

UDK: 325.2-057.875:800.7:316.7]/481:497.1)
800.7:316.7:325.2-057.875](481:497.1)
316.7:800.7: 325.2-057.875](481:497.1)
Pregledni rad
Priljeno: 25. 01. 2000.

Branka Lie

*Stavanger College, Department of Education
Stavanger, Norway*

SLAVIC AND NORWEGIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN CONTACT: THE INFLUENCE OF THE NORWEGIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE ON IMMIGRANT YOUTH FROM THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

SUMMARY

This paper is in fact an extensive summary of the author's dissertation, which focuses on the immigrant children's life in migratory existence in Norway. The dissertation is divided into two main parts: Part I – Cultures in Contact and Part II – Languages in contact. The main purpose of this dissertation was to find out what happened with the first language of the former Yugoslav immigrant youth in Norway, while under the influence of the Norwegian environment and language. It has been an aim to understand and analyse these immigrant children's bilingual and bicultural lives as immigrants in Norway. The term immigrant children are here defined as children of first generation of immigrants where both parents are ex-Yugoslavians. Among these immigrant children were those who were born in Norway, and those who arrived in Norway as babies, as preschoolers, and as school age children. Research on immigrants' language and culture indicates that it is possible for immigrant children to identify themselves with two cultures and two languages. The dissertation tries to give answer to what extent the immigrant children in this study have become bilingual and bicultural.

KEY WORDS: bilingualism, migratory environment, immigrant youth, bicultural identity, acculturation, monther tongue, language maintenance

1. Introduction

This paper is a summary of my dissertation, which focuses on the immigrant children's life in migratory existence in Norway.

The dissertation was based mainly on empirical material which was analysed and explained through different theories and where inside perspective has also played a role. In my view to share the students' language and cultural background and at the same time be part of both of their worlds requires a professional understanding of the phenomena of bilingual and bicultural identity.

When referring to the immigration debate, let me say that it is human not to always have control over one's own attitudes and understanding. The individual

attitudes we all carry in us change form and scope, all depending on the negative and positive influence that mark us. It requires courage and strength to have understanding and sensitivity to bear the human role (the human compassion in us) in the modern bicultural society as Norway has become. This specially under the condition of the strong media influence which operates with immigration problems as a group perception, where all foreign groups are seen as one and where it does not show the foreigner as a person with his or her human individuality.

One can read in Extra and Verhoeven (1993) that there is little research¹ on the immigrant children's first language and culture, and there has been little research done on the minority languages in Europe; one can say the same about research in Norway. Much research has not been done on the influence of the majority language to the minority language as well. In short, research on the immigrants' language (L1) is extremely limited in relation to the dominant language research – learning and use of (L2).

In my research I've used two languages simultaneously as instruments for thinking and research, and I've tried to distance myself psychologically in order to give a more accurate account around the problem of migration and the immigrant child in Norway.

2. Aim of the Study

The study cites these problems:

- A. What direction has these students' first language taken, the language the students themselves and others characterize as their mother tongue? Has the mother tongue only become a basic language which has the characteristics of the second language and not the mother tongue, or are they able to keep their mother tongue at the level that the mother tongue usually is?
- B. Have these immigrant students from former Yugoslavia developed a bilingual bicultural identity? And to what extent can one speak of double culture and double language competency among these immigrant students?
- A. **Culture in contact** is really meant as an introductory orientation on culture and language that concludes with empirical results. This sociolinguistic perspective is chosen as a methodological approach since language is regarded as a phenomenon that is constantly changing and is an important aspect of a culture, an instrument for culture preservation (Bernstein, 1979). By choosing a sociolinguistic approach for further language analysis I wanted to know more about the identification pattern of the parents and children from the former Yugoslavia and the relation between their social (migratory) existence and language. I found it necessary to place the research of the students' language in a frame-

¹ The research available is based mainly on surveys or questionnaires, which refer to the language in relation to language use.

work in which the parents' language and cultural background were represented. Moreover, it is of little value (according to language researchers) to do research on the immigrant child's language development (native language and bilingualism) as an isolated phenomenon.

B. Language in contact contains the linguistic analysis of the former Yugoslavian immigrant youth's written work. It is composed of lexical analysis and essay analysis (analysis of the students' texts).

I have chosen these two language dimensions (grammar and lexicon) and have used them as a basis for analysing the students' language enabling an evaluation of the state of their L1 language (if this language has been changed and to what extent). I think that through the analysis of composition one can discover the students' capabilities in constructing a text according to language rules (grammar), and with the help of lexical analysis find out if the student understands the semantic components of the words. In choosing between nouns and verbs, the lexical elements that could create the framework for the lexical analysis, I have chosen verbal analysis as a foundation for judging the students' lexicon. This is because I see verbs as the building blocks in a language, and if we can find out how the students are able to explain the semantic definition of the verb we have a good picture of how the language (here L1) fares. The semantics of the nouns on the other hand are more dependent on the things surrounding the students (the Norwegian environment), meaning that the names of the phenomena expressed by nouns change quite rapidly.

