Reflective field notes involved my interpretations and assumptions about my observations, and further reflections on emerging themes (Creswell, 2007).

In sum, data collection procedures in this research included two in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each participant, participants' Critical Incident Reports, field observations and field notes after each interview and observation.

Data Analysis Procedure

In qualitative studies, data analysis involves “preparing and organizing the data [for example, transcripts and field notes] for analysis, reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and condensing the codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion” (Creswell, 2007, p. 148). In this study, after data were obtained, transcribed by me, and edited by the participants, a rich description of the participants' perspectives on language maintenance and other issues under investigation resulted. As Patton (2002) put it, “thick, rich description provides the foundation for qualitative analysis and reporting. Good description takes the reader into the setting being described” (p. 437).

Data analysis in this study started with the field work and continued after each interview. Because the data were in Farsi, potential translation issues needed to be addressed in this research (Merriam, 2009). I translated the transcripts into English, and identified the emerging themes and supporting evidence. To analyze the interview data, I read the first edited transcripts and my reflective field notes, wrote further reflective notes in the margin, and looked for

emerging themes in each (Creswell, 2007; Huberman & Miles, cited in Creswell, 2007, p. 149). Themes are “certain words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects’ ways of thinking, and events [that are] repeat[ed] and stand out” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 161).

Having coded the themes of each transcript from the first interview in a distinct color based on the related research question, I reflected on the themes as the potential answer to research questions and the basis for the second interview. The process of analyzing the data, color coding and reflecting on the emerging themes was repeated regarding the second interview and the Critical Incident Report to facilitate an in-depth within case analysis. Then, the final coded themes for each case was listed under categories pertaining to the research questions, and compared and contrasted with the compatible ones of other cases for a cross-case analysis (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Moreover, the notes on the classroom observations were read several times in an attempt to describe the heritage language program and answer the research questions. Finally, a clear and detailed description of each case was provided, and emerging themes were listed according to relevant categories.

The Trustworthiness of the Study

Trustworthiness in a qualitative study refers to how accurately it demonstrates the participants’ perspectives on the phenomenon under study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The trustworthiness of this qualitative inquiry can be examined through its credibility, confirmability, dependability, and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), which are further explained below.

Credibility. In qualitative research, credibility refers to the extent to which the results are accurate in reflecting the participants’ perspectives (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The most important

“technique for establishing credibility”, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 314), is “member checking”, or “collaboration” (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 128). It means the participants of the study are requested to confirm the credibility of the information by reviewing the data and researcher’s interpretations. In this study, after each interview was recorded and transcribed, it was given to the participants to edit, and check for accuracy. Moreover, the emerging themes of the transcripts were discussed with the participants after each interview to ensure the accuracy of the interpretations.

To ensure the credibility of the results further, the data were triangulated, that is, multiple sources of data collection were used (Creswell, 2007; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Mathison, 1988). In-depth, semi-structured interviews, field observations, detailed descriptive and reflective field notes, and the Critical Incident Report represented reality experienced by the participants as accurately as possible.

Confirmability. Confirmability involves ensuring that the data and interpretations of the findings reflect the context, not the researcher’s expectations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, confirmability was ensured by requesting the participants to read, reflect, and provide feedback on the final results and conclusions.

Dependability. Dependability refers to the reliability of the findings, and ensures that the methods and interpretation process are documented (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Contributing factors to dependability, according to Miles and Huberman (1994), include an explicit explanation of the status and role of the researcher in the site, a study design congruent with clear research questions, findings demonstrating meaningful parallelism across data sources,

specifying basic theoretical constructs and frameworks and the presence of a reviewer to examine the process and product of the study. In this study, dependability was ensured through an explanation of the researcher's insider and outsider positionality within the research, providing a list of research questions, demonstrating meaningful parallelism across various data sources, that is, observations, interviews, field notes and critical incident reports, and specifying critical theory as the theoretical framework of the study. Finally, a clear explanation of the research design and data collection instruments and analyses was provided for a potential external auditor to examine the process and products of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Transferability. Transferability involves transferring information to other contexts and determining whether the findings can be transferred due to similar characteristics (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper & Allen, cited in Creswell, 2007, p. 209). In this research, rich, thick description, that is, “deep, dense, detailed accounts” (Denzin, in Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 128), of each case enables interested readers to compare and contrast the findings of this study with similar ones, and determine whether they can be applied to other individuals in similar contexts.

Ethical Considerations

In any qualitative research involving human participants, researchers have to follow ethical guidelines. Two basic ethical principles, according to Bogdan and Biklen (2007) are (a) participation in the study is voluntary, and participants should understand the nature of the research, possible risks and obligation involved, and (b) the dangers participants are exposed to should not be more than the potential benefits they gain from the research. Moreover, the identities of the participants have to be confidential (Lipson, cited in Creswell, 2007, p. 141) and

required debriefing with them should be mentioned in advance (University of Manitoba Research, 2011). Finally, the time and manner of disseminating the results to the participant(s) and/or any other parties should be clearly pointed out (University of Manitoba Research, 2011).

The participants of this study were informed of the nature of the study and participation requirements through the information letter they received, in which it was clearly pointed out that participation in the research is voluntary, and that they can withdraw from the study, or choose not to answer any interview question at any point with no penalty.

Because this study involved minority language speakers, and the topic pertained to language maintenance, a potential risk for the participants might have included remembering negative memories of oppression, and (some) participants might have presented symptoms of discomfort and/or stress. This risk was negotiated with the participants before gaining their informed consent.

The benefits of the study for the participants included participating in a study that can help advance knowledge in the field of language maintenance. Moreover, students', parents', and teachers' perspectives on language maintenance might have further emphasized its importance, and drawn the attention of the community members and in a broader sense, the mainstream society to the significance of language maintenance. Additionally, the awareness of potential language maintenance challenges of the students within the contexts of home, school, and the L1 community might have led parents, teachers, community members, and educational authorities to take relevant measures to facilitate language maintenance for the students. Informed by critical theory, this research challenged the status quo in minority education by questioning dominant language medium instruction for linguistic minority students. Finally, it problematized minority education with regard to issues of justice and equity by documenting students' successes and

challenges in maintaining their heritage language, parents' efforts in facilitating Farsi learning opportunities for them, and the perspectives of heritage language teachers, as a potentially marginalized teaching force (Fuerverger, 1997), on the importance of language maintenance. Such benefits were pointed out to the potential participants in the information letter.

Finally, in a decolonized methodology, it is important to report back to the participants the results of the research (Porsanger, 2004; Smith, 1999). In other words, "[t]he circle may be considered complete only when the community is provided with copies of the final report for its assessment" (Piquemal, 2001, p. 76). Therefore, instead of assuming that the participants would not be interested or able to understand the results (Smith, 1999), I shared with them the "knowledge" (Smith, 1999, p. 16) gained from the study.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the theoretical framework of this study, followed by the study design, methodology, context, the participants' profiles, participant recruitment procedure, data analysis procedure, the evaluation criteria, and ethical considerations. It also presented the researcher's position within the research and the attempts made to decolonize the methodology of the study to conform to Iranian values and traditions. Chapter Four will present the emerging themes from the study, discussed in light of critical theory, Bourdieu's (1986) concepts of capital, and the literature on heritage language maintenance and loss.

Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine heritage language maintenance from immigrant students', parents' and heritage language teachers' perspectives in an Iranian community in Canada, with a particular focus on examining children's successes and challenges in maintaining Farsi within the contexts of home, public school and the first language (L1) community. Through in-depth, semi-structured interviews, the critical incident report and field notes from interviews and classroom observations, attempts were made to capture the students', parents' and heritage language teachers' lived experiences and perceptions on the topic. Emerging themes include (1) the importance of heritage language maintenance, (2) heritage language maintenance strategies, and (3) challenges in heritage language maintenance.

The Importance of Heritage Language Maintenance

Maintaining familial and social ties.

The student participants. The student participants attempted to maintain Farsi to communicate with their parents and extended family members who did not know English in Iran. Delaram attempted to maintain Farsi to communicate with her parents because according to her, they knew it better than English. Dina's, Elham's, Tandis' and Kiana's parents, according to the students, communicated with them in Farsi and English. However, before learning Farsi, the children depended on someone else, usually their mothers, to translate English into Farsi or vice versa for them when they travelled to Iran. If an interpreter was unavailable or busy, they were unable to communicate with Farsi-speaking people or read signs on streets.

Kiana explained¹,

پدر بزرگ، مادربزرگ، خاله ها و دایی های من در ایران انگلیسی نمی دانند. در نتیجه وقتی آنجا بودم نمی توانستیم با هم ارتباط برقرار کنیم. نمی توانستم صحبت های دختر و پسر خاله هایم و دوستانشان را متوجه شوم و احساس دور بودن از جمع می کردم. از مادرم خواستم که برایم از انگلیسی به فارسی و برعکس ترجمه کند اما و وقتی که با دیگران صحبت می کرد از این کار خودداری می کرد. مثلاً یک بار در سفر از مادرم خواستم یک تابلو را برایم به انگلیسی ترجمه کند ولی او از این کار خودداری کرد چون داشت با پدر بزرگم صحبت می کرد. وقتی صحبتش تمام شد از تابلو رد شده بودیم.

My grandparents, aunts and cousins in Iran do not know English. Therefore, we could not communicate with each other while I was there. I could not understand what my cousins and their friends were talking about and felt left out. I asked my mother to translate English into Farsi and vice versa for me. However, she refused to translate for me while she was talking to other people. For example, once on a road trip, I asked my mother to translate a road sign into English for me. However, she refused to do so because she was talking to my grandfather. We had already passed the sign when she stopped talking to him. (Transcript C, p. 1, Lines 1-8)

In another incident, Kiana was unable to buy chocolate milk at a super market in Iran because neither her grandmother nor the cashier knew English. Therefore, she decided to learn

¹Direct quotes from the participants' transcripts are presented in Farsi, immediately followed by English translation. English words in the participants' quotes are cited as is in the Farsi transcripts.

Farsi to communicate with Farsi-speaking people and read signs on streets independently.

Similar to Kiana, Dina and Elham had been unable to communicate with their extended family members and relatives in Iran while visiting there because of their limited Farsi proficiency. The desire to socialize with relatives motivated them to maintain Farsi. While Kiana, Dina and Elham found themselves unable to communicate with their relatives and other people in Iran, Delaram was mocked because of mixing Farsi and English, Nilou, her mother, reported. Nilou explained,

وقتی دلارام بچه بود هر وقت ایران می رفتیم مورد تمسخر قرار می گرفت چون فارسی و انگلیسی را با هم حرف می زد. آن موقع فارسی را خوب نمی دانست. سختش بود با این چالش روبرو شود و من پیشنهاد کردم کلمه های فارسی را یاد بگیرد قبل از اینکه از آنها استفاده کند. پس از آن، به خاطر پیشرفتش در یادگیری فارسی توسط مردم در ایران تشویق می شد.

When Delaram was younger, every time we went to Iran, she was scolded by others because she mixed Farsi and English. She did not know Farsi well at that time. She had a hard time meeting this challenge and I suggested that she learn a new word in Farsi before using it. Later, she was praised by people in Iran for her improvement in learning Farsi. (Transcript F, p. 3, Lines 17-20)

A reason for code-switching, according to Schmid (2011), is that bilinguals face a challenge retrieving words which are less frequently activated in their memories. Delaram, therefore, might have code-switched because Farsi words which had not been used for a long time were not accessible to her. Hearing and using Farsi during her stay in Iran activated Farsi

words in her memory. This, in addition to learning new words, facilitated communication with Farsi speaking people in Iran.

In addition to communicating with extended family members in Iran, Delaram decided to maintain Farsi to communicate with her parents because, according to her, they knew Farsi better than English. Heritage language maintenance also enabled the children to communicate with family members such as grandparents who visited Canada. Moreover, it enabled them to maintain virtual ties with family members in Iran, that is, on the phone, Skype and Facebook.

English played a dominant role in the student participants' lives, compared to Farsi, because it facilitated educational, social, and employment opportunities in the dominant (English-speaking) Canadian society. However, the desire to integrate into the L1 community and communicate with Farsi speakers in Canada and other countries motivated them to (re)learn Farsi. Dina decided to relearn Farsi partly to understand conversations among his parents and their friends and feel included while Delaram attempted to maintain Farsi for security purposes, among other reasons: in case she was caught in an unknown place such as an airport in South Africa with another Iranian person. Farsi could facilitate communicating with him or her and seeking help in such a situation.

The parent participants. Similar to the students, the parent participants mentioned that heritage language maintenance facilitated interaction, particularly emotional communication, among immigrant children and relatives such as grandparents and aunts in Iran. The parent participants' parents who lived in Iran did not know English. Therefore, they wanted their children to know Farsi to communicate with their grandparents when they met in Iran and

Canada. Coming across immigrant children who had lost their heritage languages, Mahsa mentioned,

آن بچه ها نمی توانستند با پدربزرگ و مادربزرگهایشان ارتباط برقرار کنند چون زبان مادریشان را نمی دانستند. نمی خواهم چنین اتفاقی برای دخترم بیفتد. می خواهم فارسی یاد بگیرد تا بتواند با اقوامان در ایران ارتباط برقرار کند. خیلی به روابط خانوادگی اهمیت می دهد و پیوند محکمی با اقوامان در ایران مثل خاله هایش از طریق اسکایپ و تلفن برقرار کرده است. فارسی در این زمینه نقش مهمی ایفا کرده است. وقتی ایران می رویم، از من می خواهد فارسی و انگلیسی را با هم حرف نزنم تا افرادی که انگلیسی بلد نیستند متوجه شوند .

Those children could not communicate with their grandparents because they did not know their heritage language. I do not want this to happen to my daughter. I want her to learn Farsi to communicate with our relatives in Iran. She cares much about familial relationships and has maintained strong ties with our relatives in Iran such as her aunts, through Skype and phone. Farsi plays an important role in this case. When we go to Iran, she asks me to avoid code mixing so that those who do not know English will understand the conversation. (Transcript K, p. 1, Lines 1-8)

In addition, the parent participants mentioned that heritage language maintenance could facilitate communication among community members who did not know English in Canada. Azy recalled asking a teenage Iranian boy on the street a question in Farsi and finding him unable to understand Farsi. Therefore, Azy communicated with the boy in English. However, she mentioned that Iranian children needed to know Farsi to communicate with Iranian people who did not know English in Canada. In other words, in Azy's perspective, language loss could

hinder social interactions among community members with little or no knowledge of English (Wong Fillmore, 2000).

Emphasizing the communicative function of heritage language maintenance, Nilou also referred to its emotional aspect. She connected heritage language maintenance to expressing emotions, citing:

”شما احساسات خود را به کدام راحت تر ابراز می کنید، یک مرد کانادایی یا یک مرد ایرانی؟“

“With whom would you express your feelings easier, an English man or an Iranian man”?

(Transcript G, p. 2, Lines 11-12). Posing this question to the researcher, a Farsi/English bilingual Iranian female living in Canada, and contrasting Iranian and Canadian men, Nilou must have assumed that using a heritage language could facilitate emotional communications among its speakers. Effective emotional relationships and intimacy facilitated through heritage language use have also been highlighted in the literature on heritage language maintenance (Babaei, 2013; Chen, 2010). The Iranian participant in Babaei's (2013) study reported using Farsi to strengthen familial ties when he was socially rejected by his English speaking peers at school in England because of his different looks and insufficient English proficiency.

Finally, the parent participants highlighted the importance of developing literacy (reading and writing) skills in a heritage language, alongside maintaining oral skills. According to Azy and Mahsa, immigrant children might be in a situation where they needed to fill out a form or find an address independently in Iran, to name a few. Maintaining literacy skills in Farsi could facilitate performing those tasks for them. Azy explained,

یکی از دوستانمان در یک خانواده دو فرهنگی دنیا آمده است. اسم و فامیلش فارسی است و فارسی را بخوبی حرف می زند گرچه بیشتر عمرش را خارج از ایران گذرانده است. یک بار که به ایران مسافرت کرده بود، افسر گمرک از او خواست که اسمش را بنویسد اما او نتوانست. افسر فکر کرد دوست ما دارد دروغ می گوید

چون قیافه اش شبیه ایرانی هاست، اسم و فامیل فارسی دارد و فارسی را بخوبی صحبت می کند. افسر نزدیک بود دستگیرش کند .

One of our friends was born in a bicultural family. His first and last names are Farsi and he speaks Farsi fluently although he has spent most of his life outside Iran. However, he does not know how to write in Farsi. Once he traveled to Iran, a customs officer asked him to write his name; however, he could not. The officer thought our friend was lying to him because he looks like an Iranian person, has a Farsi first and last name and speaks Farsi fluently. The officer was about to arrest him. (Transcript I, p. 2, Lines 3-8)

Comparing and contrasting her daughter's Farsi language proficiency with her parents'

English proficiency, Nilou mentioned,

پدر و مادر بزرگ دلارام انگلیسی نمی دانند. در نتیجه، وقتی کانادا می آیند بیسواد هستند: نمی توانند به انگلیسی بخوانند و بنویسند و با انگلیسی زبانها ارتباط برقرار کنند. به طور مشابه، اگر دخترم فارسی یاد نگیرد، در ایران متوجه می شود که بیسواد است. نمی خواهم این اتفاق برایش بیفتد وقتی ایران می رویم. می خواهم فارسی یاد بگیرد که بتواند تابلو ها را مستقلا بخواند .

Delaram's grandparents do not know English; therefore, when they come to Canada, they are illiterate: unable to read and write in English and communicate with English speaking people. Similarly, if my daughter does not learn Farsi, she will realize she is illiterate in Iran. I do not want this to happen to my daughter when we travel to Iran. I would like her to learn Farsi so that she can read signs independently. (Transcript G, p. 2, Lines 13-17)

The teacher participants. The teacher participants, Sara, Rosie, Mahnaz, Mina, and Behrouz, highlighted the importance of maintaining familial and social ties in Iran and Canada through heritage language maintenance. According to Rosie, Iranian immigrant children who had lost Farsi might feel excluded if their parents spoke Farsi at home, and face challenges in communicating with their relatives who did not know English. Heritage language maintenance could prevent from these challenges. She mentioned that speaking in Farsi could facilitate communication between Iranian immigrant children and parents, particularly in situations where parents knew little English. Similar to Nilou, Rosie and Mina highlighted the importance of learning emotional expressions for immigrant children to understand and express feelings. According to them, feelings could be expressed in Farsi easier than in English because Farsi emotional expressions might lack English equivalents. They added that expressions and proverbs could facilitate communication because one could convey more with fewer words.

Mahnaz emphasized the key role that heritage language maintenance might play in maintaining familial and social ties and went on to say,

یکی از دوستان پسر من نمی تواند با مادربزرگش ارتباط برقرار کند چون فارسی نمی داند افسوس می خورد که نمی تواند به مادربزرگش بگوید چقدر دوستش دارد. یکی دیگر از دوستانش فارسی بلد نیست چون لهجه فارسی اش در ایران مورد تمسخر قرار گرفته است. در نتیجه، نمی تواند با اقوامش که انگلیسی بلد نیستند ارتباط برقرار کند .

One of my son's friends is unable to communicate with his grandmother because he does not know Farsi. He regrets that he cannot tell her how much he loves her. Another friend of his has lost Farsi because he had been mocked of his broken Farsi while travelling to

Iran. Therefore, he is unable to communicate with his relatives who do not know English.
(Transcript N, p. 1, Lines 17-22)

Heritage language maintenance, according to the teacher participants, could also facilitate communication among community members in Canada. Mina and Behrouz held that Farsi was widely used among Iranian immigrants in Canada; therefore, knowing it could make Iranian immigrant children feel included in conversations among community members, especially those who knew little or no English. Otherwise, they might feel left out.

Heritage language maintenance, according to the student, parent and teacher participants, was important for familial and social reasons: it facilitated communication among family and community members in Iran and Canada. Past experiences of failure to communicate with extended family and community members in Iran and Canada motivated most student participants to maintain Farsi. Similarly, negative experiences of those who did not know a dominant language, such as Farsi in Iran and English in Canada, or their heritage languages reminded the parents and teachers of the importance of heritage language maintenance for social and familial reasons. These experiences also motivated them to facilitate heritage language maintenance opportunities for their children and students. Additionally, the children and parents of the same family, that is, Delaram and Nilou; Elham and Ali; and Tandis and Maryam, expressed similar perspectives on the importance of heritage language maintenance. Both parties highlighted the importance of maintaining Farsi for communicating with extended family members in Iran.

The role of heritage language maintenance in facilitating familial and social interactions has also been highlighted in previous studies on language maintenance and loss (Babaei, 2013;

Chen, 2010; Rodriguez, 1982; Sohrabi, 1997; Wong Fillmore, 2000). While heritage language maintenance can contribute to familial and social interactions (Babaei, 2013), language loss can create a distance between children and parents (Rodriguez, 1982) and cause a generation gap in immigrant families, especially in situations where immigrant children and parents are unequally proficient in a socially dominant language (Wong Fillmore, 2000).

Protecting the privacy of conversations.

The student participants. Heritage language maintenance enabled the students to protect the privacy of conversation in English dominant contexts. Kiana, Dina, Tandis, and Delaram used Farsi to protect the privacy of conversations in the presence of English-speaking and immigrant female and male peers and adults. Private conversations included gossiping about non-Farsi speakers and sharing personal secrets in English-dominant contexts. Dina spoke Farsi with her mother in English dominant contexts when her mother was criticizing her and when they were gossiping about an English-speaking person present. Delaram, Kiana and Tandis used Farsi to talk to their Iranian friends and mothers at recess at the public school. For example, Delaram revealed to her Iranian-Canadian friend in Farsi that she was leaving for Iran in the summer. She used Farsi partly to exclude her non-Farsi speaking school mates from the conversation, avoiding potential security problems when their home was vacant.

Kiana also used Farsi at English dominant parties to protect the privacy of her conversation with her mother, for example, to ask whether she could ask for more food at a party.

The parent participants. Azy used Farsi to talk to Arash, her son, at the presence of his English-speaking friends and their mothers in the daycare when she intended to keep the conversation private. She stated,

برای اینکه از آرش بخواهم که از بچه های دیگر در مهد کودک تقلید نکند، فارسی حرف می زنم تا بچه ها و مادرانشان متوجه نشوند. در غیر این صورت، ممکن است ناراحت شوند اگر بفهمند دارم از آنها یا بچه هایشان انتقاد می کنم .

To ask Arash to stop imitating what other children were doing at the daycare, I use Farsi so that the children and their mothers will not understand. Otherwise, they might become upset to realize I am criticizing them or their children. (Transcript J, p. 2, Lines 16-22; p. 3, Lines 1-2)

Using the heritage language, therefore, enabled the student participants and a parent participant to exclude non-Farsi speakers from the conversation and avoid their potential resentments. Heritage language use also protected the privacy of conversations when the participants intended to save face and share a secret with a friend or a family member. Myers-Scotton (1998) suggests that language users make intentional choices with regard to available language varieties to achieve specific social goals. In this light, the participants' language choice can be linked to their social ends. In situations where the privacy of the conversation mattered to them, the participants reported choosing to speak Farsi, excluding non-Farsi speakers from the interaction.

