



International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rbeb20

Family language policy in multilingual Luxembourg: the conceptual shift from a conflictual to a contrastive dynamic

Gabrijela Aleksić & Natalia-Maria Duruş

To cite this article: Gabrijela Aleksić & Natalia-Maria Duruş (02 Jan 2025): Family language policy in multilingual Luxembourg: the conceptual shift from a conflictual to a contrastive dynamic, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, DOI: [10.1080/13670050.2024.2446550](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2024.2446550)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2024.2446550>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



[View supplementary material](#)



Published online: 02 Jan 2025.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 51



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Family language policy in multilingual Luxembourg: the conceptual shift from a conflictual to a contrastive dynamic

Gabrijela Aleksić ^a and Natalia-Maria Duruş^b

^aFaculty of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, Department of Behavioural and Cognitive Sciences, Lifespan Development, Family and Culture, University of Luxembourg, Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg; ^bLuxembourg multi-LEARN Institute for Interaction and Development in Diversity, Luxembourg, Luxembourg

ABSTRACT

The current paper explores family language policies (FLP) in multilingual Luxembourg based on 32 interviews with parents of children aged 4–5. We operate both a thematic and a pragmatic discourse analysis on the answers provided by the parents to one question: ‘What languages do you speak in your household?’. The thematic analysis looks at the specific languages reported as FLP by the 32 families: one language (16); one language ‘mostly’ (3); one parent, one language (10), a ‘mix up’ two languages (1); and three languages (2). Even though the parents use markers of certainty, self-identifying their FLP as ‘always’ monolingual/bilingual/trilingual as we see in the thematic analysis, the pragmatic analysis brings forward a contrast in the families’ discourse, advancing the possibility of a shift from the current conflictual dynamic to a contrastive dynamic. Therefore, in the multilingual context of Luxembourg, the FLP promoting home languages is in contrast, and not in conflict, with the languages of new environment. The paper contributes to the development of new conceptual models of FLP in a multilingual context and to further documenting the role of family in fostering the plurilingual development of the child.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 22 January 2024

Accepted 19 December 2024

KEYWORDS

Family language policy dynamics; multilingualism; Luxembourg; contrastive dynamic


Introduction: multilingual Luxembourg, a case study for family language policy

Families travel to new places to settle, and the narratives of these families change as the policies and language practices of the new environments evolve. The research on family language policies (FLP), which King, Fogle, and Logan-Terry (2008) define as ‘explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members’ (907) has been enjoying an ongoing interest from researchers since FLP is important for children’s formal school success, the maintenance of minority languages and family’s identity (King, Fogle, and Logan-Terry 2008).

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has the highest percentage of foreign population in Europe which amounts to 47% (STATEC 2023). More specifically, 74% of the population have a direct or indirect migratory background, meaning they have at least one parent born abroad.

A trilingual country since 1984, Luxembourg states Luxembourgish, German and French as official languages, with English being present in business, educational and public environments. The establishment of EU institutions in Luxembourg, coupled with the economic, academic and asylum migration add to the diverse profile of the country.

CONTACT Gabrijela Aleksić  gabrijela.aleksic@uni.lu

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2024.2446550>.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

This diversity triggered the need for a variety of undergraduate educational options made available or supported by the Luxembourgish government. The foreign/non-Luxembourgish families have the option of registering their children in the national educational public schools (trilingual), in one of the two EU schools (organized on language sections), in the international sections of state schools, in the private but state-financially supported schools, or in the recently created international public schools. In public schools, children start preschool education (age 4–6) in Luxembourgish, which becomes their oral language. They officially start formal literacy instruction in German at age 6, followed by French from age 7. Moreover, the new law in 2017 proclaimed multilingual early education mandatory whereby the teachers are expected to develop children's competences in Luxembourgish, their oral language, familiarize them with French but also value their home languages (MENJE 2017).

As the families establish themselves in Luxembourg, they already have one, two, three or more languages in their repertoire and by choosing the preferred schooling system for the children, they also must decide if and how to support the home languages, the new environment's languages, and the academic languages of the children.

The current study takes a qualitative approach analysing the FLP dynamics of 32 families established in Luxembourg of which at least one parent has a migratory background and addresses the conflictual nature of the FLP choice, also referred to as the 'either/or' dilemma, which we elaborate on in the next section.

Family language policy dynamics: the either/or dilemma

Curdtt-Christiansen and Huang (2020) advance the FLP research by proposing a 'theoretical conceptualisation to depict how different factors influence family language decisions in dynamic ways' (176). This 'dynamic model' (Curdtt-Christiansen and Huang 2020, 176) gives a wide perspective of the factors which influence the parents' decision making. The model includes both internal factors (emotions, identity, family culture and tradition, parental impact beliefs and child agency) and external factors (socio-political, socio-cultural, socio-economic, and socio-linguistic). We will further refer to the FLP reported discourse as FLP dynamics.

