

Perezhivanija discovered through narrative analysis: Emotive and motivational foci in parent's diverse heritage language and cultural sustaining in Australia

Robyn Babaeff

Monash University, Australia

Abstract

Extensive linguistic research and theorising relating to maintaining the family heritage, as bilingual or multilingual family in differing language contexts, is currently available. Substantial research beneficially explores approaches to multilingual parenting, outcomes for individuals through parent and child perspectives, among linguistic and social realms of being multilingual in differing contexts. Personal experiences as emotive ways of reasoning, actions, and motive for sustaining one's heritage in a differing context are partially considered, but the cognitive-affective dimension could be more comprehensively explored. This paper conveys research methodology of parents' subjective sense for sustaining their heritage, as situated and unique for individuals through cultural-historical psychology elements. A cultural-historical framework provides a dynamic and multi-faceted scope of parent's subjective sense of self, for reasoning and approaches to sustaining their heritage with family. Construction of subjective perspectives involves the temporal motion of past to present, to enlighten motive and ideals for the present and future. Narrative analysis methodologies evidencing *perezhivanie* represent individuals' subjective configurations with individuals' contemporary and transpiring development of the subjective sense of self. This study associates Vygotsky's original *perezhivanie* conceptualisation and contemporary advances of subjectivity to cognise the intellectual-affective affiliation for motive substantiated through narrative analysis to show human subjective sense in motion.

Keywords

Heritage language and culture; subjective sense; self; *perezhivanie*

Introduction

In relation to educators developing approaches for working with families and diversity, Souto-Manning & Swick (2006) convey the importance of acknowledging individuals for their own unique perspectives:

we let children and parents see us [educators] in learning roles, not only by participating in community events and going to professional conferences, but by learning from them and valuing their backgrounds, histories, and interests in developing curriculum and classroom setting that were embracing of diversity (p. 191).

The research study presented in this paper originated to develop an understanding of parents' self-perspectives in sustaining their heritage language and culture with their children. Parents' actions for sustaining heritage with their children indicates cultural and linguistic contexts and social community differs to parents' childhood experiences. Narrative analysis methodologies, as developed through participant voice, and a cultural historical psychology of Vygotsky's *perezhivanie* (emotional experience), conceptualised with González Rey's subjective sense and configurations, enables the sense of knowing about motive and action. An approach such as this provides a view with depth and dynamic evolving of parents' sustaining their heritage in surroundings they are less likely to be accustomed to. An interdisciplinary methodology of narrative, connecting with cultural-historical elements of *perezhivanie* and subjective sense, can support the values and learning for educators authentic knowing of psychological processes.

Perezhivanie and subjective sense interconnecting with narrative analysis for knowing the self

A wide range of human development theory from the work of Lev Vygotsky has founded current conceptualising for cultural-historical psychology. Vygotsky's revolutionary theory on the concept of the "social situation of development" and *perezhivanie* bring to light the connection between social experience and the emotional sense the individual takes from their experience (González Rey, 2011b).

This study aims to realise parent's subjective sense of self in who they are being as self, in a social context that differs to their own life histories for ways of being, in language and culture. An investigation of individual's *perezhivanie* can determine, from parent's lifelong cognitive-affective experiences, the process of developing their subjective sense of being and belonging with their children, in a context that differs to the parents' personal language heritage experience.

Due to the shortened lifespan of Vygotsky, his curtailed potential for exploring the notion of psyche, grounded in the initial concepts of sense, has inaugurated a pathway for many post-Vygotskians, (see, e.g., González Rey, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011; Stetsenko, 2010, 2012), who now extend and interpret the initial theorisations of subjectivity within cultural-historical traditions.

An understanding of the psyche as a dynamic function, formation, and transformation was referred to by Vygotsky as a social, reflective concept developing from the individual's relation to themselves and the processes of transformation that arise in accordance to how others are related to (Valsiner & van der Veer, 2005). Valsiner & van der Veer (2005) assert this notion of transformation as moving beyond a concept implying the replication of acquired behaviours that are simply reiterated into a new social situation. A perspective such as this is significant to

González Reys' (2007, 2009, 2011) concept of subjective configurations, in which each individual develops their own unique subjective sense of the past, although the present and the future can also transform through the cognitive-affective processing of social situations.

Active selves construct their understanding of the world not in ways that slavishly remain faithful to those experiences, but rather in ways that constantly go beyond them. Human beings consistently create novelty both by their actions and by their thinking, using their social environment as a resource for both (Valsiner & van der Veer, 2005, p. 96).

The connection between how the environment is embodied through the awareness, perceptions, interpretations, feelings, and the manner in which the individual relates to situated experience, is represented in the work of Vygotsky (1994) as *perezživanie* (Mahn, 2003). For this study, researching parents' of diverse heritage sustaining their heritage language and culture with their children in Australia was not viewed as activity that simply transfers from one generation to the next. From an analytical perspective the individual approach to life and everyday action provides scope for understanding individual perspectives of thought, emotional connection for forming of self subjectively, and conceptualising the social, as it has been throughout time, to implicate the individuals' actions of being and doing in later times. According to Stetsenko (2010):

The social and situated nature of development that is presently emerging in today's psychology of human development, enlightens understanding for the role of culture and history in determining how knowledge is generated, and how social practices contribute to the individual's sense of Self in relation to being and becoming in their world (p. 64).