Both parts (**Part I** – analysis of the student's socio-cultural framework and **Part II** – the linguistic analysis) is an account of the factors which is assumed to influence the former Yugoslav students' first language (L1) and cultural development/preservation. Factors which can relate to family background, the Norwegian language (L2) and environmental influence.

2.1. Theoretical reference framework for the research

Since research on language and culture in contact here implies two different languages and cultures which meet, and which are and constitute a reality platform for the development of the immigrant children, linguistically, culturally and socially, it was (as far as I am concerned) necessary to include a good deal of theoretical background. Here in Norway one has little knowledge of the ethnic culture which forms part of these children's background. This culture represents Serbo-Croatian, the children's first language that is replanted in a special environment.

To be able to say something about the language situation for these immigrant students' first language, it was important to give background facts about the language, Serbian or Croatian, as a common language for all of them. When this research was finalized (in 1990), Serbian or Croatian was the students' classroom language. Nevertheless, I have made a "classification" (at an introductory level) of three languages (Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian), which until 1991 were considered a variant

of a common language “Serbo-Croatian”. I mention this for the record because today’s language situation in the former Yugoslavia requires it. In 1997 the three languages were officially separated and have *de facto* and *de iure* become three independent languages (no matter what linguist/philologist think about it). I believe it was important to give a brief introduction of the dialects as a theoretical framework for further language analysis, since the dialect background for the majority of these students is really their language background and not the standardized language. In the research a (simple and summaric) synopsis is given. But a synopsis of a dialect trait in Serbian and Croatian, which the students have in their language background, is (as mentioned) thought as a very important variable for the linguistic analysis of the students’ language L1 in migration context (here M-L1). These immigrant students’ dialect background is considered as important, because their first language is founded on a dialect, which they use within the family, but on the other hand in school they were taught in standardized versions of their mother tongue.

3. Background for Choice of Methods

The total selected informants consist of 29 students and 46 parents. Interview material was collected for the 29 students who have received mother tongue instruction in the 7th and 8th grade from 1979 –1989. The students have received classes in their mother tongue at different intervals and all have received 4 hours per week. Among these students were children who were born in Norway, students who arrived in Norway as children, students who arrived as preschoolers, and school age children, among them students that had recently arrived directly from former Yugoslav schools (at the time they received mother tongue instruction). Of the 29 student informants only 10 student informants constitute the choice for the language investigation. This is so because written material was found only for the 10 students, while there was insufficient (only sporadic) material for the rest of the students. Because of certain circumstances I could not collect the material systematically from all the students. As mentioned earlier some of the students were taught in their mother tongue for one year and some for two. In addition the students received varied teaching programs, something that led to different effort from the students, which again resulted in different assignments. The student’s unequal language knowledge in L1 due to great variation in the length of stay in Norway required adjustments and flexibility in teaching methods. Besides, they also had different books, which were published in different areas of the former Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia). The fact that mother tongue instruction was an elective and not a requirement resulted in that the students not always came to school.

The group of parent informants was a natural choice (all the 46 interviewed were parents of students chosen as a basis for the research); they were only used in interview situations because for me their statements were a frame of reference for the analysis of their children’s language development.

In Part II I have tried to give insight of the immigrant children's L1- language situation. With the help of linguistic analysis I have tried to find the specific traits (bilingual traits) in the native language for this group of immigrant students. Their divergent results are interpreted in the research as being a result of the learning process (Viberg, 1992), i.e. a distinct language system that replaces the other in the process of a complete mastering of the target language (here S-L1=standard Serbo-Croatian). Bilingual traits will be understood here as specific traits in the language that occur among these bilingual students² and that vary among all the students. These bilingual traits are a result of the actual language learning process (native language instruction in S-L1), which is common between multiple language acquisition (interlanguage in the acquisition of L2), and can be considered an established part of language use, and something that constitutes an important part of these students' total language competency (Selinker, 1972 and 1992; Wande, 1991; Viberg, 1992; Gass and Selinker, 1992; Ellis, 1991 et al.). S-L1 is here the target language, which these students are in the process of acquiring and where the students have a version of this language as a mother tongue (M-L1 = in-migration Serbian/Croatian). What is complicated here is that these students are also partially native speakers (NS) of the target language (S-L1). Therefore, deviations (bilingual traits) are perceived differently in these students' language use than deviations among language users who have a complete different mother tongue and who are learning the target language. But since the students acquiring S-L1 create a new "language channel", where they transfer some of M-L1's language structure, this language learning process is also relevant for the theory on interlanguage (IL). In other words: those that learn the target language TL (target language) learn to produce different forms of NL (native language) in the process of acquiring this language. The students' written production that was analysed in this dissertation, is defined as a type of IL, where transfer of interlingual interference has a central role. Here the two language codes apply the spoken language influenced by the dialect (M-L) and standard (S-L1). It is reasonable to believe that transfer of linguistic elements between these two linguistic units happen automatically, since it seems that the use of these two language codes from the starting point are the students means of expression which they use in their language.

