11 Carving New Spaces in the Study of Individual Multilingualism across the Lifespan

Lourdes Ortega

Throughout her fruitful career, Elizabeth (Liz) Lanza has succeeded admirably in carving new spaces for others to join in with the study of multilingualism. One way she has done this is by offering her own individual work as an invitation and bid for more research, an invitation that many others have felt thrilled to accept. This *modus operandi* had already started in 1990, with her doctoral dissertation study. There Liz crafted deep, original ideas, which continued flourishing into acclaimed early solo publications such as “Can Bilingual Two-Year-Olds Code-switch?” (in the *Journal of Child Language*, 1992) and her seminal book *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective* (with Oxford University Press in 1997). Her solo publications have been sustained over four decades of tireless engagement with these and a myriad other research questions pertaining to multilingual children and adults.

But as early as four years out of her dissertation, Liz also began co-authoring and collaborating with vibrant colleagues, many of them peer junior researchers in the Scandinavian context. This is another, equally effective, way in which Liz has opened new research spaces for others to inhabit and make their own: by creating unprecedented synergies for research collaboration. It is therefore only natural, albeit a labor of patient love and extraordinary work, that Liz would conceptualize MultiLing, the Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan, and then lead it to the phenomenal success it has been as a Center of Excellence, funded by the Research Council of Norway for a full ten years of existence (two maximum renewable cycles since 2013).

The present volume celebrates Liz’s field-shaping contributions with ten chapters that showcase central questions about multilingualism and multilinguals that she has led and facilitated over four decades, addressed within psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic lenses, and pertaining to language acquisition, family language planning, and the consequences of aphasia and dementia on language use. I will offer here a commentary of each chapter, which I hope presents readers with a useful retrospective journey of what they have just read and help them further appreciate the lessons learned.

1 Linking Young Bilingual Children's Development to Discourse Dynamics and Socialization Practices

For the first time, Lanza (e.g., 1990, 1992, 1997) richly demonstrated that it is in the careful study of unfolding discourse where researchers can understand how different bilingual children are exposed to and interact in their languages in different ways, depending on their home and family contexts. In this way, she showed the unique value of drawing links between discourse and socialization with young children's bilingual development outcomes. The first three chapters in the present collection explore extensions and implications of this micro-level attention to parent-child discourse over the past four decades.

Taking to heart the reality that children are socialized into language practices differently across different local contexts, Simonsen and Southwood (Chapter 1) argue for the central role of cultural context in deciding how to exercise "mindfulness when constructing, using and interpreting child language assessment tools" (p. 25). Comparing the hurdles and solutions in their own work with children and parents in Norway vs. South Africa, they make the important point that, while thinking of socioeconomic differences and differences in language exposure has become routine and sound part of developing good multilingual assessment tools and interpreting the evidence they yield meaningfully, a pending task is to engage with radically different kinds of contexts for child multilingualism, particularly in the Global South. Simonsen and Southwood do not pretend to have all the solutions for how to integrate culture-appropriate language socialization findings, where they exist, into assessment tool development. But they invite readers to ponder over the point made over a decade ago by psychologists Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan (2010) that much if not all research knowledge in the social sciences is biased and skewed because it is largely grounded in Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) samples. In addition, they wisely remind readers that there is no such thing as a universal non-WEIRD context, nor a universal WEIRD context, when it comes to language socialization ... or anything else! Nevertheless, their geopolitically diverse experiences with multilingual assessment development in South Africa and Norway have taught them that developing non-WEIRD tools for assessing the diverse multilingualism of children is a high tall order, but an imperative for the field. Inspired by their wise discussion, I am tempted to modify the witty acronym of WEIRD into WWEEIRD, as it seems the development of multilingual assessment tools – and indeed the whole study of multilingualism – will also need to work ways to escape from White-centric and English-centric assumptions and practices.