The concept of self for this study is established through current conceptualising that has evolved through the theorising of George Herbert Mead (1863-1931), an American philosopher, sociologist, and psychologist. Jackson (2010) establishes Mead's hypothesising of the "me" to be the socialised attributes of the individual as developed through the past, and the "I" to be the present and future of the self, as pertaining to individual's notions of their identity. González Rey (2011a) explains that both Mead and Vygotsky initially alleged, "every individual act was defined on the basis of a direct external symbolic behaviour" (p. 268). Jackson's (2010) definition of the self, grounded in Mead's conceptualising, can be seen to connect with Vygotsky's association of individual acts with external symbolic behaviour.

For Mead, time, self and sociality interconnect: the self is a social phenomenon and also a temporal one, reflecting back on itself, in time, and forward from the present in anticipating others' responses and orienting future action in the world. It is always in the process of becoming as well as being (Jackson, 2010, p. 125).

Interestingly, both Vygotsky and Mead expanded the notion of self as socially constructed to consider more intensity of self through Mead's evolutionary account that "the self's reflexive awareness (and unawareness) of its temporal conditions of existence" (Jackson, 2010, p. 125). Furthermore, González Rey (2011a) verifies Vygotsky held a fundamental view of reflection within self through later work of Vygotsky emphasising the mind as an "integrative and dynamic system in development" (p. 261), reflection is not a re-generated factor of isolated or stand-alone action, but rather a higher mental psychological process that implicates the concept of subjective sense.

Senses and *perezživanie* emerge within social historical-cultural experiences, which represent not a reproduction of any social fact or situation but a generative subjective production.

The historical experiences and the complex network of other experiences that take place at any given moment of an individual's life can only be assembled together as symbolical emotional units. This assemblage would constitute a subjective production that does not result from internalization or from reflection (González Rey, 2014, p. 425).

Hence, *perezhivanie* of the individual is active in shaping the subjective sense of the developing self in motion over time. Vygotsky's use of the term sense accounts for the unity between cognitive and affective processes whereby "the social becomes subjective not because of internalization, but by sense production related to the living experience" (González Rey, 2007, p. 9).

Vygotsky (1994) soundly interconnects thought and emotion as a realm for psychological research with units of the environment:

An emotional experience [*perezhivanie*] is a unit where, on the one hand, in an indivisible state, the environment is represented, i.e. that which is being experienced – an emotional experience [*perezhivanie*] is always related to something which is found outside the person – and on the other hand what is represented is how I, myself, am experiencing this, i.e., all the personal characteristics and all the environmental characteristics are represented in an emotional experience [*perezhivanie*] (italics in original, p. 341).

The cognitive-affective elements of *perezhivanie*, as connected to the individual's subjective sense, transpire through many moments and subjectifying of life experiences to develop complex subjective configurations for individuals through higher psychological functioning. Generating data is participants' action that can apprise the individuals' personally expressed perspectives of self: their experiences, past actions, and emotive stance that pertain their ontological developing.

Subjective sense and configurations are two inseparable moments that have such a close and recursive relation that one is configured into the other. As a result of this capacity to generate subjective senses, subjective configurations become the main motive of any human action, (González Rey, 2014, p. 433)

The subjective configurations, which are ever transforming based on the newness and changes in the social and action of the momentary present, create tension for modification in aspects of the individual's subjective sense, in turn generating change to the subjective configurations, and therefore adjusting the individual's behaviour that produces motivation through the course of human activity (González Rey, 2011b). The actual objective conditions of human life are not perceived by González Rey (2009) as the psychological motivation for the way in which one participates in human activity, but rather become the psychological motivation through cognitively dealing with the consequences of past experiences to affectively determine possibilities for future participation and contribution in human activity.

Cultural historical psychology and narrative analysis: subjective configurations of self

The life histories of individuals represent the past and present that potentially engenders the possibilities of action choices for the future. Martin & Dauite (2012) states: "speaking a language is a socially and historically situated action through which speakers define themselves in relation to others" (p. 117). Dauite (2014) explains the distinguishing aspects of "life story narrative ... constitutes development of self-concept or self-representation" (p. 249), staying true to the

individual to enable authenticity, focusing on an individual's experiences of, and meaning attributed to, the foci of study. The data generated through the development of narrative methods for the narratives is presented as directly transcribed.

Data generation framework

Narrative analysis methods for data generation, throughout this study, have been developed to make prominent the participant's voice. An analytical framework of Vygotsky's cultural-historical psychology, through his concept of *perezhivanie*, and understood alongside González Rey's subjective sense and configurations, enables signifying of the subjectified self in relation to sustaining their own family heritage with their children.