Curdtt-Christiansen and Huang (2020) present the FLP choice as a dilemma of 'either raising their children bilingually or only in the societal language' (175), similar to Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2013) who show that the 37 Albanian families living in Greece they interviewed 'differ as to whether they embrace bilingualism as an asset or accept the dominant ideology according to which the simultaneous development of two languages may hinder the development of the majority language' (675). Curdtt-Christiansen and Huang (2020) and Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2013) position this dilemma as 'either/or', respectively 'whether/or', with 'either' representing a bilingual policy (the home language/other language plus the language of the environment) and with 'or' being the one 'societal' (Curdtt-Christiansen and Huang 2020), 'majority' (Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi 2013, 675) language.

The FLP literature documents both dynamics of families who declare mixed/bilingual use of languages in the family (e.g. Deprez 1999; King 2013; King and Fogle 2006), the 'either' part of the dilemma and families who report only using the home language as FLP (e.g. Fillmore 2000; Gharibi and Mirvahedi 2021; Kirsch and Gogonas 2018), the 'or' element of the dilemma. For example, Fillmore (2000) focuses on the language loss and the deteriorating family relations in the Chen family who immigrated to the United States. The researcher follows the destiny of the four children who were acquiring English in school and who, at some point, refused to continue speaking Cantonese in the home environment. Furthermore, Gharibi and Mirvahedi (2021) interviewed 18 Iranian families who immigrated to the UK and conclude that Iranian diaspora in London helped the mothers who lacked English proficiency to maintain the home language for them and their children. Moreover, Kirsch and Gogonas (2018) focus on two families of Greek origin who immigrated to Luxembourg and kept speaking Greek. While one of the families build their FLP focusing on the integrative approach supporting school languages of their children at home, the FLP of the other Greek family overtly emphasised on language separation and Greek-

only conversations at home. In addition, in a study by Deprez (1999), the mother, Sylvie, who arrived in France with her Chinese origin family, started introducing French in the communication with her children after realizing that speaking only Chinese to them as a stay-at-home mother was impacting their performance at school.

The conflicting nature of FLP emerges indeed as a reality in these studies. The plurilingual factor could, however, change the conceptual FLP model as Kostoulas and Motsiou (2022) advance. The researchers analyze parental discourses in mixed-language families as they emerge in two online parental communities. The authors concluded on 'strong positive views about fostering plurilingualism' (2022, 696) and that the 'established language development and management practices (e.g. 'OPOL', 'Minority Language at Home') were supplemented with more flexible ones, suggesting adjustment to emerging multilingual norms' (2022, 696). They therefore call for a development of new conceptual models of Family Language Policy that are 'more responsive to emerging patterns of language contact and plurilingualism' (Kostoulas and Motsiou 2022, 696).

The current paper analyses the reported FLP dynamic of 32 families established in Luxembourg by means of discourse analysis (thematic and pragmatic analysis), as it is also the case of the studies quoted in this section (less valid for Fillmore 2000 who opts for a narrative approach in the presentation of the data). Given the rather low percentage of studies using discourse analysis (13% as cited in the FLP review by Bose et al. 2023) for analysing FLP, the approach taken by the current paper allows for contributions at the conceptual and methodological level in a highly multilingual context, specifically through the findings of the pragmatic analysis.

Methodology

This study is a part of a larger project HOMELI (*Home Literacy Environment and Family Language Policy of Language minority Children in Luxembourg*), developed by the first author, and approved by the Ethics Review Panel at the University of Luxembourg (ERP 17-006). In the current paper we analyse FLP as reported in 32 parent interviews, focusing on one research question:

What are the family language policy dynamics in the multilingual context of Luxembourg?

In the following we introduce the participants of the study, the details of the procedure and the analytical approach.

Procedure and participants: 32 families living in Luxembourg

Procedure

As part of the project, the first author sent the home literacy questionnaire in eight languages (Portuguese, English, German, French, Serbian, Romanian, Hungarian and Italian) to 22 schools with more than 60% of immigrant children (MENJE 2017). The teachers distributed the questionnaires to all immigrant parents of which 600 filled in the questionnaire and 198 wanted to be interviewed. The families' background information presented in Table 1 was collected in a questionnaire format, before the realisation of the interviews. We contacted all 198 parents via phone or email and, finally, organized the interviews with 32 families who were still interested and available to participate. The interviews took place in the families' homes apart from the three interviews with Portuguese mothers taken in the shopping mall. The research assistants audio recorded the interviews except with the three Portuguese mothers who did not wish to. In this case, the research assistant took notes. In total, the research assistants interviewed 32 families with 41 participants. There were 24 interviews where only mothers participated, seven interviews with both mother and father together and one interview with mother, father, and a child. All the participants were interviewed once, with the interviews lasting between 30 and 105 min. The choice of semi-structured interviews was made on the account of previously obtained questionnaire results and the need for reliable qualitative data given that it was to be collected in several languages by different interviewers.

