2 Developmental Perspectives on Parents' Use of Discourse Strategies with Bilingual Children

Annick De Houwer and Janice Nakamura

1 Introduction

In likely the first systematic study of language choice by a bilingual child, De Houwer (1983) found that already between the ages of 2;7 (years;months) and 3;4, Dutch–English Kate adjusted her language choice according to whom she was addressing.¹ Kate spoke English to her mother (whose Dutch proficiency was minimal), Dutch to her monolingual Dutch-speaking grandparents, and mostly Dutch but also some English to her father and the investigator. Both Kate's father and the investigator addressed Kate in Dutch but also spoke fluent English, as the child had often overheard. On the few occasions (38 in a corpus of over 6000 exchanges collected over nine months) that the adults did not speak the language they normally used with Kate, she usually replied in the same 'unusual' language, thus following the Convergent Choice Principle or CCP (De Houwer 2019).

Indeed, following the CCP is the default. Bilinguals tend to speak the same way as their interlocutors, either speaking the same single language or using a mixture of the same languages, depending on what pattern has been established in their interaction history. The marked case occurs when bilinguals sharing the same set of languages consistently speak a different language to each other (De Houwer 2019), in what we term dual-lingual conversations.

By age 3, Kate addressed people she mostly heard speaking just a single language in that same language. This makes sense, given that even very young children want to make sure they are understood. However, with people she knew to be fluent speakers of the same two languages she spoke, Kate would use either language. She did not have to monitor so much which language she spoke (De Houwer 1983): She could assume bilingual speakers would understand her. Thus, it was unnecessary to stick to just one language. However, Kate still addressed her bilingual interlocutors mostly in Dutch, the language they mostly spoke with her.

How did Kate learn to do so? She was likely socialized into this pattern of response when she was younger. Elizabeth Lanza was the first to present a comprehensive analysis systematically addressing socialization patterns

regarding language choice in conversations between a bilingual parent and a bilingually raised young child. Henceforth, we refer to this analysis as Lanza's "bilingual family interaction model", BIFIM for short and explained below (in an email on January 7, 2015, Lanza gave De Houwer the permission to use this term in reference to her work).

The first author first learned about Lanza's pioneering work in (1987) at her conference presentation on "Code-Mixing and Code-Switching in the Bilingual Infant's Discourse", which proposed a first partial version of BIFIM. Lanza (1988) was the first publication relating to the model. It focused on interactions between Norwegian-English Siri at 2;2 and her bilingual parents. Lanza (1992) was based on more extensive data from Siri between ages 2;0 and 2;7, and included the first comprehensive publication regarding BIFIM. More detailed analyses of the Siri data formed the bulk of the empirical study in Lanza's dissertation (1990), which additionally discussed data from Norwegian-English Tomas, who was studied for nearly four months after his second birthday. Lanza's dissertation was the basis for her book (1997b; reprinted in 2004 with slight modifications and a new Afterword). Lanza (1997a) and Lanza (2001) also discussed data for Siri and/or Tomas. Both children's families were middle class and consisted of a Norwegian father and an American mother. They lived in Oslo, Norway. All four parents were Norwegian-English bilinguals.

BIFIM was developed for children who acquire two languages (Language Alpha and Language A) simultaneously in the home from birth (Bilingual First Language Acquisition or BFLA). BFLA children may use unilingual utterances in either Language Alpha or Language A. They may also use mixed utterances, which combine morphological elements from both languages (De Houwer 2009, 2019). BIFIM was proposed to describe how parents respond to BFLA children's language mixing, defined as their use of two languages within a conversation or utterance (Lanza 1997b, 3). It thus describes how, within a single conversation, parents who speak Language A respond to children speaking Language Alpha or using a mixed utterance.

Figure 2.1 presents BIFIM. As in De Houwer (2009), it has been slightly adapted from Lanza (1997b, 261–269). Lanza's term "code-switching" was changed to "Language-Switching" since "code-switching" can have different meanings depending on particular theoretical perspectives, a problem Lanza also acknowledges.

The top of Figure 2.1 shows that parents speaking Language A to children can ask for clarification if children used Language Alpha instead of Language A (Minimal Grasp Strategy, MGS). This may encourage children to switch to Language A (children need not interpret such clarification requests this way; see Lanza 1997b, 305). Below we treat translation requests as in *What does Shelly say?* (Chevalier 2015) as instances of MGS. Next, children may also be asked to confirm the Language A alternative offered by parents (Expressed Guess Strategy, EGS). MGS and EGS encourage children to speak the same language as their parents. Thus, they are

What do parents who normally speak Language A to children do when children speak Language Alpha to them or use a mixed utterance?