The *perezhivanie* concept of Vygotsky, for this study, has enabled an individualised view of subjectified self and intent, for parents' heritage practices with their family in both the past and present, and unique to how and why individuals engage in particular heritage-sustaining behaviours. Moreover, individual choices and the motivations behind them, manifest in everyday efforts to sustain heritage ways of being and knowing, are made evident through emotive reflections from the past.

The participant parents' sustaining of heritage language and culture communications varied with interactions with moments over lifetimes. Moving with participants' directional choice, it was reasoned that a genuine representation of the participants' sense of self requires a subjective presentation. This avoids a participants' presumption of researcher expectations following questions and prompts. This approach for data generation is grounded in the need for an authentic sense of subjective self, through facilitating participant agency.

The epistemological stance for this study, in relation to establishing data, refers to the term data generation rather than data collection. The data generation stance is that participants are constructing subjective sense as an element of the researcher-participant interviews and communications. Rather than collecting numerous moments from memory of time/event/action, the epistemological choice for data generation is that participants move with their own cognitive-affective reflection. Furthermore, data generation allows for the communications shared to be participant-situated through their subjective sense of self, in the temporal moment of past and present. To simply collect data as moments of experience or moments of personal/political/demographic historical times would provide limitations to participants' affective discourse, and hence limit *perezhivanie* narration. Choices for the social approach to generating data enabled frequent occurrence of participants offering discourse that portrayed their subjective sense of self, in relation to sustaining their heritage language and culture. Evidence through transcripts from data generation confirmed the subjective sense of self to be cognitive-affective as a recursive reflection that comes forward through participant moments in time, as shown in the analytical discussion section of this paper.

Methods were designed to ensure participant voice was principally from an *intrapersonal* realm and not predominantly influenced through the *interpersonal* with researcher. Bamberg (2012) explains that narratives are the tools that explore human memory and provide scope for temporal movement. Such a tool makes possible the lens for analysing development of self and identifying the transforming of action in motion. Sharing occurrence of events through time and connections to these aligns to Vygotsky's (1997) "history in motion", conceptualising how the social and

environment affect and create change for affirming or conflicting ways of temporal experiences. Narrative research enables the participant to share their life stories to create *perezhivanie* insight. Bamberg (2012) explains that narrative can develop the realms of personal experience, giving opportunity for subjective meaning to be conveyed and portray the participants' sense of the experience. Through participants' engagement in this sustaining heritage study, recollections, and choices for event reconstructions, the connection with emotive expression distinctly came forward throughout the dialogues. The importance of participant choice in events and experiences was identified as subjectified deliberations. The articulated subjective-indicators was eminent discourse commencing in "I want", "I believe", "I am", "I feel", and so forth, which highlighted the narration of cognitive-affective unity immersed in the historical and subjectified event recount.

González Rey (2009, 2011b) extends the idea of sense and *perezhivanie* to move beyond a portrayal of specific links between a single action or event and an affective consequence. Rather, it is extensively bound between the individual and their previous encounters in living, to develop their current subjective sense.

The social and historical realities within which persons grow up and interact should be understood as a network of ongoing facts and consequences unfolding into the subjective production of many people. Subjectivity is not an effect; it is a complex human production within which collateral effects, consequences, facts, and subjective configurations of the individuals and those social spaces within which they live combine into a recursive and complex subjective network. (González Rey, 2009, p. 65)

Blunden (2015) explains the difference between the singular (*perezhivanie*) and plural (*perezhivaniia*) of these affective-cognitive situations in life and the many interconnected life moments. The *perezhivaniia* (many moments of intertwined *perezhivanie*) are so interconnected and transformative in subjectifying over time, that González Rey's subjective configuration conceptualising allows the many narrated moments of this study to be interlinked to show subjective sense in the "now" moment of data generation. Moreover, the subjective configurations show not only a cognitive-affective unity, but also a unity of events over time presenting self as situated in differing moments of time through expression and differing connective events/experiences reflection throughout personal history. The interpsychological and intrapsychological are intrinsically interlinked with affective influence for the subjective sense of self; individuals' creation of comprehensive and dynamic life tapestries.

The data generated separately for each participant was linked through topic foci specific to participant dialogue topics. These were developed into narratives by the researcher, after analytical reflection with participants. The data reflected upon consisted of verbal and emotive expression, remembered moments, and sharing of experiences of parent participants' perspectives, as they specified social, cultural, and experiential moments of their personal history. The narrative methodology enlightened, with depth, participants' own distinguishing why and how for sustaining one's heritage language and culture with their children. The shared moments were inclusive of primary and secondary participations. Primary participation refers to the individuals' personal experience of the circumstances in their lives. Secondary participation is an indirect association with circumstances, particularly of occurrences shared from intergenerational-family communications throughout time.

Generated narratives for analyzing the subjective sense of parent self in sustaining heritage language and culture.