It's also assumed that parts of these systems fossilize. I assume that these students (exactly like learners of L-2) stop learning S-L1 when they internalise certain rules, which are different in the target language S-L1. Here I've taken into consideration the new theories of disappearance by Selinker (1992), namely that certain forms of IL which are stabilized have a temporal character and that it must be difficult for new learners to change the fossilized form of IL to the expected norm of the target language. In an additional interpretation of the students' written production as an IL language production the term interlanguage is used in an expanded meaning, where it's pointed out that use of the learning strategies are interpreted as part of the latent psychological structure (Selinker, 1992).

² Here bilingualism refers to the students' use of two languages as a means of communication from childhood, and not as competence in two languages.

Because this research consists of two parts, the migratory pedagogical and sociological on the one hand, and sociolinguistic and comparative linguistic on the other, it was necessary for different types of research methods:

The interview was used mainly for the analysis and illustration of the children's and their parents' social and cultural background. All the interviews were analysed under opinion sequences as part of common themes (problem area). These themes were organized around two interest areas.

1. *Parents' ethnic cultural background and their migratory environment in Norway.*
2. *Children's world, which consists of family environment, Norwegian environment and the bilingual bicultural life situation they find themselves in.*

The above-mentioned main themes are the dimensions, which have provided a framework for my assessment of these children's first language and their language evolution. The purpose with interview analysis otherwise (Part I in the research) is to throw light on the factors which are assumed to be indicators for these children's language and cultural development in Norway.

In the editing and interpreting of the interview material (Part I) the phenomenologic method was used as a starting point based on a hermeneutic method of understanding. The choice of the qualitative method is used because of the difficulty in measuring concretely the individuals' meaning and opinion. Likewise my informants' opinions should be understood as a result of their total existence as such.

In the analysis of the students' contradictory production (Part I and II) **contrastive analysis** and **error analysis**, as well as **translation** as a method, were used. In order to gain a more complete picture of the students' L1-language situation I've supplemented the analysis of the students' contradictory written production with analysis of the students' proficiency in L1 (here: correct use of case).

As a method I have used linguistic description of the original texts, by emphasizing linguistic unit construction as deviants. The contradictory examples were translated and analysed with the help of a combination of contrastive analysis and error analysis. Then these students competence in writing was evaluated by a contrastive analysis of the grammatical contrasts, which one can find in the two languages the students have (L1 and L2). Subsequently it was investigated how the grammatical contrastors between these two languages are reflected in the students' approximation language at that time (Richards, 1990) which is here called M-L1 their first language in-migratory context. This language is perceived as the language the students identify themselves with and the language they call their mother tongue. That is the students' spoken language (dialect), which they use at home with the parents. This language is a language that to some extent is under the influence of the parents' language and to some extent the standard language (S-L1).

I chose to analyse the students' correct use of case as a significant variable and an indication of the students' knowledge in L1, because it's important to have some grammatical knowledge, since case is a morphological category, which expresses different relations between words and sentence content.

In the translation I've placed emphasis on the functional similarity between both languages, where I also look for the function of the information in the language elements of the original text (on L1) and tried to find out which language elements have the same function in the translated texts (Levi, 1982).

The different forms of text production (errors) were interpreted according to the standard language (standard Serbian or standard Croatian) which here is taken as a compulsory context, since this language was the students' classroom language and therefore the target language. It must be pointed out that the standard norm is used here as a criterion in the diagnosis of the students language system in migratory context and not as an evaluation criterion for their language state as such.

3.1 Limitations

A type of limitation in relation to Part I Culture in contact occurred almost naturally since neither the former Yugoslav families (46) nor the children (29) are represented, but only those from Oslo. From the point of view of sociological and anthropological research it's assumed that socializing patterns among immigrants are different in the big cities and in the outskirts. The reason for the limitation in my choice was that the basis for the research was a previously limited selection. The student informants consist of 29 students who have received instruction in their mother tongue, in junior high school during 79–89 in Oslo, when I was their bilingual teacher. The parent informants were also a natural choice since all 46 informants interviewed were parents to these chosen students and they lived in Oslo as well.

When referring to the language research (Part I) the best would also have been to test the students in the spoken language. This was my original idea, but I later abandoned it because it proved to be too complicated. Nevertheless, to better understand the bilingual development and to give a complete picture of the students' total linguistic competency I should have studied (tested) these students' first and second language (not only tested the students in one language). Since these students are bilingual, their language development implies the learning and use of two languages. Unfortunately it was not possible for me to concentrate on the conditions of both L1 and L2 development (at least not at this time).