Most monolingual discourse strategies

Minimal Grasp Strategy (MGS)

Parents use Language A to ask children to clarify their utterance (as in: 'what did you say?' or 'I don't know what you mean'). The expectation is that children will respond to such requests for clarification by changing to Language A.

Expressed Guess Strategy (EGS)

Parents use a question in Language A that translates what they thought children intended to say. This constitutes a direct or indirect request for confirmation and takes the form of a yes-no-question (as in: 'did you mean to say you want something to drink?', or 'a drink?'). The expectation is that children will respond to the request in Language A.

Adult Repetition (AR)

Parents repeat the child utterance in Language A. There is no request for children to respond, although some children may in turn repeat the parental repetition in Language A.

Move On Strategy (MOS)

Parents do not use any of the three preceding strategies but just continue talking in Language A

▼ **Language Switching (LS)**

Parents switch to Language Alpha or a mixed utterance and do not stick to Language A.

Most bilingual discourse strategies

Figure 2.1 Lanza's (1992, 1997b) bilingual family interaction model (BIFIM)

monolingual discourse strategies. Simply repeating in Language A what children said in Language Alpha (Adult Repetition, AR) can be taken as (1) a correction of child language choice (a monolingual strategy), (2) a confirmation of the contents of an utterance (neutral as to language choice), or (3) a teaching strategy showing children what their utterance translates as (also neutral). Because of its ambiguity, AR is neither a monolingual nor a bilingual strategy (but see Section 2 when we discuss children between ages 2 and 4). Bilingual strategies consist of parents just continuing to use Language A without paying attention to children's use of Language Alpha (Move On Strategy, MOS), and, indeed, of parents changing to Language Alpha themselves (Language-Switching, LS). As Lanza (1997b, 261) recognizes, BIFIM forms only part of the totality of discourse strategies parents use in interaction with their children.

BIFIM is not just a descriptive model. It also helps explain why not all young, bilingually raised children speak two languages. Lanza (1997b, 321–324) compared mother–child interactions involving Siri, on the one hand, and Tomas, on the other. Through monolingual discourse strategies and her use of only English, Siri's mother negotiated a monolingual context with Siri. Lanza (1988, 75) notes, "Siri's mother was competent in Norwegian, but the role of being a bilingual can be negotiated in ongoing interaction as

the mother feigns the role of a monolingual speaker”. Siri responded to her mother’s monolingual discourse strategies by speaking mostly English with her, although Siri could also speak Norwegian. Tomas’ mother negotiated a bilingual context with Tomas through her use of bilingual discourse strategies. Furthermore, she spoke mainly English but also some Norwegian. Tomas hardly spoke any English with her.

While other factors also contribute to children’s active bilingual use (e.g., amount and source of language exposure; De Houwer 2020), Lanza (1992, 1997b, 2004) proposed that parental discourse strategies (henceforth simply: strategies) constitute negotiations that socialize children into speaking a particular language. As such, they are important in developing active bilingualism. Many have argued that each parents’ use of a single but different language consistently to their children (in what is known as the one parent, one language (1P/1L) setting) is crucial for fostering children’s use of two languages. However, the actual experiences of many parents using 1P/1L can be quite different. Many are puzzled and upset to find that children speak only a single language, viz. the societal language (SocLang) used at (pre-)school, and that they understand but do not speak the non-societal language (NonSocLang). A large survey (De Houwer 2007) showed that only 73% of 1P/1L families had children who spoke both languages at home.

Lanza’s hypothesis regarding the role of BIFIM in early bilingual development was based on just two 2-year-olds. Below we explore additional studies that have either implicitly or explicitly addressed BIFIM and its role in encouraging the use of two languages. We expand the coverage to studies of bilingually or trilingually raised children between ages 1 and 12.

BFLA children exposed to the SocLang from birth usually speak that language, so it is not ‘at risk’ (De Houwer 2009). This explains our focus on what strategies, if any, can support children’s use of the NonSocLang. Most studies also focus on the NonSocLang.