De Houwer and Nakamura (Chapter 2) set as their goal to evaluate any accumulated empirical support of Lanza's (1990, 1997) proposed link between parental discourse strategies and bilingual child outcomes. They admirably uncover and review a database of two family studies and 20

observational studies of dyadic parent–child interactions with children aged 1 to 12 published in these 40 years. They conclude that Lanza’s discourse strategies do seem to matter in fostering bilingual outcomes in the early development of bilingual children. They also tentatively suggest their predictive power may weaken at later ages, as it is well-known that once children enter school many of them will develop a strong preference for the societal language, that is, if schooling is in the societal language, and this new preference may wash out any parental discourse influences. Logically, what may work with 2-year-olds may work differently with 10-year-olds. For early ages, nevertheless, De Houwer and Nakamura see sufficient evidence to conclude that the parental strategies discovered by Lanza (1990, 1997) can be used as a sort of intervention to destabilize intergenerational language loss and reignite a pre-schooler’s use of the minority language at home with at least one parent. And yet, by reviewing bilingual parenting advice books published since 2000 (22 in English and 11 in another 6 languages), they made a chilling discovery: Only 6 of 33 books mentioned the discourse strategies or Lanza’s bilingual family interaction model, two without really endorsing them as effective. Their review is nuanced, and they emphasize (as did Lanza in her original work) the bidirectionality of interactions: parents can shape children’s language choice preferences, but children also change parents, in mutual cycles of influence. A big take-away from De Houwer and Nakamura’s chapter is the need to consider discourse strategies with a developmental perspective that assumes they will somewhat change in purpose, role, and effectiveness as the children grow older and develop full agency. In terms of future research, the authors call for more evidence from multi-party family interactions (e.g., as exemplified by Venables, Eisenclas, and Schalley 2014), so the combined role of all caretakers can be examined, beyond discourse strategies with one parent at a time.

Lanza’s pioneering work showed that turn-by-turn co-constructed language choice crystallizes into the preferred code-switching and code-mixing practices that different bilingual children display in interaction with their parents. Phillips and Deuchar (Chapter 3) issue an interesting invitation to go beyond parents and consider communities as well. They note that, as part of developing full functioning membership into bilingual speech communities, bilingual children need to master the code-switching practices of their surrounding adults. They thus tackle the question of *whether* and *how early* bilingual children acquire these normative code-switching practices. Their longitudinal evidence is drawn from 84 hours of parent–child conversation by seven children born in Wales, UK, and studied between the ages of 1 and 3 in the CHILDES CIG1 corpus (Aldridge et al. 1998). They can be assumed to be growing up surrounded by adult Welsh–English bilingual speakers, who tend to speak Welsh with each other with a density of about 10% of intraclausal code-switches to English, as established empirically in the *Siarad* adult corpus (Deuchar, Webb-Davies, and Donnelly 2018). This type of community represents 20% of the population of Wales and

is concentrated geographically in the north and west areas of the country. Phillips and Deuchar's analyses show that the overwhelming majority of children's codeswitched utterances in the CIG1 corpus were found to mirror the preferred pattern found in the *Siarad* adult corpus: English words and phrases appeared inserted into a Welsh morphosyntactic frame. They thus argue that young children code-switch *because* their parents and their communities code-switch. In terms of how early socialization into the community norms for code-switching may take place, they found that in this bilingual Welsh context children are already mirroring the code-switching patterns of their community at the very early ages of 1;9 up to 2;6 – much earlier than the suggested age of 3 found in previous research. Phillips and Deuchar imbue Lanza's seminal findings with a community-wide insight: bilingual children are socialized into code-switching norms just as they are socialized into language.

2 Wider Societal Perspectives: Policy, Ideology, and Power

Lanza's seminal work has greatly contributed to the development of a sub-field in the study of bilingualism known as family language policy (FLP), and defined as parents' or caregivers' conscious planning of language use among family members at home (King and Fogle 2013; Lanza 2020; Spolsky 2012). The field of FLP has gradually expanded its lens as it has sought to explicate the influences through which parents implicitly and explicitly settle on their own family language policies. Three chapters in the collection help put FLP in a wider societal perspective, connecting what parents do or do not do with policies, ideologies, and systems of power.

