≪講演録≫

ファミリー・ランゲージ・ポリシー

― コロナ時代における成長の痛みと新たな方向性―

キング ケンドール（ミネソタ大学）

Family language policy: Growing pains and new directions in COVID times

KING Kendall (University of Minnesota)

要旨

この 10 年間、「ファミリー・ランゲージ・ポリシー」(Family Language Policy、以下 FLP) という旗印のもとに、大規模かつ多様な研究が集結してきた。本講演では、FLP 研究の近年の発展と進歩を振り返り、この分野に対する批判、成長期に生じる成長痛、新しい方向性について考える。重要な批判としては、過去の研究に誰が参加したのか、何をもって「家族」としたのか、どのようにデータを収集し、分析したのか、などについての限界があげられる。FLP の研究者がコロナ禍の文脈で研究を進めるなかで、これらの成長の痛みが、方法論と研究の焦点における新たな方向性、新たな問いへと向かわせている。例をあげると、「長引く隔離期間は子どもの母語 / 継承語や、学校 / 社会の言語の習得にどのような影響を与えるか」、「今や至る所に存在するビデオ技術は、私たちが交流する相手とその方法にどう影響しているか」、「多くの文脈でパンデミックを特徴づけているサービスへのアクセスが不均等であることを考えると、教育の公平性にどのような持続的影響が生じるだろうか」などである。実際、FLP に関する問題は、新型コロナの大流行がもたらした無数の社会的、経済的、精神的危機に照らして考えると、より重要性を増していると思われる。新型コロナ感染拡大による隔離期間は、世界中で「家族」という単位を強固なものにしたが、同時に「家族」に非常に大きなストレスを与え、ジェンダー、経済、人種的平等におけるここ数十年の成果を、覆さないまでも脅かすことになった。この講演で示されるように、パンデミックとそれに伴う社会的、文化的、経済的な変化は、これまで以上に、FLP を現実的な課題に直結させ、重要で不可欠なものにしている。

Abstract

Over the last decade, a large and diverse body of research has coalesced under the banner of ‘family language policy’ (FLP). This talk reviews recent advances and developments in FLP research, considering critiques of the field, growing pains and new directions. Important critiques include limitations of who participated in past studies, what counted as ‘family’, and how that data was collected and analyzed. As FLP researchers advance their work in COVID contexts, these growing pains have prompted new directions in methodology and focus as well as new questions. These include: ‘What will the impact of extended quarantines be on child acquisition of home/heritage languages and on school/societal languages?’, ‘How does now near ubiquitous video technology shape who we interact with and how?’, and ‘What will be lasting impacts on educational equity given the uneven access to services that have defined the pandemic in

many contexts?' Indeed, questions of family language policy seem all the more crucial in light of the myriad social, economic and psycho-emotional crises brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. Worldwide, COVID-19 quarantines have centralized the family unit, but simultaneously put it under huge stress, threatening if not reversing the gains of recent decades in gender, economic, and racial equality. As this talk demonstrates, the pandemic and the social, cultural and economic shifts it entails, has made FLP more relevant, central, and crucial than ever.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to give this invited talk. It is my honor and privilege to share my thoughts on family language policy research. My only regret is that I am not there with you in person although I look forward to some 'live' discussion at the close of the talk.

Over the last few decades, a large and diverse body of research has coalesced under the banner of 'family language policy' (FLP). This talk reviews recent advances and developments in FLP research, considering critiques of the field, growing pains and new directions.

As I'll discuss here, important critiques include limitations of who participated in past studies, what counted as 'family', and how that data was collected and analyzed. As FLP researchers advance their work in COVID contexts, these growing pains have prompted new directions in methodology and focus as well as new questions.

As the same time, questions of family language policy seem all the more crucial in light of the myriad social, economic and psycho-emotional crises brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. Worldwide, COVID-19 quarantines have centralized the family unit, but simultaneously put it under huge stress, threatening if not reversing the gains of recent decades in gender, economic, and racial equality. I'll suggest that the pandemic and the social, cultural and economic shifts it entails, has made FLP more relevant, central, and crucial than ever.

I'd like to start off by noting that although the title of my talk initially contains the phrase, 'post-COVID times', of course much of the world is still in very much in COVID times. Here in the U.S., we are following closely the situation around the world, and in particular of course in Japan with the start of the Olympics around the corner. I know much of the country is under a state of emergency, and I want to recognize and acknowledge how difficult this is for so many children, adults, families, and workers of all types.

A mini history

A little bit of historical context might be helpful to start us off. Early definitions of family language policy were rooted in and initially framed as extensions of the field of language planning and policy. While the latter has tended to focus on language policy development and implementation in official contexts such a government, schools, or other public-facing institutions, family language policy researchers, in turn, sought to closely examine language policy, language ideology, and language practice within the home and family

domains (King, Fogle & Logan-Terry, 2008). Early definitions framed family language policy as 'explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members' (King, Fogle & Logan-Terry, 2008).