Table 1. Families' background information (Aleksić and Duruş 2024).

Families	Languages	Participants	Country of origin	Education	Children
Family 1	Portuguese and French	Mother	Portugal	vocational secondary	2
Family 2	French, Luxembourgish and German	Mother	Luxembourg	vocational secondary	1
Family 3	French, Luxembourgish, German and English	Mother	France	post-secondary	4
Family 4	English, German, French and Luxembourgish	Mother	Ireland	post-secondary	2
Family 5	English, French, Luxembourgish and German	Mother	England	post-secondary	3
Family 6	Greek and English	Mother, Father	Greece	post-secondary	1
Family 7	Vietnamese and English	Mother	Vietnam	post-secondary	1
Family 8	Bulgarian, Luxembourgish, French, German and English	Mother, Father	Bulgaria	post-secondary	2
Family 9	English and French	Mother, Father, Child	Ireland	post-secondary	2
Family 10	German, Luxembourgish and French	Mother	Germany	post-secondary	2
Family 11	Romanian and French	Mother	Moldova	post-secondary	2
Family 12	German, French, English and Luxembourgish	Mother	Germany	post-secondary	2
Family 13	German, Luxembourgish, French and English	Mother	Germany	post-secondary	2
Family 14	French, Spanish and English	Mother	France	post-secondary	1
Family 15	French, Portuguese and Luxembourgish	Mother	Portugal	vocational secondary	2
Family 16	English and Luxembourgish	Mother, Father	Philippines, Luxembourg	post-secondary	3
Family 17	French and Spanish	Mother	France	post-secondary	1
Family 18	Spanish, French, Arabic and English	Mother	Spain	post-secondary	2
Family 19	Chinese and English	Mother	China	post-secondary	1
Family 20	Luxembourgish, French, German and English	Mother	Luxembourg	post-secondary	2
Family 21	Polish and English	Mother	Poland	post-secondary	2
Family 22	French and Luxembourgish	Mother	Belgium	post-secondary	2
Family 23	French, Luxembourgish, German, Italian and English	Mother	Belgium	academic	2
Family 24	German, Italian and French	Mother	Germany	post-secondary	2
Family 25	German, French and Luxembourgish	Mother	Luxembourg	post-secondary	3
Family 26	Catalan, Spanish and French	Mother, Father	Spain	post-secondary, academic secondary	2
Family 27	Italian, Japanese and English	Mother	Japan	post-secondary	3
Family 28	Luxembourgish, English and German	Mother, Father	Luxembourg, Denmark	post-secondary	1
Family 29	Greek, German and English	Mother, Father	Greece, Luxembourg	post-secondary	2
Family 30	Portuguese, Luxembourgish and French	Mother	Portugal	vocational secondary	2
Family 31	German, Esperanto and Russian	Mother, Father	Russia, Argentina	post-secondary and academic secondary	3
Family 32	French, Portuguese and Luxembourgish	Mother	Portugal	vocational secondary	3

Out of 32 families, 57% were in their forties, 40% in their thirties and 2% in their twenties. There were 83% of the parents who hold post-secondary school degree (10% academic secondary school and 2% vocational secondary school degree), 76% of parents living in the Centre of Luxembourg (17% in the North and 2% in the South) (Aleksić and Duruş 2024). The sample is thus predominantly composed of well-educated parents. A more detailed information on families' background is presented in Table 1.

Analysis

The current article approaches the discourse from a qualitative 'discourse in context' (Amossy 2000, 162; Curdt-Christiansen and Huang 2020; Schegloff 1981) perspective, as 'tool for the study of social life' (Gee 2014, 28). Frazer (2009) refers to the meaning of a sentence both in terms of content and pragmatic meaning. We have therefore performed an analysis in two stages: a thematic discourse analysis of the data, and a pragmatic analysis of the data.

The thematic analysis looks 'at the "content" of the language being used, the themes or issues being discussed in a conversation' (Gee 2014, 8), being concerned with 'what' is being reported in a conversation. For this analysis, we have selected the answers provided to the interview question 'Could you describe what languages are spoken in the household?', independently from the answers provided in the questionnaire (Table 1). The answers are presented in Annex 1, column two. We have equally considered the completions to the parent's answer, either by the other parent, or by the child present. The third column of Annex 1 presents other references to the same question, 'languages spoken in the household', which was produced either as a follow up to the first answer or was made relevant by the participants in other parts of the interview. For reasons of space, the text of the article quotes only specific examples, the data corresponding to the 32 families being present as Annex 1. This first analysis allows for a clustering of the families based on the reported FLP dynamic as shown in Table 2.