Ethnic identity negotiation.

The student participants. Heritage language maintenance facilitated ethnic identity construction for the student participants. Delaram cited,

"ما باید فارسی یاد بگیریم چون ایرانی هستیم. ایران خونه ماست. ما away from home هستیم. تو tradition کانادائی ، تو مدرسه روسری نمی پوشیم. at least باید فارسی یاد بگیریم ."

"We must learn Farsi because we are from Iran. Iran is our home. We are away from home. In the Canadian tradition, we do not wear head coverings at schools. We must learn Farsi, at least" (Transcript E, p. 2, Lines 2-4).

The above quote suggests that Delaram associated ethnic identity with heritage language maintenance, similar to many immigrants (Chen, 2010). Moreover, she attributed it to appearance, specifically clothing. She indirectly referred to the fact that women have to cover their hair and bodies except their faces and hands in public places such as schools in Iran. Delaram assumed that because this condition does not exist in Canada, Iranian-Canadian women need to find another way to resemble those in Iran and construct ethnic identity. Heritage language maintenance, according to her, was a means of ethnic identity construction for Iranian women in Diaspora contexts. While Delaram associated ethnic identity with physical resemblance, the other students perceived it as group membership and expressed the desire to belong to the Iranian community in Canada. This desire motivated them to maintain Farsi.

The students' using Farsi to communicate with extended family and community members indicated their perceived connection to their ethnic group, what Tse (1998) calls ethnic emergence. This connection to the ethnic group and the desire to be included in the ethnic community was in fact one of the reasons the students maintained Farsi. Similar to previous studies (Babaei, 2010a; Cho, 2000; Liu, 2008; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999; Namei, 2012;

Prescher, 2007; Potowski, 2004), this study confirmed the connection between heritage language maintenance and ethnic identity formation.

The parent participants. The parent participants stated that heritage language maintenance facilitated ethnic identity construction for immigrant children because heritage language, ethnic identity, and culture were intertwined, and to know a culture, one needed to learn the language. Moreover, according to them, maintaining Farsi as a heritage language would make Iranian immigrant children proud of their ethnic background. Maryam mentioned,

مرتبا به بچه هایم یاد آوری می کنم اهمیت فرهنگشان را یاد آوری می کنم. می خواهم بدانند که چیزهای بدی که در مورد ایران در اخبار می شنوند یا در کتاب می خوانند are not the whole story. می خواهم بدانند که Iran is a beautiful country with very nice people. می خواهم بدانند که زبانشان زبان خیلی مهمی است، و اینکه they come from an important background که Ancient Persia نقش مهمی در human rights و medication داشته است .

I frequently remind my children of the importance of their culture. I want them to realize that negative things they hear on the news and read in books about Iran are not the whole story. I want them to know that Iran is a beautiful country with very nice people. I want my children to know that their language is a very important language, and that they come from a very important ethnic background. ... I want them to know that Ancient Persia played an important role in human rights and medication. (Transcript H, p. 1, Lines 13-20; p. 2, Lines 1-3)

Similarly, Mahsa and Bahar associated ethnic identity formation with heritage language maintenance. To remind their children of their ethnic origin, they facilitated heritage language maintenance opportunities for them by, for instance, speaking Farsi at home and asking their children to use it. To Mahsa and Bahar, speaking English at home would distance their children from Iranian culture.

The parent participants' perspectives on ethnic identity and heritage language maintenance is in line with López, Frawley, and Peyton's (2010) argument that "language afford its speakers identity ... because one is a speaker of the language generally, i.e., identity by speaking" (p. 24). In other words, the parents believed that by speaking Farsi as a heritage language, immigrant children could claim an Iranian ethnic identity. However, they interpreted ethnic identity differently. Referring to the perceived historical importance of Ancient Persia and the Iranian civilization, Ali and Maryam conveyed "a more impersonal view based largely on historical aspects [and] traditions" (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, as cited in Phinney, 1996, p. 923). On the other hand, Mahsa, Bahar, and Nilou expressed "a close, participatory sense of their ethnicity" by stating that they were proud of their ethnic identity and Iran (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, as cited in Phinney, 1996, p. 923). The parents' different interpretations of ethnic identity might be influenced by the frequency of their trips to Iran. Ali and Maryam had not traveled to Iran since they immigrated to Canada, twenty and nineteen years before, respectively, while Mahsa, Bahar, and Nilou frequently traveled to Iran. Ali and Maryam, therefore, interpreted ethnic identity in an impersonal way while the other parent participants expressed a participatory sense of ethnic identity.

The teacher participants. Similar to the parents, the teachers highlighted the importance of heritage language maintenance in ethnic identity formation. Mina compared a heritage language with a body part with which children are born to highlight the integral role of heritage language in ethnic identity construction. Learning Farsi, according to Sara and Behrouz, enabled Iranian children to read Farsi literary works such as *Shahnameh* and *Hafez* and familiarized them with Iran's history and Iranian culture and traditions reflected in traditional poems and stories

According to the teacher participants, the children who had maintained Farsi might feel they had roots in Iran. This could facilitate integrating into the Iranian society if they decided to return to Iran, according to Behrouz. He explained,

خیلی از بچه های ایرانی مهاجر به دلیل تصمیم والدینشان به کانادا مهاجرت می کنند اما ممکن است تصمیم بگیرند در آینده در ایران زندگی کنند. در نتیجه، بچه های ایرانی هیچگاه نباید فراموش کنند از کجا آمده اند. حفظ فارسی به عنوان زبان مادری می تواند ساخت هویت ملی را برای آنها سهولت بخشد .

Many Iranian children immigrate to Canada with their family members because of their parents' decision. They, however, might decide to live in Iran in the future. Therefore, Iranian children must never forget where they come from. Maintaining Farsi as a heritage language could facilitate ethnic identity construction for them. (Transcript Q, p. 3, Lines 1-4)

Knowing Farsi, in Behrouz's perspective, could facilitate the expansion of immigrant children's ranges of identities and their access to a wider world (Norton, 2001). By imagining themselves connected to Iranian people in Iran, Iranian immigrant children in Diaspora contexts can feel a

sense of community with individuals they do not know. Constructing this imagined community (Anderson, 1991) and imagined identity (Norton, 2000) is facilitated through heritage language maintenance.

Similarly, Rosie explained that heritage language maintenance enabled immigrant children to retain ethnic values because to her, language and culture were interrelated. Rosie's Canadian born family members, according to her, felt connected to Iran by speaking Farsi fluently and celebrating Iranian traditions and religious events. She cited,

بچه های عمه من کانادا دنیا آمده اند ولی فارسی را بخوبی صحبت می کنند. مثل ایرانیها، نوروز و محرم را هر سال به جا می آورند و سالروز مرگ مادربزرگشان را گرامی می دارند. آنها واقعا ایرانی هستند. نمی توانستند بدون فارسی ارزشهای فرهنگی را حفظ کنند چون زبان قسمتی از فرهنگ است.

My cousins were born in Canada but they speak Farsi fluently. They celebrate Nowrouz and Moharram and commemorate their grandmother's death every year, like Iranian people. They are truly Iranian. They couldn't have retained ethnic values without learning Farsi because language is part of the culture. (Transcript O, p. 2, Lines 13-16)

This excerpt revealed the strong connection which Rosie made between ethnic identity and heritage language maintenance. She referred to her cousins as "true" Iranians because according to her, they had maintained Iranian culture and Farsi. This also indicated that to Rosie, ethnic identity was not associated with birth place, as much as it was associated with heritage language and culture retention. As a result, Iranian people could be "truly" Iranian no matter whether they were born inside Iran or outside.

While the three participant groups associated heritage language maintenance with ethnic identity, they highlighted its different components. This study revealed that ethnic identity comprised of different components (Phinney, 1995) and might be perceived differently by ethnic group members (Fredman, 1992). In children and parents of the same family, Delaram and Nilou connected heritage language maintenance with ethnic origin (Phinney, 1995) while Elham and Ali, and Tandis and Maryam highlighted the role of heritage language maintenance in constructing different components of ethnic identity. The children emphasized ethnic interest and knowledge, and involvement in activities associated with the ethnic group (Phinney, 1995). Based on Tse's (1998) ethnic identity model, the student participants, who were born and raised or grew up in Canada, were at the third stage of ethnic identity construction where they realized a connection to their ethnic group and attempted to be involved in it by socializing with extended family and community members in Canada and Iran. On the other hand, the majority of the parent participants, who immigrated to Canada at an older age, compared to the children, associated ethnic identity with ethnic origin, stating that Iranian immigrant children needed to learn Farsi because they were originally from Iran (self-labeling, in Phinney's (1995) term). The immigration age, therefore, might have impacted the children's and parent participants' perceptions of ethnic identity and its relation with heritage language maintenance.

The fact that the children and parents highlighted different components of ethnic identity might have influenced their expectations of heritage language proficiency. The parents stressed oral and written proficiency development perhaps because they perceived heritage language maintenance as an ethnic identity marker, stating that Iranian children must learn Farsi no matter where they are born. On the other hand, the children stressed the mastery of oral communication

skills, perhaps because this would facilitate social communication with extended family and community members.

The heritage language as a language other than English.

The student participants. In addition to perceiving Farsi as a heritage language, the student participants perceived Farsi as a language other than English in Canada. In the critical incident reports, Davoud, Elham, and Kiana mentioned that they had used Farsi in an English dominant context and felt unique because they knew a language their non-Iranian peers or many non-Iranian people did not know. Elham recalled,

”گاهی تکلیف فارسی ام را در مدرسه انجام می دهم. وقتی دوستان کره ای-کاناداییم فارسی را می بینند، از من می پرسند این چیست. همانطور که در مورد فارسی توضیح می دهم، احساس منحصر به فردی دارم چون زبانی می دانم که آنها نمی دانند.“

“I sometimes do Farsi homework at school. When my Korean-Canadian friends see Farsi, they ask me what it is. Explaining about Farsi, I feel unique because I know a language they do not know” (Transcript B, p. 1, Lines 3-6).

Similarly, Kiana recalled speaking Farsi with her father at an Iranian restaurant. Overhearing their conversation, an English-speaking man asked them whether they were speaking Farsi, adding that his wife was Farsi-speaking. That incident made Kiana proud of herself because she could speak a language other than English which many non-Iranian people do not know in Canada.

Davoud recalled an English speaking student overhearing his conversation in Farsi with his Iranian-Canadian friend at the public school. Davoud felt unique because of speaking a language his Canadian school mate did not know.

While Davoud, Kiana, and Elham attempted to maintain Farsi to feel unique, among other reasons, Tandis learned it partly because her mother and Canadian teacher praised her for learning a language other than English and adding to her linguistic repertoire.

Bailey (2002) maintains that “[T]he linguistic forms and varieties have ranges of metaphorical social situations that individuals exploit in particular contexts for particular ends in highlighting various aspects of their identities” (p. 99). In other words, code-switching in bilinguals “is a representation of individual identity construction, which for some speakers, it is already constructed, but for others it is in the process of construction” (Velasquez, 2010, p. 89). Elham’s use of Farsi to write her non-Iranian friends’ names indicates her willingness to claim a multilingual identity (reportedly knowing English, French, Farsi and a little Spanish) in an English dominant context, perhaps to position herself in a more advantaged position vis-à-vis her peers who might have known fewer languages (Korean and English).

Equally, the other student participants’ speaking Farsi in front of non-Farsi speakers was a representation of their multiple identities. While knowing only English would limit their linguistic and social identity to a monolingual speaker, heritage language maintenance facilitated access to a wider range of socio-linguistic identity options (that is, a bilingual speaker) for Kiana, Davoud, and Tandis.

Previous research has found a relationship between code-switching and identity construction. Bilinguals in Velasquez’s (2011) study constructed multiple identities through code switching. Similarly, the results of this study showed a relationship between language choice and

social identity development. Speaking Farsi in English dominant contexts facilitated the students' access to a wider range of potentially powerful identities, such as bilingual and Farsi-speaking.

Learning a language other than English could also increase educational and employment opportunities for children in Canada. According to Delaram, knowing multiple languages could facilitate admission to university in Canada. Additionally, knowing Farsi would advantage Delaram, Kiana, and Tandis to apply for a job in Canada because it could facilitate communication with Iranian clients. For example, according to Kiana, a Farsi-speaking flight attendant or doctor could translate instructions for Farsi-speaking passengers or patients who did not know English in Canada. Moreover, a Farsi-speaking employee could communicate with Farsi-speaking people outside Canada or write reports in Farsi, if required, Delaram mentioned.

The parent participants. Similar to the student participants, the parent participants highlighted the importance of learning Farsi as a language other than English in Canada and overseas.

Demonstrating a positive attitude towards bilingualism and multilingualism, the parent participants mentioned that knowing multiple languages would facilitate children's access to educational and employment opportunities in the dominant society. Similar to the parent participants in previous studies (Chen, 2010; Hinton, 1999; Namei, 2012), to the parents in this study, a more meaningful definition of bilingualism was knowing English and the heritage language.

A study on linguistic minority children in French immersion programs in Quebec revealed that parents' choices and practices with regard to their children's education stemmed

from their expectations related to their children's language and literacy development, educational achievements, and identity construction. The Chinese parent participants opted for French immersion education for their children because their minority status in Quebec and nationwide, and their perception of inequality in the job market resulted in higher expectations for their children's educational achievements. The English parent participants, on the other hand, believed that bilingualism would provide better employment opportunities for their children in Quebec. Additionally, both groups considered multi/bilingualism as linguistic asset, and first language (that is, Chinese and English) proficiency as a priority in socio-cultural, or ethnic, identity construction. While the Anglophone children maintained English in the French immersion program and at home, the Chinese children attended a Chinese heritage language school, the parents reported (Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010).

As members of a linguistic minority group in the City and Canada, the parent participants might have opted for French immersion and heritage language education for their children for similar reasons mentioned by the participants in the above-reviewed study. In other words, the parents facilitated learning multiple languages including Farsi for their children because of their positive attitudes towards bilingualism/multilingualism (Dagenais & Berron, 2001).

According to Azy, knowing a language other than English such as Chinese, Spanish, and Farsi facilitated communication with non-English speaking clients in her job. Azy also stated that knowing Farsi could increase employment opportunities in banks and immigration centers in Canada, and in countries where it is spoken, such as Iran, or known by many people, such as the United Arab Emirates. Similarly, Mahsa mentioned that knowing Farsi as a language other than English could strengthen job applicants' resumes. This could also provide children with more educational opportunities. She explained,

”دخترم شاید در آینده بخواهد مثل شما تحقیقات آموزشی با مهاجران ایرانی انجام دهد. در نتیجه، لازم می شود

که فارسی بداند. می خواهم فارسی بداند تا بتواند فرصتهای آموزشی بیشتری داشته باشد“.

“My daughter might wish to perform educational research with Iranian immigrants in the future, like you; therefore, she would need to know Farsi. I would like her to know Farsi to have more educational possibilities” (Transcript K, p. 2, Lines 12-14).

In other words, according to Mahsa, heritage language maintenance facilitated Iranian immigrant children’s participation in an imagined community (Anderson, 1991) of researchers should they choose to conduct research on Farsi in the future.

The importance of knowing Farsi in the dominant, English speaking society was highlighted by the student and parent participants from different families. While Delaram, Tandis, and Elham highlighted the potentially important role of knowing Farsi in accessing a wider range of educational and employment opportunities, their parents emphasized the role of Farsi within the Iranian community. In other words, the role of heritage language in the dominant society was perceived differently by the first and second generation immigrant participants.

The teacher participants. Mahnaz mentioned that learning a language other than English might make students feel unique. Emphasizing the importance of multilingualism in the Canadian society, she stated that many children learn French and Spanish as a second language in Canada. Iranian immigrant children could learn Farsi which is less widely known, compared to French, and feel unique.

Behrouz stated that learning Farsi could facilitate gaining access to a wider range of educational opportunities for Iranian immigrant student, citing,

”بچه های مهاجر ایرانی ممکن است در آینده تصمیم بگیرند در رشته فارسی تحصیل کنند. اگر در بچگی آنها یاد نگیرند، ممکن است در بزرگی زمان بیشتری برای یادگیری فارسی نیاز باشد که در این صورت شاید آنها را از رسیدن به این هدف منصرف کند.“

“Iranian immigrant children might decide to major in Farsi in the future. If they do not know it in childhood, it might take a longer time to learn Farsi in adulthood, which might discourage them to fulfill this goal” (Transcript Q, p. 3, Lines 8-11).

Table 6 demonstrates the student participants’ perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance.

Table 6: The Student Participants’ Perceptions of the Importance of Language Maintenance

The Student	Perceptions			
Dina	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Communicating with the community members in Canada	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts	
Elham	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Communicating with the community members in Canada	Adding to her linguistic repertoire	
Kiana	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Communicating with the community members in Canada	Increasing employment opportunities in Canada	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts
Tandis	Communicating with extended family members	Communicating with the community	Adding to her linguistic	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts

	in Iran	members in Canada	repertoire		
Delaram	Communicating with parents in Canada	Communicating with Farsi speakers overseas	Ethnic identity: self-labelling (Phinney, 1995)	Increasing educational and employment opportunities in Canada and overseas	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts
Davoud	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Adding to his linguistic repertoire			

Table 7 lists the parent participants' perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance.

Table 7: The Parent Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Language Maintenance

The Parents	Perceptions			
Nilou	Communicating with family and community members in Canada and Iran	Expressing emotions		Self-pride and respect
Maryam	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Ethnic identity construction		
Azy	Communicating with extended family members in Iran	Communicating with community members in Canada	Increasing employment opportunities in Canada and overseas	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts
Bahar	Communicating with extended family members in Iran and Canada	Ethnic identity construction		
Mahsa	Communicating with extended family members	Ethnic identity construction		Increasing employment opportunities in Canada and overseas

	in Iran		
Ali	Communicating with extended family members in Iran and Canada	Ethnic identity construction	

Table 8 shows the teacher participants' perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance.

Table 8: The Teacher Participants' Perceptions of the Importance of Language Maintenance

The Teachers	Perceptions			
Sara	Ethnic identity construction	Communication with community members in Canada	Adding to one's linguistic repertoire	
Mahnaz	Communication with extended family members in Canada	Communication with community members in Canada	Adding to one's linguistic repertoire	
Mina	Ethnic identity construction	Communication with community members in Canada	Emotional expression	
Rosie	Ethnic identity construction	Communication with Farsi speaking people in Canada and overseas	Communication with family members	Emotional expression
Behrouz	Ethnic identity construction	Communication with community members in	Adding to one's linguistic repertoire	Increasing employment and educational opportunities in Canada and Iran

		Canada		
--	--	--------	--	--

Table 9 summarizes the three stakeholder groups' perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance.

Table 9: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Perceptions of Heritage Language Maintenance

	Advantages of Heritage Language Maintenance			
The Students	Communicating with family members In Iran and Canada	Ethnic identity construction: Sense of belonging to the L1 community (Phinney, 1995)	Increasing educational and employment opportunities in Canada	Protecting the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts
The Parents	Communicating with family and community members In Iran and Canada	Ethnic identity construction: Self- Labelling (Phinney, 1995)	Increasing educational and employment opportunities in Canada and overseas	
The Teachers	Communicating with family and community members In Iran and Canada	Ethnic identity construction: Self- labelling (Phinney, 1995)	Increasing educational and employment opportunities in Canada and overseas	

As shown in Table 9, the student, parent, and teacher participants expressed similar perceptions on the importance of heritage language maintenance. They associated heritage language maintenance with ethnic identity construction, highlighting the role of maintaining Farsi in socializing with family and community members and gaining access to further educational and socio-economic opportunities in Canada and overseas.

The notions of imagined identity (Norton, 2000) and imagined community (Anderson, 1991) were frequently brought up in the parent, and teacher participants' perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance. Previous research has revealed that attempts in

claiming a particular identity and participating in a desired imagined community, however unreal and private this might be, can influence language learning outcomes (Kanno & Norton, 2003; Norton, 2000). Based on this, in the parent and teacher participants' perspectives, maintaining Farsi could facilitate participation in the Iranian society and the researchers' communities for Iranian immigrant children should they choose to settle permanently in Iran, or conduct research on the Farsi language or with Iranian communities in Canada.

The teachers' perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance resembled those of the parents perhaps because the teacher participants were parents themselves. The teacher participants claimed different identity positions such as teacher, parent, and immigrant, during the interviews, which indicated the fluid nature of identity (Norton & Toohey, 2011). While commenting on the importance of heritage language maintenance, they positioned themselves as immigrant parents who had attempted to facilitate heritage language maintenance opportunities for their children and decided to contribute to heritage language maintenance within the wider Iranian immigrant community in Canada. In other words, the parent identity position claimed by the teacher participants might have been the reason why almost all of them referred to the personal (Babaei, 2010b), and social and familial (Kouritzin, 1999; Wong Fillmore, 2000) importance of heritage language maintenance. Had they claimed a teacher identity position, on the other hand, the teachers might have highlighted the potential educational advantages of bilingualism achieved through heritage language maintenance (Cummins, 1995). A teacher participant, Mina, referred to the educational advantage of heritage language maintenance merely based on her observations of immigrant children.

Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies

The student participants.

At home. Heritage language maintenance strategies employed by the student participants at home included using Farsi to communicate with parents and guests living in Canada and visiting from Iran. Although the children reported speaking English more easily than Farsi, they sometimes used Farsi at home to please or obey their parents. Kiana explained,

انگلیسی زبان اول من است و انگلیسی را در مقایسه با فارسی راحت تر صحبت می کنم ولی مادرم ناراحت می شود اگر ما در خانه انگلیسی صحبت کنیم و از ما می خواهد فارسی حرف بزنیم. سعی می کنیم فارسی حرف بزنیم ولی بعد از یکی دو روز یادمان می رود.

English is my first language and it is easier for me to speak English, compared to Farsi.

However, my mother becomes sad to find us speaking English at home, and asks us to switch to Farsi. We try to speak Farsi but we forget to use it after a day or two (Transcript C, p. 3, Lines 2-4).

Similarly, Tandis's mother, according to her, would become angry if Tandis and her sister spoke English at home. Tandis spoke Farsi with Farsi-speaking friends at home or at Iranian parties to please her mother. The students' heritage language use at home could be explained with regard to their identity positions (Norton, 2000). Claiming a "good" child identity requires following rules assigned by parents at home. That was perhaps why the students followed their parents' demand in using Farsi at home.

Heritage language use at home was a strategy employed by the students. This, however, partly depended on the parents' and siblings' language preference and Farsi and English

proficiency. The children reported using English with their siblings because of their lack of Farsi proficiency and their own preference to speak English. The students also reported mixing Farsi and English with their parents. The students reported speaking Farsi with relatives who occasionally visited them from Iran. They also spoke Farsi and English with adult family friends in Canada. These occasions provided them with an opportunity to hear and use Farsi at home.

