

ULRR

Family language policy: new directions

Item Type	Book chapter
Authors	Smith-Christmas, Cassie
Citation	Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences, Macalister, John & Hadi Mirvahedi, Syed (eds);pt.1, chapter 2
Publisher	Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group
Download date	2026-05-20 13:34:03
Item License	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/1.0/
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/10344/5529

FLP: New Directions

Cassie Smith-Christmas

Introduction

It is over a century now since Ronjat's (1913) study of his son Louis' simultaneous development in French and German, which came to be considered the naissance of Family Language Policy (FLP) research. This study also gave rise to the concept originally developed by Ronjat's friend Grammont of the *une-personne une-langue* strategy, which later to become known as the one-parent one-language (OPOL) strategy. In turn, this strategy came to be one of the central frameworks for FLP research (see for example, Leopold, 1939-1949; De Houwer, 1990; Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997; Kasuya, 1998; Barron-Hauwert, 2004; Takeuchi, 2006; Mishina-Mori, 2011, Palviainen and Boyd, 2013). It was not until nearly a century later, however, that the term FLP came into being, appearing in Luykx's (2003, p. 39) account of Spanish-Aymara families:

While these efforts [minority language schools] are laudable [...], it is the gradual displacement of Aymara by Spanish in functions that have traditionally been the former's stronghold (i.e. the domestic ones) that may prove definitive for the future survival of the language. For this reason, it is necessary to expand our current conception of 'language policy' to include not only the sphere of official state actions, but also decisions made at the community and family level. Such decisions are often implicit and unconscious, but they are no less crucial to determining the speed and direction of language shift. In this regard we may refer to *family language policy* as an important area for both research and activism.

It was still not until a decade later that FLP was conceptualised as a field in its own right with King, Fogle and Logan-Terry's (2008) paper titled 'Family Language Policy.' This paper, as well as subsequent work (for example, Schwartz, 2010 Spolsky, 2012; Fogle and King, 2013; King and Fogle, 2013) helped to reify the remit of FLP research and put it on the sociolinguistic map, so to speak. The emergence of FLP as a field in its own right nearly a century after initial FLP research was first carried out is perhaps an example of what the famous psycholinguist Willem Levelt (2014) refers to as a 'sleeping beauty' in linguistics: work that began much earlier is later 'awoken,' the process of which reflects shifting conceptions of *language* and how it mediates the relationship between the individual and society. After all, following from the naissance of FLP with Ronjat's study and Leopold's (1939-1949) well-known documentation of his two daughters German-English development, there was a comparative hiatus in the field; not only did linguistics turn towards other interests, but the ever-popular myth that bilingualism inhibits a child's overall development still held currency (e.g. Anastasi and Cordova, 1953; for a good overview on anti-bilingual discourses, see Pavlenko, 2006). The FLP 'awakening' in the 1980s and 1990s in the form of monographs on child bilingualism (e.g. Fantini; 1985; Saunders, 1988; de Houwer 1990; Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997) made important steps towards changing these negative discourses on bilingualism as well as expanding the narrow view of bilingualism that, as Grosjean (1992) puts it, envisages the bilingual individual as the sum of two monolinguals instead of a holistic, multilingual individual.

The shift in framing research on child bilingualism in terms of *language policy* reflects not only a growing interest in the field of language policy in its own right (see for example, Spolsky and Shohamy, 2000; Spolsky, 2004), but an emphasis on the decision-making processes that multilingual families face (as alluded to in Luykx's earlier quote) and how these decision-making processes are mediated by wider sociohistorical trajectories. As Canagarajah (2008, p. 173) writes:

We find that the family is not self-contained, closed off to other social institutions and economic conditions. Furthermore, the family is shaped by history and power, at times reproducing ideological values and power inequalities established from colonial times. Such a broadened perspective is critical to theorizing the prospects of the family in maintaining a marginalized language.

The sentiment encapsulated in Canagarajah's quote is echoed in King's (2016) introduction to the special issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* on family language policy and transnational families, as she characterises what she terms (pp. 2-3) the 'fourth' (and current) phase of FLP research as involving 'research questions that examine language competence not just as an outcome, but as a means through which adults and children define themselves, their family roles, and family life.' This premise is exemplified for instance in Zhu Hua and Li Wei's article within this special issue, which demonstrates how different generations of Chinese speakers in the UK—and even individuals within the same family—conceptualise multilingualism differently, prompting the authors to emphasise in their conclusion (p. 11) that 'bilingualism and multilingualism need to be studied as *experiences*, and experiences need to be studied holistically and multidimensionally' (emphasis in original).