King and Curdt-Christiansen (Chapter 4) trace the influence of Lanza's work on the evolving field of FLP at three levels. First, many studies have followed Lanza's example by focusing on the parent-child negotiation of language choice on the fly. But even at this micro level, the FLP lens easily captures the importance of collective ideologies that circulate within communities and in society. This is exemplified in this chapter with Curdt-Christiansen's unpublished data that suggest in Singapore, under the tremendous pressure of English, many minority-language affirming discourse strategies by parents and grandparents are being transformed into teaching-like sequences. Namely, adults issue clarification questions and comprehension checks, and they explicitly ask their 3- to 7-year old children to repeat vocabulary they provide to them in the home languages (Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil). Lanza's seminal work has had a second level of influence, King and Curdt-Christiansen note, in fostering the ethnographic study of broader bilingual practices and socialization. In this strand of FLP research, discourse analysis in the micro (family) sphere connects with the constructs of identity, ideology, and agency, which are shaped by realities in the meso (educational) and macro (national context) spheres (e.g., Lanza 2020). Here an example is given of a Chinese family in the UK who is experiencing a

marked shift to English-dominant family communication in the face of fears that the children will underperform in their (majority-language) schooling. Yet, the data also show a high degree of agency in the bilingual youth asserting Mandarin for virtual transnational communication with the older generation of Mandarin-monolingual grandparents. According to King and Curdt-Christiansen, Lanza has had a third level of influence on the study of FLP, with a more critical lens that helps recognize the political dimensions of family language policy, which stem from constraining, negative ideologies of nationhood, patriotism, and xenophobia. These can deeply and insidiously affect family language policy decisions. In the remainder of the chapter, King presents an unpublished analysis of social media in the US during the Trump presidency. She denounces an “unrecognized no-win, double-bind” for Spanish-speaking immigrant-background parents in this context (p. 98). Parents are torn apart by three contradictory messages heavily circulating in public and social media: to use Spanish as a badge of pride and/or defiance, to support Spanish bilingualism as a means to economic mobility, and to hush Spanish for fear of being identified, attacked, and deported. In sum, in this chapter, King and Curdt-Christiansen help readers refocus Lanza’s discourse strategies at three interconnected levels where close micro dynamics and maximal macro societal influences meet and must be understood in the comprehensive study of FLP.

Widening the scope of FLP even more radically, Anthonissen and Stroud (Chapter 5) employ a South African lens that confronts readers with families that fit neither nuclear nor extended traditional structures and are instead characterized by disruption and vulnerability. The authors highlight the implicit, unreflective, and covert nature of much of the “planning” (if the name really applies) that migrant families in South Africa are able to do with respect to the language choice and practices in the family: “Without a stable income, a fixed address – how does one start a family, how does one plan for the future of children, what kind of family intimacy is possible?” (p. 109). Among their informant parents, those who enjoy less precarious family economies have managed to maintain use of their languages in the home (e.g., Kibembe and Swahili for Jacob, a highly skilled tailor) while proudly noting their children were also ably adding the language of schooling (English). But for the parents in families with the most precarious economies, Anthonissen and Stroud conclude “planning” family language choices is a luxury the adults cannot “plan” or “manage.” Language and language family policies were low in the priority of concerns. Across the board, all participants “appeared not to think of themselves in terms of multilinguals with ‘linguistic capital’” (p. 117). Families whose rich multilingualism includes no or only limited competence in English (e.g., émigrés from Francophone DRC, Burundi, or Rwanda; or from Lusophone Mozambique or Angola) were caught by surprise by the dire expectations for English and experienced their multilingualism as much less advantageous than families whose multilingualism included English (e.g., émigrés from Zimbabwe,

Malawi, Tanzania, or Nigeria). Nevertheless, it was clear to the researchers that competence in English could make equally qualified immigrants attain more job security (Jacob vs. Claudette, both French-educated DRC skilled tailors). The grim conclusion is: “you cannot plan for the future unless you have one, and you cannot plan for equitable futures when you do not have the means – or access to the means (infrastructures, institutions) – to make them happen” (p. 120). In sum, in Chapter 5, Anthonissen and Stroud make it clear that researchers of FLP must carefully consider social vulnerability in the contexts they investigate. Provisionality, uncertain futures, and temporality are three forces that they argue must be included in future FLP studies of socially and economically vulnerable migrant families in the Global South.

