ROZHLEDY

Tamah Sherman – Magdalena Antonia Hromadová – Helena Özörencik –
Eliška Zaepernicková – Jiří Nekvapil

Two sociolinguistic perspectives on multilingual families*

ABSTRACT: Recent years have witnessed organized efforts to utilize social approaches to multi-
lingualism in research on families, and thus to further delimit the multilingual family as a particular
field of inquiry. This overview focuses on two recent such endeavors, a special issue of the journal
Language Policy entitled "Family Language Policy" (Curdt-Christiansen 2013) and a special issue
of the journal *Multilingua* entitled "Multilingual Communication in Binational Families: Nego-
tiating Languages, Identities and Everyday Tasks" (Ogiermann 2013). In this text, we review the
contributions to these issues in detail and explore how each issue contributes to the conception and
shaping of the multilingual family as the object of analysis. We consider the paradigms employed
and characterize how the two journal issues complement one another. We suggest that, in addition
to the family as a research focus and the presence of multiple languages, they are connected by the
presence of metalinguistic behavior. The idea emerges, then, that what is understood through the
lenses of policy and interaction might be more coherently interpreted through the lens of language
management in the sense of Jernudd & Neustupný (1987).

Key words: multilingualism, multilingual family, family language policy, metalinguistic behavior,
language management

0. Introduction

Research on language and communication in the family is not a new phenomenon,
not even when extended to bi- and multilingual families. Given the crucial role played
by the family in processes of language acquisition and socialization, issues of parent-
child and partner-partner communication on the micro-level (see Piller 2002; Pavlenko
2004), as well as interview-based studies on and overviews of the processes and social
aspects of bilingual childrearing (see e.g. Okita 2002; Lanza 2007; Nekvapil 2001)
have been extensive objects of inquiry. Recent years have witnessed increased inter-
est in these topics, with heavy consideration given to the highly specific institutional
character of the family. For example, as argued by Bastardas-Boada (2015), unlike
other social institutions dealing with multilingualism, families appear to promote
multidimensional language policy practices driven by the socio-economic context, but

also cognitive and emotional aspects. As such, self-organized family language behavior can be both strategic and rational, but often also unplanned and spontaneous.

These seemingly paradoxical aspects of family multilingualism have each recently been the subject of two special journal issues. The first is a special issue of the journal *Language Policy* entitled "Family Language Policy" (Curdt-Christiansen 2013) and the second is a special issue of the journal *Multilingua* entitled "Multilingual Communication in Binational Families: Negotiating Languages, Identities and Everyday Tasks" (Ogiermann 2013). In the text below, we consider the findings presented in these two journal issues, posing the questions of how each one approaches the family as the object of research and how the two issues complement one another, given the paradigms they utilize. We suggest that, in addition to the multilingual family as the focus of research, the two issues are connected via metalinguistic behavior done against a socioeconomic backdrop, which may be explicitly visible to varying degrees in the data analyzed.

1. A macro-perspective on multilingual families: the language policy paradigm

The first volume, the issue of *Language Policy*, presents metalinguistic behavior or manifestations of the attention devoted to language itself, as the point of departure. In the opening editorial, "Family language policy: sociopolitical reality versus linguistic continuity", Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen outlines the field of family language policy (hereafter FLP), an area defined as "emerging", which is attested to by a slew of recent publications (including King & Fogle 2006; King, Fogle & Logan-Terry 2008; Curdt-Christiansen 2009; Schwartz 2010; King & Fogle 2013; Schwartz & Verschik 2013). The scope of FLP is not limited to the study of *binational* bilingual families (generally speaking, those in which each parent has a different ethnolinguistic background) exclusively, but rather, it also includes transnational families (those in which both parents have the same ethnolinguistic background, but the family lives outside the country or region of its origin) or other families in which more than one language is of relevance, for example, families of speakers of autochthonous minority languages. Curdt-Christiansen (p. 1) postulates the following questions as central: "[…] why (and how) do members of some transnational families maintain their language while members of other families lose their language? How is it that some children, growing up in a largely monolingual society, become bilinguals while other children, growing up in a bilingual environment, become monolinguals? What policies and practices do parents implement to promote or discourage the use and practice of particular languages? And how are these language policies and practices negotiated in private domains, and concomitantly, related to broader ideologies of language and language education policies?" She also emphasizes that FLP is not, however, limited to the family domain, but also considers (p. 1) "the relevance and influence of economic, political and social structures and processes in a given society". FLP draws on the theoretical frameworks of language policy, language socialization, literacy studies and child language acquisition. In the specific context of frameworks for the study of language policy, FLP frequently examines the trio of language ideologies, language practices and language

management (Spolsky 2004). The volume, in Curdt-Christiansen's view, represents a shift from the view of the family as an exclusively private domain, with a focus on children's language acquisition in predominantly Western middle class families (cf. the concept of elite bilingualism in Skutnabb-Kangas 1984), to the examination of the family in its sociopolitical and socioeconomic context. This includes the expansion outward spatially – from home to school and other surroundings – placing state-controlled language socialization into potential conflict with the family-controlled one. It also presents an expanded range of FLP contexts, including "non-middle class, marginalized and under-studied transnational family types as well as Indigenous and endangered languages" (p. 2). The novel character of this approach also includes the strong emphasis on ethnographic research conducted within the families.