This focus on the family was driven in part by theory and research in the area of language revitalization (or reversing language shift), which was tirelessly championed by Joshua Fishman. This work stressed the critical role of the family in determining child language competencies and by extension, ensuring intergenerational transmission and language survival. Indeed, a central point across much of Fishman's later work (1991, 2001), and the key take-away from his 'Graded Intergenerational Dislocation Scale' or GIDS, was the centrality of the home and family in ensuring intergenerational transmission. For Fishman, all other language reversal efforts, including for instance, minority language newspapers, Saturday language classes, and radio programing, were at best simply biding time if they did not directly lead to restoration of intergenerational transmission.

While the GIDS was not without important critiques (e.g., Romaine, 2006), the work of Fishman and colleagues intensified interest in and scrutiny of the family domain. One problematic aspect was the binary unidirectional manner in which intergenerational transmission was conceptualized in Fishman's GIDS model, that is, as something the parent or grandparent generation achieved one and for all (or not). Luykx (2005), in early insightful research with multilingual Andean families, argued that close analysis of family language policy, and in particular, the variable influence of children in shaping adult language practices in the home, was central to understanding broader shifts towards Spanish and away from Indigenous languages such as Quechua and Aymara. Others pointed not only to the bi-directionality of language socialization, but to questions of which variety was being transmitted, how language competencies and preferences shifted over time, and what multilingual, multimodal practices were families engaging in.

Given both the importance and complexity of intergenerational transmission, King, Fogle and Logan-Terry (2008) suggested the productive potential of bridging the work of child language psychologists, on the one hand, and language policy scholars, on the other. While child language scholars had long been interested in how children acquire first, second and multiple languages, they often focused on the individual child rather than the family unit. Language policy, and in particular Spolsky's tri-part framework (2004) for language policy which focuses on language ideologies (what people believed about language), language policies (what people tried to do with language), and language use (what people actually did with language), could productively be applied to the family unit. Spolsky (2012) likewise argued for the need for more studies to examine what he termed the internal pressures (e.g., ideologies or grandparents) and external pressures (in particular the school) on what he termed 'the critical family domain'.

Growing pains

Over the last decade or two, as researchers of multilingualism and family language learning have increasingly grappled with patterns of intensified migration and technological saturation, the methodological tools and even the questions asked within family language policy have evolved and shifted. Earlier studies

of bilingual and multilingual development in the family often focused on language learning outcomes for the child, that is, what parent ideologies and language practices led to what child language proficiencies (De Houwer, 1999, 2007; Lanza, 1997; see overview in King & Fogle, 2013).

In turn, more recent work has tended to examine meaning-making and the language-mediated experiences of multilingual families, and thus posed a different set of questions. For instance: How do families make sense of multilingualism across generations and how is language woven into family dynamics (Zhu & Li, 2016)? How does meaning emerge and evolve through repeated and varied performance in everyday talk in multilingual homes (He, 2016)? How do families make decisions about language (and come to understand those decisions) in changing contexts (Curdt-Christensen, 2016)? How do families' multi-modal communication practices support the construction a family unit (Kozminska & Zhu, 2021)? Moreover, the contexts of family communication have become the target of (often ethnographic) investigation, rather than something that is assumed, as meaning is seen as both produced and interpreted within particular places, activities, social relations, interactional histories, and cultural ideologies (King & Lanza, 2019). As highlighted below, this shift in focus has implications for research methodology.

Concomitantly, the study of family language policy has been appropriately critiqued for not keeping up with the changing, variable and divergent nature and definitions of family, and concomitantly, as biased towards documenting two-parent, heteronormative, middle-class homes in which children are acquiring more than one European language (Wright, 2020). More recent work has given greater emphasis to how these language socialization and interactional processes play out within so-called non-traditional (e.g., adoptive, gay, single-parent) families in non-Western, transnational or diasporic contexts (e.g., Canagarajah, 2008; Wright & Palviainen, 2021). More broadly, as scholars have recognized that who we study largely shapes what we know, the study of family language policy has increasingly focused on and intentional recruited a wider, more diverse range of family types, languages, and social contexts (Wright & Higgins, 2022).

One thread of this work has documented the increasingly transnational nature of families and family life. Transnationalism broadly refers to the social processes by which migrants establish social fields that cross political, demographic, social, and cultural borders, maintaining relationships and connections that span nation-state borders. Transnational aspects of family lives have been highlighted in recent work. Gallo and Hornberger (2019), for instance, examined the experiences and language practices of families, who, due to U.S. deportation policies, were tenuously spread across the U.S.-Mexico border. Likewise, Said and Zhu (2019) analyzed the language practices of one four-member family within the UK. The family's transnational connections and investment in local transnational institutions resulted in the two boys (aged 6 and 9) speaking a mixture of Yemeni, Algerian Arabic, Classical Arabic, and English.