The need for multidimensional views of FLP was also one of the key themes emergent from the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA) workshop 'Affective Factors in Home Language Maintenance and Development' held in Berlin in February 2016, which was attended by over seventy participants, mainly from Europe but from as far afield as New Zealand and Australia. This importance of interdisciplinarity and multidimensionality was particularly clear from the keynote lectures delivered by Elizabeth Lanza and Annick de Houwer, which established where we were *now* in current FLP research and where we should turn our attention in order to develop the field further. Their lectures helped strengthen the sense among researchers of what is at stake in FLP research. As encapsulated by King's (2016, p. 2-3) observation earlier, what it is at stake is not simply the child's competence in the minority language; rather, the reflexive relationship between language mediation in the family and the wider community not only shapes each family's *own* experiences and outcomes, but may also play a role in social dynamics at the local, supralocal, and arguably even global level (for example, the fast rise of English as a global language as discussed in Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). Further, it is important to bear in mind that the most eminent scholar in language shift and maintenance, Joshua Fishman, characterises successful intergenerational language transmission as the 'fulcrum' (1991, p. 467) in terms of reversing language shift; in other words, if minority language transmission does not take place within the family, then it is unlikely that the language will continue to survive. For many languages at the brink of obsolescence, it is therefore critical to gain a deeper understanding of FLP and its dynamics within particular endangered language communities. Thus, it is clear to see that the stakes are high in terms of FLP research and that these stakes encompass access to empowerment, social change, and the fate of certain endangered languages, to name a few. As Lanza (2016) emphasised in her plenary lecture in Berlin, FLP researchers are tasked with

understanding the multi-layered dimensions of complexity involving families, language, wider social structures, and the relationship between the three. As the stakes are high, it is important to identify key ways in which we can advance the field.

So, where to next? The following gives an overview of the possible future directions of the field, grouping them into three major themes: contexts, methodologies, and areas of focus. These suggestions are not meant to be exhaustive; rather, they are meant as a way to stimulate an integrated dialogue and allow space for FLP researchers to reflect on the milestones in the field as well as the lacunae.

Context is Key

As the famous Tolstoy quote goes, all happy families are happy in the same way, but every unhappy family is unhappy in a different way. This is not to imply that multilingual families are unhappy, but rather, as a means to illustrate how context is crucial in FLP research: the particular composition of each family; where they are located; what languages they speak; the status of the languages they speak; the parents' life histories and linguistic trajectories; the role of other caregivers in the child(ren)'s upbringing and these other caregivers' own linguistic experiences, etc. mean that each family has the potential to be unique in terms of FLP research. Thus, the realities that contribute to one family's successful FLP may not be applicable to other families' situations or may in fact even hinder their own FLPs. In order to cover as broad a range of family experiences as possible, FLP research needs to consider the issue of context carefully.

In my own research (2016), I synthesised the different contexts of FLP research into three overarching prototypes: OPOL, in which the minority-speaking parent is an immigrant and the other parent is usually a member of the host community (for example, Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997; Kasuya, 1998; Takeuchi, 2006); immigrant community, whereby normally both parents are members of a community of immigrants in a host community (for example, Bayley, Schechter, and Torres-Ayala, 1996; Zentella, 1997; Canagarajah, 2008; Gafaranga, 2011; Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi, 2013); and autochthonous minority language community, whereby families are part of an indigenous minority community (e.g. Makihara, 2005; Meek, 2007; Ó hÍfearnáin, 2013; Smith-Christmas, 2016). I argue that there are potential relative advantages and disadvantages to each in terms of the child's potential use of the minority language. In OPOL situations, the onus of maintaining the minority language primarily falls on the minority language-speaking parent, whereas in immigrant and autochthonous minority language communities, by virtue of being a 'community,' the child may have more minority language-speaking interlocutors. However, the disenfranchisement of the immigrant or the autochthonous community vis-à-vis the majority group may counteract this advantage; further, shift-inducing practices may be well-ingrained in family and wider social communicative norms. As De Houwer (2016) pointed out in her plenary address at the AILA conference, the majority of research has been conducted in the first two contexts and there has been relatively little research situated in autochthonous minority language communities. One further direction therefore would be the expansion of FLP to include more autochthonous minority communities. Further, it should be emphasised that these categorisations of FLP contexts are prototypes and prototypes only; for example, the reverse-diaspora nature of Israel, which has served as the locus of much important FLP research (for example, Schwartz, 2008; Stavans, 2012; Altman, Feldman, Yitzhaki, Lotem and Walters, 2013), means that immigrants in Israel might not face the same level of stigmatisation as

Mexicans in the US, for example (*cf.* Bayley, Schecter, and Torres-Ayala, 1996). Research that clearly involves a blend of prototypes (for example, speakers of an autochthonous minority language who have migrated, such as Galicians in Argentina, for instance) would offer further new directions for the field. Work oriented towards this vein (for example, Yates and Terraschke, 2013) as well as studies of families in highly multilingual areas with a diverse tradition of migration and multilingualism, such as Malaysia (e.g. Dumanig, David, and Shanmuganathan, 2013; Pillai, Soh, and Kajita, 2014), accelerate FLP's path along this new trajectory.