While the children's language preference and the family members' language proficiency and preference determined heritage language use in this study, the children's age was a determining factor in heritage language use at home in Sohrabi's (1997) study with Iranian immigrants in Sweden. The results of Sohrabi's research indicated that the majority of the participants spoke their mother tongues (Farsi and minority languages in Iran) with their parents. The students born in Sweden or having migrated there below the age of six, however, had a tendency to mix Swedish and Farsi or switch to Swedish when they were in a hurry or excited to say something, compared to those who had immigrated to Sweden after age ten. In this study, the children's age was not a determining factor in their heritage language use patterns because all but one of them were Canadian born. The other student participant was born in Iran and emigrated to Europe at the age of three.

Tandis and Kiana used Farsi because their parents demanded that they use it at home. They, however, switched to English because it was easier for them to speak it, compared to Farsi. Immigrant parents' authoritarian approach to children's heritage language maintenance has been discussed in Guardado's (2002) and Hinton's (1999) studies. Children who had lost their heritage language in Guardado's (2002) study were raised by authoritarian parents who demanded that they speak their heritage language. On the contrary, a participant in Hinton's (1999) study reported that in her or his household, English, that is, the additional language, was forbidden.

This was a reason why he or she had maintained his or her heritage language although Hinton provided no further details on this participant's language maintenance experience. The present study suggested that parents' authoritarian approach needs to be complemented with other heritage language maintenance strategies. Otherwise, the children would switch to English if they spoke it more easily.

Heritage language maintenance strategies employed by the student participants also involved watching Iranian films and cartoons, reading Farsi books and magazines, and doing Farsi homework assigned by heritage language teachers. Homework mainly included copying and making sentences with new words, doing dictation and reading words, sentences and small passages aloud.

At the public school. Although the student participants employed heritage language maintenance strategies within the contexts of home and the L1 community, they, except Elham, did not practice Farsi at the public (Canadian) school. Elham, Tandis, Dina, Kiana, Davoud, and Delaram mentioned that their schools provided no heritage language resources such as Farsi storybooks neither did they offer Farsi courses. Dina's, Kiana's, Davoud's, and Delaram's teachers, according to them, did not allow students to use a language other than English in class, and that the students had no Iranian classmates. They usually spoke English with their Iranian friends at school because they intended to include non-Farsi speaking students in the conversation. Delaram greeted her Iranian friend in Farsi and she, Tandis, and Kiana used Farsi to protect the privacy of their conversations at the public school. These tended to be the only instances where the students used Farsi in public schools.

While the students in this study reported sporadic heritage language use at the public school, more than half (51%) of the Iranian student participants in Namei's (2012) research reported using Farsi sometimes at Swedish schools. The majority of the students in Namei's research, however, reported having between one to ten Iranian classmates, which might be a reason for their using Farsi at the public school. The student participants in this study reported having no Farsi speaking classmates and a few Iranian schoolmates.

Norton Peirce (1995) argues, "[I]f learners invest in learning a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in return increase the value of their cultural capital" (p. 17). Symbolic resources, according to her, included language, education, and friendship while material resources included real estate, money, and capital goods. Investment "presupposes that when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they related to the social world" (p. 18).

Investment, which Norton Peirce (1995) has brought up within the field of second language education, can be extended to the area of heritage language education and explain heritage language learners' resistance and desire to speak and learn their heritage languages in different contexts. Norton Peirce (1995) argues that "[T]he subject positions that a person takes up within a particular discourse are open to arguments" because of his or her agency (p. 16-17). In other words, "[a]lthough a person may be positioned in a particular way within a given discourse, the person might resist the subject position or even set up a counterdiscourse which positions the person in a powerful rather than marginalized subject position" (p. 17). The students encountered their peers' negative attitudes towards their heritage language use and

assumed this would risk their access to social resources at school. In other words, the students would be positioned in a disadvantaged position by their English-speaking peers if they used Farsi at school. Despite that, they communicated in Farsi with Iranian-Canadian friends to protect the privacy of their conversations. The students' investment in using Farsi, therefore, excluded the non-Farsi speakers from the interaction and limited their access to social resources (friendship and communication) gained by Farsi-speaking students. By speaking Farsi, the students rejected the identity positions assigned by non-Farsi speaking peers, claiming a more powerful identity position.

The student participants' identity negotiation at the public school can also be analyzed in light of Bourdieu's (1991) argument that

The distribution of linguistic capital is related in specific ways to the distribution of other forms of capital (economic capital, social capital, etc.) which define the location of an individual within the social space. ... The more linguistic capital that speakers possess, the more they are able to exploit the system of differences to their advantage (p. 18)

The student participants' heritage language use at the public school positioned them in a more powerful position because of possessing a linguistic capital (the Farsi language) non-Farsi speaking students lacked in that linguistic market (the public school). The linguistic capital (the Farsi language) was exchanged with the social capital (friendship and social network) which was not accessible to those who lacked it (the non-Farsi speaking students). This exchange enabled the student participants to "exploit the system of [linguistic] differences to their advantage" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 18). As Taylor (in press) mentions, the students were aware

of where they were accepted and rejected, who their friends were, and what linguistic capital strengthen their friendships. Based on these, they used their plurilingual competence.

In the L1 community. The Farsi school environment provided the students with an opportunity to be exposed to Farsi. The students practiced Farsi by copying new words and reading words and passages aloud. Additionally, the Level 1 students did dictation (Field note A, p. 9) and Level 2 students answered reading comprehension, grammar and vocabulary questions at the end of each lesson (Field note B, p. 5).

The student participants often used English to communicate with teachers and classmates for social purposes because it was easier for them to speak English, rather than Farsi. However, they switched to Farsi to communicate with teachers and other students when their teachers asked them because of the Farsi only policy of the school. This, according to the students, made them practice Farsi. Kiana explained,

”من راحت ترم که انگلیسی حرف بزنم چون کانادا دنیا آمده ام و first language من انگلیسی است ولی با معلمها در مدرسه فارسی، فارسی حرف می زنم چون دوست ندارند دانش آموزان اینجا انگلیسی حرف بزنند“.

“I am more comfortable speaking English because I was born in Canada and my first language is English. However, I speak Farsi with the teachers in the Farsi school because they don’t like students to speak English here” (Transcript C, p. 4, Lines 1-3).

Heritage language use was promoted by parents and teachers at home and in the community school. Although the student participants used Farsi at home, they switched to English because they spoke it more easily, compared to Farsi. According to the students, despite introducing a Farsi only policy at home, the parents sometimes initiated speaking English to the children or responded in English when the children addressed them in English at home. On the

other hand, the teachers monitored the students' language use and followed the Farsi only policy themselves. Compared to the parents, the teachers might have been in a more socially powerful position vis-a-vis the students to enforce the language policy. The teachers also followed the Farsi only policy consistently. These might explain why the students used Farsi at the community school more than they did at home, which, according to the students, improved their heritage language maintenance.

The most important resource for learning Farsi at the Farsi school, according to the student participants, was teachers because they asked students to speak Farsi. Additionally, according to Kiana, Delaram, Dina, and Tandis, teachers explained lessons to them and solved their problems with lessons. Kiana also stated that weekly homework facilitated learning Farsi for her.

Other resources to learn Farsi at the Farsi school, according to the student participants, included textbooks, alphabet charts and Farsi books in the library. Memorizing new words in the textbook facilitated recognizing them in other linguistic contexts for Kiana. While Kiana was unaware that she could borrow books from the library, Davoud did not borrow books because of his perceived inability to read Farsi. On the other hand, Delaram, Elham, and Tandis borrowed storybooks from the Farsi school's library.

Previous research has affirmed the role of the L1 community (Igbal, 2005; King, 2000; Kravin, 1992), particularly community schools (Chen, 2010; Chinen & Tucker, 2005) in minority children' heritage language maintenance and ethnic identity construction. This research also revealed that the L1 community and the community school contributed to the students' heritage language maintenance and ethnic identity formation. The City hosts one of the largest Iranian immigrant populations in Canada, which might indicate a correlation between the size of

an L1 community and heritage language maintenance facilities it can offer to an immigrant community.

The students attempted to maintain Farsi partly to be included in the L1 community and develop a sense of belonging to it. Involvement in activities associated with an ethnic group and a sense of belonging to it are components of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1995). Socializing with community members, particularly adults, and attending the community school, therefore, facilitated heritage language maintenance and ethnic identity construction for the students. The results of this study also confirmed those of Babae's (2013) and Guardado's (2010), who concluded that the availability of peers of the same ethnic background cannot guarantee heritage language use because many immigrant children prefer to communicate in English with their peers partly because they speak it better than their heritage languages.

The role of the community school in the children's heritage language maintenance was highlighted by the student participants. The students used Farsi to communicate with classmates and teachers at the community school, mainly because of the school's Farsi only policy and teachers' demand. Farsi teachers and parents, according to the students, insisted on the students' using Farsi at the community school and home. The students reported switching to English frequently at home because they knew it better than Farsi. They, however, reported using Farsi in Farsi classes because of the teachers' demands.

The contribution of the community school to the students' heritage language maintenance could be discussed in light of their investment in heritage language learning and the resource they could gain from it. The symbolic and material resources (Norton Peirce, 1995) which could be acquired through heritage language education, according to the students, included access to a wider range of educational and employment opportunities and involvement in the L1

community. Additionally, the students' investment in heritage language maintenance was in fact an investment in their social identity. Within an educational setting, claiming a “good” student identity partly requires following classroom rules assigned by a teacher. To construct this identity, the student participants followed the Farsi only policy introduced by the teachers in the classroom. This facilitated their heritage language maintenance.

Table 10 illustrates the resources and strategies employed by the student participants within the contexts of home, the public school, and the L1 community.

Table 10: Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies and Resources Employed by the Students

	Home	The Public School	The Community School
Dina	Farsi homework Heritage language use, particularly with guests arriving from Iran	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks The teacher Storybooks in the library
Elham	Farsi homework Heritage language use, particularly with adult friends in Canada and guests arriving from Iran Crossword puzzles Farsi films	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks Storybooks in the library
Tandis	Farsi homework Heritage language use, particularly with guests living in Canada	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks The teacher and classmates

	Farsi music Farsi news on TV Farsi Newspapers		
Kiana	Farsi homework Heritage language use with parents, adult family friends, and relatives in Iran through the Internet	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks The teacher
Delaram	Farsi homework Heritage language use with parents Watching Farsi soap operas	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks The teacher Storybooks in the library
Davoud	Farsi homework Heritage language use with parents and relatives in Iran through the Internet	Heritage language use (rarely)	Heritage language use Textbooks The teacher

As Table 10 shows, heritage language maintenance opportunities existed within the contexts of home and the L1 community. These opportunities were limited at the public schools because of a lack of Farsi classes and resources such as storybooks, the students' preference to use English, having no Farsi speaking classmates, and their Iranian-Canadian friends' preference to speak English. Resources available within the contexts of home and L1 community were complementary because, for instance, the students had access to audiovisual learning aids at home while they had access to heritage language teachers at the community school.

The students used Farsi within the contexts of home, public school, and the L1 community. Marshall and Moore (2013) state that selection, exploitation, and adaptation of available linguistic resources by plurilingual speakers are influenced by

[S]pecific social situations; speakers' perceptions of their own and their interlocutors' linguistic and cultural resources or “shared resources” (Lüdi & Py, 2009, p. 157); situational constraints and possibilities; communicative needs; life experiences; and plurilinguals' symbolic allegiances and affiliations. (p. 478)

In this light, the students' language use patterns was influenced by interlocutors' heritage and English language proficiency and preference to use Farsi or English, the dominance of English and Farsi and language policy in a given social and educational context, and the students' desired social and linguistic identities. Parents' and teachers' insistence on heritage language use and family and community members' lack of knowledge of English made the students use Farsi at home and in the Farsi school. Also, claiming a powerful social identity and constructing a bilingual identity motivated the students to use Farsi at public schools.

Heritage language maintenance strategies employed by the students in this study were reported by immigrant children in previous research (Liu, 2008). Attending the heritage language school followed by heritage language use at home were the top two frequently used strategies used by the children in this study while visiting the homeland and attending heritage language schools were the top two factors influenced the children's heritage language maintenance in Liu's (2008) study. This might indicate the importance of formal heritage language education in immigrant children's heritage language maintenance.

The parent participants. The parent participants, Maryam, Azy, Bahar, Mahsa, Ali, and Nilou facilitated heritage language maintenance for their children by registering them in the community school, speaking Farsi with them, asking them to use Farsi, and providing them with Farsi movies, cartoons, songs and storybooks. Bahar, Mahsa, and Maryam had been discouraged or received negative reactions to use Farsi in English dominant contexts such as work-places. Despite that, they continued using Farsi with their children at home and outside when non-Farsi speakers were not involved in the conversation.

Ali, Mahsa, and Nilou arranged frequent trips to Iran for their children, which, according to them, had improved their children's Farsi. According to Azy, her son's Farsi proficiency improved greatly because of a one-month trip to Iran. Similarly, trips to Iran played an important role in Mahsa's daughter's heritage language maintenance because she was immersed in an input rich context where Farsi was used all the time. Nilou's daughter was motivated to learn Farsi in Iran to communicate with people because their relatives did not know English.

In addition to providing the children with literacy recourses and arranging trips to Iran, the parent participants facilitated heritage language learning for them by interacting with Iranian families. Mahsa, Bahar, and Maryam used Farsi to communicate with their children and asked them to switch to Farsi if they used English at Iranian parties. They believed that interacting with community members could provide children with an opportunity to hear and use Farsi. This assumption was affirmed by the student participants, who mentioned that they used Farsi to communicate with their community members, specially adult family friends.

Nilou, Maryam, Azy, Bahar, and Mahsa mentioned that heritage language maintenance included developing communicative (speaking and listening) and literacy (reading and writing) skills. Therefore, they had registered their children at the community school to provide further,

perhaps more professional and formal, heritage language maintenance opportunities for their children. Nilou said,

آموزش فارسی به دلارام را با واداشتن او به کپی کردن الفبا از روی کارت پستالها و دیکته نوشتن شروع کردم. همچنین، او را واداشتم از طریق تشخیص حروف الفبا در کتابهای فارسی و روز نامه ها، الفبا را تمرین کند. گرچه دلارام می توانست الفبا را کپی کند، در دیکته نویسی دچار مشکل شد. در مدرسه فارسی ثبت نامش کردم چون من معلم نیستم و نمی توانم به او فارسی آموزش دهم .

I started teaching Delaram Farsi literacy by having her copy Farsi alphabets written on post cards and do dictation. I also had her practice the alphabet by identifying alphabetical letters in Farsi books and newspapers. Although Delaram could copy alphabetical letters, she had a hard time doing dictation. I enrolled her in the Farsi school because I am not a teacher and cannot teach her Farsi. (Transcript G, p. 3, Lines 2-8)

Maryam registered her daughters in the Farsi school so that they would pursue learning Farsi seriously. Her mother had taught Tandis and her sister Farsi at home on weekends; however, they sometimes refused to do homework because they had much English schoolwork to do on weekdays and preferred to relax on weekends. The children, according to Maryam, attended the Farsi school and did homework regularly although they preferred to relax at home on Saturdays.

Ali registered his children at the Farsi school to expose them to Farsi because, according to him, their home environment offered little heritage language maintenance opportunities to his children. His children, according to him, spoke English to each other and their friends, and he and his wife gave priority to assisting their children with English homework. Therefore, the Farsi

school with a Farsi only policy was a space for his children to use Farsi to communicate with teachers and students.

Maryam, Azy, Bahar, and Mahsa referred to other impacts of the Farsi school on their children's heritage language maintenance as well. Maryam stated that in addition to developing the literacy skills, her children practiced speaking Farsi and gained background information to understand traditional Iranian stories and know about Iran's history at the community school.

Bahar mentioned that the community school was a pleasant environment for children to learn Farsi because it was not religiously or politically oriented. She explained that she would like her daughter to develop Farsi literacy skills, rather than religious ideologies, at the Farsi school, adding that she had changed her daughter's Farsi school because the former school promoted religious ideologies. Bahar also appreciated the fact that the Farsi school celebrated Iranian traditional events such as *Shabe Yalda* and *Nowrouz* to gather Iranian immigrants together.

Highlighting the importance of discipline in education, Mahsa expressed satisfaction with the Farsi school because her daughter learned Iranian values. She mentioned that while students in Canadian schools are allowed to eat and drink in class, they are not allowed to do so in Iranian schools including the Farsi school. Many immigrant parents who "bring their cultural assets with them" to a host country strive to pass on their ethnic values to the next generation (Chen, 2010, p. 133). Registering her daughter at the Farsi school, therefore, facilitated transmitting ethnic values to her for Mahsa.

Table 11 shows the strategies employed by the parent participants to facilitate heritage language maintenance for their children.

Table 11: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Employed by the Parents

The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies	The Parent Participants					
	Nilou	Maryam	Azy	Bahar	Mahsa	Ali
	Heritage language use	Heritage language use	Heritage language use	Heritage language use	Heritage language use	Heritage language use
	Trips to Iran	Trips to Iran	Trips to Iran	Trips to Iran	Trips to Iran	Trips to Iran (arranged by his wife)
	Attending Iranian events such as concerts	Socializing with community members		Socializing with community members	Socializing with community members	
	Registering her child in the Farsi school	Registering her children in the Farsi school	Registering her child in the Farsi school	Registering her child in the Farsi school	Registering her child in the Farsi school	Registering his children in the Farsi school
		Playing Farsi cartoons and reading Farsi books to her children	Playing Farsi cartoons and singing Farsi songs to her son	Playing vocabulary games with her daughter	Watching Farsi soap operas with her daughter	
				Playing Farsi cartoons and reading Farsi books to her child		

The heritage language maintenance strategies used by the parent participants resembled those used by the immigrant parents in previous studies (Babaei, 2013; Chen, 2010; Guardado, 2010). Heritage language use is an oft-cited strategy implemented by immigrant parents to facilitate heritage language maintenance for children (Babaei, 2013; Guardado, 2002; Sohrabi,

1997). Giles and Byrne (1982) argue that minority group members attempt to construct a positive ethnic identity by emphasizing their in-group speech style. This means that they might speak their heritage language more than any other language. By speaking Farsi to their children and asking them to use Farsi at home, the parent participants attempted to foster ethnic identity construction and heritage language maintenance for them. Additionally, the parent participants followed monolingual instructional assumptions in language education (Cummins, 2009, 2005), believing that learning and using Farsi and English should be kept separate. Therefore, they prevented their children from translanguaging (Garcia, 2009), or code-switching.

Socializing with community members and trips to Iran contributed to the children's heritage language maintenance because they were immersed in a Farsi dominant context where their ethnic identities, particularly their sense of belonging to an ethnic group and involvement in its activities (Phinney, 2005), were (re)affirmed and (re)constructed. Moreover, many immigrant children feel the need to use their heritage language to communicate with people in their home countries, which could motivate them to maintain it (Babaei, 2013; Namei, 2012).

Trips to the home country could be associated with immigrant families' socio-economic status because parents need to afford trips to their home countries (Babaei, 2013). The parent participants in this study were educated, had full-time jobs, and could afford trips to Iran, which, according to them, had influenced their children's heritage language maintenance positively.

The parents enrolled their children in the community school to provide further heritage language maintenance opportunities for them, similar to many immigrant parents (Chen, 2010; Namei, 2012). Maryam and Bahar mixed Farsi and English to communicate with their children. This, in addition to the parents' reportedly busy schedules, might have revealed the importance of formal heritage language education for their children because they could practice Farsi and

receive feedback on their performance at the community school. The parent participants' emphasis on the importance of formal heritage language education contrasted a participant's assumption in Chen's (2010) study, who stated that effective heritage language programs required "parental supervision at home" (p. 93). Her child, according to Chen, eventually dropped out of the heritage language school because she believed that studying Mandarin two hours per week had been insufficient to learn it. Maryam's children dropped out of the Farsi school as well. However, the reason was that she disagreed with the religious ideologies which were transmitted to her children through the textbooks. Her children continued heritage language learning with their grandmother, which indicated Maryam's emphasis on formal heritage language education. This study revealed that heritage language schools can play an important role in immigrant children's heritage language maintenance especially in households where parents are unable to facilitate heritage language maintenance opportunities for the children at home.

Bahar highlighted the social function of the community school, appreciating that the school brought the Iranian community members together by celebrating traditional events. This function of community schools has also been highlighted by immigrant parents from a Chinese background in Canada (Chen, 2010). Some parents registered their children at the community school to facilitate socialization with peers of the same ethnic background for them while others see the community school as a site where children can learn about ethnic culture and behaviors (Chen, 2010). Socializing with community members can also create a sense of belonging in immigrants and reinforce their ethnic identity (Phinney, 1996).

The teacher participants. The teacher participants used a variety of strategies to teach Farsi to students. Sara encouraged students to study Farsi by giving them stickers and asking them to study hard to pass Level 1. While Sara emphasized the importance of heritage language maintenance in ethnic identity construction in the interview, classroom observations revealed that she highlighted the importance of learning Farsi to go to a higher level in class. In other words, she often asked the students to practice Farsi at home every day so that they could pass the final exam. In an incident, a student mentioned that she forgot to practice the alphabets. Sara responded,

”باید هر روز فارسی تمرین کنی که بتوانی به کلاس بالاتر بروی. ماه آینده امتحان فینال دارید. باید قبول شوید“.

“You must practice Farsi every day so that you can go to the next level. You have the final exam next month. You must pass it” (Field note E, p. 2, Line 12). In one incident during the observation period Sara encouraged the students to learn Farsi because they were originally from Iran. The students were complaining that learning Farsi alphabets was difficult because some sounds had two or three different written forms.

سارا به ترانه: انگلیسی برایت آسان است چون پنج روز در هفته انگلیسی می خوانی ولی فارسی فقط یک روز. ولی فارسی آسانتر است .

ترانه: ولی انگلیسی را باید بدانیم چون it 's a world language .

سارا: صحبت آسانی و سختی است ولی تو چون ایرانی هستی باید فارسی را بدانی .

Sara to Taraneh: English is easy for you because you study English five days a week but Farsi only one day. Farsi is easier, though.

Taraneh: But we need to know English because it is a world language.

Sara: We are talking about the ease and difficulty but because you are from Iran, you must know Farsi.

(Field note H, p. 4, Lines 5-9)

In this incident, Sara connected heritage language maintenance to ethnic identity construction (Phinney, 1995), assuming that claiming an Iranian ethnic identity necessitated knowing Farsi. Sara's different perceptions of the importance of heritage language maintenance in the interview and in class might have stemmed from multiple identities and the positions she claimed in those contexts (Norton, 2000). Discussing the importance of heritage language maintenance to the researcher, an Iranian immigrant speaking Farsi as a First Language, Sara positioned herself as an immigrant, emphasizing that learning Farsi would facilitate ethnic identity construction for Iranian immigrant children. On the other hand, She positioned herself as a teacher, rather than an immigrant, vis-a-vis the students in class, and positioned them as students, rather than second-generation immigrants. Therefore, she emphasized the importance of learning Farsi in passing a level.