These sorts of transnational connections are facilitated by technology, and increasingly, the lives of many families can be characterized as digitally saturated. For instance, data from the U.K. suggests that children aged five to 16 spend an average of six and a half hours a day in front of a screen compared with around three hours in 1995 (Wakefield, 2015). Scholars of family language policy are only beginning to analyze the ways that screens and technological devices shape, limit and/or promote varied and particular interactional

patterns among family members. For instance, while research long suggested that children do not learn language from passive exposure to language (e.g., viewing videos) (Kuhl, Tsao & Liu, 2003), a growing body of work suggests that if exposure is socially contingent, that is if there is back-and-forth, two-way interaction, language learning can and does take place (Roseberry, Hirsh-Pasek & Golinkoff, 2014). As interactive social media technology become ubiquitous in many homes, this raises important questions about the nature of family and language learning and transnationally connected families. Said (2021), for instance, demonstrates how families use Skype to communicate with family in other countries; in these homes, regular use of technology signifies the cultural importance of maintaining family ties and unintentionally promotes the development of the heritage language, in this case, Arabic.

The supposed overt, explicit nature of family language policy has also been examined. In many parts of the world, and in particular among the middle and upper-classes in OECD countries, approaches to parenting are increasing defined by what has been called ‘competitive’ or ‘concerted cultivation’ approaches. Indeed, family language policy has expanded as a field in step with ‘concerted cultivation’ parenting. This term, popularized by Lareau (2003), refers to a parenting style characterized by parental attempts to foster their child’s talents by incorporating organized activities in their children’s lives and cultivating particular ways of adult-like talk such as debate and negotiation. Lareau qualitatively documented the cultural logic of this high (or hyper) investment parenting, common among middle and upper-middle class parents in the U.S.

Economists explain this intensive parenting as not just the driver, but also the result of increasing economic inequality. Doepke and Zilibotti (2014) examined the relationships between economic inequality in countries such as Sweden, China, Spain and the U.S. and preferences for intensive parenting styles in those countries over time. Overall, countries with high levels of economic inequality favor pushier parenting; countries with lower levels of economic inequality favor more laisses-faire parenting which emphasizes creativity and independence. Doepke and Zilibotti further find that in the 1960s and 1970s, laissez-faire parenting reached the peak of its popularity, economic inequality was at an all-time low. This make sense: given the relatively low returns to education, there was little reason for parents to competitively cultivate their children. However, as they note, ‘the last 30 years, in contrast, have seen ever-rising inequality combined with increasing returns to education. Children who fail to complete their education can no longer look forward to a secure, middle-class life, and consequently parents have redoubled their efforts to ensure their children’s success.’ They predict that ‘if the march towards higher inequality continues, the current era will mark the beginning of a sustained trend towards ever pushier parenting’ (2014).

The rise of so-called pushier competitive parenting or concerted cultivation approaches has deep implications for the field of family language policy. Competitive parenting has given rise to an ever-increasing number of books, blogs, advice columns and ‘how to’ manuals aimed at soothing worried parents’ concerns over the ‘right’ or ‘best’ approaches to promote bilingualism in the home and to give their children a competitive ‘edge’ (e.g., King & Mackey, 2007). These advice texts are largely shaped by neoliberal objectives that treat language as a commodity and skill to be developed for individual cognitive, academic and professional gain rather than as a means for interpersonal connections or intercultural meaning. By many definitions, language policy requires some overt, explicit attention to language. This

trend towards ‘concerted cultivation’ suggests that such attention to language is increasingly common in some sectors, but as Lareau (2003) and others indicate, not in all. Thus, this attention to language teaching and use in the home, or for instance, as is described below, to at-home ‘language workouts’, has the potential to further drive existing differences in family language practices, and potentially, other types of inequalities, as (some) families engage in this competitive and private planning.

New directions

While family language policy researchers have increasingly engaged with broader, more diverse and fluid definitions of family, how scholars study families and what they seek to learn has also shifted. Indeed, as researchers of multilingualism and family language learning begin to come to terms with both material and demographic changes, the methodological tools and even the questions asked have changed. As suggested above, researchers are increasingly interested in how families are constructed through multilingual language practices, and how language functions as a resource for this process of family-making and meaning-making in contexts of transmigration, social media and technology saturation, and hypermobility. Moreover, this close analysis of semiotic data is increasingly taken by researchers as essential to understanding its significance, given that meaning is ‘far more than just the ‘expression of ideas’, and biography, [rather] identifications, stance and nuance are extensively signaled in the linguistic and textual fine-grain’ (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 10). This newer work highlights identity and agency, and is more likely to draw from multiple, complementary methodological and empirical approaches.

