

This article was downloaded by: [Goldsmiths, University of London]

On: 22 August 2011, At: 05:05

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rbeb20>

Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain

Claudine Kirsch^a

^a Department of Educational Studies, Goldsmiths, London, United Kingdom

Available online: 22 Aug 2011

To cite this article: Claudine Kirsch (2011): Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, DOI:10.1080/13670050.2011.607229

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.607229>



PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings,

demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain

Claudine Kirsch*

Department of Educational Studies, Goldsmiths, London, United Kingdom

(Received 10 December 2010; final version received 18 July 2011)

Researchers have studied family language planning within bilingual family contexts but there is a dearth of studies that examine language planning of multilingual parents who raise their children in one of the world's lesser spoken languages. In this study I explore the ideologies and language planning of Luxembourgish mothers who are raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain, where there is no Luxembourgish community to support them and where a monolingual discourse prevails. All mothers strongly identified with Luxembourgish, aimed at developing active bilingualism and recognised their role in ensuring exposure to Luxembourgish. However, five mothers choose a one-person-two-languages model which limits exposure to Luxembourgish. The article illustrates the extent to which the mothers' management of their own and of the children's language use is mediated by their ideologies, experiences of multilingualism and their interactions in a large monolingual setting.

Keywords: childhood bilingualism; minority languages; multilingualism; language planning; bilingual acquisition; language ideologies

Introduction

In our cosmopolitan world, more children grow up as bilinguals than monolinguals. However, they do not automatically become active users of both languages. Bilingual children frequently develop receptive rather than productive communicative skills in the minority language and some even stop speaking this language altogether. In their quest for explanations of what contributes to active bilingualism, researchers have examined the roles of the setting, the family and the child. Research on macro factors has focused, for example, on the size of the immigrant group, the density of social networks, the status of the languages at play and language policies of the host community. Language policies affect the type of education that children with a minority language have access to. In an ideal case, they enjoy bilingual education. However, policies can also endorse a monolingual ethos and, as a result, reduce the possibilities for developing minority languages. Such a negative context can, to some extent, be counteracted by a large immigrant group that organises community centres and mother tongue schools that encourage the use of the mother tongue and provide access to printed material. Literacy plays a large part in a community's culture and contributes to the enhancement of the minority language.

*Email: c.kirsch@gold.ac.uk

Relevant factors at the level of the family relate to attitudes, ideologies and family language planning. Parents with positive attitudes towards their first language and bilingualism influence their children's attitudes, language use and competence positively. They might choose to adopt the *one-person-one-language* approach which has been hailed as a key factor in successful bilingual upbringing. There is substantial research on family language policies within bilingual family contexts (but little within trilingual families) but most studies were carried out in the USA, Australia and Canada, and the minority languages, in this case Spanish, Japanese, Chinese or French, still enjoyed a high status in many parts of the world. There is a dearth of studies that examine language planning of immigrant multilingual parents who raise their children in one of the world's lesser spoken languages.

This article examines the parental language ideologies and language planning of Luxembourgish multilingual mothers who endeavour to raise their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain where there is no Luxembourgish community and where a discourse of monolingualism prevails. Luxembourg, a small country in the centre of Europe, has three official languages: Luxembourgish, German and French. Almost all residents are trilingual. They are literate in these languages but feel least confident in Luxembourgish, partly because of the paucity of printed resources. The present study highlights the complexities of language use and planning within the family and explains the challenges and contradictions with reference to the interplay between the ideologies of the mothers and those of the host country. In what follows *bilingualism* is used to refer to two languages and *multilingualism* to three or more.

Ideologies, language approaches and practices

The first part of this section reviews relevant literature on bilingual families' language ideologies and language planning. It makes references to literature on trilingualism as appropriate. Work in the latter field is predominantly concerned with children who become trilingual as a result of moving to or living in a particular country (e.g. Chinese children in Canada; children of an English mother and a German father living in France). The parents of these children can be bilingual or multilingual but are not necessarily so. By contrast, the mothers in the present study are multilingual and focus on bilingualism rather than trilingualism. The final part of this section examines language policies in Luxembourg and England.

Ideologies and family language planning

Language ideologies are 'any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein 1979, 193). They are influenced by a range of factors, for example, governmental policies, public discourses of bilingualism and the perceived value, power and utility of various languages (García 2005; Okita 2002). As influential if not more are the parents' personal experiences of learning and using languages and their perceptions of bilingualism (Eilers et al. 2006; Schüpbach 2009) or trilingualism (Dagenais and Day 1999). King, Fogle and Logan-Terry (2008) consider ideologies to be the driving force behind language planning.

Language planning constitutes the framework for interactions between children and parents and, as such, impacts on language acquisition. It is generally agreed that lack of attention or planning is not conducive to the development of active bilingualism (De Houwer 2009) and that family language policies are necessary though insufficient to develop active bilingualism (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry 2008). There is some disagreement about the extent to which families can plan and do plan deliberately. According to Curdt-Christiansen (2009), family language policies are a deliberate attempt to engage family members, in particular language practices. Similarly, King and Fogle (2006) and Spolsky (2009) hold that language planning is overt or explicit. By contrast, Neustupný and Nekvapil (2003) maintain that language management can be carried out both explicitly and implicitly and consciously and unconsciously. One needs to bear in mind that not all couples plan bilingual or trilingual upbringing in any detail or have a choice about how to raise their children (Barron-Hauwaert 2000; De Houwer 2009).