1.1. *Examples of intergenerational (dis)continuity of languages as an FLP issue*

In the volume's first paper, entitled "(Trans)national language ideologies and family language practices: a life history inquiry of Judeo-Spanish in Turkey", Lisya Seloni and Yusuf Sarfati provide an account of language loss undergone by the community of Sephardic Jews who settled in many municipalities around Ottoman Anatolia in the 15th century. This process appears to be another by-product of Turkey's transition from the multilingual traditional empire to a declared monolingual modern Turkish Republic starting in the late 1920s. As such, the language loss experienced by a community, which had been able to preserve its minority identity for over five hundred years, is embedded in more global historical processes. The authors depart from the framework of FLP and, together with others in the issue, point to the fact that family is an important site of language behavior research, in this case because the language loss is usually caused, in line with the ideas of J. Fishman (1991), by the lack of intergenerational transmission. An important objective of the study is, then, to approach two important issues of the discipline: the impact of language ideologies on language practice on one hand, and the interference between parental orientations towards language with official policies to which the community in question is subjected on the other hand. The research is based mainly on data from two oral history archives (*Ladino Database* and *Centropa Oral History Project*). Both were established rather recently to document and possibly preserve the Jewish and Judeo-Spanish culture in Turkey and the Balkans. Transcripts from 88 interviews were analyzed qualitatively as life history narratives in which the authors hope to obtain "Judeo-Spanish speakers' responses to dominant ideologies", as well as to reveal "webs of important family language practices" to then gain "deeper insights into how, why, and during what events Judeo-Spanish was used, negotiated, framed as an identity marker, or reflected as a whole" (p. 12). We observe here that such interviews provide rather the (re)construction of attitudes and facts in question which are provided ex-post by their actors. This fact is a highly relevant aspect of data interpretation. As the main part of their analysis, the authors provide several accounts of triangulation between historical facts and their own findings and illustrate their conclusions with quotations from the analyzed transcripts. Although the triangulation of information

acquired in various ways can be a highly relevant approach in some settings, in this particular case it brings, together with the specific nature of analyzed data, certain problems. It is not clear whether the agenda of presented analysis is set by the secondary literature or by issues which the respondents made relevant in their narratives, and to which point these two sources are relevant regarding each other. These issues could have been made more explicit by the authors, as expert attitudes to social phenomena, especially those connected to language, may be based on theoretically elaborated concepts which are not always relevant for social practice and its footprint in human memory.[1]

The second paper, by Gabriela Pérez Báez, is entitled "Family language policy, transnationalism and the diaspora community of San Lucas Quianviní of Oaxaca, Mexico". The first language of many community members is San Lucas Quianviní Zapotec (SLQZ), of which there are about 1500 speakers in San Lucas and about the same number in Los Angeles, California, USA. Children in San Lucas usually speak SLQZ, but children in Los Angeles do so only occasionally. In addition, the population of San Lucas is decreasing, especially children, which makes SLQZ an endangered language. In their home region, the community speaks mainly SLQZ and children acquire Spanish only later at school. Emigration to Los Angeles began in the 1970s, when men would work there for one or two years, and expanded until present-day permanent migration took shape, comprising whole families. However, return migration to San Lucas and re-emigration are still common and members of the emigrant community frequently travel to San Lucas. The author chose the term diaspora to underline the fact that the immigrant community and the community of origin influence each other bi-directionally (p. 30).

Pérez Báez is well aware that it is common for minority languages to become endangered by the majority language around them, it is, however, quite specific and of great interest that SLQZ is endangered mainly by migration. The aim of her paper is to explore family language policy among the San Lucas Quianviní, defining it based on King, Fogle & Logan-Terry (2008) as "what families actually do with language in day-to-day interactions; their beliefs and ideologies about language and language use; and their goals and efforts to shape language use and learning outcomes" (p. 29). With this aim, empirical data were collected through participant observation and interviews in San Lucas and Los Angeles between 2002 and 2011, serving as the basis for a case study, a community profile and spot checks (in line with Wölck's "tripartite model" – see Wölck 2004). It is important to mention here that this paper cites directly only from interviews where language usage inside the community is merely reported to the interviewer by the interviewee, i.e. it does not contain authentic communication of members of the SLQZ speaker community. FLP as it is explored here therefore relies on the views, concerns and beliefs of the interviewees (mainly San Lucas Quianviní mothers).

---

[1] The methodological challenge of confronting narrative interviews with other types of data regarding historical events has also been observed in older research dealing with FLP as a component of language biographies, see, for example, Nekvapil 2003 on the linguistic behavior of Germans who were not displaced from the former Czechoslovakia after World War II.

Based on their statements, the language usage of the diaspora community is explored in three areas: language use among adults, in parent-child communication and among children. The author suggests the FLP of the diaspora community lacks structure, which leads to language shift and endangers SLQZ. For this reason, she calls for more information for the SLQZ-speaking community about language revitalization and maintenance, as well as about the positive impacts of bi- or trilingualism. All of this aims at the strengthening of impact belief (De Houwer 1999) among the parents, so that they themselves learn to intervene in language processes and create structure for their family-internal language policies.