4. Results

4.1 Part I – Culture in contact concludes in the results as follows:

a) *An analysis and description of the parents' social and cultural background, among other things jobs, and school background, upbringing of children, integration plus the parents' understanding of the Norwegian society, i.e.*

1. **Occupational skills and school background from their home country and**

2. **Background from Norway:**

- job and housing situation
- educational background from Norway
- plans to return home
- parents' perception on their own migratory environment in Norway
- parents' social integration
- their understanding of the Norwegian society
- children's upbringing

b) *The results also apply to the research on the students' migratory environment, their adaptation and participation in the Norwegian society. An account is given on the students' background, their cultural and language identification as well as the students' social interaction, i.e.*

1. Arrival in Norway/the country the students are born in
2. The students' family background
3. The length of time mother tongue instruction was offered
4. Contact with the native country
5. Students' cultural identification and language belonging
6. Language as an identity factor
7. Culture as an identity factor
8. Identity formation
9. Student – parents interaction
10. Students' social interaction
11. Students' understanding of the Norwegian environment

In the literature dealing with social-linguistic research around the immigrant child's language one can see that researchers focus heavily on the influence of the environment. There are different levels in the linguistic knowledge and language behaviour among these students, something that can be seen as a result of i.e. background factors and could maybe have had an influence on the students' language learning and later language development in L1. Despite the fact that all my student informants have two languages and two cultures in their migratory life to grow up with, they have different possibilities to learn these two languages. When considering the parents' socio-cultural background certain variables like attitudes (rearing of children and plans to return home) are presumed to play a major role in these former Yugoslavian students' language and culture development. I also suggest that certain aspects of the parents' attitudes influence the students' language and culture, but not totally. Holmen and Jørgensen (1994) state that the parents' attitudes are an important factor for the immigrant students' language and cultural development in the majority environment. According to these researchers parents with negative attitudes can inhibit their own children's development in the majority environment. At the same time the parents' attitudes are interpreted as very important for maintaining the child's native language. As far as my research is concerned, even though the parents have developed an immigrant identity composed of dimensions that reflect their socialization pattern in the Norwegian society (Lie, 1996a), they have

come to Norway as adults with an already internalised value system which mostly reflects their ethnic language and culture. Their children, on the other hand, are exposed to other cultural values than just the one's (ethnic) which their parents insist upon. The parents' "negative" attitudes in relation to the majority environment have little influence, since my student informants are youth and probably the L2 language environment and majority culture has a greater influence at that age than in childhood.

When referring to the pattern of social interaction with the Norwegian environment, the difference between the parents and the children is quite significant. The parents' social network is composed mainly of their own compatriots, while the students' interaction pattern shows that the majority associates with both groups (Norwegian and ethnic peers). One interpretation of this can be that the parents' social interaction can be associated with their attitude and status as foreigners,³ while the children felt a more natural belonging to Norway (which for many is their home country – native land), even though they have been identified as foreigners by others.

Baker (1993) claims that the attitude among the users of the language is considered to be significant for the preservation, change or loss of the language. This can be related to both the parents' and students' attitudes towards the mother tongue instruction, which in my research prove to be very positive. One can also affirm that the students' attitude regarding their language and cultural development is characterized by bilingualism and bicultural identity.

The parents' education as a background variable is not given great attention, despite the fact that the parents' educational level is assumed to play a significant role for the children's language development (Jørgensen et al., 1994; Hagtvet, 1995). This is so because it is difficult to point out the parents' possibility/or lack of possibility for education. On the other hand one can assume that help from the parents with the homework and follow up with schoolwork is a variable that could have significance for more motivation and therefore mastery of L1. It was pointed out, however, that the parents didn't have time to help because of extra jobs (35 of 46). One can agree with Kravin (1992) in the question as to what extent the parents can provide enough input in a linguistic isolated environment (if they are the only source for L1 input).

4.2 Part II – Language in contact

The result of the lexical analysis (testing of the students on the semantic content of four verb groups – chapter 8 in the dissertation) shows that all the students (both in 7th and 8th grade) have been able to find the semantic content of the majority of the verbs.

Further one can say that only students in the 8th grade have chosen to formulate the verbs semantic content in both languages, and it is (for me) an important

³ Some of the parents are deeply rooted in the Norwegian society, but the majority have a stronger connection to their ethnic culture.

indicator that these students have developed a type of **echo-model**,⁴ which can be interpreted as an instrument in their bilingual language usage.

The largest influence from the Norwegian language (L2 > L1) is recorded among students in 7th grade. And it's worth mentioning that a student shows quite clearly a sign that the students have developed bilingualism (with L2 as a dominant language), in other words, use of both languages simultaneously.

Common for both groups is that the answers reflect bilingual traits and that lexicon is limited and concrete. Based on the material one can say that the students answer with text, and the students answer with sentences show signs that these have been concretised in the students' own experience. This can be interpreted as if their answer first and foremost is a referral to their own experience. But despite the fact that lexical has a subjective character it still represents some objective references on the verbs semantic content. The results of the lexical analysis then also show that these students find themselves in a language learning situation which is otherwise typical for younger children in a more homogeneous language (monolingual) environment, that is the students continue at this (age level) to find meaning for actions, qualities and conditions in concrete life situations which are based mainly on the children's own home experience. One can also interpret it as if the students did not receive sufficient input of the organized teaching in their mother tongue, which was adapted to their age level.

Paradigmatic conditions are less representative among students in 7th grade than among students in 8th grade.⁵ In the further discussion one can say that the fact that the students are not familiarized with paradigmatic conditions, could have had implications for the learning of L2. If these students have an underdeveloped lexicon, such as the lexical analysis shows, or parts of the lexicon which apply to different meanings of the words, it can be reflected in the students' acquisition of the language and subject knowledge at school, like, for example, development of a superior generalization (conceptualisation of concept) and different levels (of hierarchy).