2 Observational Studies of Parent–Child Interaction in Language Contact Situations

This section reviews research on strategies and child bilingual use. We focus on observational studies with micro-level analyses of dyadic parent–child interactions. Dyadic interactions most clearly reveal how individual children are socialized in terms of language choice (cf. Lanza 2001). Table 2.1 shows a selection of studies arranged according to BFLA children’s ages at the start of data collection, i.e., before age 2, between ages 2 and 4, and starting at age 4. Some BFLA children started hearing a third language later. Studies observed adult–child interactions for periods between 1 and 35 months. When adults are said to speak a particular language, this mostly refers to the NonSocLang they habitually spoke *to children*. Most adults also understood (and possibly spoke) the SocLang.

Table 2.1 Studies of Parental Discourse Strategies in Dyadic Parent-Child Interactions With BFLA Children

<i>Societal language(s)</i>	<i>Non-societal language(s)</i>	<i>N children</i>	<i>Children's names and ages (year;month)</i>	<i>Duration of study^a (months)</i>
<u>(1) Studies involving children prior to age 2;0 (and beyond, as the case may be)</u>				
*Quay (2012)	Japanese	1	Freddy (1;0-1;10)	10
Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal (2001)	Catalan	1	Andreu (1;3-4;2)	35
*Nibun and Wigglesworth (2014)	English	1	Michael (1;4-1;9)	6
Deuchar and Muntz (2003)	English	1	M (1;7-2;6)	11
Slavkov (2015)	English	1	Sophie (1;7-2;3)	8
Filipi (2015)	English	1	Cassie (1;6-2;0)	7
*Montanari (2009)	English	1	Kathryn (1;9-2;4)	7
Mishina (1999)	English	1	Ken (1;10-2;2)	4
<u>(2) Studies involving children between ages 2;0 and 4;0</u>				
Lanza (1997b)	Norwegian	2	Siri (2;0-2;7)	7
	English		Tomas (2;0-2;3)	3
Döpke (1992)	English	5	Fiona (2;4-2;9)	5
	German		Keith, Alice, Jacob and Agnes (2;8-3;2)	6 each
*Quay (2012)	Japanese	1	XiaoXiao (2;0-2;1)	1
*Chevalier (2013)	German	1	Lina (2;0-3;0)	12
*Chevalier (2015)	German	2	Lina and Elliot (2;0-4;0)	24 each
Mishina-Mori (2011)	English	2	Ken (2;3-3;2)	12
	Japanese		Rie (2;5-3;3)	11
Kasuya (1998)	English	4	Dan, Kyle, Ray, and Sho (2;10-4;1)	15 each

(Continued)

Table 2.1 (Continued)

	Societal language(s)	Non-societal language(s)	N children	Children's names and ages (year;month)	Duration of study ^a (months)
(3) Studies involving children aged 4;0 and older					
Haskell (1998)	Japanese	English	1	Shakthi (4;3-5;6)	15
Takeuchi (2000)	English	Japanese	4	Chie (5;0-6;0)	12
				Erika (5;1-5;10)	9
				Naomi (6;5-7;5)	12
				Maria (6;9-7;9)	12
Nakamura (2018)	Japanese	Italian	2	Nina (4;6-4;7)	1
	Japanese	English		Max (7;10-8;6)	8
*Kheirkhah and Cekaite (2015)	Swedish	Farsi and Kurdish	1	Mona (7)	no information
Curd-Christianen (2013)	English and Mandarin	not applicable		Jenny (6)	4
				Cheng (8)	4
				Kevin (11)	4
Gyoji (2015)	English	Japanese	1 ^b	Naomi (12)	5

* Studies on trilingual children.

^a When studies did not clearly describe the duration, we calculated estimates based on other information provided.

^b In addition, this study observed 12-year-old Shoko for five months; Shoko started learning English only at age 11.

Some children well under the age of 2 can already adjust their language choice to their interlocutor (e.g., Sinka and Schelleter 1998). However, given that in the second year of life children are just learning to speak, many still need to learn when to use which language. Discourse strategies may play a crucial role in these early stages by socializing children into using habitual patterns of language choice. At age 1;6 English–Italian Cassie was unresponsive to her English-speaking father's use of MGS and AR, but just one month later she was able to produce the English words after he modeled them (Filipi 2015). Well before German–Japanese Michael turned two, his parents most frequently used MGS and never switched languages when he used the unexpected language (Nibun and Wigglesworth 2014). In response, Michael generally spoke the expected language, i.e., German to his father and Japanese to his mother. Although he knew many more Japanese than German words, he seldom used Japanese words with his father. This was possibly related to a combination of strategies: When Michael used Japanese, his father would first engage MGS. When Michael could not repair his utterance, paternal EGS or AR followed to provide him with the necessary vocabulary. By using these strategies, Michael's father signaled that he did not wish Michael to speak Japanese while providing him with the necessary input for producing German.