The only required criteria for participation were that the participants were speakers of another language, and this language was in some way included with the child or children of the family. To fully embrace the notion of diversity, there was no prerequisite for heritage language maintenance practices, nor determinants for frequency or the type of practice undertaken for engaging heritage language and culture with their children. This initial stage of the project was deliberate to ensure no pre-conceptualising or direction for the research participants was in place, as it is acknowledged that there is a wide scope of possibilities for the way in which families communicate and spend time with their children. Furthermore, there was no request for parents of particular heritage language backgrounds to participate in the study. A research principle for the study was to establish the unique and personal for each participant with no labelling or grouping in the realms of “other” language speakers such as migrant, English as a second language (ESL), non-English speaking background (NESB), or by ethnicity. Paradise (2002), emphasises the importance of not seeing particular practices and orientations as being specific to particular cultural groups as homogenous ways of being, but instead, advocates “a holistic relational approach to understanding and explaining culture can promote 'looking beyond' cultural particulars in order to include historical, economic, and political realities in the analysis” (p. 231).

The methodology used in this study is narrative analysis, and the theoretical lens of cultural-historical psychology highlights/foregrounds the development of heritage language and culture of Self. The preliminary design of this study did not presume *perezhivanie* would come to the fore of analytical discussion. These interconnections are discussed later in this article. Bamberg (2012) explains that narrative analysis projects should involve more than text, audio, or video; a multi-layered approach brings forward a more qualitative set of data. “Narrative analysts are required to lay out the relationship between narrative means and experience that is constituted by such means in order to make transparent and document how they arrive at their interpretive conclusions” (Bamberg, 2012, p. 78). Developing a range of differing methods for participants to be involved in certainly brought forward many interlinking potentials for temporal, experiential, and subjective sense for understanding *perezhivanie*.

The interpretation of narratives was developed throughout data generation, through revelation of explicit interconnection between the affective-cognitive processing and the shared historical, personal, cultural, and societal experiences. Further interpretation transpired were the revelations aligned with motivation and individual’s agentic actions for heritage-sharing in the family.

Narrative construction methods: Data generation

First, the data generation methods are explained with an overall summary of occurrences: all participants who selected to contribute to this study spoke fluent English and chose this to be the language of study participation. Following the summary of the data generation processes, the actualities of what was brought to life shows how participant *perezhivanija* came to the fore through implementing multiple data methods. The narratives were organised after establishing comparable moments of situations and establishing a temporal flow for each participant.

Initial questionnaire: designed to identify 1) the temporal linguistic and cultural backgrounds between heritage country and current residence in Australia, and 2) the dynamics of current family and social contexts, to establish insight of participant linguistic and cultural community contact of

heritage, and in English. The participants were asked to list the artefacts, resources, and support brought to their family for language and cultural intensifying in heritage and residential (English) languages. The questionnaire purpose was to establish a sense of the family practices, to identify personal choices and subjective pathways for sustaining their heritage culture and language in their Australian home life.

Informal/unstructured interviews (x2): The first interview was organised with participant choice of time and venue to ensure participants felt empowered in self with data content and direction. First interviews occurred after initial questionnaire and prior to journal collection. The second interview occurred after the two-week journal-writing opportunity.

Interviews occurred in participants' home environments at times of their convenience. The unstructured interviews involved participants moving at their chosen pace, with the vast majority of recorded speech being the participant's voice, after a commencing question of "How have things been for you in developing more than one language?" The researcher aim throughout the interviews being for each participant to discuss what they believed to be experientially important. Throughout all three of the first interviews, many rich moments were shared in autobiographical stories of self, family, and cultural knowing. Limited researcher dialogue can be noted from the audio recording with backchannel responses constituting a majority of the researcher's prompting and acknowledging of participants dialogue content. Historical moments of political and social circumstances that arose in each interview tended to be collective dialogue with intergenerational family members, representing contextual conducive and interruptive moments in their cultural and linguistic experiences. Moments were shared by participants in relation to war times and necessitated relocation that impacted today's generation for embracing their heritage.

An intergenerational demographic and language chart (specifically designed family tree): was offered on commencement of the first interview for participants to show: their parents, grandparents, self and partner, alongside their children's country of birth, if/when migration occurred from one country to another and the language/s of each person on the chart. This process certainly prompted many *perezhivanija* from participants' own histories and accounts of the perceived affective influence of family histories on heritage being, belonging, and becoming. The intergenerational demographic and language chart mediated life and contextual history dialogue. Furthermore, the charts supported subjective agency for discourse about past and present *perezhivanija*. Participants were not asked to commence discussion during the writing of the chart, however it was fortunate the audio device had been enabled, as the construction of the chart elicited many accounts of cultural, historical, and socially mediated experiences.

Two week journal: was offered and open-ended with the suggestion of thoughts, reflection of moments of heritage language and cultural practice in action, and overall anything the participant may have wished to share and discuss at the second informal interview. Participants contributed to the journals very differently to each other. Moments of conscious awareness also appeared in the journal reflections. One journal recording expressed surprise at how unaware a participant had been in self for frequency of heritage language use in and out of the home. The journals actually seemed to be a tool for mediating the contribution for the second interview.

Second interview (final): began with participant open-ended sharing of participant choice. Closure with discussion of transcripts from the first interview to assure that the researcher had an understanding of its content consistent with the intent of the participant.