One early move in this direction was Toshie Okita’s highly original work, which analyzed bilingualism, language choice and childrearing within intermarried Japanese-English couples residing in the UK. Okita drew from studies of family, ethnicity and bilingualism to examine the factors that promote or inhibit Japanese maintenance by the children of British fathers and Japanese mothers. Her work highlights the lack of institutional or societal support, but also the emotional demands placed on mothers as this language work is largely invisible. Her analysis demonstrates that advice and recommendations to many families that they should raise their children bilingually often lacks recognition of all the work this demands and can “lead to disempowerment, intensified pressure, guilt and personal trauma” (Okita, 2002, p. 230).

More recent work builds on these methodological, personal and political insights. For instance, recent examples include Smagulova’s (2019) use of both a survey and conversational analysis (CA) to uncover the ideologies of language in Kazak language revival. Smagulova’s close analysis of code-switching in adult-child interactions uncovers how this reimagining of Kazakh is accomplished, and identifies four mutually reinforcing metalanguaging practices. These include limiting Kazakh to pedagogic formats, constructing Kazakh as school talk, confining Kazakh to ‘prior text’, and the co-occurrence of shift to Kazakh with a shift to a meta-communicative frame. Smagulova’s (2019) findings expand our understanding of the discursive processes through which ideologies of language revival are both created and sustained.

As another example, Purkarthofer (2019) critically examined the language expectations of three multilingual couples, each of whom has a different language background and varied experiences of

migration, and each of whom is expecting, or has just had, their first child. Purkarthofer (2019) adopted speaker-centered qualitative methods, including what she defines as language portrayals and biographic narratives, to analyze (real and imagined) constructed spaces of interaction. Close analysis of three co-constructed narratives based on the expectations of the future parents revealed the construction of the child as a multilingual self in her or his own right. Purkarthofer's (2019) multimodal analysis of drawings and interviews demonstrates the collective and interactive construction of three-dimensional future family spaces, and provided a window into the parents' imagined language future of these children. Purkarthofer's (2019) work highlights the importance of imagination, and also the ways in which parents' planning for multilingualism can remain open to new possibilities.

Other researchers have introduced methods such as autoethnography to deepen our understanding of family language policy experiences and interactions. Autoethnography is a research approach that explicitly acknowledges and accommodates the messy, uncertain and emotional nature of social life by showing people in their process of figuring out what to do, how to live, and the social cultural meanings of their struggles (Adams et al., 2015). Rather than try to limit subjectivity of the researcher, it embraces the researchers' subjectivity as they are the primary participant. Liu and Lin (2019) take up this method to explore their experiences in family language planning in English as a foreign language, a language which is non-native to both parent-authors. They develop and share personal narratives of their bilingual parenting experience, and analyze their decision-making processes, the concerns they encountered, their bilingual parenting practices, and their reflections on their 'journey'.

Other scholars have recently (re)examined and deepened how 'success' is defined within family language policy by unpacking the nexus of a parent's prior experiences, expectations surrounding language use, and overt and covert language policies (Smith-Christmas, Bergroth & Bezcioğlu-Göktolga, 2019). This work, which builds on long-term, large-scale ethnographies of family language policy in an immigrant context (Turkish in the Netherlands), an autochthonous minority language context (Gaelic in Scotland), and an officially bilingual state (Swedish in Finland), underscores how it is '"not simply each parent's own sense of identity that determines the degree to which languages may be successfully maintained within the home and by whom it is done but rather the intersection of personal identities (historical body) with wider sociopolitical realities (interaction order and discourses in place) and the complex and multifaceted nature of these sociopolitical identities" (Smith-Christmas, Bergroth & Bezcioğlu-Göktolga, 2019, p.98).

These post-structural research approaches have highlighted, among other dynamics, the critically important role of the child. Revis (2019), as another example, emphasized child agency in family language policy among a less-typically studied population. Drawing on ethnographic data from two refugee communities in New Zealand, Revis (2019) provided examples of the micro-processes of language transmission by focusing on children as powerful agents who alternatively collaborate with or subvert their parents' language policy. Her work shows how their language choices were influenced by exposure to the educational field and alignment with their peer groups, and sometimes explicitly tied to ethnic identity constructions. In particular, Revis (2019) demonstrates how the notion of habitus (Bourdieu, 1977) mediated between structure and agency in everyday life in migrant families. As she explains, on the one hand, children

were "confined by structures that shaped their habitus: among others, they were affected by the dominant ideologies particularly in the educational field and the rules and practices enforced by their parents. Given the partly diverging cultural and linguistic norms and attitudes conveyed in these contexts, the children acquired a 'cleft-habitus' (Bourdieu, 2008, p. 69). On the other hand, the children were agents of cultural and linguistic change" (Revis, 2019, p.187).