The third paper, by Donna Patrick, Gabriele Budach & Igah Muckpaloo, entitled "Multiliteracies and family language policy in an urban Inuit community", concerns the FLP and multiliteracy of one indigenous population living in Ottawa, Canada. The study is devoted to one of the three constitutionally acknowledged indigenous groups in Ottawa, the Inuits. The authors characterize urban Inuits, who are either first- or second-generation migrants to southern Canadian cities (p. 50), as transnationals. The study, using participant observation complemented with interviews, maps the language and cultural situation of the urban Inuits, but also due to collaboration with the Ottawa Inuit Children's Centre (OICC), provides real examples of the activities in support of the multiliteracy of Inuits which should help to increase the Inuits' funds of knowledge (Martin-Jones & Saxena 2003; Moll et al. 1992) and cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990) (p. 49). Examples of the activities provided by the OICC are illustrated by examples of verbal (transcribed) as well as authentic written texts. Like in the preceding article, which examines FLP in the context of a community undergoing processes of language shift, the authors encounter what they consider to be an inadequate state of policy, both "bottom-up" policy, in the family sphere and in other informal intergenerational contexts, and "top-down" state policy for language and education programs (p. 48). As the authors themselves write (p. 50), their contribution via the given study is above all an attempt to further build upon and add to "the (still small) body of research on urban Inuit, Indigenous family language policies, and Indigenous literacies".

The central part of the study is devoted to the description and analysis of two educational activities of the OICC conducted with the aim of connecting urban Inuits with their Arctic homeland and transferring native knowledge through the oral tradition within communities rather than mediated through institutions such as museums. The first activity, called "Photovoice", used photography in order to stimulate cultural capital and to connect the urban world with the Arctic one. The children and their parents are motivated to create a story in Inuktitut, the Inuits' language, using photographs with Arctic themes (e.g. seal, bear, Inuit hunter) and then put it into written form. This process supports intergenerational dialogue, and at the same time places the parents in a significant position, in which they have the opportunity to not only help with the development of their children's writing skills, but also with the creation of a coherent story. The second activity utilizes a tangible object, a fishing rod, to promote the learning of culturally relevant Inuktitut vocabulary used to sing a fishing song.

Both activities, through the use of visual, oral and written modes enable the transfer of the educational activity into the home and thus even the direct stimulation of the creation of FLP and the family practice of language education.

The fourth paper, "Prolepsis, reciprocity and syncretism in early language and bi-literacy practices: A case study of family language policy in Singapore" by Li Ren a Guangwei Hu, is a study which attempts to incorporate two parallel research strands, FLP and family literacy practices, into research on early language acquisition in the family setting. The study utilizes ethnographic methods, through which it attempts to provide answers to questions concerning the providers of language socialization to the children in the household, the factors influencing the language beliefs, practices and management in the families and language socialization providers, and last but not least, the relationship between the concepts of prolepsis, syncretism and synergy (Gregory 2008), the understanding of the mechanism of FLP, and the relationship between its individual components. The study is a part of a more extensive ethnographic project comparing family practices of language education and language itself in two different communities in Singapore – Singaporean Chinese families and immigrant families from mainland China. The study deals with the language policy of two representative Chinese-English bilingual families, placing their approaches to their children's language education into contrast. It shows how both internal factors (experience with the education and raising of the older child, culturally based educational principles handed down from generation to generation) and external factors (Singaporean nation-building policy, pressure from educational authorities) can influence the language socialization of the children and FLP. Attention is also devoted to the influence of individual family members, not only parents, but above all grandparents and siblings, on the development of the language education of the children. The influence of the siblings is demonstrated, among others, by two interview excerpts from everyday interaction in one of the families under study. The study stands out through its comprehensive structure, detailed analysis, and extensive amount of multiple types of data. Yet, as the authors themselves mention, it covers only one stratum of Singapore's Chinese population. Also, the results of the children's language education are not measured in any way that would lend itself to comparison; hence the effectivity of the individual family language policies cannot be evaluated from that perspective.

The fifth and final paper of the issue, "Parental ethnotheories and family language policy in transnational adoptive families" by Lyn Wright Fogle, focuses on family language policies conducted by American adoptive parents coping with adoptees from Russian language backgrounds. The analysis pursues various goals. For the most complex one, similarly to others in this issue, the author seeks to shed more light on the role of language ideologies in FLP, which, as the author argues "can help to explain the factors that mediate societal level realities (e.g. the dominance of one language over the other) with family internal processes (e.g. the choice of one language or another in family interactions)" (p. 99). Here, the ideologies in question do not (directly) concern macro-factors of social life, but rather, various aspects of the role of language in parenting and the private sphere of family life. This attitude is expressed in the central

notion of parental *ethnotheory*, defined along with Harkness & Super (2006) as a set of "beliefs that parents have about childrearing and the role of children in society" (p. 85). The tendency to explain "language and education family policies by representing children through the use of category labels and descriptors" (p. 89) emerged as relevant in the analyzed data. As far as the role of language in forming the transnational adoptive family is concerned, ethnotheories embedded in relevant categories seem to be based not on the perception of the adoptees as speakers of a different language, but rather, as children with a specific personal history. FLP is thus formed not only by attitudes to language but also by ideas of proper parenting and family formation and reflect "macro level processes in society" (p. 98) as well as personal preferences and emotional needs. Family language policies therefore appear highly complex and complicated, including monolingually oriented steps as well as attitudes supporting the English--Russian bilingualism of transnational adoptees. Adoptive parents' ethnotheories were reconstructed based on analysis of data attained in "open-ended" interviews (p. 88). The set of questions is presented in the appendix of the study, and it reveals that the interview was focused on overall strategies and opinions and less on everyday practice and interaction in the family coping with an adoptee with a different language background. This focus corresponds with the objective of the study to reveal relevant ideologies. On the other hand, it provides less information on how these ideologies influence patterns of language practices. The deficit of information on actual language practice might thus be addressed in a potential follow-up study, which could show how the detected language ideologies actually influenced FLP in the long run.