Use of AR can also encourage the use of the expected language. Adults interacting with Spanish–English M used AR quite a bit after M produced mixed utterances or the unexpected language (Deuchar and Muntz 2003). M's usual reaction after AR was to switch to the expected language. In contrast, after the monolingual strategy MGS, the child mainly continued to use mixed utterances or the unexpected language; unlike most other parents in the studies in Table 2.1, M's parents both routinely spoke both languages to her, depending on where they were. (Before age 1;11 M used mixed utterances or the unexpected language in about 25% of her utterances; after this age that proportion dropped to only about 10%; see Table 2.4 in Deuchar and Muntz 2003).

The frequent use of bilingual strategies may encourage young children to choose Language Alpha even when they know the corresponding words in Language A. At 1;9, English–Spanish–Tagalog Kathryn often said English words to her Spanish-speaking caregivers even when she knew the equivalent Spanish (Montanari 2009). Her caregivers paid no attention to these English words and responded mostly using AR or MOS, thus signaling to Kathryn that her English was understood and accepted. Likewise, English–Japanese Ken used English in nearly half the time in interactions with his Japanese-speaking mother, who tended to insert Ken's English words in her Japanese clarification requests, i.e., she used LS (Mishina 1999). In contrast, Ken's use of Japanese with his English-speaking father never exceeded 10% of his utterances. Ken's father usually engaged MGS when Ken used Japanese. When Ken did not respond to the MGS, his father changed the topic in his next turn. This maintained a monolingual context

and may have contributed to Ken's even lower level of Japanese use with his father when he was older (see below).

The studies of children under the age of 2 thus generally support BIFIM. So do studies of children between age 2 and 4. Four English–Japanese boys' language choice was Japanese 45% to 68% of the time right after their Japanese-speaking parents used "explicit" strategies, including MGS, but was only 11% to 52% of the time after "implicit" strategies, including AR and MOV, were used (Table 2.9, Kasuya 1998). In Chevalier (2013, 2015), trilingual Lina's English-speaking aunt's predominant use of monolingual (MGS and EG) and neutral (AR) strategies (41% and 44% of strategies used respectively) likely contributed to Lina's active English production. More than half of Lina's utterances to her aunt were in English. Contrastively, Lina's French-speaking father used monolingual strategies minimally (7% of discourse strategies). His frequent use of bilingual strategies, i.e., MOS and CS (45% and 13% of strategies used respectively) failed to encourage French production; only 13% of Lina's utterances to him were in French. Likewise, Ken's parents' contrasting use of strategies from early on (see above) is reflected in Ken's use of English about half of the time with his Japanese-speaking mother and his nearly absent use of Japanese with his English-speaking father after age 2 (Mishina-Mori 2011). At this point, Ken's father hardly needed to engage any monolingual strategies because Ken hardly spoke any Japanese with him. Rie, another child studied by Mishina-Mori (2011), hardly spoke any English to her Japanese-speaking mother. Her mother's use of MGS likely helped Rie make the expected language choice.

The effect of strategies on child language choice is most clearly elucidated by Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal (2001). They demonstrated how a change in parental use from bilingual to monolingual strategies can dramatically increase NonSocLang use. Between ages 1;3 and 2;5, Catalan–English Andreu frequently spoke Catalan with his English-speaking father, who relied heavily on MOS, thus negotiating a bilingual context. However, starting from when Andreu was 2;5, his father intentionally started increasing MGS. Questions such as *How does daddy say that?*, which were most frequently engaged between ages 3;1 and 3;3, dramatically reduced Andreu's Catalan use with his father, particularly from age 3;5 onwards. Whenever Andreu was unable to respond to MGS, his father followed up with EGS or AR (cf. Nibun and Wigglesworth 2014). Furthermore, Andreu was happy to accept that a puppet spoke just English. With the puppet's help, Andreu's father managed to get Andreu to speak more English. These monolingual strategies had a lasting effect even though they were used intensively for only a few months. After age 3;3, Andreu hardly addressed his father in Catalan even when the latter did not use monolingual strategies as often as he had before. This suggests that earlier used monolingual strategies may help establish a long-term pattern of parent–child interaction in the NonSocLang. Earlier, Taeschner (1983) also documented how her

Italian–German pre-school-age daughters spoke more German to her after she used more MGS.