Other recent research approaches, by looking closely at family interactions, have uncovered important routines that suggest concerted cultivation approaches to parenting. Fernandes (2019), for instance, analyzes instructional routines, what she terms to be a 'language workout'. Her examination of Swedish-Russian mother-child interactional patterns revealed use of teacher-talk register (e.g., corrections, questions with known answers, hyper-articulation) during these workouts. Her findings suggest that the realization of language policy in bilingual families relies not only on parental input and language choice, but also on the position of the child as a speaker and learner vis-a-vis the parent, and highlights a format that allows for educational, affective and engaging exploration of bilingual language use with young children at home. As Fernandes (2019) explains, "in mobilizing a teacher talk-register, it resembles classroom discourse and so-called home lessons. Yet, it is specific in its sequential organization and consistent employment of a parent talk-register, which dialectically invokes educational and intimate dimensions" (p. 97).

Song (2019), in turn, examined a South Korean migrant family's language socialization practices in a U.S. city, presenting a sociolinguistic analysis of five-year-old child's (Yongho) code-switching practices. Song (2019) focuses on how the social meanings of languages and language ideologies enacted in his home were brought into play through Yongho's code-switching during a dispute with his mother. The analysis demonstrated how Yongho's code-switching arranged and shifted different voice tones, speech acts, and stances according to the situated context. Song's (2019) work highlights how Yongho's code-switching practice "establishes an alignment with social types of persons that the particular linguistic practice indexes, through which he shifted and negotiated his social relation to others – a submissive self in Korean and an authoritative figure in English" (p. 103).

Other work has highlighted variable practices of bilingual siblings and adolescents. Kibler, Palacios, Simpson-Baird, Bergey and Yoder (2016) examined the role of older siblings in shaping language and literacy practices in Spanish-speaking immigrant homes. They demonstrate how the older siblings serve as resources in many Latino homes. Johnsen (2021), in turn, examined the multilingual experiences of three Norwegian and Spanish-speaking adolescents with transnational backgrounds. This piece highlights how youth continuously adapt to changing sociolinguistic circumstances within the family context. Indeed, she suggests that language competences, linguistic identities, language confidence and linguistic repertoires are dynamic entities that develop across the lifespan. In particular, her findings draw attention to the complex ways in which young multilinguals represent and use their linguistic repertoires, and add to the line of research that underscores the importance of considering children's and adolescents' agencies and perspectives. Analysis of the three adolescents reveals how changes in their linguistic repertoires produced tensions or conflictive feelings, opportunities as well as new, hybrid practices.

Another expanding line of work focuses on within or cross group differences over time or context. For

instance, Lee (2021) examined intragroup variations with Korean immigrant families residing in the U.S. with differing transnational life trajectories. She compared three groups: first generation families (long-term stayers); first generation families (short-term stayers or recent immigrants) and 1.5 generation (long-term settlers, with parents having arrived in middle school years). Her data demonstrate the intergenerational impact of intragroup diversity on language use, attitudes toward bilingualism, and future orientation. In general, 1.5 generation Korean parents tended to report that maintenance of Korean is based on value and strength of connections to the Korean community while short-term stayers saw Korean as useful only for eventual return to Korea. While all families strategically managed their language practices, family language practices and policies, future orientations were crucial in shaping how resources were allocated towards the two languages.

In a novel approach, Kusters, De Meulder and Napier (2021), in turn, asked how intrafamily language policy is shaped by intensive contact interfamily communication, in this instance, among deaf-hearing families on multi-family holiday. They found that language use in the group shifted over the twelve-day holiday in several ways, on the one hand, some signs and words became known by more members of the group, and thus language use became more diverse instead of converging towards commonly known or used signs/words across the group. On the other hand, there was also a slight shift in the four families towards more English, a shift towards more British Sign Language/International Sign, and a shift towards more signing and sign-speaking. Kusters, De Meulder and Napier (2021) note that as found in past work, family language policy is constantly negotiated and changeable between family members and that some language practices are legitimised over others within families. More broadly, their work points to the richness of multilingual multimodal strategies in novel contexts.

Other recent work has examined ‘narratives of change’ among repatriated, returnee and immigrant Russian-speaking mother identities in Finland (Wright & Palviainen, 2021). Through interviews and ethnographic field work they demonstrate how mothers transform their life trajectories, parenting beliefs, and ethnolinguistic identities in relation to their own children, to other Finnish parents, and the context of migration. Kozminska and Zhu (2021), in turn, closely examined multi-modal recorded moments of everyday interaction to understand how one multilingual LGBTQ-identified family with adoptive children used particular language practices to make meaning and to construct their family unit. Kozminska and Zhu demonstrate the ways in which individuals co-experience and co-create a loving family life, revealing how this sort of building of family life is done together multimodally and multilingually in English and Polish.