The various multilingualisms lived by families in Chapters 4 and 5 were an outcome of migration flows and mobility across geopolitical borders. But for many bilingual and multilingual families, bi/multilingualism is the outcome of the experience of Indigeneity and colonial occupation and violence, where borders are drawn or redrawn on peoples who are autochthonous to the land, rather than people uprooting and crossing borders. (Nevertheless, global forces of internal and external migration are not alien to many individuals and families in Indigenous communities, e.g., Wyman 2013.) Comparing the contexts for multilingualism of Indigenous peoples in Australia and Norway, Lane and Wigglesworth (Chapter 6) interrogate family language policies and practices in the context of Indigenous language awakening, revitalization, and reclamation. They argue for the importance of three distinct, yet inextricably interconnected spheres of influence. The first sphere is the daily lives of families, where language choices and practices modulate intergenerational transmission of the Indigenous language at the most concrete and material level. The second sphere is educational systems, which depending on governments and historical and political moments can play radically different roles. Educational systems very often serve as tools of colonial control. Perhaps the most horrid example are the boarding schools Lane and Wigglesworth discuss for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia and the Sámi population in Northern Norway. Nowadays illegal under United Nations international law, these boarding schools were the norm not only in Australia and Norway but also in Canada and the United States from the late 1860s and up to World War II, at least. In better historical times, education systems can become tools for language awakening and revitalization, if they make space for the teaching *of* (and additionally, better yet, *in*) the Indigenous languages. Lane and Wigglesworth suggest education can be the space for the socialization of youth not only into their ancestral languages but also into their communities’ Indigenous ways of knowing, learning, and teaching. The third sphere – interconnected with these first two of family and education – is made up of language policies, explicitly or implicitly formulated, that force Indigenous communities to abandon their own languages

and instill linguistic insecurity as an internalized ideology, making them feel ashamed of their languages as inferior. It is through the process of explicit and implicit language policies emotionally eroding generation after generation that parents end up believing the replacement of the home language for the societal majority language is for the good of their children's future. It is through the emotionally wrenching workings of policies, too, that elderly persons may feel ashamed of not speaking their own language well. The similarities in the issues faced by Indigenous communities in Australia and Norway, despite the many historical and geopolitical differences, are uncanny. They are also a good reminder of the many benefits accrued from opportunities for research interaction and collaboration across disparate geographies, such as the ones Liz Lanza has skillfully fostered at *MultiLing*.

3 Understanding and Supporting Multilingual Communication for Adults' Well-Being: Health Frailties in Older Age

Many lay and expert people have become used to the statement that the majority of the world is multilingual. It is perhaps more surprising for many, although not less true, that the world is also aging. In fact, the well-being of older adults, defined as 65 or older, will become one of the most important challenges of the 21st century in any world context. The latest statistics and projections by the United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2020) estimate that in 2019, 1 in 11 people or 9% of the world population were older adults. The areas of the world with more older adults at the time of this writing are Eastern and South-Eastern Asia (261 million), followed by Europe and North America (over 200 million). Countries are considered "super-aged" when more than one in five people (or 20% of the population) are aged 65 or older. Japan and Germany are already super-aged at the time of this writing. By 2030 there will be 34 countries that are super-aged, including the USA, the UK, France, and Singapore. Chapters 7 and 8 in this volume examine questions about language and the well-being of older adults. In both chapters multilinguals' human agency is an important value to nurture.

What health care barriers might language create for multilinguals at an older life stage when, paradoxically, they need to be served by the health system better than ever? Ng and Cavallaro (Chapter 7) provide a window into the linguistic needs of Chinese-speaking older adults negotiating the health care system of Singapore. As the authors point out, the case of Chinese Singaporean is particularly poignant in the unique multilingual ecology of Singapore. This is the ethnic majority group in the country (74%, vs. Malays who represent 13% and Indians, who represent 9%). Yet, older Chinese Singaporeans are finding it increasingly more difficult to access health care in their own mother tongue, in their own country. This is due to the workings of two language-related mandates. One is the sway of English as an international *lingua franca*, which has grown dramatically