As well, despite the existence of what I have argued to be three prototypes, FLP studies are generally situated in Western, industrialised societies: the bulk of FLP studies have been conducted within these contexts (primarily Western Europe, the US, Canada, Australia) and often the minority language parent also hails from another Western industrialised nation-state (for example, German parents in Australia in Döpke's 1992 study; American parents in Norway in Lanza's 1997 study; Luxembourgish parents in the UK in Kirsch's 2012 study). Studies of immigrant communities from non-industrialised and/or non-Western countries often involve cases where the host country is a prototypically Western, industrialised nation (for example, Rwandans in Belgium in Gafaranga's 2010 study) and research situated within autochthonous minority languages communities tends to involve groups that exist at the peripheries of mainstream Western societies but nonetheless exist within the polities of these Western, industrial societies (for example, Kaska in Canada in Meek's 2007 study) and thus members' ideas about language and the family may be strongly influenced by the ideologies held by the mainstream Western, industrialised societies. It is of course problematic to draw on concepts such as 'Westernised' and 'non-Westernised' as dichotomies, as inherently, these terms are subjective, as are 'industrialised' and 'non-industrialised.' However, the reality that the bulk of FLP research has been at least partially situated in Western, industrialised contexts is perhaps as much reflective of global migration and colonisation patterns as it is of the fact that, as Smakman and Heinrich (2015, p. xvi) point out in their book *Globalising Sociolinguistics*, much of sociolinguistic theory in general has been borne out of observations of Western, industrialised communities (which in turn is also reflective of Western privilege in terms of access to higher education, prestigious universities, etc.). However, child-rearing practices and beliefs about children and their role in the family may differ considerably in non-Western societies (*cf.* child language socialisation research, for example, Schiefflin and Ochs, 1984; 1986; Ochs, 1993; Duranti, Ochs, and Schiefflin, 2011). For instance, in his well-known study of language shift in Gapun, Papua New Guinea, Kulick (1992) finds that caregivers' beliefs about concept of 'self' in relation to language plays a role in their seemingly *laissez-faire* attitudes to the children's lack of the minority language Taiap. Studies which encapsulate experiences outside the typical largely Western, industrialised viewpoint of sociolinguistics and FLP are particularly valuable to advancing our understanding of language use in the family; currently, for example, there is a dearth of research situated within Africa or the Middle East (apart from Israel) and studies which involve highly multilingual contexts, as described for example in Myers-Scotton's (1988) well-known work on code negotiation in East Africa, would offer a much-enriched viewpoint for the field.

Curd-Christian's (2016) recent work in Singapore points toward new directions in the field. By comparing the FLPs of the three main ethnic groups in Singapore—a highly industrialised but in many respects non-Western nation and one which is both historically and currently a multilingual society—her research demonstrates the global forces underpinning language choice in the family. It shows how pressure to use the 'dominant' variety does not

only apply to immigrants and speakers of indigenous languages; rather, the mechanisms by which large-scale economic and social realities establish new dominances affect language use in the family, as in her study a number of families orient towards English use due to conceptions of English as a global language. Further, as previously mentioned, the family prototype that has tended to receive the most attention within FLP research is the OPOL prototype, a reality which is also perhaps indicative of FLP's outlook being rooted in Westernised, industrialised contexts: the child's experience of the family consists mainly of what is considered the 'nuclear' family in Western society, with relatives other than the child's parents playing a peripheral role in the child's development. In many societies outside of the so-called Western, industrialised mainstream, however, it may be more the norm rather than the exception that the children will have frequent interactions with extended family members and that multiple family members of different generations (for example, grandparents, aunts, and uncles) may live in the same household. Curdt-Christiansen's study exemplifies this premise, as it looks at the role that the language ideologies and practices of other relatives living in the children's house (for example, aunts, uncles, and grandparents) play in shaping the FLP.