Taken together, these recent examples of research illustrate a close commitment to close analysis of language use in naturalistic contexts, and in many cases, to the ways in which the broader political, cultural, and ideological context shapes family life and family language practices. As Purkarthofer (2021) notes of her research with German speakers living in Norway, but is also true of much recent work, the focus is on uncovering the complex semiotic resources that families use to construct and maintain family language policies and practices, especially in light of the subjects’ positions relative to broader ideological and societal discourses. As evident above, this newer line of work is also characterized by inclusion of broader range of languages (e.g., signed and spoken) (e.g., see Tang, 2019), family types (gay, adoptive, single-

parent) and contexts (including refugee-background and short-term migratory ones).

While much of this work has focused on meaning making and interactive processes, it is worth noting that some scholars have continued to take an outcomes-oriented approach. MacCormac and MacCormac (2021), for instance, ask "in what ways do parental decisions made throughout an immigrant child's life course regarding language use and language learning shape their multilingual identity and attitudes towards the use of multiple languages in their everyday adult life?" (pp.36-37). Focusing on immigrant-background families residing in Canada, they report notable differences between families with established, explicit language policies and those with no overt language policy. Children from families with no established language policy reported that this "lack of linguistic support or strategies provided by their parents to be detrimental to their transition into the new society" (MacCormac & MacCormac, 2021, p.42); in turn, children with an established family language policy reported a smoother transition into Canadian life.

What's next?

With few exceptions (e.g., MacCormac & MacCormac, 2021), recent family language policy work largely has stepped away from outcomes-oriented research, opting instead to focus on interaction as a meaning-making process. Indeed, scholars such as Zhu and Li (2016) have argued for the value of examining mundane moments in family interactions with the goal of understanding the varied experiences of individuals and the strategies enacted to deal with multilingualism rather than on questions of intergenerational transmission or on overall patterns of language maintenance or shift. For their part, Hiratsuka and Pennycook (2020) offer an expansion and critique of notions of family, language, and policy, arguing that better insights can be gained from exploring what they call the 'translingual family repertoire'. They suggest that rather than focusing on heritage language maintenance efforts or some sort of explicit family language policy, language attention, at least in the one family they study, is on 'getting by' translingually, that is, on doing family life with the aid of a repertoire of diverse resources. From this vantage point, 'the family repertoire', as both "an enabler and an outcome of family interactions" (Hiratsuka & Pennycook, 2020, p.749), should be the focus of study.

From one vantage point, these moves prompt questions concerning the objectives and boundaries of family language policy as an area of study. For instance, what does 'family language policy' as a banner 'buy us' and to what extent is it a productive or useful as a label for an area of study? Indeed, researchers from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds have productively studied child language learning and family-based interaction for many decades (see King & Fogle, 2013, for a historical review). For instance, scholars of child language socialization have identified interactional patterns and cultural meanings behind those in a wide range of world contexts (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Child language psychologists, in turn, have used quantitative measures like surveys and assessments to determine links between reported parental language practices and child language proficiencies (De Houwer, 2021). The 'family language policy' has a descriptive label perhaps has allowed for or even promoted a sense of coherence around research topic and context, providing scholars with a hook to hang their hat so to speak. Nevertheless, as evident here, the

objectives, boundaries, aims, and scope of study are highly divergent and indeed, far from clear or decided. Put succinctly: given the widely divergent disciplinary and methodological orientations taken up by researchers, 'family language policy' as a descriptor does not tell us overly much.

From another vantage point, this move towards ethnographic portraits of meaning making in families, while in step with work of colleagues in cultural anthropology and aligned fields, does little to answer the how questions often posed by families and by minoritized language communities in particular. Caretakers concerned with language, like many policy-makers, tend to be more interested in data-informed recommendations concerning what practices most likely to lead to what outcomes. For members of endangered, Indigenous language communities these are pressing, immediate and at times 'life or death' issues for the languages in question. Caretakers, in contrast to many researchers in the field, tend to ask questions like: How much exposure to the target language is needed and when in the child's life is this most critical? How proficient must the caretaker be in the target language to provide high quality or sufficient exposure? How can caretakers best support multiple language learning goals when a child has development disorders or special learning needs? How can caretakers help children develop expertise in target language when they are exposed to multiple varieties from different family members? What is the best practice when child refuses and rejects target language completely? Why are some speakers seemingly 'stuck' at the introductory level for so many years? (King & Hermes, 2014).