in Singapore in the last four decades years, making it the preferred and *de facto* only language for most realms of public life, including healthcare. Mandarin comes second in the language hierarchy of Singapore, given the national demographics. However, the language policy of Speak Mandarin – first campaigned in 1979 and an “unabated force” since then (Rubdy 2001, 343) – has persuaded new generations of ethnic Chinese Singaporeans to abandon their own home dialects, for a complex web of ideological reasons that have not gone unchallenged by grassroots movements (Lim, Chen, and Hiramoto 2021). Ng and Cavallaro document the negative consequences these language shifts have had for older Singaporean adults of Chinese ethnic descent, who still primarily speak many Chinese vernaculars – called dialects in Singapore – that are non-mutually intelligible (e.g., Hokkien, Cantonese, Hakka). They find their doctors and nurses use English as the language of health care and have, for the most part, no knowledge of the languages their patients speak. These older adults thus find themselves engaging in language-discordant care, where their doctors and nurses do not share any common language with them. The health care system prioritizes getting by, that is, regularly drawing on *ad hoc* (untrained) interpretation by family members and occasionally nurses or even staff who happen to speak the language of a given patient. Through interview data, Ng and Cavallaro reveal how these taken-for-granted practical solutions to language-discordant care both compromise the quality of health care and greatly reduce the ability of older adults to exercise agency over their own health care choices.

Svennevig and Hamilton (Chapter 8) make room for more optimism by asking: How can language be made into a tool that supports high-quality social participation at a time in life when aging persons become more interpersonally isolated? They focus on a subset of older adults in the world, and an important one: persons with dementia. Contrary to myth, dementia can also occur in younger adults. But it is much more frequent among older ages. According to the World Health Organization (2020), between 5% and 8% of the world population aged 60 and over has dementia, amounting to 50 million elderly with diagnosed dementia. There are nearly 10 million new cases every year. Little known is that nearly 60% of the incidence of dementia is located in low- and middle-income countries. Svennevig and Hamilton use data from the two high-income countries where they carry out their work: Norway and the United States. Using Conversation Analysis and Interactional Sociolinguistics, they reveal the architectural resources in turn-by-turn interaction that might create spaces for the elderly person with dementia to participate more agentively and more fully in any interaction. Readers are taken through two multi-party interactions. One interaction is bilingual, in Norwegian and English, at the dinner table. It involves Laura, her husband Gary, and two female friends. Laura is skillfully aided interactionally by her husband. Relying on shared life knowledge, when one of the friends apologizes for overreaching to get some food off the table, Gary invites Laura to tell a childhood story about many cousins stretching arms

over the large family table to reach rolls. He then manages to support her in telling the story without speaking on her behalf. An example of the subtle resources that Gary uses includes anticipatory laughter, by which he projects for Laura, the teller of the story, and her friends, the recipients of the story, that a “laughable” is about to come in the talk, thus helping Laura stay on track and finish her story. Laura’s two friends at the table, by comparison, issue well-intentioned peripheral questions about Laura’s family. While their resources are deployed to show interest and make Laura feel included, they instead are “byplay” that each time derails Laura. Interestingly, Svennevig and Hamilton also suggest code-switching from Norwegian to English is detrimental to Laura, at least in this interaction, as it distracts her away from the telling of her childhood story. The other multi-party interaction takes place in the institutional context of an early memory loss support group meeting in the United States. Mary, the dementia expert leading this session, deploys similar resources to those of Gary’s and manages to support Jessica in speaking for herself. In sum, in both cases an interlocutor who cared (Gary) or another one who was well trained (Mary) paid vigilant attention to narrative possibilities arising from what the person with dementia might be saying and then oriented to the person’s ability to tell something important, despite other visible signs of memory loss. Svennevig and Hamilton’s main point is that interactants who learn to support older adults with dementia to speak for themselves, rather than being spoken for, can counter the understandable tendency to withdraw from conversational involvement and to reduce engagement in social interaction, thereby creating favorable conditions for these adults’ well-being.