In a similar vein, Kopeliovich's (2013) work in Israel also exemplifies how the FLP field is evolving in terms of bringing multiple family members into scope. As Lanza (2007) points out, traditionally, even siblings have played a relatively small role in FLP research, as the focus tends to lie upon the eldest child. Kopeliovich's longitudinal examination of her own four children demonstrates not only the impact of the siblings' language use with each other, but also demonstrates the impact of extended family members, such as grandparents, on the child's language use. Kopeliovich's first child was stronger in his minority language (Russian) than his two younger sisters, due in part to the fact that his grandparents were also Russian speakers and they would often take him to the park, where they spoke Russian with other grandparents who were also looking after their grandchildren. The eldest child then went to school, however, and not only did he begin speaking Hebrew to his younger sisters but they then began using Hebrew to each other. However, at the birth of Kopeliovich's fourth child, all three siblings began to use more Russian and used the language with the fourth child. My own work (2014, 2016) on three generations of a Gaelic-speaking family on the Isle of Skye, Scotland, also examines the role of other caregivers, such as the children's grandparents, aunts, and uncles in their success in maintaining Gaelic with the third generation, as well as the impact that the siblings' language use had on the FLP overall. I found that although certain other caregivers (primarily the children's two grandmothers and mother) were the main forces in the Gaelic-centred nature of the FLP, other family members' language practices in many ways reversed the impact of these particular caregivers, as the second generation (as well as the eldest sibling) 'model' language shift to the youngest speakers. This in turn was one of the many contributing factors to the third generation's early and continuing preference for English despite the family's pro-Gaelic efforts and the children's attendance at a Gaelic immersion school (for other studies that examine the impact of other caregivers, see Bayley, Schechter, and Torres-Ayala, 1996; Kenner, Ruby, Jessel, Gregory, and Arju, 2007; Ruby, 2012; Melo-Pfeifer, 2014; Pillai, Soh, and Kajita, 2014).

Further, as Lanza (2016) emphasised in her plenary talk at the Berlin conference, one of the new directions the field is taking is an interest in 'non-traditional' family types, such as single-parent, LGBT, and adoptive families. Fogle's (2012) work on transnational parents of Russian-speaking adoptees and Fiorentino, Meulleman, and Castagne's (2016) work on Italian parents of adoptees of different linguistic backgrounds are important steps in expanding the field in this direction. Work that compares and contrasts these different

contexts and family types, such as for example Fogle and King's (2013) article, which juxtaposes Fogle's (2013) adoptive families with King and Logan-Terry's (2008) Spanish-English households, is integral to advancing the field. Further, as King and Logan-Terry point out in their 2008 study (in which mothers use their L2 of Spanish due to perceptions of bilingualism as 'good parenting'), most FLP research is centred in contexts where parents are using their native language and/or language of the wider community with the child. Increased global mobility and the rise of 'new' speakers (*cf.* O'Rourke, Pujolar, and Ramallo, 2015) both of autochthonous minority languages as well as world-dominant languages means that many parents may be raising their children in a language which is neither their L1 or the language of the wider community. In situations where the language shift is so acute that there are few 'native' speakers of the language left, this may be particularly important, as a number of moribund or near-moribund languages may rely on new speakers for the survival of the language. Further, there is very little research from a linguistic dimension on the effects of input in terms of the child's acquisition and use of the minority language in instances when one (or more) of the caregivers is undergoing language attrition due to time away from the home country (OPOL or immigrant situations) or due to language shift (autochthonous minority language situations).

In summary, the new directions the field is taking demonstrate how context is key to gaining a deeper understanding of the reflexive relationship between the family and society in FLP research. In returning to the opening Tolstoy quote, one of the key studies to illustrate this point has been Kopeliovich's (2013) 'Happylingual: A Family Project for Enhancing and Balancing Multilingual Development.' In showing how different realities play out in different families, the sentiment behind the Tolstoy quote—that no two families' experiences are the same—can be re-phrased in a more positive way: every multilingual family is 'happylingual' in its own way. The following section will discuss the difficulties in assessing the ways in which each family is 'happylingual' and will examine how the field is shifting to meet these new challenges.

Methodological Innovations

One of the main issues with FLP research is that it inherently involves capturing and analysing language use in the very intimate setting of the family. Over the trajectory of FLP research, researchers have developed different ways to deal with this potential challenge. As gleaned from some of the studies previously mentioned (for example, Ronjat, 1913; Leopold, 1939-1949; Fantini, 1985; Kopeliovich, 2013), in some cases family language use is captured and analysed by one of the children's parents in the form of language diaries and recordings. Other studies in which the researcher is not the parent of the child (for example, De Houwer, 1990; Lanza, 1997) have built on these methods and have often employed parental interviews along with recordings of family's language use and parents' diaries, etc. Studies centred primarily on the parents' language ideologies (for example, Okita, 2001; Kirsch, 2012) tend to use parental interviews as the primary methodology. Still other studies have employed more quantitative methods such as surveys (Varro, 1998; Schwartz, 2008; King and Fogle, 2006; De Houwer, 2007; Ó hÍfearnáin, 2013) in assessing family language use and the children's acquisition of the minority language. Studies of immigrant or autochthonous minority communities often centre on ethnographic methodologies, especially that of participant observation, in examining FLP from a primarily community-centred vantage point (for example, Kulick, 1992; Li Wei, 1994; Zentella, 1997; King, 2001; Luykx, 2003). Curdt-Christiansen's (2009, 2016) work in Montreal and Singapore respectively

exemplifies how a combination of these methods can lead to a very fruitful and in-depth understanding of FLP. It is clear, therefore, that over the course of the field's existence, FLP researchers have been innovative in adapting their methodologies to respond to different challenges and to maximise their understanding of multilingual families. Despite a breadth of innovativeness, however, there are still ways in which the field could further develop to better understand FLP. The following section gives some suggestions for these developments.