Pragmatics is 'primarily concerned (...) with how language is used in communication' (Rühlemann & Ajimer, 2015, 1–2). Rühlemann and Ajimer quote Fasold (2015, 119) who defines pragmatics as 'the study of the use of context to make inferences about meaning' (Rühlemann & Ajimer, 2015, 2). We therefore understand pragmatics as the study of the meaning the speakers manage to convey beyond the content that is being reported.

The analysis benefits from the work that has been done on 'pragmatic markers' (Frazer 2009), scalar implicature markers (Cheng and O'Keeffe 2015, 364; Levinson 1983, 134) and stance adverbials (Charles 2009), also referred to as focusing adverbs (Rooth 1992). Frazer emphasized that while pragmatic markers 'are not part of the propositional content of the message conveyed' (2009, 295), they 'signal aspects of the message the speaker wishes to convey' (2009, 295). Frazer mentions four classes of markers: contrastive (but, on the contrary, regardless, etc.), elaborative (and, also, moreover, or, etc.), inferential (so, then, etc.) and topic management (by the way, before I forget, etc.) (2009, 296). The scalar implicature markers hold the idea that 'there is a scale, say ⟨some, many, most, all⟩, which orders its elements from weaker to stronger' (Levinson 1983, 49). Researching on the function of stance adverbials (Charles quoting Biber et al., 2009) in academic written texts¹, Charles (2009) brings forward the idea that restrictive adverbs like 'only' and 'just', while setting clear limits through their restricting value, they also hold a 'stance' function, a 'positioning', an 'attitude' (156). In many of the examples presented by Charles, the restrictive adverbs are followed by markers of contrast like

Table 2. The five FLP dynamics as reported by the parents.

-
1. I (Parent 1) always speak (one language): Families 1–16
 2. We (Parent 1 and Parent 2) speak mostly (one language): Families 17–19
 3. I (Parent 1) speak (language), he/she (Parent 2) speaks (language): Families 20–30
 4. We (Parent 1 and Parent 2) both speak (languages)/we mix up both languages: Family 30
 5. So, (language 1), (language 2) and (language 3): Families 31 and 32
-

'but', 'however', 'whereas', 'while' (2009, 160). Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi's (2013) interview data, equally illustrate elements of scalar implicature markers followed by 'but' (682).

The data is presented in its English translation for the purposes of this paper, with the mentioning of the interview language in column 1, Annex 1. Moreover, the approach allows for an analysis with data in several languages and their respective translations into English (Frazer 2009, 318). The interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed in the original language, except for three families speaking Portuguese where notes were taken (signaled with the mention 'notes' in the Annex 1 attached).

Results

The current study focuses on the main research question:

What are the family language policy dynamics in the multilingual context of Luxembourg?

Thematic discourse analysis

To address this question, we have first performed a thematic analysis onto the answers of one of the questions asked during the interview with the parents: 'Could you describe what languages are spoken in the household?'. This resulted in 5 FLP dynamics for the 32 families as shown in Table 2. For this first analysis of the data, we have only considered the languages reported as policy and have not included the completions to the answer presented in the third column. These completions will be discussed in the second part of the analysis. For the labelling of the FLP dynamics, we have kept the same wording the parents have used.

We elaborate each of the five FLP dynamics in the following.

The first FLP dynamic, 'I always speak', refers to what we would traditionally call 'monolingual families', families that report speaking one language within family member interactions. Sixteen families out of the 32 interviewed report using only one language in the interaction with the children within the family environment. This dynamic could be summarized as the 'one passport, one language' perspective for parents who either hold the same passport (Families 1–15), or who have decided on speaking only one language (Family 16). Family 5 reports 'So our main language at home is definitely English', while Family 13 states 'I usually always speak German with my children (...)'.

Fogle and King (2013) name this approach the 'hot-house-approach' (2) and Kirsch and Gogonas (2018) mention that the parents 'immerse children in that language and provide them with great exposure' (4). The languages that are reported as policy in the 16 families are: Portuguese (2), French (3), English (4), German (3), Greek (1), Vietnamese (1), Romanian (1) and Bulgarian (1).

A secondary category is that of parents who do not share the 'one passport, one language' reality and ideology, but who report having decided to use only one language as a FLP: 'We mainly speak English in the house. So, my ... both my wife and I speak English to the children'. The discourse of the parent refers to a decision being taken by both parents as 'it would make more sense' (Family 16).

The second FLP dynamic includes three families who speak, mainly one language, but with a second and/or third language used at a lesser degree. The mother of Family 17 mentions the difficulty to be consistent with a French-Spanish bilingual language policy and that the father only uses Spanish at a percentage of 10–20% of the time as he finds it difficult to 'switch between languages' (Tr.).