1.2. *Discussion*

Overall, the volume presents a broad and colorful collection of case studies providing a wealth of information on ethnolinguistic groups not commonly discussed in the literature. There is an overarching theme of languages which are defined as "minority or endangered", which in three of the articles (Pérez Báez, Seloni & Sarfati, Patrick et al.) corresponds to the traditional definition of such languages. Ultimately, all three articles appear to be describing stages of language shift ranging from 5 to 8 on Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Interruption Scale (Fishman 1991). While Pérez Báez and Seloni & Sarfati identify these stages as problematic and consider their research to be a potential basis for the active initiation of processes geared toward reversing language shift, Patrick et al. describe a program designed for this very purpose. In the remaining texts (Fogle, Ren & Hu), the "endangerment" of the languages in question (Russian, varieties of Chinese) stems from the fact that they are not the language predominantly spoken and/or promoted in the children's surroundings, despite the existence of other surroundings (national states) in which they would theoretically take on this role.

Despite their differences, both types of research situations correspond to what Curdt-Christiansen writes in the introduction (p. 3) – that the volume looks at "how family members surrender to external forces by ceasing the cultural and linguistic practices of their heritage language". We can pose the question of whose conception of "surrender"

we are talking about here – that of the research participants or that of the researchers. In all papers, the socioeconomic background of the potential language shift is made relevant to a certain degree, yet the specifically *socioeconomic* conditions for reversing it, even in the context of the family, receive less attention. In the Pérez Báez and Seloni & Sarfati articles in particular, the reader does not receive an entirely clear picture of the degree to which the imminent language shift was perceived as a problem by the research participants themselves. The only study containing feedback by the relevant group is by Patrick et al. Their described pedagogical methods utilizing the "recontextualization" of objects (such as the fishing rod described above) in order to strengthen the insufficient state of "bottom-up" policy in indigenous families are a non-forceful means which can help to improve revitalization efforts not only in Canada. In comparison to the thematically similar study by Peréz Báez, however, this study does not place sufficient emphasis on the connections between FLP and the language ideologies of the studied group. As Peréz Báez shows, it is language ideologies which prevent the development or even the existence of FLP, yet no attention is devoted to the ideologies themselves. However, this very shortcoming serves as an inspiring point of departure in this research area. Connections between the experiences described by Peréz Báez together with the authentic revitalization activities described in the Patrick et al. paper form a very good knowledge base of good practices for improving the uncertain status of indigenous languages.

These observations lead us back to another statement made by Curdt-Christiansen in the introduction (p. 5): "Importantly, as FLP is the key factor leading to practices of continuity or discontinuity of heritage and minority languages, unpacking the relationships between micro and macro level policies can yield important insights into the everyday processes of language use and communicative practices, and can thus lead to better practices and policies to support language maintenance." We can pose the question of what is meant by "micro" in this conception of language policy. The *Language Policy* volume contains quite a bit of interesting information on the declarative level of policies concerning intergenerational (dis)continuity of languages, yet less when it comes to actually showing the everyday practices hinted at above. The papers draw on the three-component concept of language policy advocated by Spolsky (starting with Spolsky 2004), in which, as recently stressed by Johnson (2013), language practices are not separated from language policy (see also Nekvapil 2014).

2. A micro-perspective on multilingual families: the interaction paradigm

It is, in fact, the insufficient representation of micro-level data in policy-oriented studies on the family which served as one of the stimuli for the publication of the second volume we discuss here. This special issue of *Multilingua* (Ogiermann 2013), is devoted to "binational families", which are understood here as families in which "there was a strong awareness of two cultural/linguistic elements" (p. 435). The topic's declared relevance is the (perhaps questionable) "growing geographical mobility" leading to "increased migration" (ibid.). But the focus of the issue is, in fact, even narrower. All

of the families studied were living in (Western) Europe at the time of the research, and for the most part, one member of the family (most often the female half of the couple) was an economic and/or political migrant (from Russia, Poland, Morocco or Zambia). The overarching theoretical-methodological approach is an interactional one – all but one of the studies are grounded in the analysis of recordings of naturally-occurring family interaction, which is presented as a further methodological development, as previous work had been done mainly on the basis of (highly structured) interviews and questionnaires. Meal preparation and consumption, understood as a prototypical family activity limited to a recordable space, is one of the central activities in the analyzed interactions. The focus in each article differs, in some cases it is more on parent-child interaction (including stepparents), in some cases more on interaction between the members of the couple. The theoretical-methodological framework of each study is different, though all are based in sociolinguistics and sociology. There is a varying focus on different family members, but all of the studies point to a link between identity construction and bilingual practices.