One potential limitation of the scope of FLP is that due to many factors, FLP studies usually are sometimes only able to provide a record of a *particular moment* in a family's ever-evolving FLP. This observation is not restricted to FLP studies of course, as accounts of language use in general are often restricted to an in-depth understanding of a particular moment in time, nor is this to say that this 'particular moment' does not provide in-depth insight into FLP. However, in again returning to Canagarajah's (2008, p. 173) quote in the Introduction to this chapter, just as the family exists as a part of a sociohistorical trajectory, so too does it exist as part of its *own* trajectory. Long-term longitudinal studies (which I define as studies that span at least approximately four years) thus have the potential to advance understanding of the field significantly and provide valuable insight into the reflexive nature of family life and the wider community. A number of long-term longitudinal studies have been conducted by the parents of the children (for example, Ronjat, 1913; Leopold, 1939-1949; Fantini, 1985; Saunders, 1988; Caldas, 2006; Kopeliovich, 2013), a reality which may stem from the practicalities of such research and the fact that such longitudinal research often involves close relationships with the families. Caldas' (2006) study, for example, spans nineteen years in tracing his children's French-English development and maintaining close contact with a family that is not one's own for so long may be difficult. This is not to say that longitudinal studies are necessarily restricted to the researcher's own children, however; for example, Zentella's (1997) ten-year ethnography of the Puerto Rican community in New York City demonstrates how long-term longitudinal research conducted by a researcher other than the children's parents is not only feasible, but extremely valuable in expanding insight into the field. Similarly, my own eight-year ethnography of a Gaelic-speaking family demonstrates how long-term longitudinal research can be carried out by researchers who are initially very much 'outsiders' not only to the family, but also to the family's community and their language. In contrast to these very qualitative longitudinal approaches, quantitative approaches also play a role in gaining insights in FLP over a substantial period of time; for example, de Houwer and Bornstein's (2016) recent study captures the linguistic experiences of 25 children being raised with French and Dutch over a period of nearly four years.

Another way in which FLP methodologies can broaden the viewpoint of the field would be to employ methodologies designed specifically to elicit the *children's* views of their two (or more) languages. Even though the child's language use is in many ways the centre of FLP research, an understanding of the children's language ideologies and metalinguistic awareness is often obtained indirectly, either narrated through the caregivers' accounts or gleaned from the observations of the child's language use. Although these means of analysis are extremely valuable, it would be a further step to gain a more direct means of understanding the children's views of their languages, similar to the way that caregivers' language ideologies are elicited in interviews (for example, Kirsch, 2012). However, many of the children under investigation in FLP studies are in the relatively early stages of language acquisition and thus may have limited means to express themselves, not to mention the fact that their understanding of the world may be difficult to parse. The multi-modal methods employed in Crump's qualitative (2014) study of Japanese families in Montreal,

however, offer a number of innovations in this respect. Crump's study weaves together analysis of play-time, drawings, and the dialogue between the researcher and the child during these activities in arriving at an in-depth understanding of the children's multilingual identities and perceptions of multilingualism in their community. Similarly, Melo-Pfeifer's (2015) study of children being raised with Portuguese in Germany also sheds insight into ways into which researchers can gain a more child-centred perspective. In this quantitatively-oriented study, analysis of 956 drawings of children aged 6-12 reveals the importance of affective dimensions of FLP; Portuguese often conjures associations of sunshine and family, while the association with German varies. As photographing and recording devices become a frequently inexpensive part of everyday life, it is also possible to capture children's metalinguistic awareness and glimpses of their affective relationships with their languages via disposable cameras, mobile phones, tablets, etc., as demonstrated recently for example in Solovova's (2016) study of Russian-speaking children in Portugal.

In summary, the two main suggestions for future research in terms of methodology lie in gaining a deeper understanding of the family's trajectory *as a whole* and in gaining a deeper understanding of the children's views of their different languages. This last point provides the springboard for the next section, which will discuss possible future areas of focus, and in particular, the need for more research into the affective dimension of FLP research.

Areas of Focus

As King and Fogle (2013, p. 172) note in their review of the field to date, one of the recent shifts in focus has been highlighting the *child's* agency and their role in shaping the FLP, as exemplified in the work of Kulick (1992), Lanza (1997), Okita (2001), Cruz-Ferreira (2006), Gafaranga (2010, 2011), and Fogle (2012), for instance. This work has been formative in demonstrating how FLP is not simply a top-down process (in other words, caregiver to child), but instead is a dialogic and ever-evolving co-construction, which is in turn shaped by the dynamic relationship of the family to the wider community. Research in this vein has been fundamental to elucidating how language shift can take place at the microlevel (for example, Kulick, 1992; Gafaranga, 2010, 2011) and how this in turn plays a role in language shift at the community level. It has also provided insight into how linguistic competence can shape family roles and relationships; for example, recent work by He (2016) demonstrates how the child of first-generation Chinese immigrants in the United States can act as a linguistic and cultural broker for his parents and how in turn, the parents act as cultural brokers in terms of his heritage language. This dynamic in turn is formative both in shaping the evolving nature of this family's FLP and their roles vis-à-vis each other (see also Williams, 2005).