The mother of Family 18 reports speaking Spanish to the children and being responded to in the same language: 'I speak to the children in Spanish (...) With me in Spanish of course' (Tr.). The reported language of the couple is French and the father speaks several languages, while his heritage language is Arabic: 'he speaks in all languages with the children (...) Normally he has to speak in Arabic because it is his first language' (Tr. Family 18).

Family 19 reports the use of Chinese and the child (who is present during the interview) rephrases the answer into 'Chinese and English'.

The third FLP dynamic corresponds to Smith-Christmas's (2016) *one parent one language* (OPOL) approach: each parent speaks one preestablished language to the child. Ten of the 32 families we have interviewed report this FLP. The pair of languages that are reportedly spoken in the 10 families are: Luxembourgish/French, Polish/English, French/Luxembourgish (2 families), German/Italian, French/German, Catalan/Spanish, Japanese/Italian, Luxembourgish/Danish and Greek/German. For example, the mother of family 21 reports 'I speak to them Polish. Dad speaks English'.

The fourth FLP dynamic shows one family where two languages are used without any interactional policy, the parents 'mix up' both languages (Portuguese and Luxembourgish). The mother reports a FLP assumed by 'both' (Family 30) parents and accepted as 'normal' (Family 30), without any questioning, 'we never ask ourselves if we are using the wrong language' (Family 30).

Finally, the fifth FLP dynamic showcases two families who integrated three languages as a FLP. Family 31 reports the use of Russian, German and Esperanto while Family 32 reports the use of French, Portuguese, and Luxembourgish. For this fifth category, we conclude on a FLP that includes home languages (Russian and Portuguese), the languages of the environment (German and Luxembourgish) and a third category of languages (Esperanto).

The languages that are reported to be spoken in the 32 families are:

- (a) FLP dynamic 1: Portuguese (2), French (3), English (4), German (3), Greek (1), Vietnamese (1), Romanian (1) and Bulgarian (1),
- (b) FLP dynamic 2: French and Spanish; Spanish and Arabic; Chinese and English,
- (c) FLP dynamic 3: Luxembourgish and French, Polish and English, French and Luxembourgish (2 families), German and Italian, French and German, Catalan and Spanish, Japanese and Italian, Luxembourgish and Danish and Greek and German,
- (d) FLP dynamic 4: Portuguese and Luxembourgish,
- (e) FLP dynamic 5: Russian, German and Esperanto; French, Portuguese, and Luxembourgish.

We can, after these initial results, conclude that 16 out of the 32 families have one or more of the three official languages (Luxembourgish, German and French) as part of their reported FLP dynamic. In terms of 'either/or' dilemma, with 'either' representing a bilingual policy (the home language/ other language plus the language of the environment) and with 'or' being the one 'societal' (Curdts-Christiansen and Huang 2020), 'majority' (Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi 2013, 675) language, the FLP of 10 families align with the bilingual policy and the remaining 6 with the 'societal language' policy, this not excluding the overlap of a home language with a societal language. The remaining 16 families have other languages as FLP.

Pragmatic discourse analysis

The results of the thematic analysis are insights into what the parents perceive as 'policies'. The pragmatic analysis which follows goes beyond the 'propositional content of the message conveyed' (Frazer 2009, 295), signaling 'aspects of the message the speaker wishes to convey' (Frazer 2009, 295).

For example, we now know that Family 13 'usually always' speaks German at home. We take a closer look at the extended answer provided by Family 13 (FLP dynamic 1):

I usually always speak German with my children because it is the language I think in and simply because I can express myself best in German. (...) But if my children speak Luxembourgish with me because they are just back from school, for example, and they are still in that language, then I answer in Luxembourgish and accept that situation. And if she (the elder daughter) needs it, then I also speak French with her, for example for her homework or if she has to read a text, then I will do that together with her, you know.

The analysis brings forward the use of (i) scalar implicature markers (Cheng and O'Keeffe 2015, 364; Levinson 1983, 134) such as 'always' (Families 1, 2, 11 and 13), '100%' (Family 6), 'on a regular basis' (Family 32); and (ii) stance adverbials (Charles 2009), also referred to as focusing adverbs (Rooth 1992) such as 'only' (Families 3, 4, 6, 14 and 25), 'exclusively' (Families 10 and 12), 'actually' (Families

1, 6 and 17), 'basically' (Family 8), 'normal/normally' (Families 8 and 28), 'mostly' (Family 17), 'main/mainly' (Families 5, 6 and 16), 'definitely' (Family 5). Finally, we mention the use of membership categorization devices (Sacks 1992): 'we' ('we are French'), 'our' ('our main language'), 'us' ('the three of us', 'the four of us'). The markers quoted in this paragraph reinforce the message of an FLP in place.

We emphasize the use of the scalar implicature marker (Cheng and O'Keeffe 2015, 364) 'always' and the contrast marker 'but if' followed by 'then', 'and if ... then'. The parent of Family 13 always speaks German, except for situations when she speaks Luxembourgish (when the children have recently returned from school) and French (when she needs to help her daughter with homework).