2.1. *Acting out language issues in families*

The first paper in the issue, Kirsten L. Kolstrup's "'You're not in charge here': Negotiations of control and connection in a binational stepfamily", provides a case study of communication practice in a multinational and multilingual stepfamily to explore how control and connection are negotiated in these settings. Its goal is to show the interplay between the negotiation of language and the negotiation of family order. The case study concerns a family with one Danish daughter living with her biological father, and his new wife, whose mother tongue is Bemba but who speaks primarily English with her husband. The analysis is based on recordings of both natural communicative interaction, recorded by the stepmother, and her narrative, recorded by the author. The author summarizes various concepts elaborated by linguists and anthropologists, all depicting the fact that family is a structure organized along the two axes of hierarchy and closeness (Tannen 2001). The dichotomy of control and connection by Tannen (2007) is selected as an analytical tool to illustrate how the stepfamily modifies the prototypical overlap of biological, emotional and socio-cultural aspects present in a family. Challenges experienced by a stepparent related to having a say in raising the stepchild (p. 444), are approached via the notion of legitimacy as introduced by Bourdieu (1977). Legitimacy in this sense applies to all of an individual's social activities and constitutes the precursor of all socially relevant actions as only those who are correspondingly authorized might conduct them. In this view, the stepparents are those who lack sources of parental legitimacy and, if claiming it, need to gain it through negotiation. The distinction between positional and linguistic alignment done in this context is particularly worthy of appreciation because, as successfully illustrated by the author of this paper, the stepparent, in attempting to ensure his/her position by using the language of the rest of the family, may achieve legitimacy as a speaker, while his/her legitimacy as a parent is being dismissed.

The second paper, by Eva Ogiermann, entitled "On the inclusive and exclusive functions of the 'other' language in family talk", uses the micro-analysis of family interactions in Polish-British binational (step)families living in the UK in order to explore the functions of individual instances of code-switching in situations in which there is an imbalance in linguistic competence, and in which ratified participants (Goffman 1979) may be constrained. On the macro-level, the topic is particularly relevant – the Polish presence in the United Kingdom has been strong ever since the UK opened its borders to workers from EU new member states in 2004, leading to an increased number of Polish-British families. The specific focus of the article is the effect of the presence of the two languages on the British (in all cases, male) partner, who frequently lacks advanced competence in Polish – the linguistic competence in the family is thus imbalanced. The study thus reflects the perspectives of the receiving society (as opposed to those of the immigrant one). The material consists of video recordings of families and supplemental interviews with them. Ogiermann analyzes four examples from food preparation situations in two different families – interactions transcribed using conventions from conversation analysis (inspired above all by Auer 1984), though the analysis itself is based on Goffman's participation framework, specifically the concept of footing (Goffman 1979). The study is not purely conversation-analytic in that it does not consider identities as being exclusively situated or "done" in interaction, but rather, it also considers the relevance of certain macro-factors which have been uncovered through supplemental interviews. In each of the four analyzed examples, there is a ratified participant who is "constrained by language competence" (p. 466). In the first example, a British father, though he has some knowledge of Polish, switches to English in addressing his wife in order to interpret an unclear turn produced by his daughter, but switches to Polish in order to actually address his daughter. In the second example, this same British father is addressed by his Polish wife in English in the context of a conversation taking place with their two children in Polish, which is interpreted as "an ascription of incompetence and exclusion from a group of bilingual speakers" (p. 473). In the third example, a Polish mother chooses the language (English or Polish) in individual turns with the purpose of including individual speakers and, at the same time, to facilitate her son's bilingual acquisition in the presence of a stepfather and stepbrother who do not speak any Polish. The fourth example (the same family as in the third example) involves an instance of schisming, in which a participant introduces a turn to only some of the participants, resulting in those participants breaking away from the original interaction and creating two simultaneous floors. This is initiated by the son addressing his mother in Polish while an English interaction is going on. In the ensuing Polish interaction between mother and son, the stepfather is mentioned, even though he does not understand. The stepfather makes his awareness of the exclusion clear by asking his son in English if he has understood the parallel Polish interaction. This example shows that the bilingual participants decide what is relevant for the monolingual participants, engaging in participant-related code-switching, which may be problematic, as the monolingual participants express the desire to be treated as ratified participants. Ogiermann concludes by pointing out that the interactional

practices in the family interactions are related primarily to the British male partner's level of Polish, as well the strategies employed for bilingual childrearing (e.g. "one parent, one language"). The British participants orient to language choice as a possible form of exclusion, making participant-related language choice an unavoidably sensitive issue in the families.

In the volume's third paper, entitled "The role of online communication in raising awareness of bilingual identity", Dawn Marley explores the impact of computer-mediated communication (CMC) on her own children, in terms of attitudes towards Moroccan Arabic (MA), the language of their father, and the negotiation of their identity. At the time of the study, the children involved were 14, 12 and 9 years old and lived with their mother, a native speaker of English, and their father, a native speaker of MA, in England, where they have spent all their lives, only occasionally visiting Morocco for holidays. The fact that the researcher has a very close relationship to the participants is reflected explicitly and evaluated as beneficial, as this enriches the background information and enables long-term observation. The data reflected in this paper were gathered over a period of six months and include participant observation, recordings of six mealtime conversations from the nuclear family and the transcript of eight records of written online conversation between the children living in the UK and their Moroccan cousins. Marley states that CMC is "leading to new forms of 'imagined communities'" (p. 485), since "the Internet may be seen as a means of promoting the cause of minority languages" (p. 489) and "language use is inextricably tied up with identity, since it is through language that we express our own identity" (p. 487). Further, she works with the distinction between marked and unmarked codes (based on Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model, Myers-Scotton 1983), which differ for each conversation and each speaker. For conversations in the nuclear family, as the "one parent, one language model" is applied, the unmarked code of the mother is English, while for the father it is MA when addressing the children and English or even French when addressing the mother. For the children, English seems to be the only unmarked language choice for conversations within their home in England and within the nuclear family. This becomes clear also through the analyses of two dinnertime conversations of the family, which tend to have educational character when it comes to MA and French. The use of these languages seems "natural" only for the father, while the children mostly avoid speaking any other language than English and the situation very much resembles a language classroom, in which the use of other languages is elicited by the parents as if in the role of teachers. The children do prove to be passively bilingual, but also show that they feel uncomfortable and insecure speaking MA.