Continuing this new direction for the field would be fruitful in expanding the viewpoint of FLP, as would be examining the relationship between agency and the affective dimension of FLP. Pavlenko's (2004, 2006) well-known work on language and emotions demonstrates the role that emotions can play in caregivers' language choices with their children and a further direction for the field would be to examine this dimension in greater detail, and especially to examine the role that caregivers' use of a particular language in conjunction with acts of affect, such as, for example, disciplining the children in the minority language (*cf.* Kulick, 1992; Zentella, 1997; Luykx, 2003) have on the children's own language use. My work on FLP and Scottish Gaelic (2014, 2016), for example, concludes that one of the reasons for the children's low use of their minority language is that their father primarily restricts his use of Gaelic to disciplining them, and this, coupled with other realities in the family and wider

community, forms an association between the language and authority, thereby resulting in the children's negative emotional valence towards the language. Similarly, Meek's (2007) analysis of language use in the Liard River First Nation community in Canada demonstrates how the children use their minority language Kaska in taking up stances of authority vis-à-vis each other due to Kaska's association with authority figures, as the ongoing language shift means that the people who use the language most frequently are also the people who are in the highest positions of authority (in other words, the elders). However, this association of the minority language with older speakers can have the opposite effect; Melo-Pfeifer's (2015) study shows for example how associations of the minority language Portuguese with extended family members such as grandparents leads to positive affective associations with the language. As well, in her comparative study of two children growing up with Swiss German, French, and English, Chevalier (2012) shows how the interactive style of particular caregivers (in this case, one of the child's aunts) can lead to a positive affective resonance with the language and thereby to increased use of the language. Examining the different affective dimensions of multilingual families and how this shapes the child's language use and in turn, how this further impacts the FLP, is an important further direction for the field to take.

Related to this, in her keynote address at the Berlin conference, Lanza (2016) discussed the importance of bridging the gap between FLP research and psycholinguistic approaches to child multilingualism. This includes both the more affective dimensions of language and psychology, as well as multilingual acquisition research that is more psycholinguistically-oriented. A similar sentiment is strongly re-iterated in Tannenbaum's (2012) article, which introduces the re-conceptualisation of FLP within the psychological paradigm of defense and coping mechanisms and further concludes that this re-conceptualisation may not only be useful in looking at language use at the microlevel of the family, but also in examining the trajectory of language policy-making processes at the macrolevel, as many of these processes are embedded in emotionally-charged discourses. Tannenbaum (p. 64) further argues that given the centrality of emotions in family life, future FLP research should join together "psychological, psychoanalytical, and other psychodynamic approaches" instead of "viewing them as a by-product of such deep, multi-layered processes" as family multilingualism. Thus, a shift towards more psychologically-oriented approaches towards FLP may be integral to further advancing the field.

Finally, a greater understanding of the nexus between the wider community and language use in the family would be another step in advancing the field. One key way to do this is to look at the interaction between the family and the children's other main socialising agent: the school. In 2014, a workshop titled '**Language policy in the family, the preschool and the school: Theoretical and methodological directions**' was held prior to the Sociolinguistics Symposium 20 in Jyväskylä, Finland, during which FLP researchers explored the connections between state language policy, the school, and language use in the family. Additionally, the importance of broadening the contextual scope beyond the realm of the family is also apparent in Schwartz and Verschik's recent (2013) volume titled *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children, and Educators in Interaction* in which a number of chapters (Schwartz, Moin and Klayle; Moin, Protassova, Lukkari, and Schwartz; Conteh, Riasat, and Begum) specifically look at the intersection of language use in the school and in the home. Further, several articles in the 2012 special issue of *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* on FLP (Conteh; Lytra; Schwartz and Moin) also contribute to this new area of focus. Further broadening an understanding of the family-community nexus to looking specifically at the affective dimensions of this interrelationship would similarly

broaden FLP horizons. My own study, for example, showed how the child's association of the minority language with the school also contributed to the negative emotional valencing of the minority language and consequently, to its low use in the home.

In summary, shifting our attention to new directions of focus, which lie primarily in the psychological/affective realm, would be a yet another step further for the field. The section prior to this (Methodology) gave some suggestions about how to go about this particular step and as the dialogue continues and the outlook of FLP expands, we may be able to move in these new directions to uncover deeper layers of multilingualism in the family.