Classroom observations revealed that Sara followed a traditional teaching style used in Iran more than twenty years ago to teach Farsi. After writing a new letter and a few words initiating with it on the board, she asked students to copy them in their notebooks. In other words, most of the class time was spent on copying words and reading passages aloud (Field note A, p. 7). She also used a variety of teaching strategies including explanation, exemplification and translation (into English) to explain new words (Field note E, p. 5; Field note E, p. 6; Field note G, p. 3).

While Sara highlighted the importance of learning Farsi to pass the grade in her class, Mahnaz attempted to engage students in class activities so that they would enjoy learning Farsi. She said that students who found heritage language classes different from Canadian classes

might find the former uninteresting and eventually quit attending heritage language schools. Therefore, according to her, heritage language teachers need to keep students interested in learning Farsi. To that end, Mahnaz talked about cultural events such as *Nowrouz* and *Yalda Night* in class and asked students to find out more about those events. Moreover, she played games at the end of each session so that the students would practice Farsi further. She asked a student to pick an alphabet letter, asking the class to write a first name, a last name, the name of a city, an animal and a color, to name a few, starting with that letter. According to her, students had fun playing this game while practicing vocabulary, spelling and reading in Farsi.

Rosie encouraged students to learn Farsi by doing engaging and fun activities in class such as painting or playing games. In her story telling classes, Rosie attempted to build on what students learned in the Farsi class to reinforce Farsi lessons. For example, after telling a story, she asked students to do dictation and make sentences with new words. Moreover, Rosie played games with them to improve their vocabulary and spelling. She chose instructional materials based on the students' Farsi proficiency levels. However, to involve students in decision making, she sometimes asked them to bring a story book to the class, which she read aloud, or asked them to tell the class a story they had read at home.

Mina attempted to provide a “good” native Farsi speaking model for students by producing grammatically accurate utterances. She also attempted to adjust her speech to their Farsi proficiency levels and use simple words in the class. In the critical incident report, Mina reported that her and her son's speaking Farsi for a long time upset his Canadian girlfriend because she felt excluded from the conversation and asked what they had been talking. Hearing their conversation, his girl friend once asked Mina to translate باشه [meaning ok] into English. The next time they met, she had bought a Farsi manual to learn key Farsi words and sentences.

This incident inspired Mina to use simple Farsi words while talking to students so that they would learn Farsi more easily.

Mina, similar to other teachers, implemented a Farsi-only policy in class. She mentioned that children might be used to code switching; however, Mina asked them to switch to Farsi every time they spoke English. Moreover, Mina attempted to provide students with additional information on what was discussed in the class, for instance, Iranian traditions and culture. Finally, she encouraged the students to continue learn Farsi by praising their progress.

Behrouz said that because students attended Farsi classes once a week, teachers should make them interested in learning Farsi so that they would continue studying it. Behrouz incorporated traditional Iranian stories into his teaching to make students interested in lessons and encourage them to know more about the Iranian culture. He also attempted to activate the students' background knowledge before teaching a lesson by asking them questions related to the topic.

Behrouz used games in his class to facilitate vocabulary learning for the students. He also spoke Farsi to them at the school and asked them to use Farsi while talking to him or to each other. He mentioned that while teachers needed to adapt their speech to students' Farsi proficiency levels, they could sometimes use difficult words to challenge the students. For example, he once used رایانه (computer), in an attempt to make students curious in finding out about it.

Table 12 illustrates the strategies the teacher participants employed to facilitate heritage language maintenance for students.

Table 12: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Employed by the Teachers

	Sara	Rosie	Mahnaz	Mina	Behrouz
The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies	Heritage language use in class	Heritage language use in class	Heritage language use in class	Heritage language use in class	Heritage language use in class
	Giving stickers to students	Games and fun activities	Reading Farsi magazines	Praising students' progress in learning Farsi	Fun activities
	Following a traditional teaching style based on repetition and copying		games	Providing information on Iranian traditional events	Challenging students by using difficult words
			Asking students to find out more about Iranian traditional events	Using a simplified language to communicate with students	

As shown in Table 12, implementing a heritage language only policy in class was used by the teacher participants to encourage students to practice Farsi. Additionally, the teachers attempted to motivate the students to practice Farsi by incorporating fun activities in their teachings and praising the students' progress in learning Farsi. While Mina used a simplified language to facilitate learning Farsi for students, Behrouz used cognitively challenging words to motivate students to expand their vocabulary knowledge.

Table 13 illustrates the heritage language maintenance strategies employed by the students, parents, and teachers.

Table 13: The Heritage Language Maintenance Strategies Employed by the Students, Parents, and Teachers

	The Students	The Parents	The teachers
Heritage	Heritage language use	Heritage language use	Heritage language use
Language	Films, CDs, books	Trips to Iran	Fun activities and games
Maintenance	Doing Farsi homework	Films, CDs, books	
Strategies		Socializing with community members	

As shown by Table 13, heritage language use was mentioned by the three participant groups. The students, parents, and teachers highlighted the importance of heritage language maintenance in familial and social interactions. Using Farsi to interact with family and community members, therefore, was a useful strategy to fulfill that goal. Additionally, heritage language use might have created a sense of belonging to the L1 community and fostered ethnic identity construction for the students (Phinney, 1995). Heritage language was used by the students and encouraged by the parents and teachers in Farsi dominant contexts such as home and the community school more frequently than in English dominant contexts. This might have occurred because the students' cultural capital (knowledge of Farsi) was more valued in those markets, that is, contexts (Bourdieu, 1991), compared to English dominant contexts such as public schools.

Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges

Data analysis revealed that the students faced challenges in maintaining Farsi as a heritage language within the contexts of home, school and the L1 community. Similarly, the parents and teachers met challenges in facilitating heritage language maintenance opportunities for children at home and the community school. These challenges will be elaborated on in further detail below.

The student participants.

At home. One of the students' challenges to maintain Farsi at home was insufficient time to do homework or practice Farsi because of other priorities. When Dina was younger, she read Farsi story books and watched Iranian programs on the Internet. However, she spent plenty of time swimming and doing English homework later, which, according to her, left little time to practice Farsi at home. Dina sometimes did assignments in the Farsi class because of lack of time at home (Field note A, p. 3). She also assumed that studying Farsi, English, and French simultaneously would confuse her, and preferred to focus on English and French, rather than Farsi, because, according to her, English and French played a more dominant role in her life.

Knowledge of a heritage language “become[s] more difficult to access if [it has] not been used for a long time” (Schmid, 2011, p. 16). Although Dina spoke Farsi until the age of four, she reported shifting to English and beginning to relearn Farsi later. Additionally, attending a French immersion school exposed Dina to French on a daily basis. Therefore, English and French words might have been more accessible to her, compared to Farsi words. According to her, she usually used English in her daily interactions at school and home. Exposure to Farsi at the community

school for four hours a week, therefore, might have been insufficient to activate Farsi words in her memory.

The status of French at the public school and in Canada could also have influenced Dina's second (French) and heritage (Farsi) language learning. Dina might have ascribed more value and prestige (Bourdieu, 1991) to French because of its inclusion in the public school's curriculum and official status in the broader society. However, she perceived Farsi as a means of facilitating communication with community and extended family members in Canada and Iran. In other words, French played an important role for Dina in the broader society while using Farsi was limited to the L1 community. Therefore, she gave priority to studying French.

Similarly, Elham and Kiana found insufficient time a challenge to practice Farsi at home. Elham's Farsi practice including doing homework and reading Farsi story books was interrupted when guests from Iran arrived although this facilitated oral language practice. The guests arrived almost every year and stayed for around a month. Elham also mentioned that the end of the school year coincided with the last episodes of TV series and programs she was following. Therefore, she spent less time on practicing Farsi some days.

Kiana had insufficient time to practice Farsi at home because of the bulk of English homework. In an incident, she also told the teacher that she had not practiced a lesson at home because of her English assignments (Field note 3, p. 3).

Another challenge facing the students in practicing Farsi at home pertained to their parents' busy schedule inside and outside home. Elham's parents, according to her, were busy inside and outside home. Therefore, they had little time to answer her questions about Farsi assignments. In those situations, her grandmother visiting them from Iran assisted her with Farsi homework and motivated her to maintain Farsi.

Similarly, Kiana's parents, according to her, were occupied inside and outside home; therefore, they had little time to assist her with homework or answer her questions on, for example, new Farsi words on a regular basis. Kiana's Farsi teacher, Sara, often complained that Kiana did not ask her parents to check her Farsi homework and Kiana objected that she did. Checking Kiana's homework, Sara once told her she had many spelling mistakes, angrily asking her why she had not shown her assignment to her mother to check. Kiana said,

” نشان دادم. از تو آشپزخانه گفت درست هستند“.

“I did. She told me it was ok while she was in the kitchen”. Surprised, Sara asked how come Kiana's mother checked her homework from the kitchen, and asked Kiana to have her mother sign her assignments from then on, telling other students that Kiana always needed to be told what to do (Field note A, p. 8, Lines 1-4). In the next session, Kiana told the teacher that her mother had read the new lesson aloud to her at home, and summarized it for the teacher (Field note C, p. 1).

Kiana rarely watched Iranian films without English subtitles because they were beyond her Farsi proficiency level. Moreover, she rarely joined her parents to watch an Iranian film because they, according to Kiana, would be bothered to translate new words into English for her while watching the film.

At public schools. According to the student participants, the public schools' environments facilitated little learning and using Farsi. No Farsi courses were offered at schools, and lessons, assignments, and projects were in English and French although the students presented about Iranian cultural events such as Nowrouz on the Multicultural Day. This indicates that the public schools followed the Contributions, or Holidays and Heroes, Approach to

multiculturalism, which includes selecting activities and books which celebrate heroes, holidays, and special events from various cultures. However, culturally diverse books and issues are not part of the curricula (Banks, 1999). Although the Contributions Approach provides immigrant students with an opportunity to present about their culture at school, it fails to change the structure of the curricula to encourage students to view issues and concepts from several different cultural perspectives. Neither does this approach, unlike the Social Action Approach, encourage students to take actions about social issues (Banks, 1999). Although the student participants presented about their ethnic background at the public school, they were not encouraged by the teachers to compare and contrast issues from various cultural perspectives and build on their ethnic background to learn new issues. This approach to multiculturalism, therefore, provided few opportunities for immigrant students to use their knowledge of their heritage language and culture at school.

According to the students, the schools' libraries did not contain any Farsi books, and teachers did not encourage them to use Farsi in class. However, Elham mentioned that her teacher allowed heritage language use when a new student with little English proficiency arrived. This suggests that the teacher, unlike public school teachers who insist on English monolingualism in the classroom (Goldstein, 2003b), recognized immigrant students' needs to use their heritage languages in the classroom although she or he restricted heritage language use to newcomers. Elham, however, did not speak Farsi in class because her Iranian-Canadian classmate knew little Farsi. Similarly, Tandis' teacher allowed using a heritage language while working at the computer; however, she rarely used Farsi because her classmates did not know it.

In addition to facing the overt challenges mentioned above, deeper investigation revealed the student participants faced covert challenges in maintaining Farsi at public schools, which

included the dominance of English over other (heritage) languages and peer pressure. Dina, Elham, Tandis, Delaram, Davoud, and Kiana assumed that they had to talk in English because teachers and other students spoke English. They also chose to use English to communicate with their Iranian friends at the public school so that teachers and non-Iranian students would understand the conversation. Otherwise, they might have assumed the Farsi-speaking students were talking negatively about them. Kiana stated,

وقتی غیر فارسی زبانها حاضرند، انگلیسی حرف می زنیم تا آنها مکالمه را متوجه شوند. به علاوه، اگر فارسی یا یک زبان دیگر جز انگلیسی حرف بزنیم، بدجور نگاهمان می کنند ولی این کار من را ناراحت نمی کند چون به آن عادت دارم و خودم هم همین کار را می کنم. اگر مثلاً دانش آموزان اسپانیایی جلو من اسپانیایی حرف بزنند، فکر می کنم دارند به زبانشان در مورد من حرف می زنند.

When non-Farsi-speaking students are present, we speak English so that they will understand the conversation. Moreover, they will give us a dirty look if we speak Farsi or a language other than English at their presence. It will not upset me, though, because I am used to it, and I would do the same if, say, Spanish students spoke Spanish in front of me. I would think they might be talking about me in their language. (Transcript C, p. 6, Lines 6-10)

The students' language choice at the public school, therefore, was partly influenced by social relations. The dilemma associated with heritage language use in English dominant contexts has also been investigated in previous studies. In a study with Cantonese speaking students in a high school in Toronto (Goldstein, 2003b), English speaking teachers and students reported feeling talked about and excluded when Cantonese students spoke in Cantonese in front

of them. The researcher also reported an English-speaking high school student deciding to leave her group in a math class because other members spoke Cantonese all the time and she could not break in. That was why the teachers introduced an English only policy and would discipline students for speaking their heritage languages in classrooms. Cantonese-speaking students who did not want to risk the teachers' or English-speaking students' displeasure used English to communicate with each other in the presence of an English speaker while others decided to speak Cantonese despite the resentment of English-speaking students (Goldstein, 2003b). Similar to the first group, the student participants in this study chose to speak English with their Iranian-Canadian friends to avoid their English-speaking school mates' and teachers' anger or misjudgement.

The potential role of public education on linguistic minority students' heritage language maintenance and loss has been extensively studied. Schools' English only language policy, teachers' and peers' negative attitudes towards heritage languages can make linguistic minority children abandon their heritage languages and shift to English (Cooper, 2007; Hinton, 1999; Kouritzin, 1999; MacGregor-Mendoza, 2000; Torres, 2006).

The results of this study were in line with another study on Iranian immigrant children's heritage language maintenance in Sweden (Namei, 2012). Although the Iranian immigrant students in Namei's study attended a heritage language program at public schools after regular school hours, 22% of them reported never using Farsi at school. This occurred even though some had Iranian classmates. Namei connected the students' reluctance to use Farsi at the public school to the school's strong orientation towards promoting Swedish monolingualism among immigrant children. The potential influences of other factors such as peer pressure and interlocutor's effects, however, were not examined in her research. The results of this study

indicated that peer pressure and interlocutor's effects might influence immigrant students' language choice at public school. These will be discussed in more detail below.

Unlike the student participants in this study, the Cantonese-speaking children in Goldstein's (2003b) study communicated with each other mainly in Cantonese at school. The use of Cantonese, the author stated, "was associated with membership in the Cantonese-speaking community at the school [which] symbolized a Hong Kong-Canadian identity" (p. 13). This membership was related to the students' social and educational success at school. The use of Cantonese in a finite mathematics class, for example, was found to allow "students to gain access to friendship and assistance that helped them achieve good marks in the course". The students in Goldstein's study were first generation immigrants, born in Hong Kong who spoke English with different degrees of proficiency while the students in this study, except one, were second generation immigrants, born in Canada, who reported speaking English better than Farsi. The students also reported that their Iranian-Canadian schoolmates knew a little Farsi, if any and preferred to communicate in English. Therefore, gaining access to social resources and friendship for the student participants was associated with speaking English at the public school. Therefore, the heritage language was used minimally not to jeopardize the students' membership in peer groups.

The students' challenges in practicing Farsi at the public school can also be analyzed with respect to the power relations at the school. Bourdieu (1991) states that linguistic utterances are assigned certain values in particular contexts or markets, and that "some products are valued more highly than others". He adds, "part of the practical competence of speakers is to know how, and to be able, to produce expressions which are highly valued on the markets concerned" (p. 18). The reported English-only policy of the school and teachers' and non-Farsi-speaking

students' negative attitudes towards heritage language use assigned a higher value to English, compared to heritage languages in public schools. Therefore, possessing a certain linguistic capital (knowledge of English) could lead to acquiring social capital (accessing social networks) and cultural capital (academic success) at the public school. That was a reason why the student participants gave priority to studying and using English, rather than Farsi, at the public school although in some cases, two students, Dina and Tandis, had an opportunity to use Farsi in the computer labs.

Another reason for the students' reluctance or lack of opportunity to practice Farsi in public school, according to them, was a lack of formal Farsi learning opportunities such as Farsi classes and teachers' insistence on an English only policy in class. Such opportunities offered by the school and teachers would have legitimized, in Bourdieu's (1991) term, using Farsi at school because of the policy makers' and teachers' more socially powerful position vis-a vis the students. Because such opportunities were non-existent, the students preferred to use English at school.

The students mentioned that they avoided speaking Farsi at the public school partly to avoid non-Farsi speaking students' and teachers' resentment and displeasure. They, however, had not experienced or witnessed such reactions from the teachers and students. The students' assumptions, therefore, suggested symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1991) relations underlying social interactions at public schools. Bourdieu (1991) states that "[T]he efficacy of symbolic power presupposes certain forms of cognition or belief, in such a way that even those who benefit least from the exercise of power participate, to some extent, in their own subjection" (p. 23). In this light, the student participants were not passive individuals to whom symbolic power was exercised. Rather, they actively, and perhaps unconsciously, contributed to the unequal power

relations in the school by following the unwritten English only policy to interact with their Iranian-Canadian schoolmates even at recess.

The students' challenges in heritage language maintenance at public schools also needed to be understood in terms of power relations in the Canadian society because according to Cummins (2001), schools tend to reflect the societal power structure. In other words, the unequal power relations in educational contexts represent unequal power relations in the broader society. Cummins argues that when teachers discourage or prevent immigrant students to use their heritage languages in school, they could reinforce the coercive, societal discourse that "bilingualism shuts doors" (Schlesinger, 1991, p. 108, as cited in Cummins, 2001, p. 652). Equally, teachers' lack of recognition of immigrant students' heritage languages in this study, reported by the student participants, might reflect a similar societal discourse. By being neutral about immigrant students' heritage languages and ethnic identities, teachers, perhaps unconsciously, can contribute to the students' heritage language loss and disempowerment within the school and the broader society.

The socio-political power of the dominant language (English) at school and in the broader society, schools' language policy (English Only), teachers' reportedly negative attitudes towards heritage languages, and the students' reluctance and lack of opportunity to use their heritage language at school might have led to covert linguicide. This occurs as a result of positive reinforcement of the dominant language and identity and negative reinforcement of heritage languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Perhaps because of the above mentioned factors, the students prioritized learning English and doing English homework at home, which had a negative influence on the level of heritage language proficiency they could have achieved.

In the L1 community. Observational and interview data revealed that the challenges faced by the students in maintaining Farsi at the community school involved the community school's time, homework, teachers' teaching style, instructional materials, and insufficient educational facilities.

The Farsi school's time posed a challenge to the students because of coinciding with their extracurricular and social activities. Before coming to the Farsi class, Kiana and Dina attended the swimming class, which often made Kiana tired and sleepy during the Farsi class. They also missed some sessions of the Farsi class to participate in swimming competitions. In an incident, Kiana closed her eyes and leaned on her classmate's shoulder while a student was reading a text aloud. The teacher, Sara, asked her to look at her book. Then, Sara asked Kiana to sit next to her (the teacher) and read a passage aloud, asking her if she still felt sleepy. Kiana responded that she had gone to bed late last night and had gone swimming before the Farsi class. That was why she felt tired (Field note A, p. 8). Similarly, Davoud mentioned that he missed the Farsi school when it coincided with his taekwondo and soccer class.

Furthermore, Kiana preferred to socialize with her family members and friends on weekends, which left little time for practicing Farsi. She explained,

”من و خانواده ام معمولاً Saturday دوستانمان را می بینیم و Sunday هم family time هست که با خانواده ام می گذرانم پس وقت کمی دارم که فارسی را در خانه practice کنم.“

“My family and I usually visit our friends after the Farsi class on Saturdays, and it is family time on Sundays, when I spend time with my family members. So, I have little time to practice Farsi at home” (Transcript C, p. 3, Lines 15-17).

Delaram and Dina mentioned that Farsi homework was too much and boring because it mainly involved multiple copying of letters and words. Delaram added that the Farsi class was

boring because the students had no fun. They had to listen to the teacher, read comprehension texts and copy words for two hours without playing games.

Classroom observations revealed that the Level 1 students sometimes verbally complained that they became tired or demonstrated their fatigue by closing their eyes or leaning on their neighbor's shoulder (Filed note A, p. 7). The teacher responded to the student's expression of fatigue by giving the class a short break, ignoring the student's tiredness, and objecting angrily to it (Field note A, p. 4, Lines 1-12).

A potential reason for the student participants' challenges in the Farsi school was that the teacher followed a traditional Iranian teaching style in which multiple copying of words and sentences and rote memorization was emphasized. The students, however, found these teaching and assessment strategies boring because they mentioned in the interview that they were used to alternative techniques in Canadian schools, such as hands-on activities. Research suggests that although heritage language teachers might have many years of teaching experience in their home countries, they might be unfamiliar with the Canadian education system (Coelho, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). Therefore, they might follow teaching and assessment strategies uncommon in the Canadian context. Sara had over twenty years teaching experience in Iran; however, she lacked Canadian teaching experience and a teaching certificate. Her unfamiliarity with the Canadian educational contexts, therefore, might have been a reason why she followed a pedagogical approach unfamiliar to the students, leading to their occasional boredom.

Traditional teaching styles employed in community schools have also been a challenge faced by immigrant students in other contexts. For instance, the student participants in Liu's (2008) study faced a challenge in maintaining Chinese at a community school because of

copying Chinese characters repeatedly and memorizing lessons most of the time. While these learning strategies might be frequently practiced in immigrant students' home countries, they might be less effective in host countries where alternative strategies are used at school.

Tandis mentioned that an ideal Farsi school should resemble a typical classroom in Iran because Farsi learners inside and outside Iran were learning the same language, that is, Farsi. She mentioned that it would have been interesting if the physical environment of the classroom and the class atmosphere had resembled a typical classroom in Iran, for example, desks had been smaller, resembling those at Iranian schools. Tandis knew about these through her mother, grandmother, friends coming from Iran recently and Iranian films.

Additionally, the content of the textbooks posed a challenge to most of the student participants because some of them were uninterested in learning about politics and religion. For example, while reading a text on the Islamic republic of Iran, Dina asked the teacher whether the information was true, to which the teacher responded,

”بعضی باور می کنند، بعضی که قبول نکردند آمدند بیرون“.

“Some people believe it. Those who did not believe it left Iran” (Field note E, p. 3, Line 15). In the interview, Dina mentioned that she did not like to study religious materials at the Farsi school because she did not care about them, and that they had nothing to do with her.

Similarly, Tandis and Kiana expressed dissatisfaction with the religious materials in the textbooks because they could not relate to them. Kiana explained that the textbook contained information about God, which she did not like because it was confusing and boring. In an incident, Behrouz, the teacher, asked the class to elaborate on دعا (prayer), a religious concept. Tandis said,

’من هیچ وقت نماز نمی خوانم. فقط وقت غذا می گویم، “سپاس پروردگار”‘.

“I never say prayer. I only say, ‘Thank you, God’ at meal times” (Field note F, p. 2, Lines 9-10).

Religious prayers such as thanking God are often said in Arabic, the language of Islam, rather than Farsi. However, Tandis said “Thank you, God” in Farsi, which might suggest that she was trying to be spiritual, rather than religious.