The fourth paper, by Liliane Meyer Pitton, entitled "From language maintenance to bilingual parenting: Negotiating behavior and language choice at the dinner table in binational-bilingual families", came about as part of a project called *Multilingualism in social and vocational settings*. The object of the presented research was Russian-French speaking couples with young children living in Switzerland and the linguistic behavior of these families. Both the project and this paper are based on two main premises. First, it is argued that language maintenance may not only be seen as something

achieved in a macro-social framework, but actually happens within everyday interaction. This interaction itself is always bilingual or even multilingual, since language maintenance becomes an issue only if there is at least one other language involved. Therefore, language maintenance means not only the passing on of one language, but rather, its specific combination with another language. Secondly, the author states that when the researcher is analyzing situations in which two languages are combined on the micro-level, it cannot be assumed that language is usually the primary concern of these conversations. In family conversations, parents are not only dealing with language, but they are primarily raising their children. For this reason, Meyer Pitton applies the language socialization approach (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984), which suggests that acquiring language is always part of socialization. She further develops this theory, saying that bilingual socialization always means "socialization through the use of two (or more) languages and socialization to use two (or more) languages" (p. 510). Through the analysis of these processes, language maintenance can be studied.

All three analyzed extracts contain Russian as well as French utterances, and their main focus lies on the behavior of the children. They are subjected to conversation analysis with a special regard to different types of repair movements. In the three mealtime conversations, which occurred in different families, there is only one case of an "explicit language lesson" (p. 522), in all other instances language is, rather, a factor influencing other processes. Very often, it is a medium helping to underline or realize certain aspects of the concrete situation. In the first example, an elder sibling uses Russian to align with his mother when telling his brother he hasn't asked for dessert in the right way. In excerpt two, a Russian-speaking mother uses her own language to display authority when facing her small daughter. Only in excerpt three does language itself become an issue, as the two boys have to ask for dessert in Russian in addition to finishing their main course in order to "qualify" for getting dessert. All three excerpts show parents occupied mainly with educating their children in general, with language choice strategies as an integral part of this process. This supports the author's assumption that language maintenance is rarely only about passing a language on, but rather, also about socializing children bilingually.

The fifth and final paper of the issue, "'Cooking lunch, that's Swiss': Constructing hybrid identities based on socio-cultural practices", by Kellie Gonçalves, attempts to provide a picture of the negotiation and formation of hybrid identities in binational Swiss German-English-speaking couples, based on the analysis of interviews. Her analysis is based on Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) sociocultural linguistic model, which conceives of identity as something that emerges in social interaction, thus allowing for its investigation at various analytical levels (p. 527). This article's main contribution is above all its concentration on the everyday sociocultural customs and habits discussed by the couples. In addition, the analysis of the materials is considerably detailed, taking place on three analytical levels departing from Bucholtz and Hall's framework: (a) demographic categories on the macro-level, (b) local, ethnographically specific cultural attitudes, and (c) temporary and interactionally specific states and participant roles (p. 529–530). The author devotes detailed attention to the means used by her respondents

to construct their identities as well as the identities of others in the interactions, e.g. prosodically marked utterances, the use of pronouns, and code-switching. The material basis for the study includes not only interviews, but also field notes and observation, helping to provide further basic information about the participants which was then utilized in the analysis. The interviews were conducted using a method known as "conversations with a purpose", the structure of which is not pre-determined, thus providing the researcher with a sufficient degree of flexibility, but still allowing him or her to control the situation (p. 532).

This is the only article in the *Multilingua* issue which does not primarily involve the analysis of multilingual talk, or even interview data referring to such talk (this is mentioned minimally). The participants are identified as "Anglophones married to German-speaking Swiss" (p. 527), yet the language aspect of the family life and its connection to identity is limited to the one instance of an American participant "doing Swiss" by pronouncing the names of certain foods in the Bernese (local) variety of Swiss German during an interview conducted in English. The researcher's own identity as an American living in Switzerland cannot be separated from the couples' talk. In the first excerpt, for example, she herself introduces the concept of "Swiss identity" (p. 535, example 1, line 5), and in the second excerpt, she is the one who first says "you now make lunches" (p. 537, example 2, line 70). In the third excerpt, the discussion of making lunches is in response to her question (p. 539, example 3, line 1). Given the amount of data shown, the reader may then question the degree to which the food-related topics emerged on their own. Finally, given the focus on prosodically marked utterances, it should be noted that the article lacks the full utilization of potential resources for the transcription and analysis of such utterances, which would allow for a more thorough analysis and convincing illustration of certain aspects of the examples.