The relationship between ideologies, planning and practices is complex and beliefs are not always and may not be directly translated into practices. For example, Schwartz (2008) has shown a clear discrepancy between the parents' declared commitment to developing their home language Russian, their language management and their actual language practices when raising their children in Russian. The best intentions of parents might not necessarily result in success because practices are constantly negotiated and co-constructed between parents and children (Bayley and Schecter 2003; Schecter and Bayley 2002). Eilers et al. (2006) and Tuominen (1999) have reported that some children socialised their parents into speaking the majority language rather than the parents teaching them the minority language.

As language use within the family is central to the child's acquisition of two languages, the next section reviews some approaches considered effective in mixed-language couples (one majority-language speaker and one minority-language speaker).

Effective approaches and strategies

Research into bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) reveals several strategies and conditions that facilitate the development of active bilingualism from birth (Caldas 2006; De Houwer 2009). Firstly, the minority language-speaking parents need to be aware of their role and of the status of their language, and the majority language-speaking parents need to be supportive of both bilingualism and the heritage language. Second, children need regular and natural exposure to the languages in a variety of circumstances and with a range of speakers. Parents should provide rich, varied and age-appropriate opportunities for language use. Supporting the development of multiple literacies will contribute to language acquisition (Dagenais and Day 1999; Li 2006; Obied 2009). Third, children need an incentive to communicate in both languages. Finally, the parental transmission strategies need to be clear.

One might assume that mixed-marriage couples meet these conditions best when each parent systematically uses 'their' language with the child (one-language-one-parent-model or 1P/1L hereafter). The 1P/1L approach allows for maximum language exposure and has been hailed as a fundamental principle in BFLA, particularly for the transmission of a minority language (Döpke 1998). However, the model has not been without criticism. The approach does not automatically

guarantee success. Some children only became passive rather than active bilinguals (De Houwer 2009). Furthermore, even parents who claim to use the 1P/1L approach occasionally use two languages (Goodz 1989). For example, Cunningham-Andersson and Andersson (1999) have shown that minority-speaking parents switch to the majority language in order to include majority language speakers. Finally, studies focusing on the 1P/1L approach are not representative; most of them were carried out by the parent who was a linguist and the approach itself is not the most widely used. The importance of the 1P/1L approach and its perceived effectiveness has also been criticised by researchers in the field of trilingual language acquisition. Barron-Hauwaert (2000) and Braun and Cline (2010) have found that trilingual families considered the approach unnatural and impractical. Further, Quay (2008, 31) maintains that strict language separation is not necessary in order to develop sociolinguistic differentiation and pragmatic competence at an early age.

De Houwer (2009) suspects that the most frequent language presentation in mixed-language bilingual families is a setting where one parent uses both the minority and the majority language (1P/2L), and the other uses one of these (1P/1L). (The trilingual parents in the studies of Quay [2008] and Bursch [2005] even happened to use three languages with their trilingual children.) As a result of the home practices, children are likely to get more input in one of the languages. The status

of the language shared by the couple determines the degree of bilingual proficiency. De Houwer (2007) and Yamamoto (2001) have found that children were least likely to develop active bilingualism if parents communicated in the majority language with the children.

While the overall approach adopted by the parents is important, Lanza (2004) has shown that the use of parental discourse strategies rather than the 1P/1L or 1P/2L approach per se helps explain the outcomes of bilingual childrearing. Lanza holds that parents and children negotiate language use through the manner in which parents respond to the children's use of the 'inappropriate' language. When children use the 'wrong' language parents could, for example, ask them to repeat the utterance in the 'right' language (Lanza's 'minimal grasp' strategy) or continue the conversation in the language used by the child ('language switch'). Lanza identified five such discourse strategies which she classified on a continuum from more monolingual to more bilingual. The more monolingual the strategy the parents adopt, the more successful they are in developing active bilingualism (Döpke 1998).

The following section moves from the micro to the macro level and examines the dominant language ideologies, practices and policies in Luxembourg and England. As six of the mothers in this study lived in England and only one in Scotland, the focus will be on England.

Language use, policies and ideologies

Luxembourg's official trilingualism can be explained by its size (2586 square kilometres), location (bordering France, French-speaking Belgium and Germany), history, demography and economy. Lëtzebuergesch (Luxembourgish) is the national language; French is used in legislation; Luxembourgish, French and German are all used for administrative and judicial matters. What distinguishes Luxembourg from other trilingual countries is the fact that almost all residents are trilingual and choose languages according to the situation. The findings of Fehlen's (2009) large

survey showed that 96% of the residents used French, 78% Luxembourgish and 75% German, and that residents were least confident in writing in Luxembourgish. The demography of the population and the high percentage of cross-border workers help explain the popularity of French at the work place, in the public domain and in administration.

Because of the country's dependence on foreign labour force and capital, schools are expected to develop the residents' multilingual competence. French and German are taught as discrete subjects as well as being the media of instruction from primary school onwards. The system which leads to individual multilingualism has been hailed by the Ministry of Education as a model for other EU countries. (See Horner and Weber (2008) and Weber (2008) for a discussion of the issues related to the education system.) The official discourse promotes a trilingual identity emphasising the benefits of multilingualism. It praises the Luxembourgers for their linguistic flexibility and holds that the residents excel in code-switching (MEN 2008, 7). A report even indicated that 'perhaps multilingualism is the hidden mother tongue of many Luxembourgers' (MEN 2005, 34). Despite, or possibly because of the pressure for multilingual competence, public discourses also feature a strong link between Luxembourgish and identity (Horner 2007). Luxembourgish assumes an integrative function and is portrayed as a key symbol of national identity (Horner 2007). The ideologies of multilingualism and monolingualism remain two sides of the same coin. According to Horner (2007) and Horner and Weber (2008) they can be in harmony as long as there is not too much emphasis on one side.