Research in L2 acquisition (SLA – second language acquisition) shows that development of the first language (L1) among immigrant children influences the development of L2. My research shows the opposite, that also L2 influences L1.

According to Verhallen and Schoonen (1993) the attrition of paradigmatic meaning is directly attached to learning.

One can say that analysis of the linguistic units/constructions (chapter 9 in the dissertation) shows that the students' first language and the Norwegian language in contact cause changes in L1 language system, resulting in new conditions for the students' language development. But the analysis also shows that the language change in L1 through learning of L1 (language process) should not be solely attributed to the influence of L2.

⁴ Echo-model is a kind of a repetitive explanation of L1, which the students report again (in addition), but this time in Norwegian.

⁵ I.e. students in 8th grade use more paradigmatic categories.

When referring to the students' diverging production it can be ascertained that transfer to a great extent directs the students' language (written) behaviour. But their (contradictory) production can also be partially attributed intralingual reasons and is regarded as a result of language development since the students have not learned their language completely due to lack of L1 instruction and because of their young age.

Many deviations in these students' production are a result of reciprocal interference (transfer) between the two languages (L1 and L2) which the students learn, but also a result of L1 language learning process (intralingual reasons). In short, the deviations the students have produced in their compositions were caused by external influences (crosslinguistic influences), as a result of the two languages (L1 and L2) in contact.

The deviations are also attributed to internal factors, i.e. the linguistic influence from two language usage codes in contact (the students' spoken language/home language, which is a Serbian or Croatian dialect, and the respective standard mother tongue/language of instruction).

One can say that despite the grammatical weakness of L1 shown in the analysis, it seems like that the majority of the students have maintained most of the grammatical competence in L1. I've based my results on the theories of Sharwood Smith and van Buren (1991), i.e. that competency in a language can be seen from two aspects:

a) grammatical competence – (according to Chomsky it would have been acquired in the mother tongue based on the principles of universal grammar – UG). Chomsky's UG shows how children learn their first language (native language – NL).

b) pragmatic knowledge

There is a tendency for all the informants to operate with different compensatory and /or communicative strategies in their compositions. This can maybe be explained by the fact that even if the written language places a larger demand for correctness and lucidity in the written composition, it also gives greater possibility to think out the linguistic/grammatical "strategies". The students' use of compensatory strategies in text production (compositions) indicates that the students have control, they are aware of their weakness in L1 language, something that is of importance for the evaluation of L1-language attrition. Here one speaks of the distinction between the learning of L1 and that, which relates to language attrition.

Smith and van Buren (1991) separate the changes in the students' L1– knowledge and change in the control of this knowledge. Control applies to mechanisms as compensation (regaining) and integration and not availability of knowledge. The students' contradictory production relating to the use of case is not so important, i.e. does not have serious consequence, for language comprehension as, for example, the students' "strange" constructions, which often imply meaningless linguistic sequences. The analysis of the correct use of case which was undertaken in the students' texts analysis as an indicator of the students language proficiency in L1, shows that the students' proficiency in case all in all is satisfactory.

The students' use of the elements from the spoken language and dialect is considered here more as a creative process than a deviation, even though they use idioms which are not school related, and despite the fact that these are contradictory (based on standard language rules), since they come under unofficial idiomatic use. Use of the spoken language and dialectal words is their choice based on their linguistic repertoire, which they choose consciously without knowing whether the words they choose are school related or not. The creative value lies in the fact that the text carries the students' individual character. The individual character in the language use lies in the fact that they use language in the way they feel like it.

5. Discussion

With regard to the problem number 1 (what direction has this former Yugoslav students' first language (L1) taken), which language do these students define as their mother tongue? Has their mother tongue only become a basic language, which has the characteristics of the second language (L2), and not the mother tongue, or are they able to keep their mother tongue at the level that the mother tongue usually lies?

It can be concluded that the students' mother tongue (seen as language competence) has been weakened, but it has not been lost. The mother tongue for the majority of these children has developed so that it lies on the communicative level where L2 (Norwegian) gradually replaces the role, which the first language (mother tongue) has. The mother tongue here has another dimension and meaning than what the mother tongue usually has. This can be explained from the children's bilingualism, since the mother tongue is the one language (L1) their bilingualism is composed of. In other words, L1 is regarded by these children equal to L2. Because both languages have the same status among these children it can be perceived as if both languages have status as the first language (Svonni, 1993; Berggreen and Latomaa, 1994). But, the mother tongue as a phenomenon is not only competence in one language. The mother tongue is also for them an identification factor, which is a result of the ethnic culture they originate from, as well as an expression of that culture, and for these students here more than an instrument for, or a means of communication. The *levedyktigheten* viability of ethnic language and culture is seen, according to Jaspaert and Kroon (1991) as a central factor for self-identification among immigrant children. Besides the linguistic codes they operate with now, can vary in being dominant, depending on their life situation.

The role of the mother tongue should also be seen in relation to the pedagogical perspective, i.e. mastering and development of the mother tongue also promotes development of bilingualism (Hvenekilde, 1994), something that is also an objective for the teaching of bilingual students in Norway (Curriculum guide M/87, Teachers' guide L-97 and Parliamentary report no. 17 1996/97).