2.2. *Discussion*

Overall, the issue highlights interaction in the family as a collection of everyday practices. Metalinguistic behavior appears in all of the texts, e.g. in the form of exposed corrections and code-switching. The participants are also constantly trying to maximize harmony between progressivity and intersubjectivity (as has also been observed elsewhere, see Markaki et al. 2013) – they attempt to continue in the flow of talk while at the same time monitoring whether all relevant participants understand what is being said, and, often in the case of the parents, whether their children are using the appropriate language and doing so correctly. There is also an interesting presentation of asymmetries in the linguistic competence of individual family members. These texts serve as evidence that even despite the best efforts to treat languages as equal within the family, languages are not (and never have been or will be) equal in terms of their socioeconomic status and the cultural capital tied to their knowledge in a given society and in the global context. In most of the families studied, there is a language associated with the parent living in the country of his or her origin, which is typically found in Western Europe, and a language associated with the parent who is an immigrant,

typically coming from areas to the east and south. The problems occurring in interaction are often related to both children's and parents' lack of exposure to the "immigrant" language. In societies where multilingualism is mostly practiced in the private sphere (e.g. selected European nation-states), the maintenance of immigrant languages always presents a hefty challenge in mixed families, unless those languages are tied to significant capital internationally (e.g. English). In wealthier countries such as Switzerland and Denmark, on the other hand, the supply of English is sufficient, and focus thus shifts to parents' competence in local language varieties (Swiss German, Danish) in order to achieve local legitimacy. In the Gonçalves text, the women interviewed have often undergone a transformation en route to Swiss "authenticity", the ultimate achievement of which is connected to certain home activities, not being employed outside the home, as well as competence in Swiss German. This example is one of several that suggest that this specific socioeconomic backdrop may also include a gender dimension. Another can be found in the Ogiermann article, in which the English fathers either do not have competence in Polish or are just beginning to learn it, which often leads to extra "invisible work" (to recall the concept used by Toshie Okita in 2002, though with a slightly different connotation) in interactions on the part of the Polish mothers.

3. Conclusion

The publication of these two volumes reflects some general tendencies in sociolinguistic research on multilingualism, multilingual interaction, and language policy, planning and management. In comparison to other domains traditionally examined in these areas (schools, workplaces, official institutions, and the like), the family presents a highly accessible research site which allows for the collection of multiple types of data – audio and video recordings, different types of interviews, and also for longitudinal examinations of members of a given family. In fact, it is not uncommon for researchers to collect data in their own families, as could be observed in particular in the *Multilingua* volume. This accessibility can be both a boon and liability, as it can shed light on previously unresearched constellations, but it can also continue in the over-representation of educated elites in the description of bilingual practices (as stated in the introduction to the *Language Policy* volume). Although the *Multilingua* volume responds to the need for more detailed analysis of interaction in multilingual families, it can be argued that many of the families studied there represent highly specific constellations which often elude the area of official policy and are mostly expected to be managed on an ad hoc basis by the family members themselves.

Though it does employ ethnographic methods, the *Language Policy* volume explores the family from a specific macro-perspective, depicting the family as one of the major players in the transmission of important, endangered cultural heritage, outlining the factors which prevent this transmission, and presenting examples of good practice which can serve, at least for a time, to help reverse language shift. In doing so, it delves into the less commonly explored relationship between language practices in the family and in other institutions (schools, national governments). The family is the clear focus,

but it is also emphasized that the family does not exist in isolation. The *Multilingua* volume complements this by showing the day-to-day efforts and problems connected to family-specific interaction – the concept of "family" is represented by certain types of interactional activities during which language socialization takes place (or does not take place), above all cooking, eating and spending free time together at home. Both volumes, then, are connected through their extensive description of different types of metalinguistic behavior, or language management (see Nekvapil & Sherman 2014, 2015). Of particular interest here is that language management research focuses on the interconnection between language, communication and sociocultural/socioeconomic management, which, in short, presumes that certain aspects of language and its use can only be adjusted if the "external" social conditions allow for it. The articles in both volumes demonstrate that this interconnection is *always* present, and if individuals and societies decide that family multilingualism is positive and desirable, they must closely examine the processes through which it takes place.

It can be argued, then, that what has been grouped in each volume under the headings of policy and interaction, respectively, might be better understood and connected through the view of these practices as management, more precisely, "organized management" and "simple management", that is, through the concepts constituting one of the basic distinctions within Language Management Theory (Jernudd & Neustupný 1987; Nekvapil & Sherman 2014, 2015). Policy represents organized management while interaction underlies simple management, and the main challenge would be to elucidate their interplay.

REFERENCES

Auer, P. (1984): *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bastardas-Boada, A. (2015): Language (self)organization in linguistically mixed families: Some preliminary results. Unpublished speech delivered at GLOBLINMED Workshop, 6th February 2015, University of Barcelona.

Bourdieu, P. (1977): The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16 (6), 645–668.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1990): *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2004): Language and identity. In: A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 369–394.

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, 351–375.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (ed.) (2013): *Family Language Policy. Language Policy* 12 (1). Thematic issue.

De Houwer, A. (1999): Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In: G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (eds.), *Studies on Language Acquisition*. 14th edition. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 75–95.