While Luxembourg was labelled the most 'multilingual European country' by the European Commission (2001), England has been continually portrayed as one of the most monolingual. In 2006, 62% of the citizens polled had no knowledge of any language apart from English (European Commission 2006). Blackledge (2000) argues that the dominant ideology of England is monolingual despite its multilingual population and that a discourse of homogeneity obliterates minority languages. The presentation of the failure to understand English as a threat to national unity and British identity has led to the belief that 'monolingualism in English is the natural and desirable state' (Blackledge and Creese 2010, 7). Accordingly, language policies privilege the teaching of English. Although the National Curriculum (DfEE 2000) seems to value and respect diversity and to explicitly support bilingual learners in various ways, it makes few references to the languages and cultures of children of ethnic minority backgrounds. Bilingual teaching strategies have been promoted in order to facilitate a quick transition to English rather than to develop the minority language (Blackledge and Creese 2010). The status English enjoyed as a world language and lingua franca does not encourage the development of foreign language learning policies either. The teaching of Modern Languages (which includes *Modern*, *World* and *Community* languages) is not compulsory at primary school unlike in most EU countries. Children currently have an entitlement to learn languages but provision tends to depend on the schools. At secondary level, there has been a dramatic decrease of students taking Modern Languages since the *Languages Strategy* (DfES 2002) made the subject optional for students aged 14. The *Languages Strategy* had an impact but the 'incoherent discourses' around multilingualism (Anderson, Kenner, and Gregory 2008) neither endorsed an inclusive language policy nor seriously challenged the monocultural perspectives.

The language situation and policies are different in other parts of Great Britain. For the purpose of this article, it suffices to say that Scotland privileges English over

other languages but, contrary to England, all children learn a Modern Language in primary school.

Methodology

The aim of this study was to investigate the aspirations, language beliefs, planning and practices of mothers who were raising their two children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain. The sample consisted of seven Luxembourgish mothers, six of whom were married to native English speakers and one to a native German-speaker. They came to England on average 10 years ago in order to study or to add an international dimension to their careers. At the time of the study six families lived in England and one in Scotland. All parents had been briefed about the research topic and methodology and had been guaranteed anonymity, confidentiality and the right to withdraw. The researcher's status as a Luxembourgish mother facilitated the access to the families and contributed to the development of a good rapport.

The methods for data collection comprised episodic and semi-structured interviews, and observations. Bates (2004) and Flick (2009) define episodic interviewing as a narrative interview technique that elicits a comprehensive and contextualised account of relevant episodes in the participants' daily lives. Researchers ask general questions as well as inviting the interviewees to recount events. The participants select episodes and decide whether to recount them in the form of descriptions or narratives. The data gathered enable the researchers to understand the experiences from the perspective of the participants and against their particular sociocultural context. Okita (2002) and Schüpbach (2009) have convincingly shown that narrative interviews provide valuable insights into people's lives and help understand the connections between the macro and micro levels (Pavlenko 2007). Among the disadvantages of the method are the difficulty of generalising findings and the subjective nature of the accounts which have been described as 'discursive constructions' (Pavlenko 2007, 181). Many of the recounts are memories and recollections and, as such, might be coloured, partial or distorted (Goodson and Sikes 2001; Hodkinson 2005). To address this issue, the parents in this study were interviewed twice, and the interviews were complemented with observations.

The interviews sought to provide insights into the mothers' beliefs, transmission strategies and the language use in a range of settings. They were conducted either in their London home or over the phone, and were recorded and transcribed. (The excerpts on the following pages were translated from Luxembourgish.) The episodic interview encouraged the recounting of experiences and lasted on average half an hour. Like the participants in Hodkinson's study (2005) the mothers in this study were open and keen to share their lives. They narrated personal experiences of language use, recounted daily events where they used Luxembourgish with their children and explained the reasons for raising their children bilingually. The 45-minute semi-structured interview addressed more specific questions such as the following:

- How important is it for you that your children speak Luxembourgish? How important is Luxembourgish to your children?
- What are your expectations regarding the children's language skills in Luxembourgish? How well do they speak Luxembourgish?

- What languages do you and your children use at home and in public places?
- What particular things do you do to encourage your children to speak Luxembourgish?
- Do you switch between Luxembourgish and English? When? Why?

Observations were used to triangulate data and to collect additional data on the language use within five of the families. This subset comprised two families who had at least one bilingual child and three who had a child who spoke limited Luxembourgish. The observations were carried out at the children's homes and at a social event in the Luxembourgish Embassy. The conversations between the parents and their children were recorded.

The data analysis drew on both content analysis and discourse analysis. The former allowed for the identification of major themes emerging from the data, such as attitudes towards bilingualism, inclusion and contradictions. Discourse analysis underpinned the analysis of the conversations between the mothers and their children and focused on the parental discourse strategies (Lanza 2004).

Findings

This section presents the mothers' language ideologies and family language planning. It shows that language planning was heavily influenced by the interplay between the mothers' strong ideologies and multilingual experiences, and the predominantly monolingual environment.