As reported, Family 21 is included in the 16 families which does not speak any of the languages of the new environment as FLP. The mother reports:

I speak to them Polish. Dad speaks English. (...) If they are just English speakers, English, but yes, some German and French, depending on what's necessary and if the message is to all of the children, then I try to speak something that most of them will get.

Similar to the previous example, the mother of Family 21 makes use of the contrast marker 'but' followed by 'depending on', 'and if ... then'.

It is the case in our data where the first FLP statement is followed by a 'contrastiveness in information structure' (Lee 2017) enacted with contrastive markers (Frazer 2009, 296): 'except if ... then' (Family 1), 'except when ... then ... and then' (Family 5), 'unless ... in that case' (Family 6), 'occasionally' (Family 10), 'and then' (Family 11),

Well, 'exclusively' is not completely true ... And in a playful way we sometimes ... But in that case, it is always playful. That is never ... When we are at school or in kindergarten, it's frequently ... because ... And when ... it is also often ... Well, depending on ... then we speak in (Family 12),

'but if' (Family 13), 'if ... usually ... but if ... usually' (Family 18), 'sometimes' (Families 20, 29), 'if ... depending on ... and if ... then' (Family 21), 'when ... and so ... if ... after that' (Family 23), 'but' (Family 31).

The pragmatic analysis showcases an opening towards a situated multilingual FLP based on the interactional needs associated with: the situated context (the child who is picked up from school speaks Luxembourgish), the topic (when discussing sensitive topics), the academic languages (reading a book in the one of the academic languages), and other people's needs (accommodating to other people's language repertoire).

We can conclude that all the parents report using other languages (at different proficiency levels) in interaction with their children's friends, with other parents or with other persons from the environment, and that this multilingual practice is evolving, as the parents themselves continue to acquire new language competences.

Discussion: the shift from a conflictual to a contrastive FLP dynamic

Guided by our research question: *What are the family language policy dynamics in the multilingual context of Luxembourg?* we analysed the answers to one question from 32 interviews with parents of children aged 4–5: 'Could you describe what languages are spoken in the household?'. The answers were analysed from a thematic and pragmatic discourse approach to include a description of both what the parents reported and how they used language to report it which might 'signal aspects of the message the speaker wishes to convey' (Frazer 2009, 295). For the first part, the analysis has shown 5 FLP dynamics: (1) I (Parent 1) always speak (one language), (2) We (Parent 1 and Parent 2) speak mostly (one language), (3) I (Parent 1) speak (language), he/she (Parent 2) speaks (language), (4) We (Parent 1 and Parent 2) both speak (languages)/we mix up both languages, and (5) So, (language 1), (language 2) and (language 3).

The first FLP dynamic includes 16 families who report having one language as a FLP, this being either a home language that the parents have in common (15 families) or a language the parents

have agreed upon (one family). The second FLP dynamic includes three families who speak one language 'mostly' and with a second and/or third language used at a lesser degree by both parents. The two languages are home languages of the parents. The third FLP dynamic includes ten families with each parent speaking one language to the children as FLP, either corresponding to the home languages or a language of the environment. The fourth FLP dynamic shows one family where two languages are used without any interactional policy, the parents 'mix up' both languages. The fifth FLP dynamic showcases two families who integrated three languages as a FLP, two of them being home languages and the third being either a language of the environment or another language of choice. We concluded that 16 out of the 32 families have one or more of the three societal languages (Luxembourgish, German and French) as part of their reported FLP dynamic, for some of them this being also a home language.

Secondly, the pragmatic analysis shows the parents report a derogation from the reported FLP when picking up the child from school, when supporting the academic advancement in the languages of the environment, when discussing sensitive topics, when the child is accompanied by friends who speak other languages or in the presence of other persons who don't speak the FLP language(s).

The 'contrastiveness in information structure' (Lee 2017) identified in the data was introduced by 'but if', 'except if', 'except when', 'if', etc. Ducrot's interest in the use of 'mais' (Tr. but) comes from its role to 'operate, in relation to a *r* [result, conclusion] a weighing of antagonist arguments, *p* and *q* and present *q* as the strongest' (Ducrot 1980, 17, our translation). The existence of contrastive information does not invalidate the policy, it could however change the understanding of the larger context in which the policy is carried out and balance its monolingual/bilingual/trilingual character (Table 2). The FLP promoting home languages is in contrast, however not in conflict with the languages of the new environment. The parents of the families learn and use the languages of the new environment and have or are willing to construct the language competences to accompany their children in the activities of the new environment.