Sue: parent *perezhivaniya* sources motivational rationale for approach to heritage language and culture with children

Sustaining Vietnamese heritage: Sue is a mother of three boys (“J”, 3.5 years old, “B”, 8 months old, and on commencing data generation, a third son pre-natal). Sue arrived in Australia on refugee status at the age of six, after previously residing for three years in a refugee camp in Japan. Sue’s husband, the children’s father, is of non-Vietnamese heritage and does not speak the language beyond a few words of direction and affection.

Sue explained varying elements of her childhood that were conflictual for self in wanting to be and do in heritage culture and the lived-in Australian culture.

I was more closer to my Mum at the time growing up than with my Dad, we had a lot of conversations every night, so pretty much she be telling me a lot of things and teaching me a lot of things in Vietnamese. I don’t know what it is, but my Vietnamese is quite, my vocabulary, is quite extensive for a person that’s left Vietnam. I left when I was 3 ½ and went to a Refugee camp in Japan, we escaped the War and went to Japan, a Refugee Camp for 3 years and then we came here, so when I go back to Vietnam [was for a visit at 24 years of age] they’re quite shocked that I left there when I was 3 ½ and I can totally communicate. I think it comes from within me as well...and it’s also a gift being able to absorb a lot and pay attention to the different vocabs that have been thrown at me. I think because I had a good relationship with my Mum it made me pay attention more to what she was saying...then if ... it’s like kids in general they don’t wanna [sic] listen to their parents, they just zone out...So you know I was zoning in a lot’

I preferred to avoid Vietnamese [in public] when I was younger and speak more English ... and also because we were the new group that migrated to Australia and it was the Vietnamese ...umm... it was more, it was more trying to fit in....

[Vietnamese] wasn’t something I was proud of and I used to, I remember in the car being little and trying to bang the Vietnamese out of my head, I tried to pretend I couldn’t understand Vietnamese [laughs]. Just pretend I can’t understand and I’m like it doesn’t work, it doesn’t work.... I still understand! I just wanted to know what it was like to not be Vietnamese. I was trying and it didn’t work and [laughs] and yeah, and so when your parents spoke to you when you were say in shops or that, it was in Vietnamese. Yeah and that was a bit embarrassing too, I’d get told off for not speaking in Vietnamese in public...Yeah, yeah that was embarrassing. (Sue, first informal interview, September, 2008)

The *perezhivaniya* that comes forward from this component of the narrative data is interpreted as feeling torn in being a part of own heritage in the broader society of English. It appears there were feelings of not being accepted for all that Sue could be, in her heritage and in the context of her Australian schooling. In the narrative excerpt of speaking and being Vietnamese with Mum, it is clear emotional connection is present and a sense of pride in her Vietnamese language abilities. However, during this time in the 1980s, which were early days of Vietnamese refugeeism in Australia, Sue clearly does not feel accepted in the broader community, particularly at school in stating she was trying to remove the Vietnamese from her head on her way to school. As *perezhivaniya* together with the motivation through the developing subjective configurations, it seems that the polemic and subjective sense of self were in conflict, developing in Sue’s early years of schooling. Sue seemed to have felt challenged in her own; it seems she felt she should be one or

the other, unable to embrace both languages and cultural as a dynamic self and identity. During the interview contributions, there were expressions of holding back from or offering too much Vietnamese to her children in current times, not wanting them to feel different. How much of the heritage Vietnamese Sue wants for her children, in terms of their bilingualism/biculturalism, seemed to vary from wanting full immersion to only offering words of necessity. This can be linked to Sue's own *perezhivaniya*, with particular affective significance and some reflection on seeing Australia as a transforming context in viewing cultural and linguistic diversity.

Well growing up now like being an adult and having my own family and just, you know, Australia being a lot more accepting to multiculturalism and just more people realising from travelling. Just my outlook on life, what an advantage it is to be bilingual so it makes me appreciate a lot more my Vietnamese. The skills I acquired you know, that I have so I would like for 'J' more, more so for 'J' and 'B' as part of identity. To me that's the mmm, probably the, the biggest reason that I want to instill Vietnamese in them. Into my kids, both of them because of their identity. I think if you don't know your identity, your roots from both sides, you're a bit lost without it growing up as an adult. And if you're not able to, to identify that pretty much, it's really hard, there's something missing inside you...

As Sue reflects on identity and bilingualism as an advantage, with a differing view of the Australian societal context for greater embracement to being multicultural, it seems there has been subjective transforming for Sue between her childhood and adulthood in relation to subjective sense. The concern regarding "something missing inside [her]" in relation to heritage identity is an affective reflection that appears to have derived from relationships with parents and peers. Most of all, feeling a sense of belonging at home and school seems to have been amiss for Sue throughout childhood and adolescence. In parts of the interview it seems the cultural and linguistic being between heritage and context is not only in oppositional motion to motivation for doing, but also a sense of avoidance of heritage for her children.