The families

The seven families were all middle class and shared several features: all but two parents were university graduates and all but one family lived in England (Family B lives in Scotland). All families had two children aged between 5 months and 15 years and all were exposed to both Luxembourgish and English at home. Columns 1 and 3 in Table 1 summarise the information on the families. Column 2 will be explained in the section on language planning.

Six of the seven fathers were native English speakers and one (Family F) a native German speaker. Nevertheless, he spoke in English to his children like the other fathers. While all fathers understand some basic phrases in Luxembourgish, none speaks this language. All Luxembourgish mothers were fluent in a number of languages. At the time of the study they used English at work, in the public domain and at home with their husbands. They tended to speak Luxembourgish with their children as well as with Luxembourgers. They had almost no opportunities to speak Luxembourgish outside their British homes. The Luxembourgish community is too small to organise regular family events or children's clubs in order to promote the use of Luxembourgish. In addition to Luxembourgish and English, all mothers had a good command of German and French. However, only four used these languages for work or socialising in Great Britain.

All children older than two years were fluent in English and able to communicate in Luxembourgish to different degrees. The children in Families A and B and the oldest child in Family C were bilingual although their Luxembourgish was not error-free. The children in Families A and B also developed a third language mainly because of language teaching at school. The children younger than two years

Table 1. Summary table of the families: language approach and proficiency of the children.

	1	2	3	4	5
Family	Date of arrival of the mother	Mothers' Language approach	Age of the child	Competence in Luxembourgish	Competence in other languages
A	1999	1P/2L	15 14	Fluent Fluent	Basic French Basic French
B	1989	1P/1L	10 8	Fluent Fluent	Basic French Fluent in German and beginning to read Fluent German
C	1999	1P/1L 1P/2L	10 5	Fluent Makes himself understood	
D	1998	1P/2L Towards 1P/1L	4;5 2	Makes himself understood Limited	
E	1999	1P/2L Towards 1P/1L	2;5 0;5	Limited None	
F	1999	1P/2L	1;11 1;11	Some words Some words	
G	2000	1P/2L	1;8 1;8	Some words Some words	

understood Luxembourgish and used it at the word level. The degree of competence in Luxembourgish depended on the age, the birth order and the family. Proficiency increased with the age of the child and was higher for the older than the younger sibling in each family. Columns 4 and 5 in Table 1 summarise the children's language competence.

Ideologies and aspirations

All mothers strongly identified with Luxembourgish considering it their emotional language. They used phrases such as 'Luxembourgish is closest to my heart' and 'the most natural way to communicate'. In addition, they associated Luxembourgish with their nationality and national identity as illustrated in the following quotations:

Luxembourgish is the most intimate, personal and immediate thing. (Mother A)

I am a Luxembourger. Luxembourgish is my mother tongue. It is the language of my home country. (Mother C)

But we are Luxembourgers. Luxembourgish is a part of us. (Mother D)

At the same time as identifying with their tongue, the mothers considered multilingualism a key characteristic of Luxembourgers. As Mother D explained:

We are used to speaking many languages and we are proud to be able to do so.

Because Luxembourgish is not spoken by all residents in Luxembourg, the mothers were used to switching to the language of their interlocutor or to a lingua franca (mainly French). In Great Britain, they continued to switch ‘automatically’ and ‘naturally’ to English as soon as they met English speakers. Being competent speakers of several languages, the mothers had developed positive attitudes to bilingualism. They explained that bilingualism can bring communicative skills in different languages, cognitive advantages and intercultural benefits.

There are advantages to speaking two languages because children know already that they have a different perspective. He [oldest son] knows already that there is more than one way to say things, think and exist. The world is not monolingual. (Mother C)

Language learning is good brain training. The brain is more malleable and better trained to learn other languages and things. (Mother G)

Children become more sensitive to other cultures. (Mother A)

All seven mothers had high expectations. They hoped that their youngsters would become fluent in Luxembourgish and English as well as in at least one additional language. They believed that the acquisition process should be natural and pressure-free. Conversations, stories, videos and music were considered to be the ideal manner to develop Luxembourgish and English. The mothers also found it ‘normal’ to provide music and videos in German and French. ‘This is the way one does it in Luxembourg’, commented Mother A. None of the mothers pushed for the development of a third language, but they all hoped that this early and enjoyable encounter with multiple languages would develop an ear for languages. All but one mother stated that they never forced their children to speak Luxembourgish by, for example pretending that they had not understood an English phrase. Three participants noted that they praised their children when they overheard the siblings communicate in Luxembourgish. Yet they would not ask them to use this language.

None of the mothers considered it necessary to develop literacy in Luxembourgish because they perceived that Luxembourgish print did not play a big role either in Luxembourg or in their current lives. They hoped that their children would eventually develop this skill ‘naturally’ – much like themselves – once they were able to transfer skills across languages. The following quotation is representative of other mothers:

Literacy in Luxembourgish? Mmm, not now. There are few children’s books in Luxembourgish and there are no newspapers written entirely in Luxembourgish. When the kids are older they will learn it like us. We only had one hour of Luxembourgish at school and we managed. (Mother D)

How do the mothers’ positive attitudes and high expectations translate into language practices?

Family language planning and practices

The parents explicitly planned their language use on several levels: the general approach, the use of resources and the handling of language mixes. As one might

expect, the complex relationship between ideologies, planning and practices was mediated both by social and individual factors.