In another instance, Behrouz asked the class to talk about Imam Reza, a holy person for Shi’e Muslims, which Tandis objected by impatiently asking,

“چرا باید این چیزها را بدانیم؟”

“Why are we supposed to know these things”? (Field note I, p. 1, Line 14).

Tandis’s objection to studying religious concepts at the Farsi school contradicted her comment that Farsi schools in Canada should resemble schools in Iran. While she suggested that the Farsi school should resemble a typical school in Iran, she objected to studying religious concepts taught in Iranian schools. This contradiction might have stemmed from Tandis’s perception of ethnic identity. She might have perceived the construction of an Iranian ethnic identity in terms of learning Farsi in a physical environment resembling a typical Iranian school. In this process, however, having religious (Islamic) ideologies might have had no place.

While Kiana, Dina, and Tandis preferred not to study about religion at the Farsi school, Delaram was open to learning it. However, she lacked background information while teachers, according to her, did not elaborate on religious issues.

Contextually inappropriate educational resources are one of the challenges of many heritage language programs in Canada (Canadian Education Association, 1991; Chiu, 2011; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995). The educational materials designed in immigrant students’ home countries might be irrelevant or pose potential ethnic

identity challenges to immigrant students in Diaspora contexts (Chiu, 2011; Feuerverger, 1997).

For example, Chiu (2011) states that

While the worldview presented in these textbooks may be deemed as important, and viewed as legitimate in CHL [Chinese heritage language] students' home countries (in the case of immigrant students), it may conflict with the values and ideologies CHL students encounter at the Canadian English mainstream schools. (p. 82)

In addition, heritage language teachers might need to produce the materials or buy them themselves because of a lack of funding. This can pose a challenge to immigrant students' heritage language education because many students do not find professionally made materials in their heritage language classes (Majhanovich & Richards, 1995).

While the materials taught at the Farsi school were professionally made, they were designed for students who spoke Farsi as a first language in Iran, a conservative context where religious (Islamic) values are highly promoted by the government. These values, coupled with political ideologies, were transmitted through textbooks to students. Immigrant children from non-religious backgrounds, however, faced a challenge in learning these issues because of what they perceived as insufficient background knowledge.

I critically analyzed the Level 1 textbook in a separate study to examine the ideologies and values it transmitted to students overtly and covertly through content, images, and recurring characters (Babaei, 2012). The results revealed that the textbook portrayed an "ideal" Iranian citizen as practicing Muslim, Farsi-speaking, middle-class, and urban. Religious values were produced most frequently, followed by educational values, encouraging students to pursue education and emphasizing the value of education. I argued that the textbook could pose ethnic

identity challenges for Iranian immigrant children because of associating religious (Islamic) values with an Iranian ethnic identity. In other words, the students might assume that developing an Iranian ethnic identity requires a religious (Islamic) background while nationality and religious beliefs are distinct identity categories. Claiming an Iranian ethnic identity does not necessitate following a particular religious tradition.

Classroom observations revealed that the Level 1 teacher highly emphasized educational achievements, encouraging the students to learn Farsi to move to higher levels (Field note E, p. 2; Field note G, p. 6; Field note J, p. 3). For example, noticing that a student had a hard time reading a text, Sara said,

"فقط دو هفته وقت داری. باید در خانه زیاد تمرین کنی."

"You have only two weeks. You must practice reading a lot at home". In one incident, Sara encouraged the students to learn Farsi because they were originally from Iran (Field note H, p. 4). This was the only time during the observation when Sara connected learning Farsi to ethnic identity construction in class.

Interviews with Dina and Kiana, however, revealed that they pursued heritage language education for social, rather than educational and religious, purposes. In other words, the students' imagined communities (Anderson, 1991) and imagined identities (Norton, 2000) differed from those promoted by the textbook and the teacher. The discrepancy among the imagined identities and imagined communities constructed by the textbook, the teacher, and the students posed a challenge to the children in maintaining Farsi at the community school.

Another challenge mentioned by a student participant pertained to the community school's educational facilities. Elham said that audiovisual teaching aids such as Iranian films and TV programs were nonexistent at the Farsi school. She added that one session during the

dictation time, students who had fallen behind repeatedly asked other students to repeat what the teacher had been saying. Elham suggested that two teachers be present in the class so that one of them would teach a lesson and the other would make sure students are following.

The lack of audio-visual teaching equipments and teacher assistants in the community school might have been a result of insufficient funding, a challenge faced by many community-based heritage language programs (Liu et al., 2011). The educational aides mentioned above could not be provided for students in the Farsi school perhaps because of tight budget.

Table 14 illustrates the students' challenges in maintaining Farsi at home, the public school, and the L1 community.

Table 14: The Students' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges

Challenges	Home	Public schools	The L1 community
	Insufficient time to practice Farsi	Dominance of English	Conflicting or confusing religious ideologies in the textbooks
	Busy parents	A lack of Farsi courses	Teachers' teaching styles and homework (perceived as boring)
		Peer pressure	Insufficient educational aids
			The Farsi school's time (Saturday)

The heritage language maintenance challenges faced by the students in this study, particularly insufficient time to practice the heritage language at home and the boring nature of the community school, have been reported in previous research (Liu, 2008). Additionally, the results of this study confirmed to those of a similar research in Sweden (Namei, 2012). In both

studies, it was found that the Iranian immigrant children were socialized in the dominant language, English and Swedish, more than in Farsi. In other words, they were growing up in a situation where the dominant language was the medium of instruction at public schools and the major medium of communication between children and siblings, peers, and to a lesser degree, parents. Instances of Farsi use included the four hours (two hours in the second study) Farsi education per week and sporadic interaction in Farsi with parents and community members (mainly adults).

In addition to the dominance of English, peer pressure influenced the children's heritage language maintenance. Previous studies (Harris, 2009; Hinton, 1999) revealed that peer pressure might influence heritage language maintenance negatively because of the immigrant children's desire to become accepted by their peers. To achieve this goal, many immigrant children abandon their heritage language to fit into the broader society. While peers in the previous studies came from different ethno-linguistic backgrounds, this study revealed that peers from the same ethno-linguistic backgrounds could also influence one's heritage language maintenance and loss. Iranian-Canadian peers' insufficient Farsi knowledge or their tendency to communicate in English made the student participants to use English in English and Farsi dominant contexts. This limited their opportunities to practice Farsi.

The parent participants. The challenges faced by the parent participants in facilitating Farsi learning opportunities for their children inside and outside home pertained to their busy schedule, literacy resources and educational aids at the Farsi school, and Farsi school's time. These challenges are elaborated on below.

Ali, Bahar, and Azy had little time to spend on their children's Farsi learning activities because of their busy schedules inside and outside of the home. Bahar would read Farsi books to her daughter and tell her dictation if she had time at home while Azy would take her son to the city library which offered weekly story telling programs in Farsi. Azy would also ask him to recognize Farsi alphabets in Farsi newspapers. However, because she had a full time job, she mentioned she could not provide these Farsi learning opportunities for her son. Ali's and Maryam's mothers facilitated learning Farsi for their children by telling them dictation and encouraging them to practice Farsi.

Although the mission of the school was promoting ethnic, rather than Islamic, values (the school principal, personal communication, August 2011), religious ideologies were transmitted to students through the textbooks, designed and taught in Iran, a highly conservative context. This posed a challenge to the parents who wished to raise non-religious children in Canada. Among the parent participants, Maryam made the strongest complaint about the religious ideologies transmitted through textbooks. She mentioned that much information in the textbooks was not what she intended her children to learn, referring to religious ideas promoted in the textbooks. She preferred her children to perform good deeds

”به خاطر وظیفه آنها به عنوان یک انسان، نه به خاطر ترس از خدا و رفتن به بهشت“.

“because of their responsibility as human beings, not because of being afraid of God or hoping to go to the Heaven in the other world” (Transcript G, p. 4, Lines 15-17).

Maryam's daughter, Tandis, according to her, learned religious beliefs in the Farsi school and asked her to explain them further at home. Although Maryam explained them to Tandis, she explained that

”پیغمبر آدم خوبی بود نه به خاطر اینکه خدا با او حرف می زد، به خاطر اینکه کارهای خوب انجام می داد“.

“The Prophet was a good person, not because God talked to him, because he performed good deeds” (Transcript G, p. 4, Line 22).

Similarly, Bahar preferred that her child learn about Iranian culture, traditions and geography, rather than religion, and suggested cultural issues substitute religious materials at the Farsi school. However, unlike Maryam who strongly opposed religious education and ideologies, Bahar said that studying religious and political issues covered in Farsi textbooks required background information, which Iranian immigrant students might lack. According to her, her daughter faced a challenge learning political and religious materials taught at the Farsi school, including the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1975 and the concept of martyrdom in Islam, because of insufficient background information. The parent participants’ attitudes towards the inclusion of religious materials in children’s heritage language education tended to reflect their religious perspectives. Those who come from non-religious backgrounds, Maryam and Bahar, objected to religious education at the community school while Nilou and Mahsa, who came from religious backgrounds, supported that.

Another challenge mentioned by a parent participant pertained to the Farsi school’s educational facilities. Although Farsi classes had a whiteboard, Azy’s son’s class lacked it. Azy suggested that facilities such as a whiteboard, audiovisual equipments for playing cartoons and songs and painting books should be available to students so that they could practice Farsi further. Although attending the school improved her son’s speaking skill, it had less of an impact on his reading and writing skills. The reason, according to Azy, was that because of students’ young age (four years old), the teacher played games most of the time to keep them interested in the class, instead of engaging them in literacy activities. Immigrant parents’ expectations of heritage language programs might decline over time, “observing lower than desired results” (Chen, 2010,

p. 145). However, Azy attributed the lower than desired results in her son's literacy development to his age and the need for children at that age to be entertained by the teacher. Maintaining high expectations of the heritage language program, Azy hoped that her son's Farsi reading and writing skills would improve as he became older.

Finally, the Farsi school's time (Saturdays) posed a challenge to Ali, Bahar, and Maryam. Ali suggested that the Farsi classes be held on weekdays, rather than on Saturdays, to have students practice Farsi during the week. Bahar and Maryam, however, referred to their children's reluctance to attend the Farsi school on weekends. According to Bahar, her daughter, Nina, held that the Farsi school took too much time. Nina, Bahar stated, complained that going to the Farsi school for four hours on Saturdays was too much. As a result, Nina was sometimes reluctant to practice Farsi at home and postponed doing Farsi homework to the last minute. To respond to that challenge, Bahar asked Nina to practice Farsi and encouraged her to practice it together, for example, by reading a passage with her.

Similarly, Maryam's children, according to her, preferred to relax on weekends, rather than attending the Farsi school. To motivate them to continue attending the Farsi school, Maryam reminded them of the importance of learning Farsi and doing Farsi homework.

Table 15 shows the parents' challenges in providing heritage language maintenance opportunities for the children.

Table 15: The Parents' Challenges in Providing Heritage Language Maintenance**Opportunities for the Children**

Challenges	Home	The L1 Community
	Busy schedules	Religious ideologies in the Farsi textbooks
	Overemphasis on the child's correct Farsi pronunciation	The Farsi school's time (Saturdays)
		Insufficient teaching aids
		Teachers' traditional teaching style

The parents' challenges with the community school resembled those faced by immigrant parents in Chen's (2010) study. These challenges mainly included the difference between heritage language education and the mainstream (public school) education. The parent participants in Chen's study mentioned that their children preferred student-centered classes, hands-on activities, and less homework in Canadian public schools, compared to teacher-centered classes in heritage language schools. Additionally, the shorter length of educational time (two hours per week) in the community school, compared to the public school, was insufficient to learn the heritage language according to a participant in Chen's research.

Although the parents had insufficient time to spend on their children's Farsi learning practice at home, live-in and visiting grandparents facilitated learning Farsi for the children. The role of grandparents in transmitting ethnic values and heritage languages to immigrant children has been investigated by Barresi (1987). The researcher suggests that because grandparents serve as family historians, they play a more important role in immigrant groups than in the dominant culture. Similarly, Kamo (1998) found that grandparents could contribute to immigrant children's heritage language and culture maintenance through socializing with them.

Accordingly, while the second-generation Japanese attempted to fully assimilate into American society in the 1930s and 1940s, the third-generation Japanese Americans attempted to restore their ethnic identity during the 1960s and 1970s. In this process, grandparents played an important role. In a recent study in the States, Ishizawa (2004) discovered that the presence of a non-English speaking parent, grandparent, or other adult in a household increased the likelihood of an immigrant child speaking a heritage language. In line with the results of previous studies, this study confirmed the role of visiting and co-residing grandparents in immigrant children's heritage language maintenance.

The teacher participants. Challenges that the teacher participants faced in teaching Farsi at the community school involved the instructional materials which included religious values and concepts specific to the Iranian context. A teacher also referred to his insufficient training to teach Farsi at the Farsi school.

Behrouz questioned the validity of the religious stories including super-human powers mentioned in the textbooks. He added that most parents complain about including such information in their children's Farsi education and told him they preferred that their children did not learn those issues.

Another challenge of teaching religious materials, according to Behrouz, was that super-human activities and miracles performed by God, prophets, and Imams did not make sense to many immigrant students, and they wondered how those actions could have been performed. To explain those phenomena, Behrouz told students that Imams were holy, implying that they had super-human power which enabled them to perform extraordinary actions. He also discouraged

students to probe into religious matters because he had no accurate answer to religious questions and was unwilling to tell lies to students.

Mahnaz and Sara, similar to Behrouz, criticized the religious values incorporated into textbook contents taught at the community school. According to Mahnaz, the textbooks included religious issues while immigrant families might not intend to convey them to their children. Moreover, according to her, religious concepts such as محرم (mahram) and نامحرم (naamahram) were difficult for many non-religious students to understand. Muslim women have to cover their hair and bodies except their faces and hands in front of *namahram* men, who include male people except one's father, brother, husband, and uncle, or *mahrams*.

In addition to religious values, Mahnaz added, the accounts of violence during Islamic wars mentioned in the textbooks were undesirable to many students. Mahnaz recalled that one of her students squirmed uncomfortably at reading how a religious figure was brutally killed in a war when he was a child. Mahnaz mentioned,

”پدر مادرهایی که می خواهند بچه های مذهبی تربیت کنند می توانند مسایل مذهبی را در خانه به آنها آموزش دهند.
خواندن مسایل مذهبی ممکن است بچه های غیر مذهبی را گیج کند“.

“Parents who would like to raise religious children can teach them religious issues at home.

Studying religious issues might confuse children who come from non-religious backgrounds”

(Transcript N, p. 4, Lines 21-23).

Sara might have discussed religious issues in a religiously homogeneous class. However, because she was unsure of her students' religions, she avoided talking about religious (Islamic) issues in the class as much as possible. According to her, discussing a particular religion such as Islam in class would marginalize non-Muslim students.

Although Sara explained religious concepts mentioned in the textbook, she sometimes challenged them. For instance, after Sara explained نماز (daily prayers), اذان (the call for prayer) and وضو (washing the body in a particular way before saying prayer),

نگار: مادر بزرگم می گوید نباید موقع نماز make up داشته باشیم .
سارا: خیلی وقت پیش این اعتقاد را داشتند. الان حتی با لاک هم می شود نماز خواند.

Negar: My grandma says we should not wear makeup to say prayer.

Sara: This is what people believed many years ago. These days, prayers can be said even while nail polish is worn. (Field note E, p. 1, para. 3)

Muslims have to ensure their bodies are clean before washing it in a certain way to prepare for the prayer. Negar's grandmother represents a traditional view that Muslim women have to remove their make up before preparing for the prayer. By stating that prayers could be said with nail polish, Sara challenged that traditional perspective.

Furthermore, Mahnaz and Sara said that the textbooks taught in the Farsi school were designed to teach Iranian students in Iran; therefore, they included concepts which might be difficult to understand for Iranian immigrant students in Diaspora contexts.

According to Sara, many words in the Level 1 textbook included letters students had not learned yet; however, they had to know those letters to read the words. Sara explained,

”امروز کلمه جنگل را درس دادم. بچه ها گیج شده بودند چون هنوز /ج/ و /ل/ را یاد نگرفته بودند.“

“I taught the word jungle today. The children were confused because they have not learned /j/ and /l/ yet” (Transcript K, p. 4, Line 23, p. 5, Line 1). In other words, students were supposed to know how to read and write /j/ and /l/ in a unit while those letters would be taught in future units.

She added that the textbook was inappropriate even for Iranian students in Iran due to this; however, because they were highly exposed to Farsi in and out of home, students in Iran might face less difficulty studying it.

Mahnaz stated that because textbooks were produced for Iranian students in Iran, reading comprehension texts included context-based vocabularies, which might make comprehension difficult for many Iranian students in Canada. For instance, بنا might be translated into English as construction worker, which, according to Mahnaz, was inaccurate. While a بنا builds building manually using brick, a construction worker usually uses mechanical devices and prefabricated structures to build a building. In other words, although both build buildings, the method and instruments each uses is different. Mahnaz stated that students who had traveled to Iran might notice these differences while those who had not might not understand the meanings of those words accurately.

Finally, Behrouz taught Farsi at the community school to gain experience to teach it to his daughter in the future. According to him, although he enjoyed teaching, he lacked adequate teacher training because he had not taught Farsi in Iran. Behrouz attempted to make learning Farsi an enjoyable experience for students by, for instance, playing educational games; however, he acknowledged the need to receive teacher training.

Table 16 shows the teachers' challenges in teaching Farsi as a heritage language.

Table 16: The Teachers' Challenges in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language

Challenges	The Teachers	
	The Farsi textbooks: religious and decontextualized materials	
	Insufficient teaching experience	

Table 17 lists the students' heritage language maintenance challenges, and the parents' and teachers' challenges in providing heritage language maintenance opportunities for children.

Table 17: The Students', Parents', and Teachers' Heritage Language Maintenance Challenges

	The Students	The Parents	The Teachers
The Challenges at Home	Parents' busy schedules Insufficient time to practice Farsi	Busy schedules	
The Challenges at Public Schools	A lack of Farsi courses Peer pressure The dominance of English		
The Challenges at the Community School	The textbooks Insufficient educational aids The community school's time Teachers' teaching styles Homework type	The textbooks Insufficient educational aids The community school's time	The textbooks Inadequate teacher training

As shown in Table 17, parents' busy schedules prevented the parents from spending time on the children's heritage language maintenance practices, such as taking them to the city library which contained Farsi books and explaining new words to them. Additionally, insufficient educational aids and the community school's time (Saturdays) posed challenges to the student and parent participants. Textbooks posed a challenge to the student, parent, and teacher participants. Including religious materials in heritage language education pertained to individuals' religious backgrounds and orientations towards religion. While religious student and parent participants promoted integrating religious education into heritage language education, non-religious students, parents, and teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the religious contents of the textbooks. This was also evident in the student and parents of the same family. While Nilou and Delaram supported religious education at the Farsi school, Maryam and Tandis objected to integrating religious and heritage language education. Additionally, two teachers mentioned that the textbooks were context-inappropriate because they were designed for the students who speak Farsi as a First Language in Iran.

The challenges of the community school in this study reflected the challenges of heritage language programs in Canada with respect to contextually inappropriate textbooks (Canadian Education Association, 1991; Chiu, 2011; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997; Majhanovich & Richards, 1995) and heritage language teachers' unfamiliarity with the Canadian educational system (Coelho, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997). Additionally, the heritage language teachers in this study, similar to many heritage language teachers in public schools, lacked networking opportunities to interact with mainstream teachers, share their perspectives and experiences, and learn from them (Coelho, 2008; Duff, 2008; Feuerverger, 1997). Heritage language teachers can gain insights into the Canadian educational system through teacher training and networking with

mainstream teachers. Implementing educational approaches and strategies common in Canada in heritage language classrooms can increase the quality of heritage language programs because heritage language learners are familiar with them.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the emerging themes of this study, including (1) the importance of heritage language maintenance, (2) heritage language maintenance strategies, and (3) heritage language maintenance challenges. These themes were critically analyzed in light of critical perspectives and the literature on heritage language maintenance and loss. The next chapter will present the summary of the study, followed by recommendations.

Chapter Five: Summary and Recommendations

Chapter Five provides the answers to the research questions, followed by recommendations.

The research questions guiding this study included,

1. How do Farsi-speaking students, parents, and heritage language teachers perceive heritage language maintenance?
2. What successes and challenges do students meet in maintaining Farsi as a heritage language within the contexts of home, school and first language community?
3. What successes and challenges do parents meet in facilitating heritage language maintenance opportunities for their children?
4. What successes and challenges do heritage language teachers meet in teaching Farsi as a heritage language to students at a community school?

The answers to these questions will be presented below.

The Participants' Perceptions of Heritage Language Maintenance

The students' perceptions. The student participants perceived Farsi as a heritage language and as a language other than English. Maintaining Farsi as a heritage language enabled the students to communicate with their family and community members and relatives. The students also reported communicating with their relatives such as aunts and uncles in Iran in Farsi via the Internet. Additionally, heritage language maintenance would enable them to read

Farsi signs and communicate with people independently in Iran. In other words, maintaining Farsi strengthened social and familial ties for the students.

Learning Farsi as a language other than English enabled the students to protect the privacy of conversations in English dominant contexts. They reported using Farsi in public schools or English dominant parties to communicate with their Iranian-Canadian friends and parents privately although this might have risked non-Farsi speaking people. Furthermore, Learning Farsi would provided a wider range of educational and employment opportunities for the students. Knowing Farsi would also facilitated assessing to a wider range of identity options for the students. A bi/multilingual linguistic identity would make them feel unique and be proud of their bilingual or multilingual competence before those who knew fewer languages, especially peers.

The parents' perceptions. Similar to the students, the parent participants perceived Farsi as a heritage language and as a language other than English. The majority of parents mentioned that heritage language, culture, and ethnic identity were interwoven. According to them, heritage language maintenance would enable children to connect with Iranian culture and develop a sense of ethnic identity. The parent participants also mentioned that heritage language maintenance would facilitate communication between children and family and community members who did not know English.

Related to the parents' perception of heritage language maintenance was their language ideology. Ali, Bahar, Mahsa, Nilou, Maryam, and Bahar expressed positive attitudes towards Farsi, and Iranian culture and ancient civilization, and perceived it as their responsibility to pass on Farsi to next generation.

Demonstrating a positive attitude towards bilingualism and multilingualism, the parent participants mentioned that knowing multiple languages would facilitate children's access to educational and employment opportunities in the dominant society.

The teachers' perceptions. The teacher participants perceived Farsi as a heritage language and a language other than English. They highly emphasized the role of heritage language maintenance in ethnic identity construction, and the fact that learning Farsi would connect Iranian immigrant children to their past. Furthermore, heritage language maintenance, according to Sara, Rosie, Behrouz, Mina, and Mahnaz, would facilitate social and emotional interactions among Iranian family and community members. Learning Farsi as a language other than English, Mahnaz and Behrouz added, could lead to socioeconomic and educational advantages in the dominant, English speaking, society.