Grace: subjective perspective in motion for managing Heritage and English language learning between home and school

Sustaining Hungarian heritage: Grace, a mother of two children (son, 8 years, and daughter, 7 years). Grace arrived alone and single in Australia in her late 20s. Her husband is also of Hungarian heritage, born in Australia, his parents being first-generation Australians. Grace's husband speaks Hungarian fluently but less frequently with the children. Grace explained her demographic town of heritage to have experienced border changes from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and later to Serbia due to the Treaty of Trianon.

I think it's important to have that opportunity [bilingual], somebody talk to you from your early age, because I always feel guilty that I didn't really learn my Country's language but I didn't have opportunity. I mean it was school but you can't learn the language in the school for 45 minutes twice a week... and afterwards nobody talked to you.

See it's hard and I learn English there [homeland], but when I come to Australia I didn't have English as a fluent language. It was just in a text book kind of English which is the same thing – so that's a really good advantage to have somebody to talk to you. That's why I call my husband a live dictionary because it's good to have somebody and just you know tell me this word...

For me, it was even more because I know and I knew that in the end I'm gonna be the one who speaks Hungarian the best [in the home]. I would love my children to be able to speak with me when I get older and you know and my family. And of course I know that how important and how good is to have other language. As I develop and slowly learn English. Yeah it definitely helps development to have another language – cognitively definitely, they're gonna see the world in two windows because every language has their own riches and thinking, ways of thinking. They [her children] don't know yet as children they not know how privileged are they in the way of having that opportunity [of another language].

It's not [that] they become better people, it's just the way of seeing the world, and they can make differences because they can see different ways. It is so much more than the way we speak or the things we do, it includes emotions as well.

The affective is clearly identified by Grace in the last transcribed sentence. Through Grace's own experiences of multi-language learning, her *perezhivanija* has clearly guided her motive for thinking about bilingual opportunities in the home. Clearly the *perezhivanie* is indicative of her not having learnt a language that was available through her schooling, as emphasised with her expression of feeling guilty. It appears that the *perezhivanie* of learning a language in a country with shifting borders is reflected in Grace's consideration of the "best way" to learn another language. She considers learning a language in school to be limited in providing meaning. Grace believes that the best way of learning a language is to be immersed in the experience of everyday learning and contexts of reality. In the interview, Grace connected the community refusal to speak Serbian due to the forced national border change with her schooling. The *perezhivanija* shared throughout the narrative indicates discontentment for not engaging in potential opportunities for "other" learning of languages during school years. Additionally, Grace challenges the mode of her school language learning. The juxtaposition in her childhood sees her motivated to provide a differing scope for her children in having another language as an asset, and contextual immersion for this being achieved.

Sometimes I feel I made the mistake because my philosophy was that to speak only Hungarian in the house – we have not been able to maintain that because you know my husband born here so we don't act strict for just Hungarian. What happened when he [husband] was a child they just pick the spoken Hungarian in his [childhood] home, so he doesn't know English when he started school. He was the outsider and he felt terrible, and he said that from his own experience he didn't want that for his children to experience. We have tried to balance but then I started to worry when they started school – so I was thinking alright so what if I say that rule from the beginning; that them talking just Hungarian what might happen? In the end I think that I should give them more English, and it's gonna be their choice... In the end I think that's still fine to have the two language and they can learn – they switch.

Through the process of organising the family practice and ways of doing the heritage language and culture, Grace expresses a moment of *perezhivanie* from her husband's own *perezhivanija*. Grace and her husband negotiated how their bilingual parenting could work best for the children in their early years of parenting, prior to the children's participation in mainstream English-speaking community contexts such as educational settings. Their views differed early on whilst they were establishing strategies for language choice and participation for what they believed to be the most supportive to their children's well-being in the home and school context. Grace's subjective sense transformed through interpersonal connection with her husband's *perezhivanija*.

The consideration of family practice shows the *perezhivaniya* of two people in social mediation; bringing their subjective sense perspectives to find a resolve that will realise their emotive motives for the Hungarian heritage language to be a conducive aspect of their children's lives alongside their English learning and participation in home and school community. Grace evidently reflects her own *perezhivanie* of "other" language contexts, in connection with her husband's *perezhivaniya* of disruption when commencing school. Clearly, an understanding of the emotional impact of her husband's sense of not belonging in school, mediates Grace's change to Mother-child interactions, whilst still holding the heritage language as a family priority.

Grace's affective expression of feeling that she has made a mistake based on her philosophy (as developed through her *perezhivaniya*) indicates that past and present experiences in connection are not always conducive to the motives and ideals that have been subjectively established for the parent-self.

Sarah: the same situations of *perezhivanie* do not bring forth a designated or generalised effect

Sustaining Yiddish/Hebrew - Jewish Heritage: Sarah a mother of five children (sons 5.5, 4, and 2 years old, daughter 1 year old; and a son prenatal at time of data generation). Sarah (director of a Hebrew/Yiddish immersion early childhood centre) and her husband (*Rabi* of a local synagogue), also arrived in Australia when their eldest son was 1.5 years old. The rationale for moving to Australia was to support the reigniting of Jewish religion, culture, and language taking place in one of many suburban Melbourne Jewish communities. Intergenerational Hebrew and Yiddish language loss being a direct experience of both Sarah and her husband's intergenerational times, similarly for a large number of Jewish individuals and communities around the globe.