Making a choice: communicating in one or two languages

All families had discussed the practicalities of a bilingual upbringing and all mothers were aware of their key role in transmitting the minority language. The families decided on a bilingual upbringing for four reasons. Firstly, the mothers stated that they would not consider raising children in a language other than their mother tongue although most of them eventually did so. Second, they maintained that good communication skills in this language were necessary to maintain a good relationship with Luxembourgish relatives. In addition, the children were Luxembourgish like themselves and should know their cultural heritage. The following statements are representative of others:

My parents speak little English and their little cousins do not speak any English yet. How are they [the children] going to communicate if they do not speak Luxembourgish? (Mother D)

They [the children] both know that they are half Luxembourgish and they know that part of their heritage well. It is also part of their identity. It is important for me because I am from there and I like them to know it. Otherwise it is as if they were not my children anymore. (Mother C)

Finally, the parents believed that Luxembourgish helps develop bilingualism which, in turn, is a stepping stone towards multilingualism. Mother D went as far as saying that Luxembourgish is a 'language of little use as it is not much spoken' but that it is useful as 'a bridge to multilingualism'.

The parents had two options in which to promote the acquisition of two languages at home; each parent speaks his or her mother tongue (1P/1L) or the mother speaks both Luxembourgish and English (1P/2L) while the father speaks only English. Mothers B and C opted for a 1P/1L approach. Mother B lived in Scotland. The remoteness, the poor transport facilities and the absence of her Luxembourgish close friends led to a feeling of isolation in the first years of her new settlement. Communicating exclusively in Luxembourgish with her children was a means of creating a welcoming and comfortable environment:

I did not want to feel so lonely. Luxembourgish is a part of me. I have given my children something from my country and a bit of Luxembourg is living through the children and me in Scotland. (Mother B)

She used a strict 1P/1L approach and even spoke Luxembourgish in the presence of her husband who understood very little. Mother C tried to stick as much as possible to Luxembourgish although she used some English with her children in the presence of English speakers. The other five mothers had planned to use a 1P/1L approach but soon came to believe that they were responsible for the development of both Luxembourgish and English. Their choice of a 1P/2L approach was influenced by the perceived subtractive context and their multilingual ideology. They recalled that

social workers, neighbours or friends confronted them with disadvantages related to bilingualism which made them rethink their initial decision.

I took my child to the baby clinic and the social worker heard me speak Luxembourgish to Tom. She told me immediately that they had a special service to help bilingual children overcome language problems. (Mother D)

Alex spoke late and everybody said it was because he was a boy and bilingual. Several suggested that I stop speaking Luxembourgish. (Mother E)

The setting might have made the mothers reconsider the amount of Luxembourgish they wanted to develop but it certainly made them believe that English was 'a priority' given the country they lived in while Luxembourgish was only 'important'. English was the language of integration and the mothers felt responsible for developing it.

The children's first language is English although their mother tongue is Luxembourgish. (Mother A)

I taught the boys some important words like 'careful' and 'yes, no'. They need to understand these when they are with the English childminder. (Mother G)

In order to guarantee that their children integrated well in England these mothers deliberately used the English words 'please', 'thank you' and 'sorry' rather than Luxembourgish equivalents. They also sang songs or recited rhymes in both Luxembourgish and English. Apart from these social reasons mothers code-switched between Luxembourgish and English on pragmatic grounds. They used English to attract their children's attention, to discipline them or to ensure comprehension in linguistically more demanding situations. (The word code-switching is used here to refer to mixing languages at intrasentential and intersentential level.)

Mothers D and F realised that the code-switching was detrimental to their first-borns' emerging competence in Luxembourgish and therefore decided to move towards a 1P/1L approach with the second-born. They hoped both to increase the input frequency for the older son and to create a supportive Luxembourgish environment for the younger one. By contrast, Mother C decided to move from a 1P/1L to a 1P/2L approach. Her husband had left her and she felt responsible for developing both languages. The change of language approach is a clear indication that these mothers assessed their children's skills and the context, evaluated the success of their language approach and took informed decisions when planning their language policy.

Resources at home and at school

In order to provide children with an incentive to use Luxembourgish and to boost their proficiency all mothers planned regular trips to Luxembourg where they stayed on average three to four weeks a year. Mother A emphasised the importance of the holidays for language acquisition:

The little cousins acted as a catalyst for the language development of my daughters. They found the Luxembourgish of the visitors at times a bit bizarre and the mistakes charming but they did not hinder the development of a good relationship. Playing together definitively motivated my girls to speak.

While in Luxembourg, the children encountered languages other than Luxembourgish. The older children watched German movies and overheard French but most mothers were unsure how much their children understood. Back at home, the responsibility lay on the mothers to provide rich, varied and interesting input in Luxembourgish and to encourage language use. They sang and read to their children making good use of Luxembourgish books, CDs and DVDs which they had either bought in Luxembourg or asked relatives to buy and send to Great Britain. Four mothers also organised resources in German and French. They found it 'normal' that their children should listen to French songs and German stories and thereby replicated the cultural practices that they had experienced in their childhood. They hoped that the familiarisation with a range of languages in an enjoyable manner would facilitate multilingualism. Two mothers, representative of the others, explained:

That's the way one does it in Luxembourg. (Mother A)

He listens to German or French songs and sometimes watches short videos in German. I did that as a child. I am not sure how much he understands. He seems to enjoy the music. It will help him to develop an ear for languages. (Mother E)

The mothers did not use the Luxembourgish or German books to develop biliteracy in their children. Mother D explained that the reception teacher advised her against involving the child in any written work in Luxembourgish, as it could interfere with the development of literacy in English. Mothers A and C occasionally sent their children text-messages in Luxembourgish which the youngsters understood but answered in English.