Conclusion

It is clear to see that in the years of its existence, FLP research has accomplished much already and is currently expanding to encompass new modes of innovation in understanding multilingualism in the family. Still, there is much we can still do and the aim of this chapter has been to give ideas for these further expansions and to provide an overview of the studies which are currently leading the way in these new directions. The chapter began by discussing how widening the contextual viewpoint is key to furthering the field and highlighted the main ways that this could be accomplished: by more research on autochthonous minority communities and especially on communities outside the bounds of Western, industrialised nations; by looking at a broader range of family types, including more in-depth research on the impact of extended family members and situations where parents are not using their native languages/the language(s) of the community; and finally, by comparing and contrasting FLPs in different contexts. The chapter went on to discuss how in terms of methodological approaches, more long-term longitudinal research and research that is designed explicitly to elicit the *child's* views of the language would be particularly fruitful in expanding the field. The final section drew on this latter point in discussing the need for more research oriented towards the affective dimensions of language use, as well as research designed to investigate the family-community nexus more thoroughly. As emphasised in the Introduction, there is much at stake in FLP research and it is our job as researchers to see that we move the field forward.

References

- Anastasi, A., & Cordova, F. A. (1953). Some effects of bilingualism upon the intelligence test performance of Puerto Rican children in New York City. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 44(1), 1–19.
- Altman, C., Feldman, Z., Yitzhaki, D., Lotem, S., & Walters, J. (2014). Family language policies, reported language use and proficiency in Russian – Hebrew bilingual children in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(3), 216–234.
- Bayley, R., Schecter, S., & Torres-Ayala, B. (1996). Strategies for Bilingual Maintenance: Case Studies of Mexican-Origin Families in Texas. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 389–408.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2004). *Language Strategies for Bilingual Families: The One-Parent One-Language Approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Canagarajah, S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(2), 143–176.
- Caldas, S. J. (2006). *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in monolingual cultures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Chatzidaki, A., & Maligkoudi, C. (2013). Family language policies among Albanian immigrants in Greece. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(6), 675–789.
- Chevalier, S. (2012). Active Trilingualism in Early Childhood: the motivating role of caregivers in interaction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 9(4), 437-454.
- Conteh, J. (2012). Families, pupils and teachers learning together in a multilingual British city. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 101–116.
- Conteh, J., Riasat, S., & Begum, S. (2013). *Children Learning Multilingually in Home, Community and School Contexts in Britain*. (M. Schwartz & A. Verschik, Eds.). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Crump, A. (2014). “*But your face, it looks like you’re English*”: *LangCrit and the Experiences of Multilingual Japanese-Canadian Children in Montreal*. Unpublished PhD thesis: McGill University.
- Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2006). *Three is a crowd?: Acquiring Portuguese in a trilingual environment*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8(4), 351–375.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2016): Conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices in Singaporean multilingual families, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2015.1127926
- De Houwer, A. (1990). *The Acquisition of Two Languages from Birth: A Case Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Döpke, S. (1992). *One Parent, One Language: An Interactional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- De Houwer, A. (2016). Minority language parenting in Europe and children's well-being. Keynote Address delivered at ‘Affective Factors in Home Language Maintenance and Development’ (AILA), Berlin.
- De Houwer, A. & Bornstein, M.H. (2016): Bilingual mothers’ language choice in child-directed speech: continuity and change, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2015.1127929
- Dumanig, F. P., David, M. K., & Shanmuganathan, T. (2013). Language choice and language policies in Filipino-Malaysian families in multilingual Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(6), 582–596.

- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schiefflin, B. (2011). *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fantini, A. E. (1985). *Language Acquisition of a Bilingual Child: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L. (2012). *Second language socialization and learner agency: Talk in three adoptive families*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L., & King, K. A. (2013). Child Agency and Language Policy in Transnational Families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19, 1–25.
- Gafaranga, J. (2010). Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society*, 39, 241–270.
- Gafaranga, J. (2011). Transition space medium repair: Language shift talked into being. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 118–135.
- Grosjean, F. (1992). Another view of bilingualism. *Advances in Psychology*, 83, 51–62.
- He, A. W. (2016): Discursive roles and responsibilities: a study of interactions in Chinese immigrant households, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2015.1127930
- Kasuya, H. (1998). Determinants of Language Choice in Bilingual Children: The Role of Input. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(3), 327–346.
- Kenner, C., Ruby, M., Jessel, J., Gregory, E., & Arju, T. (2007). Intergenerational learning between children and grandparents in east London. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 5(3), 219–243.
- King, K. A. (2000). Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(3), 167–184.
- King, K., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents' Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907–922.
- King, K. A., & Fogle, L. (2013). Family language policy and bilingual parenting. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 172–194.
- King, K.A. (2016): Language policy, multilingual encounters and transnational families, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*,