The Students' Successes in Maintaining Farsi

At home. The student participants attempted to practice Farsi at home by speaking to their parents in Farsi and doing Farsi homework. In situations where the students used English with their parents and siblings at home, interacting with grandparents and guests arriving from Iran facilitated practicing Farsi for the children. Speaking Farsi at home, however, depended on the parents' and siblings' language preference and Farsi and English proficiency. Other heritage language maintenance strategies employed by the students included watching Iranian soap operas and news, doing crossword puzzles, and reading Farsi storybooks, magazines and newspapers.

At public schools. The students mentioned that they used Farsi at public schools mainly to protect the privacy of their conversations. In other situations, the students mentioned that they used English to communicate with Iranian-Canadian students. According to them, the reason was that the students spoke English better than Farsi, and that none of them had Farsi-speaking classmates. Moreover, the students believed that hearing a conversation in a heritage language might have caused non-Farsi-speaking students' and teachers' anger. In other words, sporadic heritage language use was the only opportunity for the majority of the student participants to practice Farsi at the public school.

In the L1 community. Although they had Iranian-Canadian friends, the students talked mainly in English with them. However, they used Farsi and English to communicate with adults family friends. This provided an opportunity for them to practice Farsi. The students perceived the community school as a major resource within the L1 community which contributed to their heritage language maintenance. Because of the Farsi Only policy of the community school, the students reported using Farsi to communicate with teachers and classmates. However, they sometimes switched to English to communicate with each other, especially when teachers were absent.

The Students' Challenges in Maintaining Farsi

At home. One of the challenges of the students in maintaining Farsi at home pertained to insufficient time to do Farsi homework. English assignments and lessons left little time for Farsi practice at home, and the students prioritized English homework because of the perceived dominance and importance of English in their lives. In addition to the bulk of English

assignments, recreational activities and friendly gatherings on weekends limited the students' opportunities to practice Farsi at home.

In addition to insufficient time to practice Farsi at home, other challenges faced by the students included unforeseen circumstances interrupting their practice, and their family members' insufficient time or reluctance to explain lessons or new words for them.

At public schools. The student participants used Farsi at the public school minimally because of the dominance of English, the scarcity of (competent) Farsi-speaking students, the reluctance of Farsi-speaking students to use Farsi, and a lack of formal Farsi learning opportunities. According to the students, lessons, homework, and projects were in English and French, and no Farsi courses were offered at the public school. Although some teachers allowed heritage language use in class, the students did not use Farsi because they had no Farsi speaking classmates. Additionally, the students assumed that non-Farsi speaking teachers and students had to understand their conversations. Otherwise, they might assume the Farsi-speaking students were talking negatively about them.

In the L1 community. One of the challenges faced by the students in learning Farsi in the community school was Farsi school's time. Farsi classes were offered on Saturdays, when the students attended sports classes and parties or preferred to relax at home.

The content of the Farsi textbooks was also a challenge to most of the student participants. While some students were uninterested in learning about politics and religion, others lacked sufficient background information to understand religious concepts mentioned in the textbooks.

The type and bulk of Farsi lessons and assignments, coupled with teachers' traditional teaching style emphasizing memorization and repetition, posed another challenge to three student participants. The lack of educational facilities such as Iranian films and TV programs at the Farsi school was brought up by another student.

The Parents' Successes in Providing Farsi Learning Opportunities for Children

The parent participants facilitated heritage language maintenance for their children by speaking Farsi with them, asking them to use Farsi at home, providing them with Farsi films, cartoons, songs and storybooks. They also provided the children with formal heritage language education by teaching them Farsi literacy at home and registering them at the community school. Additionally, the parent participants facilitated heritage language learning for children by interacting with Iranian families. Trips to Iran improved their children's Farsi as well.

The Parents' Challenges in Providing Farsi Learning Opportunities for Children

The challenges faced by the parent participants in facilitating heritage language maintenance opportunities for children pertained to their busy schedules, educational aids at the Farsi school, and the Farsi school's time. Additionally, religious ideologies transmitted through Farsi textbooks posed a challenge to the parents who wished to raise non-religious children.

The Teachers' Successes in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language

The teacher participants used various strategies to teach Farsi to students such as giving them stickers for answering questions correctly, introducing fun activities, and insisting on a

Farsi only policy in class. They followed an Iranian traditional teaching style which emphasised repetition and copying of new words.

The Teachers' Challenges in Teaching Farsi as a Heritage Language

The challenges faced by teacher participants in teaching Farsi included inadequate teacher training and the educational materials which promoted religious ideologies. Additionally, according to the teachers, the textbooks, produced in Iran, included context-based words which might be difficult to understand for Iranian immigrant students in Canada.

The results of this study revealed the Iranian immigrant community's positive attitudes towards its heritage language and culture although most of the participants were discouraged or consciously chose to avoid using Farsi in English dominant contexts. In other words, Farsi was a core value for that community. Heritage language maintenance was perceived by the community members as a means of strengthening social and familial ties. Maintaining Farsi was also linked to ethnic, social and linguistic identity, which could connect children to Iranian culture while providing them with a wider range of educational and employment opportunities in the broader society.

This study also revealed the Iranian community's perseverance in maintaining Farsi and Iranian culture in spite of the challenges previously mentioned. The unequal power relations existing between the students and parents and English-speaking teachers, peers, managers, and colleagues in English dominant contexts reflects inequitable relations of power in the broader society, where heritage languages might not be acknowledged and valued.

While the students, parents, and teachers employed various heritage language maintenance strategies, they highlighted heritage language use at home as a useful heritage

language maintenance strategy. In this regard, the community school played a key role because the students, especially those who used mainly English at home and outside, used and heard mainly Farsi at the community school.

Recommendations

This study sought to investigate an Iranian immigrant community's perception on the importance of maintaining Farsi, heritage language maintenance attempts made by students, parents, and teachers, and their successes and challenges in this regard. Based on the results of this study and the participants' suggestions, the following recommendations will be offered.

Recommendations for immigrant parents. Immigrant parents who intend to pass on their heritage language and culture to next generation need to encourage their children to use their heritage language at home at the beginning stages of children's growth. Introducing a heritage language only policy at home exposes the children to their heritage language, making them use it on a daily basis. The language policy, however, needs to be consistently followed. Otherwise, the children might discontinue heritage language use if they find parents frequently speaking in a dominant language with them at home. Additionally, an effective language policy needs to include measures to impact people's self-identification so that the identity of the target language population becomes desirable (Fasold, 1984). In this light, parents could motivate their children to speak their heritage language by fostering ethnic identity construction for them. Negative emotional reactions to the children's lack of heritage language use at home might force the children to use the heritage language for a while; however, heritage language use might discontinue if the children do not invest in a bilingual or bicultural identity.

Although heritage language use might be restricted outside home, it can still be used between parents and children in heritage language dominant contexts such as parties and community schools. Speaking in a dominant language at community schools might communicate the message to the students that their heritage languages were of less value. This might influence their heritage language maintenance efforts negatively.

While heritage language use at home might contribute to heritage language maintenance, activities such as watching films and cartoons and reading story books can facilitate this process. Therefore, parents can initiate these activities before children enter public and possibly community schools and continue them afterwards.

Parents also need to realize that heritage language maintenance can be a challenge for their children, especially if they receive formal heritage language education for limited hours per week. Therefore, they need to monitor their children's progress in heritage language maintenance and assist them with heritage language learning through, for example, explaining the meanings of new words to them. If the children attend heritage language classes, parents can communicate children's potential challenges to heritage language teachers in case they, that is, parents, are unable to address them. This, however, might be difficult to put into practice for parents who have little time to assist their children with heritage language learning at home.

Recommendations for community members. Community members can contribute to immigrant children's heritage language maintenance by organizing various activities such as ethnic festivals. Participating in such activities exposes the children to their heritage languages, familiarizes them with ethnic traditions and might foster ethnic identity development for them.

Community members who establish community based heritage language schools need to consider the following factors. First, the mission of the school and the intention beyond heritage language education needs to be determined and announced to teachers, parents and students from the outset. For example, if the school intends to incorporate religious education into heritage language education, this needs to be made clear from the beginning.

Second, textbooks need to be carefully chosen to reflect the mission of the school. If the mission of the school is to transfer heritage language and culture with no emphasis on a particular religion, the textbooks need to be void of overt and covert religious ideologies and content. Religious ideologies might be included in the textbooks to familiarize immigrant children with the religious diversity of their home-lands if various religions are practiced there. However, attempts must be made not to advantage one religion over another if the school intends to exclude religious education from heritage language education.

Third, professional development sessions need to be held for heritage language teachers in community schools. These sessions need to focus on classroom management, teaching and assessment techniques, and materials development to familiarize the teachers with the educational system of the host society. Teachers with many years of experience in their home countries might be reluctant to re-learn about educational issues. However, they need to be convinced by, for example, the school principal or someone with professional authority in the school, that heritage language teachers need to follow educational practices which conform to the educational system of the host country, that is, those familiar to immigrant students. Professional community members willing to contribute to the preservation of their heritage language could be invited to offer these professional sessions to the heritage language teachers.

Forth, in addition to experienced teachers, younger teachers need to be employed in community schools to contribute to the sustainability of heritage language programs. These teachers need to receive teacher training and familiarize themselves with educational practices in the Canadian educational system.

Fifth, attempts need to be made to provide required educational equipments for students in heritage language schools. In case of budget constraints, community schools could ask interested community members to contribute to the school's inventory and organize fundraising events.

Recommendations for heritage language teachers. Heritage language teachers regardless of their teaching experiences in their home countries need to familiarize themselves with the educational system of the host country through, for example, attending professional development sessions and reading relevant books and articles. Pedagogical discrepancies between heritage and mainstream education, especially in classroom management, materials development, and teaching and assessment techniques, could discourage immigrant students to pursue heritage language education.

Heritage language teachers need to seek students' objectives of heritage language education, tailor educational materials to meet their needs, and provide them with adequate background information. To motivate students to continue heritage language education, the teachers can give them prizes and organize plays or exhibitions to display the students' heritage language performance. Additionally, if the teachers indeed intend to contribute to heritage language learners' bilingual development, they need to facilitate bilingual identity construction and investment in heritage language maintenance for them. By seeking the students' purposes of

heritage language maintenance at the beginning of the semester, the teachers could find out about the students' imagined identities and imagined communities and facilitate realizing them for the students. Simply motivating or asking the students to study the heritage language to go to a higher level might be ineffective or insufficient if an academically successful identity is not what the students have imagined and invested.

Teachers also need to seek students' feedback on their teaching performance and classroom management ideally in the middle and at the end of the semester or school year. This would assist them to modify and improve their performance, if required.

Recommendations for public school teachers. Public schools teachers should acknowledge and value ethno-linguistic diversity in class, if any. This could be realized through following a culturally responsive approach which uses diverse students' prior experiences and cultural knowledge to make learning more appropriate for them (Gay, 2000). This recommendation, however, might be difficult to implement in the case of teachers who are pressed for time in following lesson plans.

Teachers could also organize class and group activities which incorporate multiple languages and cultural perspectives. Instead of insisting on an English-only policy in the classroom, teachers could occasionally provide immigrant students with an opportunity to use their heritage languages to complete tasks and projects and report the results in English. These activities could foster ethnic identity construction and heritage language maintenance for immigrant students while communicating the message to English students that ethnic languages and cultures need to be respected at school.

Recommendations for policy makers. Heritage languages and cultures need to be reflected in curricula to facilitate heritage language maintenance in immigrant communities and multiculturalism in dominant societies. Simply celebrating the Multicultural Day while providing few opportunities for heritage language use at public schools might be insufficient to value heritage languages represented at schools. Instead of following a Contributions Approach to multiculturalism, reported by the student participants, schools need to engage students in cultural diversity more meaningfully. This could be fulfilled by incorporating educational materials from diverse cultures in the curricula and providing students with an opportunity to discuss, compare and contrast issues from several different cultural perspectives. The students could also be asked to be proactive and engage in activities which are intended to bring about social change. Following a Social Action Approach (Banks, 1999) might contribute to immigrant students' heritage language and culture maintenance, compared to the Contributions Approach.

Policy makers need to consider offering heritage language courses at public schools. If this is impossible, arrangements could be made so that immigrant students take credit by studying their heritage languages in community schools which follow the Ministry of Education's second language education curricula. This community-school partnership could facilitate heritage language maintenance in immigrant communities.

One of the teacher participants in this study mentioned that she would develop literacy materials if government funds were available. Community based heritage language programs in Canada seem unlikely to receive government funding while allocation of funds could contribute to the improvement of these programs.

Recommendations for further research. This study was conducted in a community based heritage language school. Therefore, second hand data on heritage language use patterns and practices within the contexts of home and public schools based on the participants' reports were collected. Another study could be conducted to examine language use patterns, heritage language practices and power relations within immigrant students' public school and perhaps home contexts.

The scope of this study was limited to heritage language maintenance in an immigrant community in Canada. Another study could investigate language socialization and cultural and ideological transmission patterns in immigrant communities.

This study was conducted in a heritage language school outside regular school hours and disconnected from the mainstream educational system. Another study could investigate immigrant children's and heritage language teachers' successes and challenges in preserving a heritage language in heritage language classes in public schools. Results could be compared and contrasted with those of this study.

The current study was focused on Farsi as a heritage language in an Iranian immigrant community in Canada. Farsi is the dominant, official language in Iran while a number of minority languages such as Turkish and Kurdish are also spoken. Another study could seek the perspectives of Iranian immigrants belonging to ethno-linguistic minority groups in Iran on the definition of a heritage language and investigate their potential heritage language maintenance successes and challenges.

This research proved that multiple (personal, familial, community, and educational) factors need to be in place to facilitate heritage language education for immigrant students. The above-mentioned implications might improve the quality of heritage language programs and

support immigrant children, parents, community members, teachers, and policy makers in their efforts to preserve heritage languages in a host society.

References

- Action Plan. (2000-01 to 2002-03). Retrieved from
<http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/publications/archives/fulleng.pdf>
- Ada, A. F. (1988). Creative reading: A relevant methodology for language minority children. In L. M. Malave (Ed.). *NABE '87. Theory, research, and application: Selected papers*. Buffalo: State University of New York.
- Adegija, E. (1994). *Language attitudes in sub-Saharan Africa*. Levedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.
- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1987). *Membership roles in field research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Adler, S., & Goodman, J. (1986). *Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses*. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 2-8.
- Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Reviews*, 17, 105-131.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (revised edn). New York: Verso.
- Arzoz, X. (2007). The nature of language rights. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, 2, 1-35.
- Asselin, M. E. (2003). Insider research: Issues to consider when doing qualitative research in your own setting. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 19(2), 99-103.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2010). Retrieved from
<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/1301.0Feature%20Article32009%E2%80%9310?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=1301.0&issue=2009%9610&num=&view=>

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/society.html>

Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/04fifty.htm>

Babae, N. (2013). Reminiscing about childhood: The language maintenance of an Iranian growing up in the United Kingdom. *the Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 7(4), 199-213.

Babae, N. (2012). Potential ethnic identity formation challenges at community schools: Insights from a critical textbook analysis. Paper presented at *First Voices Lecture Series*, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Richmond, British Columbia, September.

Babae, N., & Mohammadian Haghighi, F. (2012). Teacher identity and public school ESL students' investment and academic achievements. Paper presented at *TESL-Canada Conference*, Thomson River University, Kamloops, British Columbia, October.

Babae, N. (2011). Language rights, language loss, and maintenance in Canadian Aboriginals and immigrants. Paper presented in *the 43rd Annual BC TEAL Conference*, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada, May.

Babae, N. (2010a). Aboriginal language and culture maintenance and university life: Three case studies. Paper presented at *the 39th Annual SAG Co-ordinated Conferences*, Winnipeg, October.

Babae, N. (2010b). An Aboriginal student's account of university life, Indigenous language and culture. *TEAL-MB Journal*, 26 (2), 17-23.

Baez, B. (2002). Learning to forget: Reflections on identity and language. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1(2), 123-132.

- Bailey, B. (2002). *Language, race and negotiation of identity: A study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Banks, J.A. (1999). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barratt-Pugh, C., & Rohl, M. (2001). Learning in two languages: A bilingual in Western Australia. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(7), 664-676.
- Barresi, C. M. (1987). Ethnic aging and the life course. In D. E. Gelfand, & C. M. Barresi (Ed.s), *Ethnic dimensions of aging* (pp. 18-34). New York: Springer.
- Battiste, M. (1997) Enabling the autumn seed: Framing a decolonized curricular approach toward Aboriginal knowledge and education. Paper presented at *the CSAA Learned Society Conference*, St John's, Newfoundland, 8–11 June.
- Battiste, M. (1986). Micmac literacy and cognitive assimilation. In J. Barman, Y. Herbert, & D. McCaskell (Eds.), *Indian education in Canada, Vol. 1: The legacy* (pp. 23-44). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Bhattacharya, K. (2009). Othering research, researching the Other: De/Colonizing approaches to qualitative inquiry. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory of Research* (pp. 105-150). USA: Springer Science + Business Media B.V.
- Bister-Broosen, H., & Willemyns, R. (1998). French-German bilingual education in Alsace, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1(1), 3-17.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education Introduction to theories and methods*. (5th ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Knopp Biklen, S. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge MS, Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71(2), 195-207.
- Brecht, R. D., & Rivers, W. P. (2000). *Language and national security in the 21st century: The role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays in supporting national language capacity*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- British Columbia. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/>
- British Columbia Education. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/en/themes/education/index.page?WT.svl=TopNav>
- Büchel, H., Bühler-Otten, S., Fürstenau, S., and Gogolin, I. (2001). The home language survey Language diversity in Hamburg. Research-Report (in preparation)
- Canadian Education Association. (1991). *Heritage language programs in Canadian school boards*. Toronto, ON.
- Chen, S. C. (1992). *Language maintenance and shift in the Chinese community of Greater Philadelphia*. (Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Paper. (UMI NO. AAI9227637)
- Chen, Y. F. (2010). *Language Politics and Language Retention in a Canadian Chinese Diaspora Community: Challenges for Parents*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Manitoba, Canada.
- Cho, G. (2000). The role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships: Reflections from a language minority group. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24 (4),

333-348.

Chow, H. (2001). The Challenge of diversity: Ethnic identity maintenance and heritage language retention in the Canadian mosaic. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.138.4851&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2010/permanent/11.asp>

Coelho, E. (2008). Multilingualism in Ontario: An educational perspective. Paper presented in *Managing Immigration and Diversity in Quebec and Canada Forum, 22-23 October, Barcelona*.

Cooper, M. J. (2007). *Patterns of use of Inuktitut and English within communities in Iqaluit, Nunavut: Implications for education*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of New Brunswick, Canada.

Coste, D., De Pietro, J. F., & Moore, D. (2012). Hymes et le palimpseste de la compétence de communication [Hymes and the palimpsest of the notion of communicative competence]. *Langages et Societe*, 139, 103–123. doi:10.3917/ls.139.0103.

Council conclusions on the education of children with a migrant background. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/111482.pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry research design Choosing among the five approaches*. (2nd ed.). California, the United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*.

- Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39 (3), 124-130.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43 (2), 317-321.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A Proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89 (4), 585-592.
- Cummins, J. (2003a). The academic and discourse of minority language education: Claims and counter-claims about reading, academic language, pedagogy, and assessment as they relate to bilingual children's educational development. University of Toronto. Summary of paper presented at the International Conference on Bilingualism, Bristol, UK, April 2001. Retrieved from iteachilearn.org/cummins/claims.html
- Cummins, J. (2001a). Author's Introduction Framing the universe of discourse: Are the constructs of power and identity relevant to school failure? *Harvard Education Review*, 71(4), 649-675.
- Cummins, J. (2001b). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. In J. Cummins, C. Baker, & N. H. Hornberger (Ed.s). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins* (pp. 63-95). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Language issues and educational change. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Ed.s), *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 440-459). Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Cummins, J. (1997). Minority status and schooling in Canada. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 28 (3), 411-430.
- Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curricula* (pp. 33-58). New York, the United States of America: The Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Heritage language teaching in Canadian schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24(3), 281-286.
- Cummins, J. (1983). *Heritage language education: A literature review*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.
- Dagenais, D., & Berron, C. (2001). Promoting multilingualism through French immersion and language maintenance in three immigrant families. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14(2), 142-155.
- Dagenais, D., & Day, E. (1999). Home language practices of trilingual children in French Immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 99–123.
- Department of Education Newfoundland and Labrador. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov.nl.ca/edu/>
- de Courcy, M. (2005). Policy challenges for bilingual and immersion education in

- Australia: Literacy and language choices for users of aboriginal languages, Auslan and Italian, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2-3), 178-187.
- Diversity in B.C. School Boards A Framework. (2008). Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/diversity/diversity_framework.pdf
- Dopke, S. (1992). *One parent, one language: An interactional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Duff, P. (2008). Heritage language education in Canada. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Bauckus (Ed.s), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 71-90). New York and London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1), 54-63.
- Edmonton Public Schools. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.epsb.ca/language/Language.shtml>
- Elementary and Junior Secondary School Handbook. (2006-2007). Retrieved from <http://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/>
- Enhancing Second Language Learning in Alberta. (2003). Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/media/618506/enhancesllearn.pdf>
- Eric Hamber Secondary School Course Planning Booklet. (2011-2012). Retrieved from <http://hamber.vsb.bc.ca/mambo/pdfs/ehcoursebookdec15.pdf>
- Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2002). *Language diversity in multicultural Europe Comparative perspectives on immigrant minority languages at home and at school*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/most/dp63extra.pdf>
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. New York: Blackwell.

- Fay, B. (1996). *Contemporary philosophy of social science: A multicultural approach*. Cambridge, UK: Blackwell.
- Feuerverger, G. (1997). "ON THE EDGES OF THE MAP": A study of heritage language teachers in Toronto. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 39-53.
- Fishman, J. A. (1977). "Language and Ethnicity." In Howard Giles (Ed.), *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Filewych, T. (1997). Trends and issues in language education A discussion paper. Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/media/832118/trends.pdf>
- Fordham, S. (1990). Racelessness as a factor in black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? In N. M. Hidalgo, C. L. McDowell, and E. V. Siddle (Ed.s), *Facing racism in education* (pp. 232-262). Harvard Educational Review reprint series, 21. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.
- Fredman, B. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic identity in organizations: Toward integrative models. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory, and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Gal, S. (1991). Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. In M. di Leonardo (Ed.), *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge: Feminist anthropology in the postmodern era* (pp. 175-203). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Garcia, M.E. (2003). Recent research on language maintenance. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 22-43.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, & Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gibbons, J., & Ramirez, E. (2004). *Maintaining a minority language: A case study of Hispanic teenagers*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Gogonas, N. (2007). *Ethnolinguistic Vitality and Language Maintenance in Second-Generation Migrants: A Study of Albanian and Egyptian Pupils in Athens*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Sussex, England.

Gogolin, I. (2002). *Linguistic diversity and new minorities in Europe Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe: From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/GogolinEN.pdf>

Goldstein, T. (2003a). Contemporary Life at a Canadian high school: Choices, risks, tensions, and dilemmas. *Sociology of Education*, 76(3), 247-264.