The mothers agreed that neither the primary nor secondary school considered Luxembourgish a valuable resource. The interviews with mothers A, B and C revealed that only one Year 1 teacher had acknowledged the cultural heritage of one of the children. Mothers A and B further agreed that the teaching of Modern Languages in Great Britain was less efficient than in Luxembourg. Although three children had learned French for several years they had only developed basic skills and were not able to communicate in Luxembourg. By contrast, the children of family B spoke fluent albeit not error-free German as a result of a friendship with Swiss German children. The elder daughter was even able to read parts of letters she exchanged with her friend. She was on the way to developing biliteracy.

Switching between Luxembourgish and English

As explained earlier, the mothers who used a 1P/2L approach deliberately chose formulaic phrases such as 'thank you' to socialise their children into English practices. They also tended to switch to English with their children both deliberately and unintentionally in the presence of English speakers. They offered two reasons for doing so. Firstly, English was a lingua franca, the language that included everybody, and second, they felt that the use of Luxembourgish portrayed them as foreigners. English was a powerful tool that helped both the mothers and the children integrate into British society. The following quotations illustrate the mothers' perceptions:

But it is normal to speak English. It is also the easiest thing to do because everybody understands it. (Mother E)

If I speak Luxembourgish I exclude the other person. (Mother F)

I do not want to be considered a foreigner. (Mother G)

The observations of families D, E and F also revealed that the mothers code-switched when they heard their children use English. Rather than correcting them for using the ‘wrong’ language, they ignored the mistake and continued the conversation in English. It generally took several turns before they noticed the change and switched back to Luxembourgish. This shows how difficult it is for a these multilingual parents to remain vigilant of when they speak the majority language. When confronted with the same issue, mothers A and C used monolingual discourse strategies. While mother A tended to ignore the inappropriate language and continue in Luxembourgish, mother C tended to ask her son to repeat a phrase in Luxembourgish. The example below illustrates the overt manner in which she negotiated a monolingual Luxembourgish setting. Words spoken in English are underlined and words emphasised are in bold:

1	Child	Ech kucken déi DVDen ganz <u>rarely</u> , <u>actually.</u>	<i>I watch these DVDs <u>very rarely</u>, <u>actually.</u></i>
2	Mother	Ech kucken déi net esou oft.	<i>I do not watch these very often.</i>
3		Et seet en net ganz rarely, actually.	<i>One does not say very rarely, actually.</i>
4		Dat as jo kee Lëtzebuergesche Satz.	<i>That is not a Luxembourgish sentence.</i>
5		Wéi giffs du dat op Lëtzebuergesch soen?	<i>How would you say that in Luxembourgish?</i>
6	Child	Ech kucken et ganz, eh.	<i>I watch it very, uh.</i>
7	Mother	Seelen.	<i>Seldom.</i>
8	Child	Seelen.	<i>Seldom.</i>

In line 2 the mother recast the sentence and offered the correct Luxembourgish words. In lines 3–5 she explained that the sentence was incorrect and requested a translation. She offered the Luxembourgish word (line 7) when she realised that her son did not know it (line 6). This mother stated very clear expectations about the use of Luxembourgish at home. She did not approve of code-switching and wanted her son to make an effort to speak ‘properly’. Her discourse about the use of the ‘incorrect sentence’ is reminiscent of school and contrasted with the view that Luxembourgish has to be taught naturally. Mother C might have been so explicit because she was being observed, but the fact that her son automatically repeated the word (line 8) indicates that this kind of language management was not unusual. It is worth noting that the mother was less strict with her second child who spoke Luxembourgish less well.

All parents felt that their code-switching limited the input in Luxembourgish and had a detrimental effect on their children’s development of the language. Mothers A, D and E explained that they tried to remedy the situation by deploying strategies to use Luxembourgish more consistently. Mothers A and D used the phrases ‘Ech schwätze Lëtzebuergesch’ (I speak Luxembourgish) and ‘Lëtzebuergesch, Lëtzebuergesch, Lëtzebuergesch’ to develop a ‘reflex to speak Luxembourgish’. Mothers D and E hoped that their formula would help them to establish a more monolingual Luxembourgish setting and to move towards a 1P/1L approach.

To conclude, while the mothers' strong identification with Luxembourgish and their highly positive attitudes to bilingualism were important they were in most cases insufficient to guarantee consistent use of Luxembourgish. The mothers provided children with a range of opportunities to use Luxembourgish at home and on holidays but their aim to socialise children into British cultural practices, underpinned by their own wish to adapt and feel included, led the majority to use English in a wide range of contexts.

Discussion and conclusion

The mothers' multilingual competence, the ease with which they integrated in Great Britain and their successful professional careers explain their motivation to develop bilingualism which they considered a stepping stone towards multilingualism. As parents they were now in the position to help develop in their children some of the linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1991) that had contributed to their success. The planning and the management of their own and their children's language use provided the mothers with many challenges which resulted in the inconsistent use of the minority language. The challenges, which will be discussed in turn, arose because of the interaction between the mothers' ideologies and multilingual experiences, and the monolingual English context.