Sarah makes deliberations of her own childhood family situation and brings forward what this means for her aims in supporting the language and culture of her and her children's heritage with communities that are also of the Jewish heritage values and religious beliefs. Alongside consideration of differences with the community, in current times Sarah reflects on difference within her immediate family during childhood and speculates that the ways of upbringing is in the same context with the same family values: there is a clear, unique, subjective action for each individual. Tracing the family's Jewish heritage back two generations showed the culture and language to have previously travelled, in this family line, from Eastern Europe to Canada and the United States. There was a strong generational language shift from Hebrew and Yiddish to English between the generations of Sarah's grandparents and parents; the personal and societal consequence of anti-Jewish laws in Eastern Europe at the onset of World War II and LaShoah (the Holocaust) being the catalyst for this language shift. This event had a secondary fallout for Sarah's generation: she did not go into detail from a war time historical perspective, but expressed appreciation for the subsequent reigniting of the language for her generation, after the languages had almost ceased to exist in her parents' generation:

If you will notice from my family background, that neither of my parents grew up with Hebrew Yiddish in their home. (Stated during intergenerational demographic chart work). In fact neither of them grew up observant at all. They became observant later on in life so....so we learned Hebrew and Yiddish and these other languages that are cultural

culturally related only when they [parents] were in their 20's. Me, my brothers and sisters all went to a very good Jewish school.

So they [parents] never really had that deep language [knowing and being], but they wanted us, the children to have it. It feels so good that we can have it back for our values and our languages.

In Sarah's current country of residence, interactions and language support to Hebrew occur largely through religious practices both in and out of the home. Much of the Hebrew language learning occurs through artefacts and prayer. Sarah speaks of prayer cards that are placed in the baby's cot from birth, songs and books, and the blessings that are given before food in the very early days of the child's life. All of the everyday artefact activities are the beginnings of immersing the child in cultural tools and knowledge for their future, cultural, and psychological development. The use of these particular artefacts in practice moves beyond the use of tools as mere implements for language practice in the here and now, but rather form part of humanity's continuous historical practices (Vianna & Stetsenko, 2011). Yiddish interactions and support occur in the home, school, and with the family's Jewish community largely through cultural practices and the sharing of Jewish community in social and religious beliefs and values.

We want for our children, so they should feel like even though they might be different than a lot of others ... But that it's a positive difference. It's something that they can share. That's sort of how we deal with it [differing family values in community], I mean there are different ways of dealing with it. I wouldn't, I mean I won't say it works all the time. Even amongst my family and I'm the oldest of 13. There's a whole range in my family, we were all brought up with the same values. But, my, some of my Brothers and Sisters have decided that they wanted to lead more Secular lives. On the other hand I want to live in a more or a wider Jewish Community, so there'd be more resources available for them [children].

Myself and my husband have chosen to live sort of a little bit more orthodox and be the Givers, others have chosen that they decided that they don't have the energy or desire to be the Givers [Jewish culture, religion and languages – Hebrew and Yiddish]. Some of my family they wanna be the receivers, with a bit of our culture, or others they wanna be living in a place where they think is more conducive to raising their children with hardly any of our culture, so it's not fool proof [planned so well to ensure all goes as planned] in the way we are brought up. As a parent, you just have to do the best you can.

Vygotsky (1994) explains a family situation from his clinical work where three children have experienced the same plightful situation, and yet each of the three children have been influenced differently from the same family moments. The analysis of this situation for Vygotsky holds that even though similarity in genetics and circumstances may be evident, the implications for each individual differs as determined through their *perezhivanie*.

Vygotsky explains that for considering *perezhivanie*, the analysis should not occur from the environment, but rather "represented in an emotional experience". Furthermore, Vygotsky (1994) aligns the emotional experience to be "an indivisible unity of personal characteristics and situational characteristics" (p. 341). All will vary, depending on the person's *perezhivanie* in the moments of occurrence and their current point of personal characteristics whilst merging with the situation/event.

Sarah has clearly expressed her motive to give to her Jewish community, and in connection with her *rabi* husband, her motive for this to occur is community situated. To leave one's country of childhood to support reigniting Jewish languages and Judaism, in communities threatened by loss of culture and practice, is a very proactive form of participation to sustain heritage beyond one's own next generation family. The motive and agency for reigniting and sustaining heritage is a substantial signifier of the interconnection between *perezhivanie*, as the narrative formed to show many elements of subjective sense that substantiated subjective configurations, for her agency to continue what she feels is a strong community necessity.

Throughout this study, the interconnection of *perezhivanie* and situation/event is considered through González Rey's formation of subjective configurations, hence this leads to motive and agency in later times. As this study was with adults, there was a connection made between the parents' motives and choice of practices that were linked to the stories of childhood they told with emotive language throughout the data. Compiling these into narratives is what enabled correlation between past experiences of situation/environment and the emotional connections to their thinking and perceptions of present day action from each participants' self-elucidated standpoint.