4 Multilingual Communication in People With Aphasia: The Human and the Theoretical Dimensions

The last two chapters in the collection are devoted to multilingualism and aphasia, an acquired language disorder resulting from sudden damage to the brain – particularly although not exclusively after a stroke. According to the World Health Organization (n.d.), stroke “is the brain equivalent of a heart attack” and 15 million people worldwide suffer a stroke annually. A third of them die, another third are survivors with permanent disabilities, and the last third are survivors who recover almost completely or with minor impairments. About 30% of stroke survivors will suffer from aphasia. Half of aphasia cases will show permanent symptoms (half of cases are transient aphasia and will recover after about three months). The prevalence of post-stroke aphasia is greater among adults aged 65 or older than among younger adults (Ellis and Urban 2016), but there is ample evidence that treatments can benefit these older adults with aphasia (Fabian, Bunker, and Hillis 2020). For the elderly adults with dementia studied by Svennevig and Hamilton (Chapter 8), cognitive functioning declines and this makes ideas, thoughts, and memories difficult to access. For people with aphasia,

non-language cognition is intact, and it is only the ability to *access* ideas and thoughts *via language* that is problematic; what is affected is the production of speech, and sometimes the comprehension or the ability to read or write as well. However, both multilinguals who suffer dementia and those who suffer aphasia experience communication difficulties, and thus they share the danger of diminished self-confidence and social isolation due to a likely restriction of social interactions. It is therefore of utmost importance to provide high-quality diagnostic and treatment services to multilinguals with aphasia, as increased functioning is possible after proper diagnosis and a suitable choice of treatment for a year or longer.

Norvik and Goral (Chapter 9) discuss the main challenges in diagnosing and treating multilinguals who suffer aphasia, and they offer recommendations for best practices. A striking point is the difficulty yet importance of being able to characterize the proficiency of an individual across their languages *prior* to the onset of aphasia. Namely, for accurate diagnosis and treatment, aphasia-related qualities of speech must be teased apart from less than “perfect” proficiency qualities of communication that may have already existed for the multilingual patient pre-morbidity. As with all contexts of multilingualism, defining and measuring proficiency in a given language and across languages is therefore a real challenge. Norvik and Goral note that diagnostic accuracy can be increased dramatically by integrating formal and informal, quantitative and qualitative sources of assessment. They must be applied, fundamentally, to all the languages of the multilingual, or at least all that the patient–client wishes to be assessed in. The authors’ characterization of the situation for adults with aphasia harkens back to the fundamental issues discussed by Simonsen and Southwood (Chapter 1) for multilingual assessment of children. For example, throughout the chapter, Norvik and Goral emphasize the importance of meaningfully accounting for cultural, linguistic, and social considerations in both the assessments and the treatments offered, and to prioritize the respect for a person’s multilingual and multicultural identity. The importance of developing a good knowledge base leading to high-quality services for multilingual persons with aphasia will only grow in the future, as part of a more global growth of multiethnic older groups susceptible to post-stroke aphasia in many world geographies, as attested in the special issue of *Aphasiology* guest-edited by Centeno, Kiran, and Armstrong (2020).

But multilinguals with aphasia can also provide pieces of the puzzle of a full theory of the human capacity for language, understood to be a capacity that is multilingual, fundamentally and by default. This is ultimately the motivation of Fyndanis and Lehtonen (Chapter 10) in reviewing studies of multilingual persons with aphasia who are reported to engage in higher than expected amounts of language switching or mixing. Their purpose is to elucidate three questions: (1) Is this aphasia symptom the result of uncontrollable and unintentional (“pathological”) difficulties at regulating bilingual language use? Or might it be the result – as Goral, Norvik, and Jensen

(2019) have proposed – of compensatory strategic communication behavior, whereby the multilingual draws from his or her full repertoire in order to ameliorate communication difficulties resulting from the brain damage, such as anomia (i.e., word-finding difficulties)? (2) Is the code-switching or mixing symptom associated with documentation of less than optimal functioning of domain-general cognitive control mechanisms or to deteriorated verbal cognitive control mechanisms? And (3) What are the brain locations for the lesions associated with each patient's aphasia in these cases of higher than expected language switching or mixing?