When referring to the problem no. 2 (to what extent can one speak of double culture belonging and double language competence [bilingualism] among these im-

migrant students?), one can ascertain that the students from the former Yugoslavia use both languages alternately and they are confident with both languages, depending on the situation. They can convey meaning in both languages, which is contingent on the distribution between the functions of their first and second language. It can also be concluded that the students that have kept their first language at a good level are the students that identify themselves as bilinguals and those that are defined by the teacher as bilinguals (Svonni; 1993).

It is postulated in the dissertation that it is possible for immigrant children to identify themselves with two cultures as a necessity (a functional reality) in relation to their bicultural and bilingual life style.

According to Jaspaert and Kroon (1991) bicultural competence is an absolutely necessary solution for immigrant children's future, and their cultural identity should not be viewed as one-dimensional since it is composed of two cultural and linguistic dimensions. The fact that these immigrant youths have to learn a new language (Norwegian), which represents a new culture, implies a change of the ethnic culture in relation to their linguistic and ethnic cultural world, which the mother language represents.

The analysis of the students' attitudes, social interactions and their opinions of the Norwegian society shows that the former Yugoslavian immigrant children are in the process of developing an identity with two different identity variants, which are based on ethnic culture identification and identification with the Norwegian culture.

Their bicultural identity is perceived here as a result of a mutual and active cultural process (development) based on the cultural elements that they have acquired from the two cultures and two languages, and which they use alternately and alternatively in their social behaviour.

The formation of the students' bicultural identity in the dissertation is based on Sahaf's theory (1994) on communicative culture and Meads' theory on attitudes and actions through the social process.

6. Conclusion

As mentioned before L2 acquisition has been a main interest within research, while the status of the minority language or language preservation and culture preservation/development among the minorities on the other hand, has not been particularly focused upon. The lack of interest in this research area has created a big need for research as for example:

- acquisition and use of the minority language
- code exchange, language exchange and language attrition in L1
- language change over time (L2>L1)
- L1 as a target language and L1 as an original language
- language principals and interaction between L1 and L2

- immigrant children's first language alternative learning (compare, project work and chosen language in L97)
- bilinguals and formation of double culture belonging

Since little has been researched in Norway on the development of immigrant children's mother tongue and ethnic culture, more in-depth studies in these areas are missing. It's important to point out that in order to reveal the formation of a bicultural identity, to map out the importance of the development of immigrant children's language there is a need for several studies so that the idea of bicultural identity is not reduced to just "a myth on bicultural identity".

In conclusion it can be pointed out that many pedagogues and other researchers in Norway have engaged in the discussion on the importance of the mother tongue for the immigrant children, while a professional and comprehensive debate on the position the minority language should have in teaching (training) has never taken place in Norway. Maybe this can be explained by the lack of description and evaluation and analysis of pedagogic and didactic research results, which explain the actual problem around mother tongue instruction. It is also a fact that the majority of the researchers in the Norwegian research environment who work in this area, as a point of departure take the arguments of Hvenekilde (1994 and 1996), Befring et al. (1993), Wold (1992), Engen (1994 and 1996) and others. But the research results of the above mentioned researchers are to a very little extent used as a basis for regulations (rules) and laws, which have to do with the teaching of the minority language in Norway.

LITERATURE

BAKER, C. (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

BEFRING, E. m.fl. (1993). *Tospråklig undervisning i internasjonalt perspektiv*. Oslo: Ad Notam/Gyldendal.

BERNSTEIN, B. (1970). *Social Class, Language and Socialization*. London: Penguin.

BERGGREEN, H. & S. LATOMAA (1994). "Språkbytte og språkbevaring blant vietnamesere i Bergen og Helsinki", in: Boyd, S. m.fl. (ed.). *Språkbrug og språkvalg blant innvandrere i Norden*. København: Center for multi-kulturelle studier, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole (Københavnstudier i tosprågethed, bind 22).

ENGEN, T. O. (1994). *Normalisering og inkorporering*. Arbeidsmanus. Hamar Lærerhøgskole.

ENGEN, T. O. (1996). "Språkopplæring og identitetsutvikling i et didaktisk perspektiv" in: *Tilpass språkopplæring for minoritets elever*. Norges forskningsråd.