Conclusion

Although the central focus for this study has been heritage language and culture, the actual social and contextually mediated subjective sense of self within and across generations is relevant for all realms of social living and self in life. Intergenerational family histories hold the potential to become *perezhivaniya* in the lives of each of the participants in their current day times from childhood to adulthood with the affects and psychological processing. Clearly, parent motives and approaches for child rearing, with particular language and culture rationales, are embedded in how the parents regard their own heritage. Moreover, this regard of their heritage influences how they approach maintaining heritage languages and cultures in contexts where those languages and cultures are otherwise not readily accessible. This brings forward the interdisciplinary approach of narrative analysis through the cultural historical psychology elements to be a dynamic methodology for exploring many particular phenomena of human activity and motive. The methodology and multifaceted methods are relations for exploring the many realms of human subjectified agency and action.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to the participant parents of the sustaining heritage language and culture study. Much appreciation to the editors and reviewers of this edition for such extensive review and editing to support academic writing.

References

- Bamberg, M. (2012). Narrative analysis. In H. Cooper (Editor-in-chief), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology (Vol. 2): Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 77-94). Washington: APA Press.
- Blunden, A. (2015). *Perezhivanie*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Daiute, C. (2014). *Narrative inquiry: A dynamic approach*. New York: Sage.
- González Rey, F. (2007) Social and individual subjectivity from an historical cultural standpoint. *Critical Social Studies*, 9(2), 3-14.
- González_Rey, F. (2008). Subject, subjectivity, and development in cultural-historical psychology. In B. Van Oers, W. Wardekker, E. Elbers, & R. Van Der Veer (Eds.), *The transformation of learning: Advances in cultural-historical activity theory* (pp. 137-154). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- González Rey, F. (2009). Historical relevance of Vygotsky's work: Its significance for a new approach to the problem of subjectivity in psychology. *Outline*, 1, 59-73.
- González Rey, F. (2011a). A re-examination of defining moments in Vygotsky's work and their implications for his continuing legacy. *Mind, Culture & Activity*, 18(3), 257-275.
- González Rey, F. (2011b). The path to subjectivity: Advancing alternative understandings of Vygotsky and cultural historical legacy. In P. Portes, & S. Salas (Eds.), *Vygotsky in the 21st Century: Advances in cultural historical theory with non-dominant communities* (pp. 32-49). Oxford: Peter Lang.
- González Rey, F. (2014). Human motivation in question: Discussing emotions, motives, and subjectivity from a cultural-historical standpoint. *Journal for the theory of social behavior*, 45(2), 419-439.
- González Rey, F. (2015). A new path for the discussion of social representations: Advancing the topic of subjectivity from a cultural-historical standpoint. *Theory & Psychology*, 25(4), 494-512.
- Jackson, S. (2010). Self, time, narrative: Re-thinking the contribution of G.H. Mead. *Life Writing*, 7(2), 123-136.
- Mahn, H. (2003). Periods in child development: Vygotsky's perspective. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, & S. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 119-137). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, D., & Daiute, C. (2012). English as a second language, a second chance, or second class membership: Exploring the costs and opportunities of Latina immigrants' narratives. *Culture & Psychology*, 19(1), 117-138.
- Paradise, R. (2002). Finding ways to study culture in context. *Human Development*, 45(4), 229-236.
- Souto-Manning, M. & Swick, K. (2006). Teachers' beliefs about parent and family involvement: Rethinking our family involvement paradigm. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 34(2), 187-193.

Stetsenko, A. (2010). Standing on the shoulders of giants: A balancing act of dialectically theorizing conceptual understanding on the grounds of Vygotsky's project. In W.M. Roth (Ed.), *Re/Structuring science education: ReUniting sociological and psychological perspectives* (pp. 69-88). New York: Springer.

Stetsenko, A. (2012). Personhood: An activist project of historical becoming through collaborative pursuits of social transformation. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 30, 144-153.

Valsiner, J., & van der Veer, R. (2005). On the social nature of human cognition: An analysis of the shared intellectual roots of George Herbert Mead and Lev Vygotsky. In H. Daniels (Ed.), *An introduction to Vygotsky* (pp. 81-100). East Sussex: Routledge.

Vianna, A., & Stetsenko, A. (2011). Connecting learning and identity development through transformative active stance: Application in adolescent development in child welfare program. *Human Development*, 54, 313-338.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1994). The problem of the environment. In R. van der Veer, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *The Vygotsky Reader* (pp. 338-354). Oxford: Blackwell.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). The history of the development of higher mental functions [M.J. Hall, Trans.]. In R.W. Reiber (Ed.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky (Vol. 4)*. New York: Plenum Press.

Author

Robyn Babaeff is Associate Lecturer/Researcher at Monash University, Faculty of Education, Early Childhood. Robyn has worked in the early childhood as a preschool teacher, lecturer for children's services with a focus on child development, diversity and family. Currently completing PhD Family and Diversity: Parents' participatory motivation for sustaining heritage language and culture through family practice in Australia.

Correspondence: robyn.babaeff@monash.edu