BIFIM also plays a role for children aged 4 and up. Haskell's (1998) examples suggest a link between English–Japanese Shakthi's frequent use of Japanese with her English-speaking father and his tendency to use MOS, which established a bilingual context. Discourse strategies were apparently able to counter the effect of increased exposure to English at school in four older English–Japanese children with mothers who consistently spoke Japanese to them (Takeuchi 2000). While MGS was rarely used and not found to be effective, maternal use of EGS or AR was quite successful in eliciting Japanese from the children's next conversational turn. For three of these children (ages 5 to 7), the occasional maternal use of MOS did not matter much because they rarely spoke English and were already actively interacting with their mothers in Japanese. However, for the 5-year-old who spoke more English, her mother's frequent use of bilingual strategies did little to promote her Japanese use. The girl only replied in Japanese 19.4% and 3.3% of the time that MOS and LS were used, respectively.

Data from an unusual longitudinal and observational large study confirm that strategies are important even for school-aged children. Based on analyses of parent–child story-telling interaction in bilingual families in the United States, Park et al. (2012) traced the use and proficiency in Cantonese or Mandarin by 68 children who were 6 years old at Time1 and nearly 7.5 years old at Time2. Parents who used monolingual strategies and consistently spoke a NonSocLang with children at Time1 had children who were proficient in that language at Time2. Parents who used more bilingual strategies at Time1 had children with limited proficiency in the NonSocLang at Time2. Furthermore, parents of children who were less proficient in the NonSocLang at Time1 provided less support for the NonSocLang at Time2. Park et al.'s (2012) study shows the many transactional processes (see Section 3.1 below) transpiring in parent–child interaction over time.

MOS may become a permanent feature of parental discourse style with older receptive bilingual children (children who understand two or more languages but speak only one). Nakamura (2018) studied two such children (ages 4 and 7). They used mostly Japanese with their Italian-speaking and English-speaking fathers, respectively. Regardless of the fathers' consistency in speaking the NonSocLang with their children, the children mainly spoke Japanese, the SocLang. The fathers' prevalent use of MOS perpetuated dual-lingual interactions. The few monolingual strategies that they used did little to elicit a NonSocLang response. Likewise, but now for Japanese as the NonSocLang, 12-year-old Naomi spoke almost exclusively English with her Japanese-speaking mother, who used MOS whenever Naomi spoke English, resulting in mostly dual-lingual conversations (Gyoji 2015).

The case studies of BFLA children discussed so far suggest that the use of mostly bilingual strategies by NonSocLang-speaking parents with young children hampers children's NonSocLang development, thus confirming

Lanza's (e.g., 1997b) results for Tomas. Meng and Miyamoto's (2012) study of 2-year-old Xin, who had first only heard Chinese and after a move to Japan started hearing Japanese through daycare, suggests that strategies also play a role for sequential bilingual children. Although Chinese was the home language, Xin's mother's frequent use of MOS after Xin's Japanese utterances led to only 20% child production of Chinese utterances by the time she was 3. A unique longitudinal study of children who had supposedly only heard Ukrainian from birth (see Section 3.2) but added English from daycare and school suggests that bilingual strategies can affect long-term NonSocLang maintenance. Ten mothers of 3-year-olds often used MOS when children spoke English to them (Chumak-Horbatsch 1987). At age 3, the children spoke Ukrainian at age-appropriate levels. At age 13, the same children were very close to losing Ukrainian (Chumak-Horbatsch 1999). Chumak-Horbatsch blames this partly on the use of some English in the home in the pre-school years and on mothers using bilingual strategies at that time.

As Taeschner (1983) and Juan-Garau and Pérez-Vidal (2001) showed, a switch to monolingual strategies can help turn things around and encourage NonSocLang use in BFLA pre-schoolers. The case studies in Table 2.1 do not furnish sufficient information for conclusions as regards older children. As we discuss below, children's agency may be an important factor here.