Fishman, J. (1991): *Reversing Language Shift*: *Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Goffman, E. (1979): Footing. *Semiotica* 25, 1–29.

Gregory, E. (2008): *Learning to Read in a New Language: Making Sense of Words and Worlds*. 2nd edition. London: Sage Publications.

Harkness, S. & Super, C. (2006): Themes and variations: Parental ethnotheories in Western cultures. In: K. Rubin & O. B. Chung (eds.), *Parenting Beliefs, Behaviors, and Parent-Child Relations: A Cross Cultural Perspective*. New York: Psychology Press, 61–80.

Jernudd, B. H. & Neustupný, J. V. (1987): Language planning: for whom? In: L. Laforge (ed.), *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique / Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval, 69–84.

Johnson, D. C. (2013): *Language Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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. W. (2013): Family language policy and bilingual parenting. *Language Teaching* 46 (2), 172–194.

King, K. A., Fogle, L. & Logan-Terry, A. (2008): Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2 (5), 907–922.

Lanza, E. (2007): Multilingualism in the family. In: P. Auer & Wei Li (eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 45–67.

Markaki, V., Merlino, S., Mondada, L., Oloff, F. & Traverso, V. (2013): Multilingual practices in professional settings: Keeping the delicate balance between progressivity and intersubjectivity. In: A.-C. Berthoud, F. Grin & G. Lüdi (eds.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Multilingualism: The DYLAN Project*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–32.

Martin-Jones, M. & Saxena, M. (2003): Bilingual resources and 'funds of knowledge' for teaching and learning in multi-ethnic classrooms. In: A. Creese & P. Martin (eds.), *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 107–122.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992): Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and communities. *Theory and Practice* 31, 132–141.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1983): The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44, 115–136.

Nekvapil, J. (2001): From the biographical narratives of Czech Germans: Language biographies in the family of Mr. and Mrs. S. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 11, 77–99.

Nekvapil, J. (2003): Language biographies and the analysis of language situations: On the life of the German community in the Czech Republic. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 63–83.

Nekvapil, J. (2014): [Review of:] David Cassels Johnson: Language Policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75, 361–365.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2014): Jazykový management a teorie jazykového managementu: úvodní poznámky. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75, 245–254.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2015): Language Management Theory in Language Policy and Planning: An introduction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 232, 1–12.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984): Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In: R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 276–320.

Ogiermann, E. (ed.) (2013): *Multilingual Communication in Binational Families: Negotiating Languages, Identities and Everyday Tasks. Multilingua* 32 (4). Special issue.

Okita, T. (2002): *Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice and Childrearing in Intermarried Families*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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.

Piller, I. (2002): *Bilingual Couples Talk: The Discursive Construction of Hybridity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schwartz, M. (2010): Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. *Applied Linguistics Review* 1 (1), 171–191.

Sᴄʜᴡᴀʀᴛᴢ, M. & Vᴇʀsᴄʜɪᴋ, A. (eds.) (2013): *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Sᴋᴜᴛɴᴀʙʙ-Kᴀɴɢᴀs, T. (1984): *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Sᴘᴏʟsᴋʏ, B. (2004): *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tᴀɴɴᴇɴ, D. (2001): *I Only Say This Because I Love You.* New York: Ballantine.

Tᴀɴɴᴇɴ, D. (2007): Power maneuvers and connection maneuvers in family interaction. In: D. Tannen, S. Kendall & C. Gordon (eds.), *Family Talk: Discourse and Identity in Four American Families*. New York: Oxford University Press, 27–48.

Wöʟᴄᴋ, W. (2004): Sampling and interviewing: Community profiles revisited. In: P. H. Nelde (ed.), *Mehrsprachigkeit, Minderheiten und Sprachwandel / Multilingualism, Minorities, and Language Change* (= *Plurilingua* 28). St. Augustin: Asgard Verlag, 167–172.

RÉSUMÉ

Dva sociolingvistické přístupy k výzkumu mnohojazyčných rodin

Tento text představuje a analyzuje dva aktuální příspěvky k různým formám sociolingvistického zkoumání mnohojazyčných rodin, zvláštní vydání časopisu Language Policy nazvané Family Language Policy (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013) a monotematické číslo časopisu Multilingua nazvané Multilingual Communication in Binational Families: Negotiating Language, Identities and Everyday Tasks (Ogiermann, 2013). Text identifikuje a komentuje výzkumná paradigmata, na nichž jsou příspěvky v těchto zvláštních číslech založeny. Podrobně se věnuje především odlišnému přístupu ke zkoumání metajazykového chování: analýze makroperspektivy jazykové politiky (Language Policy) a mikroperspektivy konkrétních interakcí (Multilingua). Text popisuje, jak se tyto dva komplementární pohledy podílejí na konceptualizaci mnohojazyčné rodiny jako výzkumného objektu, a naznačuje možnosti, jak je v duchu teorie jazykového managementu (Nekvapil – Sherman, 2014) koherentně propojit.

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<tamah.sherman@ff.cuni.cz>

Institute of Czech Language and Theory of Communication, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<hromadova.magdalena@gmail.com>

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<helenaozorencik@gmail.com>

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
Institute of Phonetics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<eliska.zaepernickova@mensa.cz>

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<jiri.nekvapil@ff.cuni.cz>