The weighing towards a plurilingual FLP could be supported by the accounts of a multilingual repertoire for the children of all the 32 families in the perspective of a 'plurality' of languages (Kramsch, Levy, and Zarate 2011). The child reportedly 'mixes' languages and 'adapts to the surroundings' using. In this line, we propose to view FLP dynamics as changing and continue to reflect on the factors (Curdt-Christiansen and Huang 2020, 176) that change them. Beyond the FLP languages, it is reported that Luxembourgish is the 'schooling' language followed by French present both in school and in social interactions (playgrounds, shops, etc.). The siblings speak among themselves either the established home language or yet another language.

In terms of policies, we believe that the generalized multilingual policy of Luxembourg (school, workplace, social space, entertainment etc.) influences and shapes the FLP for the existing and newly arriving families. The current paper addresses a gap in terms of empirical discourse documentation of FLP within a situated multilingual context like Luxembourg. The discourse analysis results go beyond contrastive ideologies and allow for in-depth insights into complex, fast-changing family dynamics. It was reported that these changes operate over generations give us reasons to look further into the FLP of this second generation as an interactionally-based practice. Lastly, future studies could compare these findings both with other contexts which support the development of multilingual families dynamics and with contexts where multilingualism is challenged in terms of power and social desirability.

Limitations

There are several limitations related to this study. First, our analysis is mostly based on the interviews of well-educated parents (83% hold post-secondary school degree). In a recent study, Bose et al. (2023) systematically reviewed 163 studies on FLP and reported that there was a 'significant selection bias towards well-educated migrants and those employed in white-collar professions' (359). Our study is no exception. Moreover, Bose et al. (2023) note that there is a lack of FLP studies that for example involve South Asian migrants. They add that a third of 163 reviewed FLP studies focused

on Chinese, Korean, and Russian migrants, which means that two thirds of the studies focused on Western families and languages. In this matter as well, our study is no exception.

The language hierarchies and ideologies might not be the same in the predominantly Western well-educated families in our sample who opened their home spaces to the researchers as in the three Portuguese families who did not want to be audio-recorded and preferred to be interviewed in a shopping mall. While well-educated parents speaking predominantly Western European languages might consider multilingualism as an asset, working class families such as our working-class Portuguese participants might focus on the acquisition of the society language for their children to assure the school integration and a future place in the job market. For example, one of the findings of a study of 37 Albanian working-class parents in Greece (Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi 2013) was that 21 parents, despite their positive attitudes towards Albanian, did not put a specific effort in maintaining their language at home and adapted to the children's preference for Greek, the language of the environment. Therefore, it is important to underline the sample bias in the FLP research.

Conclusion

The present paper explored family language policies in multilingual Luxembourg based on 32 parent interviews with 5 FLP dynamics being identified. The novelty emerges from the conceptual shift from the current conflictual dynamic to a contrastive dynamic between home languages and the languages of the new environment. The FLP promoting home languages is in contrast, but not in conflict, with the languages of the new environment. The paper contributes to the understanding of FLP dynamics in a multilingual context and to further documenting the role of family in fostering the plurilingual development of the child. Future studies intend to look further into (i) reports of the languages spoken by the children and (ii) the FLP of families with children above 5 years of age, once the alphabetisation in German, the language of written literacy in Luxembourg, starts, followed by a documentation of the children's language practices.

Note

1. Even though the work of Charles was done on written texts, the author states conversation has a double number of stance adverbials compared to academic writing.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by the University of Luxembourg. The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose. We thank Džoen Bebić-Crestany for preparing and precoding the data and Gudrun Ziegler for her insights into Luxembourg's schooling system.

Notes on contributors

Gabrijela Aleksić is a research scientist at the University of Luxembourg, Department of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, Lifespan Development, Family and Culture. She has published in the areas of multilingualism and translanguaging in early childhood education, home literacy environment, family language policy and home-school collaboration. She gives professional development courses to teachers on translanguaging pedagogy. She has also published books for migrant preschool children and parents as well as a website for teachers working with multilingual children (www.transla-program.org).

Natalia-Maria Duruş is the co-founder and the head of training and development at Luxembourg multi-LEARN Institute for Interaction and Development in Diversity, an NGO created in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in 2008 by

university professors, students and connected initiatives. The NGO promotes research-driven learning and development in interaction, particularly through cultural, social, professional and linguistic diversity. Natalia's interaction analysis research focuses on the many verbal and multimodal elements that make the interaction a space for learning, constructing common ground, and so much more. Natalia is a fellow of the Romanian Young Academy, funded by Stiftung Mercator and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the period 2020-2022.