EXTRA, G & VERHOEVEN (1993). *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

ELLIS, R. (1991). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- GASS, S. & L. SELINKER (1992). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins P.C.
- HOLMEN, A. & J. N. JØRGENSEN (1994). "Forelderholdninger til skole og språkbrug", in: Boyd, S. m.fl. (ed.). *Språkbrug og språkvalg blant indvandrere i Norden*. København: Center for multi-kulturelle studier, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole (Københavnstudier i tosprågethed, bind 23).
- HAGTEVET, E. B. (1994). *Fra tale til skrift. Om prediksjon og utvikling av leseferdighet i fire til åtteårsalderen*. Oslo: Institutt for spesialpedagogikk, Universitetet i Oslo.
- HVENEKILDE, A. (1994). "Morsmålsundervisningens plass og betydning i undervisningen for elever fra språklige minoriteter i grunnskolen", in: A. Hvenekilde (ed.). *Veier til kunnskap og deltakelse*. Oslo: Novus.
- HVENEKILDE, A. m.fl. (1996). "Språktilegnelse og tospråklighet", in: Hyltenstam, K. M. m.fl. (ed.). *Tilpasset språkopplæring for minoritets elever. Rapport fra konsensus konferanse*. Norges forskningsråd.
- JØRGENSEN, J. N. & A. HOLMEN (1994). "Språkbrug hos tyrker i Danmark og Sverig", in: Boyd, S. m.fl. (ed.). *Språkbrug og språkvalg blant indvandrere i Norden*. København: Center for multi-kulturelle studier, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole (Københavnstudier i tosprågethed, bind 22).
- KRAVIN, H. (1992). "Erosion of a Language in Bilingual Development", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Clevedon, vol. 13, no. 4.
- LIE, B. (1996a). *Det slaviske og det norske språk og kultur i kontakt – innflytelsen fra norsk miljø og språk på innvandererungdom fra Eks-Jugoslavia*. Doktoravhandling. Oslo: Det Utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultetet, Institutt for spesialpedagogikk, Universitetet i Oslo.
- LIE, B. (1996b). "To språk: en plattform for en sammensatt tospråklig skriftlig kompetanse", in: M. Kalin and S. Latomaa (eds). *Rapport fra det tredje forskersymposiet i Jyväskylä, 24–25. 3. 1996*. Jyväskylä Universitet, Finland.
- MEAD, G. H. (1976). *Medvetandet jaget och samhället*. Lund: Från socialbehavioristisk ståndpunkt; Argos.
- SELINKER, L. (1974). "Interlanguage", in: J. C. Richards (ed.). *Error Analysis*. Longman.
- SELINKER, L. (1992). *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. Longman.
- SHARWOOD SMITH, M. A. & V. P. BUREN (1991). "First language attrition and the parameter setting model", in: W. Seliger & M. R. Vago (eds). *First language attrition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SVONNI, M. (1993). *Samiska skolbarns samiska: (En undersökning av minoretts språks behärsning i en språkbyteskontext)*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksel international.
- VERHALLEN, M. & R. SHOONEN (1993). "Lexical Knowledge of Monolingual and Bilingual Children", *Applied Linguistics*, Oxford, vol. 14, no. 4.
- VIBERG, Å. (1992). *Vägen till ett nytt språk*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- WOLD, A. H. (1992). "Debatten om morsmålsundervisning for språklige minoriteter", *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*, Nr. 5.
- WANDE, E. (1992). "Sverigefinnars två språk. Språkbruk och attityder hos två generationer – en projektpresentation", in: K. Herbets and C. Laurèn (eds). *Flerspråkighet i och utanfor Norden*. Åbo.

Branka Lie

SLAVENSKI I NORVEŠKI JEZIK I KULTURE U DOTICAJU: UTJECAJ NORVEŠKOG JEZIKA I KULTURE NA MLADE IMIGRANTE IZ BIVŠE JUGOSLAVIJE

SAŽETAK

Tema ovog rada zasniva se na autoričinoj doktorskoj disertaciji *Slavenski i norveški jezik i kulture u doticaju: utjecaj norveškog jezika i kulture na mlade imigrante iz bivše Jugoslavije*. Disertacija je podijeljena na dva dijela: I. dio – Kulture u doticaju i II. dio – Jezici u doticaju, te završni dio koji rezimira prethodna dva dajući ocjenu i razmišljanja o jeziku i kulturi. Oba dijela (I. – analiza studentskog društveno-kulturnog okvira i II. – lingvistička analiza) prikaz su čimbenika za koje se pretpostavlja da utječu na prvi jezik (L1) studenata iz bivše Jugoslavije te kulturni razvoj, očuvanje kulture, čimbenici koji se mogu povezati s obiteljskom sredinom i podrijetlom, norveškim jezikom (L2) i utjecajem okruženja. Može se zaključiti da studenti slabije govore materinski jezik (promatran kao jezična kompetencija), ali ga nisu zaboravili. Isto tako može se doći do zaključka da studenti koji dobro znaju materinski jezik jesu oni koji sebe označavaju kao dvojezične a tako ih određuju i njihovi profesori. U disertaciji je izrečena tvrdnja da je moguće da se imigrantska djeca identificiraju s dvjema kulturama kao nužnost (funkcionalna realnost) u odnosu na svoj bikulturalni i bilingvalni stil života. Analiza studentskih stavova, društvene interakcije i njihovo mišljenje o norveškom društvu pokazuju da se djeca imigranata iz bivše Jugoslavije nalaze u procesu razvoja identiteta s dvjema različitim varijantama identiteta koji se zasnivaju na identifikaciji s njihovom etničkom kulturom i identifikaciji s norveškom kulturom. Bikulturalni identitet studenata tu se smatra posljedicom uzajamnih i djelatnih kulturnih procesa čiji su temelj kulturni elementi koje su stekli iz dviju kultura i dvaju jezika a u svom društvenom ponašanju koriste ih i naizmjenice i kao alternativu.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: dvojezičnost, migracijska sredina, imigrantska mladež, dvokulturni identitet, akulturacija, materinski jezik, održavanje jezika