With regard to the first question, Fyndanis and Lehtonen conclude that in some cases at least the multilinguals knew their interlocutors could not understand the languages they were mixing in their speech, thus attesting to uncontrollable and unintentional (or “pathological”) behavior. They do concede that in other attested cases, where the person with aphasia knew their interviewers to share their bilingualism, Goral et al. (2019) may be right in claiming a strategic motivation. As for the second and third questions posed by Fyndanis and Lehtonen in their review, they both indirectly contribute to the currently much scrutinized and disputed cognitive advantages of bilingualism, or the hypothesis that bilinguals develop superior executive control functioning than monolinguals due to their constant juggling with two or more languages (e.g., Antoniou 2019). Part of the wider issue involves the fundamental question of whether language switching behavior relies on domain-general executive functions (which would “train” the brain and result in the putative advantage) or on language-specific control mechanisms (which would make us expect no general cognitive advantages). Fyndanis and Lehtonen tentatively conclude that there seems to be greater involvement of suboptimal verbal control in the aphasic code-switching and mixing symptom. Indirectly, this may mean that whatever brain gymnastics multilingual code-switching brings about, it would not be expected to result in domain-general cognitive advantages over monolingual brains. This refutation of special cognitive benefits of bilingualism over monolingualism is consistent with several meta-analyses, including one by Lehtonen (Lehtonen et al. 2018). With regard to their Question 3, Fyndanis and Lehtonen note that whenever the location of brain lesions was reported across studies, more often than not there was subcortical damage in the basal ganglia. They thus side with Green and Abutalebi's (e.g., 2013) well-known contention that efficient language selection and switching involves not only the left frontal cortex (i.e., verbal control mechanisms) but also the basal ganglia (i.e., nonverbal cognitive control processes). This might be a point of support in favor of bilingualism having beneficial consequences for cognition. However, definitive answers on any of these issues are far from sight because, as Fyndanis and Lehtonen acknowledge, they hit roadblocks given how few studies report fully and clearly the crucial information points needed to draw firm answers to the three questions they pose. For future studies of multilingual aphasia to

shed useful light on these issues, therefore, Fyndanis and Lehtonen urge researchers to always: (1) report whether the multilingual person with aphasia thought they were speaking to a monolingual or bilingual interviewer; (2) engage in systematic testing of both verbal and nonverbal executive functions; and (3) report the location of the lesion associated with each patient's aphasia.

The reporting standards Fyndanis and Lehtonen propose are most welcomed. In addition, I would like to suggest it will be appropriate to address better in the future the issue of whether language switching or mixing is "pathological" vs. strategic when multilinguals with aphasia engage in such behavior. For one, it has serious consequences for the well-being and treatment of these patients, as a therapist will likely respond to higher than expected code-switching/code-mixing quite differently when the behavior is construed as a deficit versus as a strategy. Moreover, rather than just using an etic (researcher-observer) perspective in deciding the "pathological" versus strategic nature of code-switching and code-mixing by multilinguals with aphasia, ideally these judgments would be made from emic (participant) perspectives, for example, by forming interdisciplinary research teams with members trained in Conversation Analysis and Interactional Sociolinguistics, who can greatly aid in the adjudication of what counts as (in)appropriate communicatively or interactionally, as shown in the study of older persons with dementia by Svennevig and Hamilton (Chapter 8).

5 Concluding Thoughts

The authors in this collection have risen to the tall order of celebrating Liz Lanza's seminal influence on scholarship in multilingualism. Across their ten chapters, they clearly show how much Liz's ideas have shaped the field into several fruitful directions over these 40 years. Countless scholars have benefited from her work, by expanding and elaborating on the research spaces that Liz had already carved in 1990 and on the new research paths that she has continued building tirelessly over four decades. Through the original work by Liz, these authors and so many others have forged organic, variegated, and well-traveled pathways for the study of multilingualism over the lifespan, across geopolitical contexts, and inclusive of vulnerable populations. A sociolinguist and qualitative discourse analyst by training, Liz has always been committed to understanding multilingualism as a lived reality for individuals, families, and communities, and as a phenomenon that can be best understood at the confluence of micro and macro levels – from on-the-fly co-constructed discourse to collective policies and ideologies, at the dialectic intersection of systemic structures and human agency. Very few scholars are capable of marrying sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics as Liz has done. In this, too, she stands as an inviting role model for the next generations of scholars of multilingualism. Thank you, Liz Lanza!