ORCID

Gabrijela Aleksić  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5382-6637>

References

- Aleksić, G., and N. Duruş. 2024. "Home Literacy Environment of Multilingual Preschool Children." *Journal of Educational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000938>.
- Amossy, R. 2000. *L'argumentation dans le discours. Discours politique, littérature d'idées, fiction. Comment peut-on agir sur un public en orientant ses façons de voir, de penser?* Paris: Nathan Université.
- Bose, P., X. Gao, S. Starfield, S. Sun, and J. M. Ramdani. 2023. "Conceptualisation of Family and Language Practice in Family Language Policy Research on Migrants: A Systematic Review." *Language Policy* 22 (3): 343–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09661-8>
- Charles, M. 2009. "Stance, Interaction and the Rhetorical Patterns of Restrictive Adverbs: Discourse Roles of Only, Just, Simply and Merely." In *Academic Writing at the Interface of Corpus and Discourse*, edited by M. Charles, D. Pecorari, and S. Hunston, 152–169. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Chatzidakis, A., and C. Maligkoudi. 2013. "Family Language Policies among Albanian Immigrants in Greece." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (6): 675–689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.709817>
- Cheng, W., and A. O'Keeffe. 2015. "Vagueness." In *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*, edited by K. Ajimer, and C. Rühlemann, 360–378. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., and J. Huang. 2020. "Factors Influencing Family Language Policy." In *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development: Social and Affective Factors*, edited by Andrea C. Schalley, and Susana A. Eisenclas, 174–193. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Deprez, C. 1999. "Les enquêtes micro. Pratiques et transmissions familiales des langues d'origine dans l'immigration en France." In *L'enquête sociolinguistique*, edited by L.-J. Calvet, and P. Dumont, 77–102. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Ducrot, O. 1980. "Analyses Pragmatiques." *Communications* 32 (1): 11–60. Les actes de discours. <https://doi.org/10.3406/comm.1980.1481>
- Fillmore, L. W. 2000. "Loss of Family Languages: Should Educators be Concerned?" *Theory into Practice* 39 (4): 203–210. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3904_3
- Fogle, L. W., and K. A. King. 2013. "Child Agency and Language Policy in Transnational Families." *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 19:1–25. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L4190005288>.
- Frazer, B. 2009. "An Account of Discourse Markers." *International Review of Pragmatics* 1:293–320. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187730909X12538045489818>
- Gee, J. P. 2014. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Gharibi, K., and S. H. Mirvahedi. 2021. "'You are Iranian Even if You were Born on the Moon': Family Language Policies of the Iranian Diaspora in the UK." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 45 (4): 1017–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1935974>.
- King, K. A. 2013. "A Tale of Three Sisters: Language Ideologies, Identities, and Negotiations in a Bilingual, Transnational Family." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 7 (1): 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2013.746800>.
- King, K., 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 (6): 695–712. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb362.0>.
- King, K., L. Fogle, and A. Logan-Terry. 2008. "Family Language Policy." *Linguistics and Language Compass* 2 (5): 907–922. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x>.
- Kirsch, C., and N. Gogonas. 2018. "Transnational Experiences, Language Competences and Worldviews: Contrasting Language Policies in Two Recently Migrated Greek Families in Luxembourg." *Multilingua* 37 (2): 153–175. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0017>
- Kostoulas, A., and E. Motsiou. 2022. "Family Language Policy in Mixed-Language Families: An Exploratory Study of Online Parental Discourses." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25 (2): 696–708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1715915>
- Kramsch, C., D. Levy, and G. Zarate. 2011. "General Introduction." In *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism*, edited by C. Kramsch, D. Levy, and G. Zarate. Editions des archives contemporaines.

- Lee, C. 2017. "Contrastive Topic, Contrastive Focus, Alternatives, and Scalar Implicatures." In *Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives and Scalar Implicatures*, edited by C. Lee, and M. Krifka, 3–22. Cham: Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Levinson, S. 1983. "Speech Acts." In *Pragmatics (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*, 226–283. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MENJE [Ministry of National Education, Children, and Youth]. 2017. *Plurilingual Education for Children age 1–4*. Luxembourg: Ministry of National Education, Children and Youth. <https://men.public.lu/fr/enfance/05-plurilingue.html>
- Rooth, M. 1992. "A Theory of Focus Interpretation." *Natural Language Semantics* 1 (1): 75–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02342617>
- Rühlemann, C., and K. Ajimer. 2015. "Introduction Corpus Pragmatics: Laying the Foundations." In *Corpus Pragmatics A Handbook*, edited by K. Ajimer, and C. Rühlemann, 360–378. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*, (Combined vols. ed.). edited by G. Jefferson. introduction by E. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. 1981. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'uh huh' and Other Things that Come Between Sentences." In *Analysing Discourse: Text and Talk*, edited by D. Tannen, 71–93. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Smith-Christmas, C. 2016. "What is Family Language Policy?" In *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language in the Home*, edited by C. Smith-Christmas, 1–19. New York: Palgrave Pivot.
- STATEC. 2023. Evolution of Total, Luxembourgish and Foreign Population on 1st January. <https://lustat.statec.lu>.