3 Factors Moderating Parents' Use of Discourse Strategies

Section 2 shows how BIFIM contributes to bilingual children's NonSocLang use and development. Here we explore what factors might help explain parents' use of bilingual rather than monolingual strategies in interactions with children.

3.1 *Transactional Parent and Child Effects*

Bornstein's (2009, 145) three-term transactional model of child development and parenting posits that "the child changes the parent and is in turn changed by the changed parent, or the parent changes the child who in turn changes the parent". Given this transactional model, the use of parental discourse strategies is also considered transactional: Its use is crucially and fundamentally about parents' language behavior in relation to their children's and vice versa.

Transactional relations are present from the beginning. BFLA infants may already react to parental language choice. Four-month-old bilinguals responded annoyed when their mother, who had spoken Portuguese to them all day, addressed their father in Swedish at the end of the day (Cruz-Ferreira 2006, 62). Arnberg (1979, 109) describes how a Swedish-English infant placed his hands over his Swedish-speaking father's mouth whenever he tried to speak English. Three-year-old Dutch-English Susan cried when

her Dutch-speaking mother inadvertently addressed her in English, leading her mother to quickly switch back to Dutch (De Houwer 2009). Another 3-year-old, Finnish–Swedish Sara, refused to accept her Finnish-speaking father's Swedish utterance and declared that Swedish was her mother's language (Palviainen and Boyd 2013).

Very young bilingual children learn everything from scratch, including awareness about language choice. Lanza (1988) pointed out that parents who ask children for translations are fostering their bilingual awareness: “the metalinguistic input in various strategies used by the parents may contribute to bilingual awareness in these children” (Lanza 1988, 82). This developing awareness may affect children's responsiveness to strategies. Children must know that it is their language choice that is being queried when parents use MGS. By age 2 and a half most actively bilingual children are able to repair their language choice after being prompted (De Houwer 2017). Section 2 shows that some children can do so much earlier, but other children apparently cannot. Low awareness may be one reason why some children do not repair their language choice when prompted. Two-year-old Tomas did not interpret the few instances of MGS used by his mother as a cue to switch to English (Lanza 2004). Likewise, even at the much older age of 4;7, receptive bilingual Nina treated her English-speaking father's occasional use of EGS as genuine clarification requests and did not repair her Japanese utterances (Nakamura 2018). The “plurifunctionality of requests for clarification” (Lanza 2004, 305), coupled with parents' limited use of monolingual strategies, likely makes some children less aware that clarification requests may be prompts to switch languages.

Children may also actively resist such prompts. At around 1;7, after starting English daycare, Sophie ignored her Bulgarian-speaking father's requests for translation of her English into Bulgarian, a language she had spoken quite well for her age earlier. Instead, she moved on with the conversation, declined invitations to switch languages, and displayed negative emotions whenever her father used monolingual strategies (Slavkov 2015). In contrast to Sophie, Japanese–Mandarin–English Xiaoxiao spoke three languages at age 2;0 despite having a Chinese-speaking mother who predominantly used MOS in response to Xiaoxiao's use of Japanese and mixed utterances (Quay 2012). Unlike Quay's other trilingual subject, Freddy, who preferred to speak Japanese both at home and in daycare, Xiaoxiao was more eager to please her parents. Quay surmised that child personality and socio-psychological factors are one possible explanation for Xiaoxiao's willingness to accommodate her parents by using their respective languages. For slightly older Japanese–Mandarin–English trilingual Y (age 2;6), such factors were probably also at play. Y was fully aware that her grandparents were monolingual Mandarin speakers, but used non-verbal cues to help them decode her non-Mandarin speech and only switched to Mandarin as a last resort (Zhan 2020). The underlying child-related factors contributing

to young children's accommodation or resistance to their interlocutors' language choice need further investigation.