Most researchers of family language policy are committed to raciolinguistic equity, that is, we share the belief that speakers of all languages are entitled to equal respect, rights, and privileges, including the opportunity to pass on their language to their children. As McIvor (2020) argues, applied linguists hold specific knowledge and skills that could be extended to Indigenous language revitalization and other language minority communities to support these aims. To ensure progress towards the goal of raciolinguistic equity, family language policy researchers have the responsibility to ask and answer stakeholder, in this case, caretaker or parent questions about language use and language learning in the home, and the policies and practices most likely to ensure intergenerational transmission of some sort.

We have many of the tools to this already at hand. For instance, we have a solid body of research pointing to the ways that identity and ideology matter and often serve as constraints to transmission. We know that race-based ideologies of language diminish the perceived value of a language, and that children are highly sensitive to these valuations. We know that children need significant amounts of sustained, interactive exposure to the language to develop productive competence in it. We further understand that language socialization is two-way, interactive, highly fluid, and that any study of family language policy must take into account child agency. We also have evidence that the language policies caretakers establish have lasting consequences for the well-being of the child, impacting how they connect with family and community into adulthood. What is less clear – and what drives many parents' questions – is the balance or interplay between these broader constraints and individual agencies.

Equally unclear how to balance competing and divergent research agendas and how to best predict which direction the next generation of scholars will take this area of study. Arguably, in light of the 2020 pandemic, research on family language use and learning is more important than ever before. Worldwide, people are

spending much more time at home, with parents not just parenting, but home-schooling, serving as friends, entertainment, and teachers to their kids. This is gendered work. In the U.S., for instance, 4.6 million U.S. women have lost their jobs since pandemic; 32% report that is because of lack of childcare. Women, long the primary caregivers with an outsized influence on language development, have been taking on this caretaking role disproportionately. Stress, fatigue, mental health and economic challenges of extreme isolation, including the loss of 'weak ties' is increasingly well documented. Further, in the U.S. and in many other contexts, this crisis is racialized with the most vulnerable communities disproportionately impacted. And concomitantly, these last 18 months have been characterized by huge upticks in screen time for both children and adults and uneven access to in person, high quality education.

In this dramatically new landscape, a number of new family language policy questions have arisen, including: To what extent will all this 'at home' time bolster or protect home languages? What will be the impact of extended school closures be on acquisition of second, school, or societal languages? How do video technologies such as Zoom shape all of these questions given dramatic upticks in screen time for parents and children, and profound changes in who we interact with and how? What will be lasting impacts on educational equity and language proficiencies given the uneven access to services that have defined pandemic at least in the U.S.?

Indeed, questions of family language policy seem all the more crucial in light of the myriad social, economic and psycho-emotional crises brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic and resultant extended quarantines. Worldwide, quarantines and lockdowns have tended to centralize the family unit, but simultaneously put it under huge stress. These stressors will threaten if not wholly reverse the gains of recent decades in gender, economic, and racial equality. Arguably, the pandemic and the social, cultural and economic shifts it entails has made family language learning and use and its related questions and fields, more relevant and more central than ever.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you and I look forward to our discussion to follow.

References

Adams, T. E., Jones, S. H., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Ox- ford University Press.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, *13*(2), 1-21.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2008). *Sketch for a self-analysis* (R. Nice, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 12*(2), 143-176.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L. (2016). Conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices in Singaporean multilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 694-709.

De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and Migration* (pp. 75-96). Mouton de Gruyter.

De Houwer, A. (2007). Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholin- guistics, 28*(3), 411-424.

De Houwer, A. (2021). *Bilingual development in childhood*. Cambridge University Press.

Doepke, M., & Zilibotti, F. (2014). Tiger moms and helicopter parents: The economics of parenting style. *VOX CEPR Policy Portal*. https://voxeu.org/article/economics-parenting

Fernandes, O. A. (2019). Language workout in bilingual mother-child interaction: A case study of heritage language practices in Russian-Swedish family talk. *Journal of Pragmatics, 140*, 88-99.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages.* Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved?: Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective (Vol. 116)*. Multilingual Matters.

Gallo, S., & Hornberger, N. H. (2019). Immigration policy as family language policy: Mexican immigrant children and families in search of biliteracy. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 757-770.

He, A. W. (2016). Discursive roles and responsibilities: A study of interactions in Chinese immigrant households. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 667–679.

Hiratsuka, A., & Pennycook, A. (2020). Translingual family repertoires: 'No, Morci is itaiitai panzita, amor'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4*1(9), 749-763. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1645145

Johnsen, R.V. (2021). 'Then suddenly I spoke a lot of Spanish' – Changing linguistic practices and heritage language from adolescents' points of view. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 15*(2), 105-125.