The mothers strongly identified with the 'two-pronged language ideology' (Horner 2007; Horner and Weber 2008) which is dominant in Luxembourg. On the one hand, all of them associated their mother tongue with their identity and nationality, and, as a result, felt a need to develop Luxembourgish. On the other hand they cherished their multilingual skills which lay at the heart of their successful lives. Consequently, they wished to develop in their children the same language skills, language flexibility and adaptability. The emphasis the mothers placed on a particular side of this double language ideology influenced their language approach. The two mothers who felt most strongly about their mother tongue and identity chose the 1P/1L model which guarantees maximum exposure to Luxembourgish. The isolation felt by the mother in Scotland contributed to her decision to develop a small Luxembourgish enclave. The other five mothers seemed to value multilingualism over Luxembourgish. Their choice of a 1P/2L approach was further informed by the negative views of bilingualism which English social workers, teachers and friends confronted them with. They felt responsible for developing English which socialised their children into British practices.

Apart from the language ideologies in Luxembourg, the mothers continued to be influenced by the practice of code-switching which has been described as a key characteristic of the multilingual Luxembourgers (MEN 2008). The ability to adapt to the language of the interlocutor and to behave like 'linguistic hybrids' (Weitzel quoted in MEN 2005, 35) is highly praised in Luxembourg. All mothers in this study admitted to code-switching. They moved between languages in order to integrate themselves and their children into British society and to make non-Luxembourgers feel included. They behaved similarly to other trilingual mothers studied although they used the majority language (i.e. English) far more frequently when addressing their own children in the presence of non-Luxembourgish speakers. Barron-Hauwaert (2000) found that the mothers in her study only code-switched 45% of the time with their children in order to include majority-language speakers. In addition, the mothers in the present study perceived code-switching as more negative

and detrimental to language learning than the mother in Quay's (2008) study. The Luxembourgish mothers were the only source of regular input in Luxembourgish and, therefore, code-switching immediately reduced the input children received in this language. The mothers in other studies could draw on linguistic support from their extended family or the community network (Braun and Cline 2010; Dagenais and Day 1999; Li 2006).

Whilst it is clear that frequent code-switching does not facilitate the development of Luxembourgish it might not even have helped the Luxembourgish mothers to socialise their children into becoming bilinguals. The youngsters might have learned that different languages are used with different people and for different purposes (Nicoladis and Genesee 1998; Zentella 1997). However, they might also have become *less* comfortable with bilingualism because the code-switching mothers reminded them constantly about the symbolic power of English (Bourdieu 1991). English seemed to be the only language that counted outside their home.

The mothers' choice of a 1P/2L approach in conjunction with their tendency for code-switching, the use of English at home and the children's lack of communicative needs in Luxembourgish are not conducive to active bilingualism (Caldas 2006; De Houwer 2009; Lanza 2004). It is too early to evaluate the success of the parents in this study because seven children are younger than 3 years. So far only Families A, B and C have managed to raise both or at least one of their children bilingually: mother A in England who choose a 1P/2L approach and mothers B and C who opted for a 1P/1L approach (at least with their first child). These mothers attributed their success to three factors: the children's wish to speak Luxembourgish, the need to use this language and the atmosphere which encouraged the development of positive attitudes to the minority language. The communicative needs, the quality of the relationship between the interlocutors and the children's attitudes have also been highlighted as crucial variables by other researchers (Obied 2009; Schwartz 2008). Further research into children's identity and their attitudes towards languages is necessary in order to explain the older children's mastery of Luxembourgish. What motivated them to continue to develop their minority language despite the largely monolingual environment? In-depth case studies of the language use within the families would illustrate the manner in which all participants negotiate language use and tackle language development. This short small-scale study limited the number of observations. In addition it drew on few families and included only multilingual high achievers with positive attitudes to languages. (Fifteen women volunteered to participate but all had similar biographies.) A different picture might emerge if one studied Luxembourgish mothers with different biographies and those living in proximity to a Luxembourgish community.

In sum, this study has shown that the dominant language ideology in Luxembourg, the mothers' multilingual competence and their experience of multilingualism strongly influenced their language ideologies. This finding corroborates the findings of Curdt-Christiansen (2009), Eilers et al. (2006), King and Fogle (2006) and Schüpbach (2009). It further supports King, Fogle and Logan-Terry's (2008) argument that parental ideologies inform family language planning and that this planning is to a great extent explicit. The mothers in the present study discussed the bilingual upbringing, decided on a 1P/1L or 1P/2L approach and tried to change the amount of code-switching. Further research is required to determine whether the mothers' overt planning and family language management are due to their wish to develop additive bilingualism and to their good awareness of others'

language needs which could be related to their positive experience of multilingualism. This study is original in that it illustrates how the interaction between the mothers' ideologies and those of the country of residence affects language planning. Living in a monolingual setting that endorses the use of English lured these multilingual mothers into the frequent use of English with their children which, in turn, reduced the input in Luxembourgish and, therefore, the chances to raise the children as bilinguals. Mothers less able and eager to constantly accommodate the language needs of their interlocutors might have resisted the temptation to speak English so frequently. It is hoped that this article will trigger further research into the process of family language planning with a particular focus on cases where the ideologies of the parents and those of the countries of residence clash.