DOI:10.1080/01434632.2015.1127927

- Kirsch, C. (2012). Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 95–112.
- Kopeliovich, S. (2013). Happylingual: A Family Project for Enhancing and Balancing Multilingual Development. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy* (pp. 249–276). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: a sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, E. (2007). Multilingualism in the Family. In P. Auer & Li Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication* (pp. 45–69). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lanza, E. (2016). All in the family? The complexities of urban multilingualism. Keynote Address delivered at ‘Affective Factors in Home Language Maintenance and Development’ (AILA), Berlin.
- Leopold, W. (1939-1949). *Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist’s record*. Evanston: III.
- Levelt, W. (2014). *Sleeping Beauties: What had to be reinvented in psycholinguistics*. Public Lecture given at the University of Edinburgh.
- Li Wei. (1994). *Three Generations Two Languages One Family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Luykx, A. (2003). Weaving Languages Together: Family Language Policy and Gender Socialization in Bilingual Aymara Households. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies* (pp. 10–25). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lytra, V. (2012). Discursive constructions of language and identity: parents’ competing perspectives in London Turkish complementary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 85–100.
- Mishina-Mori, S. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of language choice in bilingual children: The role of parental input and interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3122–3138.
- Makihara, M. (2005). Rapa Nui ways of speaking Spanish: Language shift and socialization on Easter Island. *Language in Society*, 34(05), 727–762.

- Meek, B. A. (2007). Respecting the Language of Elders: Ideological Shift and Linguistic Discontinuity in a Northern Athapascan Community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(1), 23–43.
- Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2015). The role of the family in heritage language use and learning: impact on heritage language policies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(1), 26–44.
- Moin, V., Protassova, E., Lukkari, V., & Schwartz, M. (2013). The Role of Family Background in Early Bilingual Education: The Finnish-Russian Experience. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 53–82). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader* (2000th ed., pp. 151–86). London: Routledge.
- Ó hÍfearnáin, T. (2013). Family language policy, first language Irish speaker attitudes and community-based response to language shift. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(4), 348–365.
- Okita, T. (2001). *Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice, and Childrearing in Intermarried Families*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pillai, S., Soh, W.-Y., & Kajita, A. S. (2014). Family language policy and heritage language maintenance of Malacca Portuguese Creole. *Language and Communication*, 37, 75–85.
- Palviainen, Å., & Boyd, S. (2013). Unity in Discourse, Diversity in Practice: The One Person One Language Policy in Bilingual Families. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 223–248). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004). “Stop Doing That, Ia Komu Skazala !”: Language Choice and Emotions in Parent—Child Communication. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(2-3), 179–203.
- Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Emotions and Multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris: Champion.
- Ruby, M. (2012). The role of a grandmother in maintaining Bangla with her granddaughter in East London. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 67–83.
- Schiefflin, B., & Ochs, E. (1984). Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and their Implications. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader* (pp. 296–328). London: Blackwell.
- Schiefflin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language Socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.

- Schwartz, M. (2008). Exploring the Relationship between Family Language Policy and Heritage Language Knowledge Among Second Generation Russian–Jewish Immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(5), 400–418.
- Schwartz, M. (2010). Family Language Policy: Core Issues of an Emerging Field. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 171–192.
- Schwartz, M., & Moin, V. (2012). Parents’ assessment of their preschool children's bilingual development in the context of family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 35–55.
- Schwartz, M., Moin, V., & Klayle, M. (2013). Parents’ Choice of a Bilingual Hebrew-Arabic Kindergarten for the Children. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 53–82). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Schwartz, M., & Verschik, A. (2013). *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children, and Educators in Interaction*. London: Springer.
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2014). Being socialised in language shift: the impact of extended family members on family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 5(35), 511–526.
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2016). *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language in the Home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Solovova, O. Between the rational and the emotional: Russian language ideologies in migration contexts in Portugal. Paper delivered at ‘Affective Factors in Home Language Maintenance and Development’ (AILA), Berlin.
- Spolsky, B., & Shohamy, E. (2000). Language Practice, Language Ideology, and Language Policy. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 1–42). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy. Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 3–11.
- Stavans, A. (2012). Language policy and literacy practices in the family: the case of Ethiopian parental narrative input. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 13–33.
- Takeuchi, M. (2006). The Japanese Language Development of Children through the “One Parent–One Language” Approach in Melbourne. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(4), 319–331.
- Tannenbaum, M. (2012). Family language policy as a form of coping or defence mechanism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 57–66.

Williams, A. M. (2005). Fighting words and challenging expectations: language alternation and social roles in a family dispute. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 317-328. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.005

Yates, L., & Terraschke, A. (2013). Love, Language and Little Ones: Successes and Stresses for Mothers Raising Bilingual Children in Exogamous Relationships. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 105–126). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.