Бранка Лие

СЛАВЯНСКИЙ И НОРВЕЖСКИЙ ЯЗЫКИ И КУЛЬТУРЫ В КОНТАКТЕ: ВЛИЯНИЕ НОРВЕЖСКОГО ЯЗЫКА И КУЛЬТУРЫ НА МОЛОДЫХ ИММИГРАНТОВ ИЗ БЫВШЕЙ ЮГОСЛАВИИ

РЕЗЮМЕ

Тема настоящей работы основывается на докторской диссертации автора – *Славянский и норвежский язык и культуры в контакте: влияние норвежского языка и культуры на молодых иммигрантов из бывшей Югославии*. Диссертация состоит из двух частей: I часть – Культуры в контакте и II часть – Языки в контакте; заключительная часть подводит итоги первых двух частей, предлагая оценку и рассуждения о языке и культуре. Обе части (I – анализ студенческих общественно-культурных рамок и II – лингвистический анализ) являются показом факторов, касательно которых предполагается, что они влияют на первый язык (L1) студентов из бывшей Югославии, а также на культурное развитие, сохранение культуры, то есть факторов, которые возможно связать с семейной средой и происхождением, с норвежским языком (L2) и влиянием окружения. Можно прийти к выводу, что студенты хуже говорят на родном языке (рассматриваемом в качестве языковой компетентности), но не забыли его. Точно так же можно прийти к выводу, что студенты, хорошо знающие родной язык, суть те, кто самих себя считает двуязычными, и кого их преподаватели считают билингвами. В диссертации высказывается мысль, что дети иммигрантов могут отождествлять себя с двумя культурами в силу необходимости (функциональная реальность) по отношению к своему двухкультурному и двуязычному образу жизни. Анализ студенческих позиций, общественные взаимодействия и мнение молодежи о норвежском обществе показывают, что дети иммигрантов из бывшей Югославии переживают процесс развития идентитета с двумя различными вариантами идентитета, основывающимися на отождествлении с их этнической культурой, а также отождествлении с норвежской культурой. Двухкультурный идентитет студентов считается здесь последствием взаимных и действенных культурных процессов: их основой выступают культурные элементы, которые они усвоили из двух культур и двух языков, а в своем общественном поведении используют их как попеременно, так и в качестве альтернативы.

КЛЮЧЕВИЕ СЛОВА: билингвизм, миграционная среда, иммигрантская молодежь, двухкультурный идентитет, акультурация, родной язык, сохранение языка

Branka Lie

DET SLAVISKE OG DET NORSKE SPRÅK OG KULTUR I KONTAKT: INNFLYTELSEN FRA NORSK MILJØ OG SPRØK PÅ INNVANDRERUNGDOM FRA EKS-JUGOSLAVIA

OPPSUMMERING

Denne artikkelen baserer seg på min avhandling *Det slaviske og det norske språk og kultur i kontakt – innflytelsen fra norsk miljø og språk på innvandrerungdom fra Eks-Jugoslavia*. Avhandlingen består av to hoveddeler: Del I – Kultur i kontakt og Del II – Språk i kontakt, og et avsluttende kapittel som sammenfatter resultatene fra den første og denne andre delen av avhandlingen i form av vurdering og betraktning omkring språk og kultur. Begge de to delene (Del I – analysen av elevenes sosiokulturelle ramme og Del II – den lingvistiske analyse) er en redegjørelse for de faktorene som antas å påvirke de eks – jugoslaviske elevenes første språk (L1) og kulturutvikling/- bevaring, her de faktorene som kan relateres til familiebakgrunn og det norske språk (L2) og miljøpåvirkning. Det kan konkluderes med at elevenes morsmål (sett som språkkompetanse) er svekket, men ikke gått tapt. Det kan også konkluderes med at de elevene som har bevart sitt første språk godt, er de elevene som identifiserer seg som tospråklige og de som ble definert av lærerne som tospråklige. Det postuleres i avhandlingen at det er mulig for innvandrerbarn å identifisere seg med to kulturer. Dette som en nødvendighet (en funksjonell realitet) i forhold til deres tokulturelle og tospråklige livestil. Analysen av elevenes holdninger, sosiale interaksjon og deres oppfatning av det norske samfunnet viser at de eks-jugoslaviske innvandrerbarna holder på å utvikle identitet med to ulike identitetsvarianter som baserer seg på etnisk kulturidentifikasjon og identifikasjon med den norske kulturen. Deres tokulturelle identitet oppfattes her som et resultat av en gjensidig og aktiv kulturprosess (utvikling) basert på de kulturelementene som de har ervervet seg fra to kulturer og to språk og som de anvender vekselvis og alternativt i sin sosiale atferd.

EMNEORD: tospråklighet, migrasjonstilværelse, innvandrerungdom, tokulturell identitet, akkulturasjon, morsmål, språkbevaring