Goldstein, T. (2003b). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual school: Choices, risks, and dilemmas*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Government of Alberta Education. (1995). Retrieved from <http://www.education.alberta.ca/>

Government of Saskatchewan Education. (2007). Retrieved from www.education.gov.sk.ca

Government of Northwest Territories. (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.gov.nt.ca/research/facts/index.html>

Guardado, M. (2010). Engaging language and cultural spaces: Latin American parents' reflections on language loss and maintenance in Vancouver. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9 (1), 51-72.

- Guardado, M. (2006). Engaging Language and Cultural Spaces: Latin American Parents' Reflections on Language Loss and Maintenance in Vancouver. *Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 51-72.
- Guardado, M. (2002). Loss and maintenance of first language skills: Case studies of Hispanic families in Vancouver. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 341–363.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guess, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hakuta, K., & D'Andrea, D. (1992). Some properties of bilingual maintenance and loss in Mexican background high school students. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 72-99.
- Handelman, J. A. (1999). Culture jamming: Expanding the application of the critical research project, *Advances in Costumer Research*, 26, 339-404.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 35-67.
- Harré R., & Moghaddam, F. (2003). Introduction: the self and others in traditional psychology and in positioning theory. In R. Harré & F. Moghaddam (Ed.s), *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political and cultural contexts* (pp. 1-11). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hart, M. (1990). Critical theory and beyond: Further perspectives on emancipatory education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 40(3), 125-138.

- Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. The United States of America: University of California Press.
- Helot, C., & Young, A. (2002). Bilingualism and language education in French primary schools: why and how should migrant languages be valued? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(2), 96-112
- Heritage Language Education. (1994). Retrieved from <http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/policy/multi/hert.html.waq13102009>
- Hinton, L. (2009). Trading tongues: Loss of heritage languages in the United States. In A. Reyes, & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp.331-346). Oxford New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Huckle, J. (1993). Environmental education and sustainability: A view from critical theory. In J. Fien (Ed.). *Environmental education: A pathway to sustainability* (pp. 43-68). Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Ishizawa, H. (2004). Minority language use among grandchildren in multigenerational households. *Sociological Perspectives*, 47(4), 465-483.
- Iqbal, I. (2005). Mother tongue and motherhood: Implications for French language maintenance in Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61 (3), 305-323.
- James, C. E. (1994). I Don't Want to Talk About It: Silencing Students in Today's Classrooms. *Orbit*, 25, 26-29.
- Jeon, M. (2008). Korean heritage language maintenance and language ideology. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6 (2), 54-71.

- Juaristi, P., Reagan, T., & Tonkin, H. (2008). Linguistic diversity in the European Union: An overview. In X. Arzoz (Ed.), *Respecting linguistic diversity in the European Union* (pp. 47-72). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jupp, V. (Ed.). (2006). *The Sage dictionary of social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kamo, Y. (1998). Asian grandparents. In M. E. Szinovacz (Ed.), *Handbook of grandparenthood* (pp. 97-112). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241-249.
- Kanuha, V. K. (2000). "Being" native versus "going native": Conducting social work research as an insider. *Social Work*, 45(5), 439-447.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldouf, R. B. (2005). Language in education policy and planning. In E. Hinkle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (n. p.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2002). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Y. Zou & E. T. Trueba (Eds.), *Ethnography and schools: Qualitative approaches to the study of education*. Maryland, the United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher, Inc.
- King, K. A. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(3), 167-184.
- Kopke, B. (2004b). Attrition is not a unitary phenomenon. On different possible outcomes of language contact situations. In A. M. L. Suarez, F. Ramallo & X.-P. Rodriguez-Yanez (Ed.s), *Bilingual Socialization and Bilingual Language Acquisition: Proceedings from*

- the Second International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 1331-1347). Vigo: Servizo Del Publicacions da Universidade de Vigo. Retrieved from <http://webs.uvigo.es/ssl/actas2002/06/06.%20Barbara%20Kopke.pdf>
- Kouritzin, S. G. (2006). Songs from taboo tongues: Experiencing first language loss. *Language and Literacy*, 8 (1), 1-28.
- Kouritzin, S.G. (1999). *Face(t)s of first language loss*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kraus, P. A. (2008). A one-dimensional diversity? European integration and the challenge of language policy. In X. Arzoz (Ed.), *Respecting linguistic diversity in the European Union* (pp. 85-104). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kravin, H. (1992). Erosion of a language in bilingual development. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13, 307-325.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Languages in B.C. 2011 Fact Sheet. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.welcomebc.ca/welcome_bc/media/Media-Gallery/docs/communities/Census-2011-Languages.pdf
- Lee, S. (2002). The significance of language and cultural education on secondary achievement: A survey of Chinese American and Korean American students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 213-224.
- Lewis, S. (1992). *Report on Race Relations in Ontario*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.
- Li, J. J. (1995). *Heritage language retention in second-generation Chinese Americans*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, the United States.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Liu, R. (2008). Maintaining Chinese as a heritage language in the United States: What really matters? *Arizona Working Papers in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 15, 37-64.
- Liu, N., Musica, A., Koscak, S., Vinogradova, P., & López, J. (2011). Challenges and needs of community-based heritage language programs and how they are addressed. *Heritage Briefs*, 1-18. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/heritage/pdfs/briefs/challenges-and%20needs-of-community-based-heritage-language-programs.pdf>
- Lopez, J., Frawley, W., Payton, J.K. (2010). “Se puede conservar la cultura y también se puede aspirar”: Language and cultural identities among the Cora of Mexico. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7 (2), 22-45.
- Lopez, D. E. (1978). Chicano Language Loyalty in an Urban Setting. *Sociology and Social Research*, 62 (2), 267-278.
- MacGregor-Mendoza, P. (2000). Aqui no se habla espanol: Stories of linguistic repression in Southwest schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333-345.
- Majhanovich, S.E. & Richards, L. (1995). The state of heritage language programs in small- and mid-sized school boards in central and south western Ontario. In K.A. McLeod (Ed.), *Multicultural Education: The State of the Art Studies of Canadian Heritage* (pp. 23-35). Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.
- Manitoba Education. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/languages/>
- Marshall, S., & Moore, D. (2013). 2B or not 2B plurilingual? Navigating languages literacies, and plurilingual competence in postsecondary education in Canada. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 472-499.

Marti, F., Ortega, P. Barrena, A., Idiazabal, I., Juaristi, C., Uranga, B. & Amorrortu, E. (2005).

Words and worlds: World languages review. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate. *Educational researcher*, 17 (2), 13-17.

McAlpine, L., & Herodier, D. (1994). Schooling as a vehicle for Aboriginal language maintenance: Implementing Cree as the language of instruction in northern Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 19 (2), 128–141.

McKinney, C. (2007). ‘If I speak English does it make me less black anyway?’ ‘Race’ and English in South African desegregated schools. *English Academy Review*, 24 (2), 6–24.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morrow, R. (1994). *Critical theory and methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mugaddam, A. R. H. (August 2005). Language attitudes and language shift among ethnic migrants in Khartoum. *Afrikanistik Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.afrikanistik-online.de/archiv/2005/181>

Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: Some dilemmas of interviewing in a crosscultural setting. *Geoforum*, 30, 337-350.

- Murray, J. B., & Ozenn, J. L. (1991). The critical imagination: Emancipatory interest in consumer research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (2), 129-144.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In C. Myers-Scotton (Ed.), *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties* (pp. 18-40). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Namei, Sh. (2012). *Iranians in Sweden A study of language maintenance and shift*. Sweden: Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.
- Neegan, E. (2005). Excuse me: Who are the first peoples of Canada? A historical analysis of Aboriginal education in Canada then and now. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9 (1), 3–15.
- New Brunswick Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.gnb.ca/0000/index-e.asp>
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (2), 9-31.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44 (4), 412-446.
- Nunavut Approved Curriculum and Teaching Resources. (2010-2011). Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.nu.ca/apps/UPLOADS/fck/file/K-12/NU%20CUR%20GUIDE%20SEPT%202010.pdf>
- Nunavut Bureau of Statistics. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.stats.gov.nu.ca/en/Population%20estimate.aspx>

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2011). Retrieved from

http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/intlLang_LangIntl.pdf

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Bemhard, J. K., & Freire, M. (2001). Struggling to preserve home language: The experiences of Latino students and families in the Canadian school system. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(1-2), 115-145.

Park, S.M., & Sarkar, M. (2007). Parents' attitudes toward heritage language maintenance for their children and their efforts to help their children maintain the heritage language: A case study of Korean-Canadian immigrants. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 20(3), 223-235.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pease-Alvarez, L. (1993). *Moving in and out of bilingualism: Investigating native language maintenance and shift in Mexican-descent children*. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Research Report 6.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, 51 (9), 918-927.

Phinney, J. S. (1995). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: A review and integration. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Hispanic Psychology: Critical Issues in Theory and Research* (pp. 57-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research. *Psychological bulletin*, 108, 499-514.
- Piquemal, N. (2001). Free and informed consent in research involving Native American communities. *American Indian culture and research Journal*, 25 (1), 65-79.
- Policy Document: Language Education Policy. (1997). Retrieved from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/policy/policies/language_educ.htm#
- Porsanger, J. (2004). An essay about indigenous methodology. *Nordlit*, 15, 105–120.
- Potowski, K. (2007). *Language and identity in a dual immersion school*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Prescher, P. (2007). Identity, immigration and first language attrition. In B. Köpke, M. Schmid, M. Keijzer, & S. Dostert (Eds.), *Language attrition: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 189-204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Prince Edward Island Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.gov.pe.ca/eecd/>
- Profile of Diversity in BC Communities. (2006). Retrieved from http://www.welcomebc.ca/welcome_bc/media/Media-Gallery/docs/diversity/2006/Coquitlam.pdf
- Public School Programs. (2003-2004). Retrieved from http://www.ednet.ns.ca/pdfdocs/psp/psp_03_04_full.pdf
- Pyke, K., & Dang, T. (2003). “FOB” and “Whitewashed”: Identity and internalized racism among second generation Asian Americans. *Qualitative Sociology*, 26(2), 147-172.
- Reeves, J. (2009). Teacher investment in learner identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 34-41.

- Reid, E., & Reich, H. (Ed.s). (1992). *Breaking the boundaries: Migrants workers' children in the EC*. Clevedon , England: Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 348-368.
- Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez*. Toronto and New York: Bantam Books.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex, England: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., M. Fix, & B. Chu Clewell. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Runfors, A., & Sjorgen, A. (1994). Language, dominance, and resistance: An ethnological perspective on teaching and learning Swedish in an immigrant environment in Sweden. *Migration*, 23-24, 293-314.
- School District Number 20 Kootenay Columbia. (n. d.). Retrieved from <http://www.sd20.bc.ca/>
- Shibata, S. (2000). Opening a Japanese saturday school in a small town in the United States: Community collaboration to teach Japanese as a heritage language. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 465-474.
- Siguan, M. (1995). *La Europa de las lenguas*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009). The stakes: Linguistic diversity, linguistic human rights and mother- tongue- based multilingual education- or linguistic genocide, crimes against humanity and even faster destruction of biodiversity and our planet. [PDF document]. Retrieved from <http://www.tove-skutnabb->

- kangas.org/pdf/Tove_Skutnabb_Kangas_Keynote_presentation_at_Bamako_International_Forum_on_Multilingualism_Bamako_Mali_19_21_Jan_2009.pdf
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002a) Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education, *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1(3), 179-205.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & McCarty, T. L. (2008). Key Concepts in bilingual education: Ideological, historical, epistemological, and empirical foundations. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Vol. 5, pp. 3-17). New York: Springer.
- Smolicz, J.J. (1999). Who is an Australian? Identity, core values and the resilience of culture. In M. J. Secombe and J. Zajda (Ed.s), *J.J. Smolicz on Education and Culture* (pp. 11-50). Melbourne : James Nicholas Publishers.
- Smolicz J.J. (1981). Language as a core value of culture. In H. B. Beardsmore (Ed.), *Elements of bilingual theory* (pp. 104-124). Universiteit Brussel: Brussels.
- Smolicz, J.J., & Secombe, M.J. (1989). Types of language activation in an ethnically plural society. In U. Ammon (Ed.) *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*, (pp. 478-514). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies Research and indigenous peoples*. London, Uk: Zed Books Ltd.
- Sohrabi, B. (1997). Ethnolinguistic vitality and patterns of communication among the second generation of Iranian immigrants in Sweden. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 128, 45–71.
- Statistics Canada. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/start-debut-eng.html>

- Statistics Canada. (2006). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/start-debut-eng.html>
- Statistics Canada. (2006). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo26l-eng.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2006). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo24a-eng.htm>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1991) Heritage language children in an English-French bilingual program. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47, 635–43.
- Tagoma, m., Kim, M., Brink, S, & Telteman, J. (2010). *OECD Reviews of Migrant Education Sweden*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/40/44862803.pdf>
- Taylor, S. K. (1998). Beyond “Belief”: Variance in models of content-based instruction and school success among minority language learners. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliqué*, 67, 61-83.
- Taylor, S. (1992) Victor: A case study of a Cantonese child in Early French Immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, 736–59.
- Taylor, S. K. (in press). *They sic dogs on us: Ethnographic narratives as glimpses into language learners’ everyday lives and social conditions*. In S. Marshall, A. Clemente & M. J. Higgins (Eds.), *Language, social action and identities in multilingual and multicultural contexts: Reshaping the ethnographic encounter* (pp. 151-172). London, Canada: Althouse Press.
- The Common Curriculum Framework for Bilingual Programming. (1999). Retrieved from <http://www.wncp.ca/media/44395/framework.pdf>
- The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10 Classical Studies and International Languages. (1999). Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/classiclang910curr.pdf>

The Ontario Curriculum Grades 11 and 12 Classical Studies and International Languages.

(2000). Retrieved from

<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/classiclang1112curr.pdf>

Torres, A. (2006). *Family, ethnic identity and education in relation to generational heritage language maintenance and shift among Chicanos of the south plains*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University, the United States.

TREND. (2012). Retrived from <http://en.trend.az/regions/iran/2087540.html>

Tse, L. (1998). Ethnic identity formation and its implications for heritage language development. In S. Krashen, L. Tse & J. McQuillan(Ed.s) *Heritage language development* (pp.15-29). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

University of Manitoba Research Ethic Board. (2011). Retrieved from

http://umanitoba.ca/research/orec/ethics/human_ethics_REB_forms_guidelines.html

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K.

Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37-77). Washington, DC and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Vancouver School Board. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.vsb.bc.ca/programs/early-mandarin-bilingual>

Vancouver School Board. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.vsb.bc.ca/about-vsb>

Vannini, A., & Gladue, C. (2008). Decolonised methodologies in cross-cultural research. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Doing cross-cultural research Ethical and methodological perspectives* (pp. 137-159). New York, USA: Springer.

Victoria German School. (n. d.). Retrieved from <http://www.victoriagermanschool.org/>

Victoria Japanese Heritage Language School Society. (n. d.). Retrieved from

<http://en.vicnihongo.com/about/about-the-school>

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Lexington: D. C. Heath.

Weaver, H. N. (2001). Indigenous identity - What is it, and who really has it? *American Indian Quarterly*, 25(2), 240-256.

Wong Fillmore, L. (2000). Loss of family languages: Should educators be concerned? *Theory into Practice*, 39 (4), 203-210.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6, 323-346.

Xie, M. (2010). *First language maintenance and attrition among young Chinese adult immigrants: A multi-case study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alberta, Canada.

Yagmur, K. (n. d.). Language policy in the Netherlands. Retrieved from http://www.amarauna-languages.com/orokorra/artikuluak/eu/Bilbao_Yagmur.pdf

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yukon Education. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.education.gov.yk.ca/psb/>

Yu-Tung Carol, L. (2009). Language maintenance and language loss in first language. *US-China Foreign Language*, 7 (7), 10-16.

Appendix A: The Observation Protocol (Adapted from Creswell, 2007, p. 137)**Date:****Time:****Level:****Location:**

Learning/Teaching Activities	Reflective Notes
	SKETCH OF CLASSROOM

Appendix B: The Students' Interview Protocol

Name (Pseudonym):

Date:

You have a right to refuse to answer any questions and the right to stop the interview at any time by simply telling me.

1. Please tell me about yourself.

a. How old are you?

چند سال دا رید؟

b. When were you born?

کجا دنیا آمده اید؟

c. Where were you born?

کجا دنیا آماده اید؟

d. When did you immigrate to Canada?

کی به کانادا مهاجرت کردید؟

e. How long have you studied Farsi at the Farsi school?

چند مدت است که در مدرسه فارسی درس می خوانید؟

f. Whose ideas was it for you to study Farsi at the Farsi school?

بانظر چه کسی در مدرسه فارسی ثبت نام کردید؟

g. What language(s) do you speak at home most often and with whom?

در منزل بیشتر به چه زبانی صحبت می کنید ؟ با چه کسی؟

- h. At what times, in what places with whom do you speak Farsi? English? Other languages?

چه زمانهایی ، در چه مکانی، با چه افرادی فارسی/ انگلیسی /زبانهای دیگر صحبت میکنید ؟

- i. Do you watch Iranian TV programs or read Farsi books? Where?

آیا برنامه های تلویزیونی ایرانی تماشا میکنید یا کتاب فارسی میخوانید ؟ کجا ؟

- j. What resources exist for you to learn or use Farsi at home? Please explain.

چه امکاناتی در منزل برای یادگیری یا استفاده از فارسی برای شما وجود دارد؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

- k. Do you face any problems in learning or using Farsi at home? Please explain.

آیا در استفاده یا یادگیری فارسی در منزل با مساله ای مواجه هستید؟ لطفا توضیح دهید .

- l. Do you think your home environment has overall helped you learn or use Farsi?

Please explain.

آیا فکر میکنید محیط خانه به طور کلی در یادگیری یا استفاده از فارسی به شما کمک میکند؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

2. Please tell me about your public (Canadian) school.

- a. What grade are you in at the public school?

در مدرسه کانادائی کلاس چندم هستید ؟

- b. Do you learn any other languages (languages other than English) at school?

Please explain.

آیا در مدرسه زبان دیگری جز انگلیسی میخوانید؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

- c. Do students from other countries study at your school?

آیا مدرسه شما دانش آموزان زیادی دارد که از کشورهای دیگر آمده اند؟

- d. Do you have non-English books in your school's library? How about Farsi books?

آیا در کتابخانه مدرسه کتابهای غیر انگلیسی وجود دارد؟ کتابهای فارسی چطور؟

- e. Do your teachers encourage using languages other than English, for example Farsi, in the class? Please explain.

آیا معلمان شما را به استفاده از زبانهای دیگر جز انگلیسی، مثلاً فارسی، تشویق می کنند؟ لطفاً توضیح دهید.

- f. Does your school encourage using other languages, Farsi in your case? Please explain.

آیا مدرسه شما را به استفاده از زبان دیگری جز انگلیسی تشویق می کند؟ لطفاً توضیح دهید.

- g. Do you face any problems in learning or using Farsi at school? Please explain.

آیا در مدرسه با مسائلی در مورد یادگیری یا استفاده از فارسی مواجه هستید؟ لطفاً توضیح دهید.

- h. Do you have Iranian friends at school? If so, what language do you use most often in your interactions with them? Please explain.

آیا در مدرسه دوستان ایرانی دارید؟ اگر چنین است، بیشتر با چه زبانی با آنها صحبت می کنید؟ چرا؟

- i. Do you think your Canadian school has overall helped you learn or use Farsi? Please explain.

آیا فکر می‌کنید مدرسه کانادایی شما به طور کلی به شما در یادگیری یا استفاده از فارسی کمک کرده است؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

3. Please tell me about your community.

a. What language(s) do you use at the Farsi school? With whom?

در مدرسه فارسی چه زبا نهایی صحبت می‌کنید؟ با چه کسان؟

b. What are some resources to learn or use Farsi at the Farsi school?

در مدرسه فارسی چه منابعی برای استفاده یا یادگیری فارسی موجود هستند؟

c. What has helped you most in learning or using Farsi at the Farsi school?

چه عاملی بیشتر از بقیه در یادگیری یا استفاده از فارسی در مدرسه فارسی برای شما مفید بوده است؟

d. What do you think an ideal Farsi language school should be like?

به نظر شما بهترین محیط برای یادگیری فارسی چه محیطی است؟

e. What else would you like the Farsi school to do to help you learn or use Farsi better?

مایلید مدرسه فارسی چه اقدامات دیگری جهت یادگیری بهتر یا استفاده بیشتر فارسی برای شما انجام دهد؟

4. Would you like to add anything else?

آیا مایلید مطلب دیگری اضافه کنید؟

Thanks !

متشکرم!

Appendix C: The Parents' Interview Protocol

Name (Pseudonym):

Date:

You have a right to refuse to answer any questions and the right to stop the interview at any time by simply telling me.

1. Please tell me about yourself.

a. How long have you been in Canada and Vancouver?

چه مدت هست که در کانادا و ونکوور اقامت دارید؟

b. What do you do?

شغل شما چیست؟

c. Please tell me about your education background.

لطفا در مورد تحصیلات خود توضیح دهید.

d. How many children do you have?

چند فرزند دارید؟

2. What language(s) do you use with each family member most often at home?

با هر یک از افراد خانواده اغلب به چه زبان / زبان هایی صحبت می کنید؟

3. What are your family's priorities as immigrants in Canada?

اولویت های خانواده شما به عنوان مهاجر در کانادا چیست؟

4. How do you try to facilitate learning Farsi for your child in and out of home?

چگونه سعی می‌کنید یادگیری فارسی را برای فرزندتان در منزل و خارج از آن تسهیل کنید؟

5. Why did you enroll your child in the Farsi school?

چرا فرزند خود را در مدرسه فارسی ثبت نام کردید؟

6. Have you ever used any other resources, in addition to the Farsi school, to facilitate learning Farsi for your child? Please explain.

آیا علاوه بر مدرسه فارسی، از امکانات دیگری جهت تسهیل یادگیری فارسی برای فرزندتان استفاده کرده اید؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

7. Have you ever faced any challenges in helping your child learn or use Farsi at home?

Please explain.

آیا تا کنون در کمک به فرزندتان جهت یادگیری فارسی با مساله ای مواجه شده اید؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

8. What else do you think should be done for your child at home and outside to help him/her learn or use Farsi?

فکر می‌کنید چه اقدامات دیگری در منزل و بیرون باید صورت گیرد تا فرزندتان فارسی را بهتر یاد بگیرد یا بیشتر استفاده کند؟

9. Would you like to add anything else?

آیا مایلید نکته دیگری اضافه کنید؟

Thanks!

متشکرم !

Appendix D: The Heritage Language Teachers' Interview Protocol

Name (Pseudonym):

Date:

You have a right to refuse to answer any questions and the right to stop the interview at any time by simply telling me.

1. Please tell me about yourself.

a. When did you immigrate to Canada?

کی به کانادا مهاجرت کردید؟

b. What do you do besides teaching Farsi at the Farsi school?

علاوه بر تدریس در مدرسه فارسی، شغل دیگری هم دارید؟

c. Did you have teaching experiences before starting your job as a Farsi teacher here?