Kibler, A. K., Palacios, N., Simpson-Baird, A., Bergey, R., & Yoder, M. (2016). Bilingual Latin@ children's exposure to language and literacy practices through older siblings in immigrant families. *Linguistics and Education, 35*, 63-77.

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.

King, K.A., & Hermes, M. (2014). Why is this so hard?: Ideologies of endangerment, passive language learning approaches, and Ojibwe in the United States. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 13*(4), 268–282.

King, K.A., & Lanza, E. (2019). Ideology, agency, and imagination in multilingual families. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 717-723.

King, K.A., & Mackey, A. (2007). *The bilingual edge: Why, when, and how to teach your child a second language.* Harper Collins.

Kozminska, K., & Zhu, H. (2021, March 20-23). Making a family: Language ideologies and practices in a multilingual LGBTQ-identified family with adopted children. [Conference presentation abstract]. The American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2021 Virtual Conference. https://www.aaal.org/2021-colloquia-lyn-wright

Kuhl, PK., Tsao, F., & Liu, H. (2003). *Foreign-language experience in infancy: Effects of short-term exposure and social interaction on phonetic learning*. PNAS, *100*(15), 9096–9101.

Kusters, A., De Meulder, M, & Napier, J. (2021). Family language policy on holiday: Four multilingual signing and speaking families travelling together. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 42,* 698-715. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1890752

Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism.* Clarendon Press.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods*. University of California Press.

Lee, H. (2021). "No more Korean at home." Family language policies, language practices, and challenges in Korean immigrant families: Intragroup diversities and intergenerational impacts. *Linguistics and Education, 63.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100929

Liu, W., & Lin, X. (2019). Family language policy in English as a foreign language: A case study from China to Canada. *Language Policy, 18*(2)*,* 191-207.

Luykx, A. (2005). Children as socializing agents: Family language policy in situations of language shift. *In* J. Cohen, K.T. McAlister, K. Rolstad & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp.1407-1414)*.* Cascadilla Press.

MacCormac, K., & MacCormac, M. (2021). Navigating the cumulative effects of family language policy during childhood for immigrant youth in Canada. *Society Register, 5*(2), 31-56.

McIvor, O. (2020). Indigenous language revitalization and applied linguistics: Parallel histories, shared futures? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 40*, 78-96.

Okita, T. (2002). *Invisible work: Bilingualism, language choice and childrearing in intermarried families.* John Benjamins Publishing.

Purkarthofer, J. (2019). Building expectations: Imagining family language policy and heteroglossic social spaces. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 724-739.

Purkarthofer, J. (2021). Navigating partially shared linguistic repertoires: Attempts to understand centre and periphery in the scope of family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, (42)*8, 747-762. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1924755

Revis, M. (2019). A Bourdieusian perspective on child agency in family language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(2), 177-191.

Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the survival of linguistic diversity. *Language Policy, 5*(4), 443-475.

Roseberry, S., Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R.M. (2013). Skype me! Socially contingent interactions help toddlers learn language. *Child Development, 85*(3), 956-970. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12166

Said,F., & Zhu, H. (2019). "No, no Maama! Say 'Shaatir ya Ouledee Shaatir'!" Children's agency in language use and socialisation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 771-785.

Said, F. F. S. (2021) '*Ba*-SKY-*a*P with her each day at dinner': technology as supporter in the learning and management of home languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 42*(8), 747-762. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1924755

Schieffelin, B.B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163-191.

Smagulova, J. (2019). Ideologies of language revival: Kazakh as school talk. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 740-756.

Smith-Christmas, C., Bergroth, M., & Bezcioğlu-Göktolga, I. (2019). A kind of success story: Family lan- guage policy in three different sociopolitical contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 13*(2), 88-101.

Song, J. (2019). Language socialization and code-switching: A case study of a Korean–English bilingual child in a Korean transnational family. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(2), 91-106.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy: The critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(1), 3-11.

Tang, G. (2019). Educating deaf students as bilingual. *Studies in Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education, 15*, 38-54.

Wakefield, J. (2015, March 27). Children spend six hours or more a day on screens. *BBC online news.* https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-32067158

Wright, L. (2020). *Critical perspectives on language and kinship in multilingual families*. Bloomsbury Ac- ademic.

Wright, L., & Higgins, C. (2022). *Diversifying family language policy: Diverse families, modalities, speakers, and contexts.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Wright, L., & Palviainen, A. (2021, March 20-23). Narratives of change: Repatriated, returnee, and immigrant Russian-speaking mother identities in Finland. [Conference presentation abstract]. The American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2021 Virtual Conference. https://www.aaal.org/2021-colloquia-lyn-wright

Zhu, H., & Li, W. (2016). Transnational experience, aspiration and family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 655-666.