References

- Anderson, J., C. Kenner, and E. Gregory. 2008. The national languages strategy in the UK: Are minority languages still on the margins? In *Forging multilingual spaces. Integrating perspectives on majority and minority bilingual education*, ed. C. Hélot, A.M. Mejía, 183–202. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. 2000. Issues surrounding trilingual families: Children with simultaneous exposure to three languages. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 5, no. 1. http://www.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/projekt_ejournal/jg_05_1/beitrag/barron.htm (accessed May 1, 2011).
- Bates, J. 2004. Use of narrative interviewing in everyday information behaviour research. *Library & Information Science Research* 26: 15–28.
- Bayley, R., and S.R. Schecter, ed. 2003. *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Blackledge, A. 2000. *Literacy, power and social justice*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Blackledge, A., and A. Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism: A critical perspective (advances in sociolinguistics)*. London: Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Braun, A., and Cline, T. 2010. Trilingual families in mainly monolingual societies: Working towards a typology. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7, no. 2: 110–27.
- Bursch, J. 2005. Language patterns in a trilingual household. *The Bilingual Family Newsletter. Multilingual Matters* 23, no. 5: 6–7.
- Caldas, S.J. 2006. *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in monolingual cultures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cunningham-Andersson, U., and S. Andersson. 1999. *Growing up with two languages: A practical guide*. London: Routledge.
- 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: 351–75.
- Dagenais, D., and Day, E. 1999. Home language practices of trilingual children in French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 56, no. 1: 99–123.
- De Houwer, A. 2007. Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28: 411–24.
- De Houwer, A. 2009. *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Bristol: mttextbooks.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). 2000. *National Curriculum 2000*. Suffolk: DfEE.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2002. *Languages for all: Languages for life*. Annesley, Notts: DfES.
- Döpke, S. 1998. Can the principle of 'one person-one language' be disregarded as unrealistically elitist? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 21: 41–56.

- Eilers, R.E., B.Z. Pearson, and A.B. Cobo-Lewis. 2006. Social factors in bilingual development: The Miami experience. In *Childhood bilingualism. Research on infancy through school age*, ed. P. McCardle and E. Hoff, 68–90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- European Commission. 2001. *Eurobarometer 54.1*. Brussels: EC.
- European Commission. 2006. *Special Eurobarometer 'Europeans and their Languages'*. Brussels: EC. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_243_sum_de.pdf (accessed November 15, 2010).
- Fehlen, F. 2009. *Baleine bis. Une enquête sur un marché linguistique multilingue en profonde mutation/Luxemburgs Sprachmarkt im Wandel* [The changing multilingual market]. Luxembourg: Recherche Etude Documentation.
- Flick, U. 2009. *An introduction to qualitative research*, 4th ed. London: Sage.
- García, P. 2005. Parental language attitudes and practices to socialise children in a diglossic society. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8: 328–44.
- Goodson, I.F., and P. Sikes. 2001. *Life history research in educational settings: Learning from lives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Goodz, N.S. 1989. Parental language mixing in bilingual families. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 10: 25–44.
- Hodkinson, H. 2005. Combining life history and longitudinal qualitative research to explore transitions and learning in the course. *Lifelong Learning Institute*. University of Leeds. http://www.learninglives.org/papers/papers/HH_LE_PCET_Queensland_Australia_2005.doc. (accessed May 5, 2010).
- Horner, K. 2007. Language and Luxembourgish national identity: Ideologies of hybridity and purity in the past and present. In *Germanic Language Histories 'from Below' (1700–2000)*, ed. S. Elspaß, N. Langer, J. Scharloth, and W. Vandebussche, 363–78. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Horner, K., and J.J. Weber. 2008. The language situation in Luxembourg. *Current issues in Language Planning* 9: 69–128.
- King, K.A., and L. Fogle. 2006. Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9: 695–712.
- King, K.A., L. Fogle, and A. Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2: 907–22.
- Lanza, E. 2004. *Language mixing in infant bilingualism. A sociolinguistic perspective. Oxford studies in language contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li, G. 2006. Biliteracy and trilingual practices in the home context: Case studies of Chinese-Canadian children. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy Copyright* 6, no. 3: 355–81.
- MEN. 2005. *Rapport national* [National Report]. Luxembourg: Le gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de la formation professionnelle. CESIJE.
- MEN. 2008. A propos des langues. http://www.gouvernement.lu/publications/luxembourg/a_propos_des_langues/a_propos_des_langues_2008_EN.pdf (accessed September 10, 2009).
- Neustupný, J.V., and J. Nekvapil. 2003. Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current issues in Language Planning* 4: 181–366.
- Nicoladis, E., and F. Genesee. 1998. Parental discourse and code-mixing in bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2: 85–99.
- Obied, V.M. 2009. How do siblings shape the language environment in bilingual families? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12: 705–20.
- Okita, T. 2002. *Invisible work: Bilingualism, language choice and childrearing in intermarried families*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pavlenko, A. 2007. Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 28: 163–88.
- Quay, S. 2008. Dinner conversations with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language* 28: 5–33.
- Schecter, S.R., and R. Bayley. 2002. *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schüpbach, D. 2009. Language transmission revisited: Family type, linguistic environment and language attitudes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12: 15–30.

- Schwartz, M. 2008. Exploring the relationship between family language policy and heritage language knowledge among second generation Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29: 400–18.
- Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels*, ed. P. Clyne, R.W.F. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer, 193–247. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuominen, A. 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140: 59–76.
- Weber, J.J. 2008. Safetalk revisited, or language and ideology in Luxembourgish educational policy. *Language and Education* 22: 155–69.
- Yamamoto, M. 2001. *Language use in interlingual families: A Japanese-English sociolinguistic study*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Zentella, A.C. 1997. *Growing up bilingual*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.