آیا قبل از تدریس در مدرسه فارسی، سابقه تدریس داشته اید؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

2. What has the role of Farsi been for you?

نقش فارسی برای شما چه بوده است؟

3. What brought you to teach Farsi at this institute?

چرا اقدام به تدریس فارسی در این مدرسه کردید؟

4. What do you see as the role of Farsi in the lives of Canadian-Iranians generally?

نقش فارسی را در زندگی کانادائی-ایرانی ها به طور کلی چه می بینید؟

5. Why you believe immigrant children should learn their heritage languages (Farsi for Iranian immigrants)? Please explain.

چرا به نظر شما فرزندان مهاجران باید زبان مادری خود (فارسی برای ایرانیان مهاجر) را یاد بگیرند؟

6. How do you try to encourage your students to use or learn Farsi?

چگونه تلاش می کنید دانش آموزانتان را به استفاده از یا آموختن فارسی تشویق کنید؟

7. Would you like to add anything else?

آیا مایلید مطلب دیگری اضافه کنید؟

Thanks!

متشکرم!

Appendix E: The Critical Incident Report Guideline

Please record one of your positive or negative experiences of using Farsi in the presence of a non-Farsi speaker in Canada in your preferred format (written or oral narratives, chart or drawing, to name a few) in either Farsi or English. Examples are, but not limited to, (1) talking to your child/classmate or schoolmate in Farsi at the public school in the presence of a non-Farsi-speaking teacher or principal, and (2) a contact with another Iranian individual at work where a non-Farsi speaker was also present. In describing your experience, please provide the following information. Please use pseudonyms for any third party and exclude any identifying information about them. If you would like to record your experience orally, a digital voice recorder will be provided for you.

لطفاً یک خاطره مثبت یا منفی را از استفاده خود از فارسی در حضور یک غیر فارسی زبان در کانادا به زبان فارسی یا انگلیسی به روش دلخواه (توصیف کتبی یا شفاهی، جدول یا ترسیم و غیره) تشریح کنید. نمونه‌ها شامل این موارد هستند ولی فقط به اینها محدود نمی‌شوند: (۱) صحبت با فرزندان یا همکلاسی یا هم مدرسه‌تان به فارسی در مدرسه کانادایی در حضور یک معلم یا مدیر غیر فارسی زبان و (۲) تماس با یک ایرانی دیگر در محل کارتان در حضور یک غیر فارسی زبان.

در تشریح این تجربه، لطفاً اطلاعات زیر را ذکر کنید. لطفاً از اسامی مستعار برای افراد استفاده کنید و از دادن هر گونه اطلاعاتی که منجر به شناسایی آنها می‌شود خودداری فرمائید. در صورت تمایل به ضبط این خاطره به جای نوشتن آن، دستگاه ضبط صوت در اختیار شما قرار داده خواهد شد.

1. Context

۱. محیط

a. When did it happen?

a. این اتفاق کی افتاد؟

b. Where did it happen?

b. این اتفاق کجا رخ داد؟

2. Action/Behaviour

۲. رفتار

a. What happened exactly?

a. دقیقاً چه اتفاقی افتاد؟

b. What was challenging/ unpleasant or pleasant?

b. کدام قسمت ماجرا برای شما چالش انگیز (دشوار، نا پسند، مضطرب کننده، ...) یا خوش آیند و مطلوب

بود؟

c. Who else was involved? Please explain.

c. چه فرد/ افراد دیگری هم در این اتفاق نقش داشتند؟ لطفاً توضیح دهید.

3. Consequence

۳. نتیجه

a. What was the consequence of this action/behavior?

a. نتیجه این اتفاق چه بود؟

b. Did the event lead to any changes in your feeling and behavior at that moment?

Please explain.

b. آیا این اتفاق تأثیری بر احساسات و رفتار شما در آن لحظه گذاشت؟ لطفاً توضیح دهید.

c. Do you think something else should have been done? Please explain.

c. آیا فکر می‌کنید اقدام دیگری باید انجام داده می‌شد ؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

d. Did the event impact your attitudes towards Farsi? Please explain.

d. آیا این اتفاق تأثیری روی نظر شما در مورد زبان فارسی گذاشت ؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

e. Did the event influence your decision on your child's learning or using Farsi?

Please explain.

e. آیا این اتفاق تأثیری بر استفاده شما از فارسی در کانادا، آموختن آن یا تشویق فرزندان به آموختن آن

گذاشت ؟ لطفا توضیح دهید.

Appendix F: The Request Letter to the Principal of the Farsi School

درخواست همکاری از مدیریت محترم مدرسه فارسی جهت انجام تحقیق



Research Project Title: Language Maintenance in an Iranian Community in Canada: Successes and Challenges

عنوان پروژه تحقیق: حفظ و از دست دادن زبان مادری در یک جامعه ایرانی در کانادا: موفقیتها و چالشها

Principle Investigator and Contact Information: Naghmeh Babaee, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

محقق: نغمه بابایی, دانشکده آموزش, دانشگاه منیتوبا

Mailing address: (to be added at the time of the submission of this letter to the principal)

Cell phone number: (to be added at the time of the submission of this letter to the principal)

Email address: (to be added at the time of the submission of this letter to the principal)

Research Supervisor: Dr Clea Schmidt, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

استاد راهنما: دکتر کلی شمیت, دانشکده آموزش, دانشگاه منیتوبا

Associate Professor
Room 268 Education Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB Canada
R3T 2N2
204-474-9314
schmidtcc@cc.umanitoba.ca

31 March 2012

Dear Mr: (The principal's name will be added here at the time of submitting the letter.)

جناب آقای.....

ضمن عرض سلام

I am a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Education, the University of Manitoba. My supervisor is Dr Clea Schmidt from the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba. I am conducting a study entitled Language Maintenance in an Iranian Community: Successes and Challenges. This study is my PhD dissertation, which has been approved by the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board.

اینجانب ، نغمه بابائی، دانشجوی دکترا در رشته آموزش زبان دوم در دانشگاه مانیتوبا هستم و موضوع تحقیق پایان نامه دکترایم حفظ زبان مادری در یک جامعه ایرانی در کانادا می باشد. این تحقیق توسط the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board در دانشگاه منیتوبا تأیید شده است و استاد راهنمای این جانب Dr Clea Schmidt از دانشکده آموزش دانشگاه منیتوبا می باشد.

Participants will include five Level 1 or 2 students aged ten or above, five Iranian parents and five Farsi pre-school, Level 1 and Level 2 teachers. Data will be collected between April 07, 2012 and June 16, 2012. Data collection will include two in-depth, semi-structured interviews with students, parents and Farsi teachers, taking almost 60 minutes each at a time and place convenient for participants. Moreover, it will involve descriptive and reflective notes on the interviews, participants' reflections on each interview documented in a journal and a critical incident report in which participants will document one of their experiences in using Farsi at the presence of a non-Farsi speaker in Canada. Each of these should not take more than 30 minutes. Finally, data collection will include descriptive and reflective field notes from observing Level 1 and 2 classes.

شرکت کنندگان عبارت خواهند بود از پنج دانش آموز کلاس اول یا دوم ده سال به بالا، پنج پدر/مادر ایرانی و پنج معلم کلاسهای پیش دبستانی، اول و دوم. اطلاعات برای این تحقیق از 07April 2012 تا 16 June 2012 از طریق ۲ مصاحبه با هر شرکت کننده، ثبت یک خاطره مصاحبه شونده از استفاده از زبان فارسی در کانادا در حضور یک غیر فارسی زبان و تحلیل عمیقتر مصاحبه شونده و این جانب از مسایل مطرح شده در مصاحبه ها گردآوری خواهد شد. هر مصاحبه حداکثر ۶۰ دقیقه و تجزیه و تحلیل آن و ثبت خاطره هر یک حد اکثر ۳۰ دقیقه به طول خواهند انجامید. علاوه بر این، فعالیت های آموزشی در کلاسهای اول و دوم مدرسه فارسی توسط این جانب ثبت و تجزیه و تحلیل می شوند.

Due to the nature of the study, this research needs to be conducted at a community-based heritage language school in the City (the name of the city where the study will be conducted will be added here at the time of submitting the letter to the principal). I would like to request your permission to conduct this study at your school. If you grant me permission, I will seek Ms s (the office assistant's name will be added here at the time of submitting the letter to the principal) assistance with recruitment and data collection. Appended to this letter are copies of interview questions, an information letter and consent forms, which you might keep for your record and reference.

این تحقیق به خاطر ویژگی هایش نیازمند اجرا در یک مدرسه خصوصی زبان فارسی در شهر (نام شهر در هنگام ارائه نامه به مدیر اضافه می شود) می باشد. خواهمشمنم اجازه فرمائید تا در صورت امکان این تحقیق در این مدرسه فارسی انجام شود. در صورت اجازه شما، اینجانب از سر کار خانم تقاضا می کنم تا لطف کرده، مرا در پیدا کردن شرکت کنندگان و گردآوری اطلاعات یاری دهند. جهت اطلاع، یک نسخه از سوالهای مصاحبه، آگهی تحقیق و رضایت نامه شرکت کنندگان به پیوست خدمتتان ارائه می شود.

The information letter invites students, parents and teachers to participate in this study by contacting me directly at my email address or cell phone number if interested. After they contact me, I will make arrangements for collecting data (two interviews, reflective journals, a critical incident report, and my reflective notes on the interviews) at a time and place convenient for the participants. The information letter informs potential participants that Level 1 and Level 2 classes will need to be observed by me from April 07, 2012 to June 09, 2012 to document and analyze learning activities, seeking Level 1 and 2 teachers', students' and their parents' informed consents by signing a consent form.

آگهی تحقیق از دانش آموزان کلاسهای اول و دوم ده سال به بالا، والدین ایرانی و معلمهای پیش دبستانی، اول و دوم دعوت می کند تا در صورت تمایل به شرکت در این تحقیق، با این جانب مستقیماً از طریق ایمیل یا تلفن تماس بگیرند. سپس، گردآوری اطلاعات (۲ مصاحبه، تجزیه و تحلیل مصاحبه ها توسط شرکت کنندگان و این جانب، و یک خاطره مربوط به موضوع تحقیق توسط شرکت کنندگان) در مکان و زمان مناسب برای شرکت کنندگان با آنان هماهنگ خواهد شد. آگهی تحقیق همچنین به آگاهی افراد می رساند که نیاز است کلاسهای اول و دوم توسط اینجانب جهت ثبت و بررسی فعالیتهای آموزشی از ۷ آوریل تا ۹ جون ۲۰۱۲ بازدید شوند و موافقت معلمها، دانش آموزان و والدین آنها را در این کلاسها جهت این امر از طریق امضای یک رضایت نامه جویا می شود.

In the information letter, it is made clear that the identity of participants and the school will be protected in the data (audio files, interview transcripts, participants' reflections on the interviews, critical incident reports, my reflections on the interviews, and reflective and descriptive field notes from classroom observations), my dissertation, any papers arising from the study and the final report to participants by assigning pseudonyms and excluding any identifying information about them.

در آگهی تحقیق به وضوح ذکر شده است که هویت شرکت کنندگان و این مدرسه در اطلاعات (فایلها ی صوتی، ۲ مصاحبه، تجزیه و تحلیل مصاحبه ها توسط شرکت کنندگان و این جانب، یک خاطره مربوط به موضوع تحقیق توسط شرکت کنندگان، گزارش مشاهده کلاسها و تجزیه و تحلیل فعالیتهای آموزشی در آنها)، پایان نامه این جانب، مقالات برآمده از این تحقیق و گزارش نهائی به شرکت کنندگان از طریق استفاده از اسامی مستعار و حذف اطلاعاتی که منجر به شناسایی شوند محرمانه خواهد ماند.

Students, parents and teachers who agree to participate in this study will be asked to sign a consent form prior to data collection to ensure they are aware of the nature of the study, their rights while being involved in it and the right to withdraw at any time with no penalty. Data will be kept confidential in a locked cabinet in my place accessible only to me and in password protected files in my personal computer. Data will be shredded and recycled and the files will be permanently deleted as soon as the dissertation is written up (in September 2012).

از دانش آموزان، والدین و معلمانی که حاضر به شرکت در این تحقیق شوند در خواست خواهد شد که قبل از گردآوری اطلاعات، رضایت نامه ای را امضا کنند تا اطمینان حاصل شود که از ماهیت این تحقیق، حقوق خود طی شرکت در آن و حق کنار رفتن از تحقیق در هر زمان بدون هیچ جریمه ای آگاهی دارند. اطلاعات به طور محرمانه در یک کشو قفل دار در منزل که تنها توسط این جانب قابل دسترسی است و در فایل های رمزدار در کامپیوتر شخصی این جانب نگه داری خواهند شد. به مجرد اینکه نوشتن پایان نامه به پایان رسد (سپتامبر ۲۰۱۲) این اطلاعات از بین برده (بازیافت) خواهند شد و فایل های کامپیوتر به طور دائمی حذف خواهند شد.

If you require more information about the study, please do not hesitate to contact me at my cell phone (to be added at the time of the submission of this letter to the principal) or email address (to be added at the time of the submission of this letter to the principal).

در صورت داشتن هر گونه سوال در مورد این تحقیق لطفاً با این جانب از طریق ایمیل (.....) یا تلفن (در هنگام ارائه نامه به مدیر اضافه می شود) تماس حاصل فرمایید.

Sincerely,

Naghmeh Babaei

ارادتمند
نغمه بابائی

This research has been approved by the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact my supervisor at Schmidt@cc.umanitoba.ca or 204-474-9314 or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at 474-7122 or email Margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Principal's signature----- Date-----

Researcher's signature ----- Date -----

این تحقیق توسط the University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board تأیید شده است .
راهنمای این جانب لطفاً در صورت داشتن سوال با استاد Schmidt@cc.umanitoba.ca or 204-474-9314
یا با هماهنگ کننده تحقیقات 204-474-7122 or Margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca
تماس حاصل فرمایید . یک نسخه از این رضایت نامه به شما تحویل داده شده است.

امضا-----

تاریخ-----

امضاء محقق-----

تاریخ-----

Appendix G: The Consent Form for Classroom Observations for Teachers

رضایت نامه جهت مشاهده کلاس برای آموزگاران



Study Title: Language Maintenance in an Iranian Community in Canada: Successes and Challenges

عنوان پروژه تحقیق: حفظ و از دست دادن زبان مادری در یک جامعه ایرانی در کانادا: موفقیتها و چالشها

Principal Investigator: Naghmeh Babaee, 3rd Year PhD Candidate, Second Language Education,
Phone number: (to be added at the time of the submission of the letter to potential teacher participants)
Email address: umbabaee@cc.umanitoba.ca

محقق: نغمه بابایی، دانشکده آموزش، دانشگاه منیتوبا

Research Supervisor: Dr Clea Schmidt

استاد راهنما: دکتر کلی شمیت
دانشکده آموزش، دانشگاه منیتوبا

Associate Professor, Education,
Phone number: 204-474-9314
Email address: schmidtcc@cc.umanitoba.ca

This consent form, a copy of which you may save or print for your records and reference at this time (it will not be available later), is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to contact us. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

این رضایت نامه، که یک نسخه از آنرا الان جهت اطلاع خود می توانید ذخیره کنید یا پرینت بگیرید (بعداً در دسترس نخواهد بود)، تنها یک بخش از روند کسب موافقت شما [برای شرکت در این تحقیق] می باشد. این [رضایت نامه] یک ایده

کلی در مورد موضوع این تحقیق و چگونگی شرکت شما در آن می دهد. در صورت تمایل می توانید جهت کسب اطلاعات بیشتر در مورد هر نکته ای که اینجا ذکر شده یا نشده است با ما تماس بگیرید. لطفاً این رضایت نامه را با دقت بخوانید.

Naghmeh Babaei is conducting this study as her PhD dissertation, under the supervision of Dr Clea Schmidt. The purpose of this research is to investigate Iranian immigrant children's learning and using Farsi within the contexts of home, school and community. Participants will include five Level 1 or 2 students aged ten or above, five Iranian parents and five Farsi pre-school, Level 1 and Level 2 teachers. Data will be collected between April 07, 2012 and June 16, 2012.

نغمه بابائی این تحقیق را جهت پایان نامه دکترایش تحت نظارت دکتر کلی اشمیت انجام می دهد. هدف از این تحقیق بررسی یادگیری زبان فارسی در منزل، مدرسه و جامعه ایرانی توسط کودکان ایرانی مهاجر در کانادا می باشد. شرکت کنندگان در این تحقیق شامل پنج دانش آموز کلاس اول یا دوم (در مدرسه فارسی) بالای ده سال، پنج پدر/مادر ایرانی و پنج آموزگار کلاسهای پیش دبستانی، اول و دوم می شوند. اطلاعات برای این تحقیق از April 07, 2012 تا June 16, 2012 گردآوری خواهد شد.

Part of data collection will involve observing Level 1 and 2 classrooms in the Farsi school and documenting and analyzing teaching and learning activities from April 07, 2012 to June 09, 2012. There will be eight observations and each observation will take two hours.

بخشی از اطلاعات مورد نیاز برای این تحقیق شامل بازدید از کلاسهای اول و دوم است که طی آن این جانب فعالیتهای آموزشی را در این کلاسها از ۰۷ آوریل ۲۰۱۲ تا ۰۹ ژوئن ۲۰۱۲ ثبت و تجزیه و تحلیل خواهم نمود. تعداد دفعات بازدید از کلاسها هشت دفعه خواهد بود و هر جلسه دو ساعت طول خواهد کشید.

I am requesting your permission to allow me to observe your class and take descriptive and reflective field notes on teaching and learning activities. You are free to withdraw at anytime without penalty by telling me, and your data will be destroyed immediately. Your decision of participating or not participating in this study will not influence your career at the Farsi school.

تقاضا می کنم اجازه فرمائید تا کلاس شما مورد بازدید قرار گیرد و فعالیتهای آموزشی در آن ثبت و تجزیه و تحلیل شوند. شما این امکان را دارید که در هر زمان با مطلع کردن من و بدون هیچ موردی از این تحقیق انصراف دهید. در این صورت اطلاعات مربوط به شما بلا فاصله از بین برده خواهند شد. تصمیم شما بر شرکت یا عدم شرکت در این تحقیق بر تدریس شما در مدرسه فارسی تاثیری نخواهد گذاشت.

Field notes on classroom observations will only be shared with the dissertation advisor, Dr Clea Schmidt. Descriptive and reflective field notes will be kept confidential in a locked cabinet at my place and in a password protected file in my personal computer accessible only to me, and will

be shredded and recycled after the research is finished and the dissertation is written up (September 2012). The computer files will be permanently deleted then.

گزارش فعالیتهای آموزشی در کلاسهای اول و دوم و تجزیه و تحلیل این جانب از آنها تنها به استاد راهنما Dr Clea Schmidt ارائه خواهند شد. این اطلاعات به طور محرمانه در کامپیوتر شخصی این جانب و یک کمد قفل دار در منزل این جانب نگهداری خواهند شد و تنها توسط این جانب قابل دسترسی خواهند بود. به مجرد اینکه نوشتن پایان نامه به پایان رسد (سپتامبر ۲۰۱۲) این اطلاعات از بین برده (بازیافت) خواهند شد و فایلهای کامپیوتر به طور دائمی حذف خواهند شد.

To ensure anonymity, neither your real name nor any identifying information about you will be mentioned in descriptive and reflective field notes, my PhD dissertation, any publication or presentation which might arise from this study and the final report to the community (teachers, students, and parent participants in the Farsi school). A pseudonym will be used, instead.

جهت مخفی نگاه داشتن هویت شما، نام اصلی و اطلاعاتی که منجر به شناسایی شما شود در گزارش بازدید کلاس و تجزیه و تحلیل آن، پایان نامه دکترای این جانب، مقالات آتی بر آمده از این تحقیق و گزارش نهایی به شرکت کنندگان در این تحقیق (معلمان، دانش آموزان و والدین در مدرسه فارسی که در این تحقیق شرکت کرده اند) ذکر نخواهد شد و از اسم مستعار استفاده می شود.

The findings of this study will be disseminated in the form of a PhD dissertation, papers which may be published in scholarly journals, or presented in academic conferences, and the final report to the community. Direct quotes from classroom observations might be used in the dissertation, paper(s) arising from the research and the final report to the community. However, no reference to your real name or any identifying information about you will be made. The pseudonym will be used, instead. The results of this study should be available by September 2012. If you would like to receive a research summary, please provide your email address or contact information below. Your email address or contact information will be kept confidential. The only benefit for participation will be the knowledge you may acquire about the topic and the research process.

نتایج این تحقیق در پایان نامه دکترای این جانب، مقالاتی که ممکن است در مجلات علمی چاپ یا در کنفرانسها ارائه شوند، و گزارش نهایی به شرکت کنندگان در این تحقیق مطرح خواهند شد. نقل قول مستقیم از گزارش مشاهده کلاسها ممکن است در پایان نامه، مقالات یا گزارش نهایی به شرکت کنندگان استفاده شوند اما نام شما یا اطلاعاتی که منجر به شناسایی شما شوند ذکر نخواهند شد و از اسم مستعار استفاده می شود. نتایج این تحقیق تا سپتامبر ۲۰۱۲ آماده خواهند شد. در صورت تمایل به دریافت آنها، لطفاً آدرس ایمیل یا نشانی خود را در پایین صفحه بنویسید. نشانی یا آدرس ایمیل شما محرمانه خواهند ماند. فایده شرکت در این تحقیق دانشی است که در مورد موضوع و روند مطالعه کسب می شود.

___I prefer to receive a summary of the findings via e-mail. Email address_____

___I prefer to receive a summary of the findings in hard copy. Address_____

من مایلم که خلاصه ای از نتایج تحقیق را از طریق ایمیل دریافت کنم.
آدرس ایمیل:

من مایلم که خلاصه ای از نتایج تحقیق را از طریق پست دریافت کنم.
آدرس پستی:

If you have any questions or concerns about this study throughout classroom observations, please contact me.

در صورت داشتن هر گونه سوال در مورد این تحقیق در طول مشاهده کلاس لطفاً با این جانب تماس حاصل فرمایید.

Sincerely,

Naghmeh Babaei

با تشکر
نغمه بابائی

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

دانشگاه منیتوبا ممکن است جهت حصول اطمینان از صحت انجام تحقیق به رکورد تحقیق شما دسترسی یابد.

This research has been approved by the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact my supervisor at schmidt@cc.umanitoba.ca or 204-474-9314 or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at 204-474-7122 or email at Margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

این تحقیق توسط **the University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board** تأیید شده است .

لطفاً در صورت داشتن سوال با استاد راهنمای این جانب

204- 474-7122 Schmidt@cc.umanitoba.ca or 204-474-9314 یا با هماهنگی کننده تحقیقات

Margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca or تماس حاصل فرمایید. یک نسخه از این رضایت نامه به شما تحویل

داده شده است.

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's Signature _____ Date _____

----- امضاء

----- تاريخ

----- امضاء محقق

----- تاريخ