References

- Aldridge, M., R. Borsely, S. Clack, and G. Creunant. 1998. "The Acquisition of Noun Phrases in Welsh." In *Language Acquisition: Knowledge Representation and Processing. Proceedings of GALA '97*, edited by C.B. Heycock, R. Shillcock, and A. Sorace. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Antoniou, M. 2019. "The Advantages of Bilingualism Debate." *Annual Review of Linguistics* 5: 395–415.
- Centeno, J.G., S. Kiran, and E. Armstrong. 2020. "Aphasia Management in Growing Multiethnic Populations." *Aphasiology* 34 (11): 1314–1455.
- Deuchar, M., P. Webb-Davies, and K. Donnelly. 2018. *Building and Using the Siarad corpus: Bilingual Conversations in Welsh and English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ellis, C. and S. Urban. 2016. "Age and Aphasia: A Review of Presence, Type, Recovery and Clinical Outcomes." *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation* 23 (6): 430–439.
- Fabian, R., L. Bunker, and A.E. Hillis. 2020. "Is Aphasia Treatment Beneficial for the Elderly? A Review of Recent Evidence." *Current Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Reports* 8: 478–492.
- Goral, M., M. Norvik, and B.U. Jensen. 2019. "Variation in Language Mixing in Multilingual Aphasia." *Clinical linguistics & phonetics* 33 (10–11): 915–929.
- Green, D.W., and J. Abutalebi. 2013. "Language Control in Bilinguals: The Adaptive Control Hypothesis." *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 25 (5): 515–530.
- Henrich, J., S.J. Heine, and A. Norenzayan. 2010. "The Weirdest People in the World?" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33: 61–135.
- King, K.A., and L.W. Fogle. 2013. "Research Timeline: Family Language Policy and Bilingual Parenting." *Language Teaching* 46 (2): 172–194.
- Lanza, E. 1990. "Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.
- Lanza, E. 1992. "Can Bilingual Two-year-olds Code-switch?" *Journal of child language* 19 (3): 633–658.
- Lanza, E. 1997. *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, E. 2020. "Urban Multilingualism and Family Language Policy." In *Urban Multilingualism in Europe: Bridging the Gap between Language Policies and Language Practices*, edited by G. Caliando, R. Janssens, S. Slembrouck, and P.V. Avermaet, 121–139. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Lehtonen, M., A. Soveri, A. Laine, J. Järvenpää, A. de Bruin, and J. Antfolk. 2018. "Is Bilingualism Associated with Enhanced Executive Functioning in Adults? A Meta-analytic Review." *Psychological Bulletin* 144 (4): 394–425.
- Lim, J. J., S.C. Chen, and M. Hiramoto. 2021. "'You Don't Ask Me to Speak Mandarin, Okay?': Ideologies of Language and Race Among Chinese Singaporeans." *Language & Communication* 76: 100–110.
- Rubdy, R. 2001. "Creative Destruction: Singapore's Speak Good English Movement." *World Englishes* 20 (3): 341–355.
- Spolsky, B. 2012. "Family Language Policy–The Critical Domain." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33 (1): 3–11.

- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. 2020. *World population ageing 2019: Highlights*. ST/ESA/SER.A/444.
- Venables, E., S.A. Eisenclas, and A.C. Schalley. 2014. "One-parent-one-language (OPOL) Families: Is the Majority Language-speaking parent Instrumental in the Minority Language Development?" *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17 (4): 429–448.
- World Health Organization. September 21, 2020. *Fact Sheets, Dementia*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia>
- World Health Organization. n. d. *The Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke*. https://www.who.int/cardiovascular_diseases/resources/atlas/en/
- Wyman, L.T. 2013. "Indigenous Youth Migration and Language Contact." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 7 (1): 66–82.