At older ages, children exercise greater agency related to language choice. Primary school-aged children growing up with Kinyarwanda and French responded to their parents' use of Kinyarwanda just through French, the SocLang (Gafaranga 2010; this study concerns mainly multi-party interactions). At ages 5 and 6, children used MGSs themselves, e.g., the French question *quoi?* (*what?*). This question mirrored parental MGSs and signaled the children's preference for French. In comprehension checks, a 7-year-old used an EGS or AR by repeating a parent's Kinyarwanda utterance in French. Seven-year-old trilingual Mona (Kheirkhah and Cekaite 2015) often complied with her parents' insistence that she speak just the NonSocLang (Farsi or Kurdish), requests for translations and explicit teaching of the NonSocLang (see also Meyer Pitton's (2013) examples of dinner conversations in three Russian–French families in Switzerland). However, Mona also occasionally showed negative affect where she insisted on using Swedish, the SocLang, and explicitly stated that she did not know Farsi and Kurdish well enough. Her parents, eager to keep family life harmonious, often stopped insisting on NonSocLang use when Mona got angry. In less tense situations, they would pretend they did not understand a Swedish word Mona used in order to prompt her to say the word in the NonSocLang. Naomi, 12 years old, was able to articulate why she used English or Japanese, citing phonological or semantic factors. In interactions with her Japanese-speaking mother, she used mainly English but also some Japanese, against her mother's wish for purely Japanese interactions (Gyoji 2015). Her mother did not argue the point but persisted in using Japanese.

In a study of 44 Chinese–American families with pre-schoolers in the United States, Kuo (1974) noted that parents may use more English (LS) rather than just Chinese in response to children speaking more English. In addition to children's language choice *per se*, their use of passive resistance to the NonSocLang from a young age through monolingual strategies favoring the SocLang and at older ages through more explicit negotiations of language choice shows that their developing agency may counter parental strategies aimed at supporting the NonSocLang. Children's monolingual strategies favoring the SocLang thus may push parents to speak the SocLang too (Gafaranga 2010). However, children who earlier exercised their agency and rejected the NonSocLang may later regret that they are unable to speak the NonSocLang (Nakamura 2020). In young adulthood, some may ask their parents to speak the NonSocLang to them or may enroll in NonSocLang classes.

Despite showing resistance to the NonSocLang, children may use it selectively for achieving specific communicative goals. Said and Zhu's (2017) study of multi-party family interaction in the United Kingdom involving two brothers aged 6 and 9 showed how they used Arabic to gain the attention of their English-and-Arabic-speaking parents and to challenge their

mother's authority. Likewise, an English–Gaelic 7-year-old used Gaelic, the NonSocLang, to request something, attract attention, or mitigate admonishments (Smith-Christmas 2016). Thus, as Lanza (e.g., 2004, 333) also acknowledged, children are co-constructive agents in socialization contexts for language choice. Children's developing maturity may help determine how successful they are in pushing their own agenda. However, parents' reactions to children's agency are just as important. These reactions will partly depend on parental levels of language awareness (see below).

3.2 Parental Language Awareness

As a bilingual investigator, De Houwer (1983) had to make a conscious effort to only speak Dutch to Kate. When Kate addressed her in English in an early recording, De Houwer responded in English twice before switching to Dutch. As an investigator, she was acutely aware of linguistic choices. However, caregivers may be quite unaware of their linguistic choices or the strategies they use (Lanza 1997b). This helps to explain why there may be a mismatch between what language(s) parents say they speak to children and what they actually speak. The ten mothers interviewed by Chumak-Horbatsch (1987) firmly believed that they only spoke Ukrainian at home. Yet extended recordings of mother–child interactions in the home showed quite a bit of English present in mothers' language use, of which they were unaware. Moreover, mothers paid little attention to their children's English use and always used MOS.

Not only may parents be unaware of their language choice behavior. They may also be unaware that their language choice behavior may matter. This point is elaborated in the next subsection.

3.3 Parental Beliefs and Other Factors

While the studies reviewed in Section 2 underscore the importance of monolingual strategies for encouraging child bilingualism, the extent to which parents use such strategies is arguably affected by their impact belief or the conviction that they can “exercise some sort of control over their children's linguistic functioning” (De Houwer 1999, 83). Parents with a strong impact belief may engage monolingual strategies more often to influence children's language choice. Parents who use bilingual strategies may have a weak(er) impact belief; that is, they may be unaware that how they talk to children can influence their bilingual development.

Parents of English–Japanese bilingual children in Japan who had a strong impact belief reported that they spoke English consistently to their children and expected their children to do the same, likely signaling this through monolingual strategies (Nakamura 2019). Yet, despite having a strong impact belief, some parents may decide not to press the issue of language choice because they are worried about communication breakdowns.

The fathers in Nakamura (2018) prioritized communication with their receptive bilingual children, so they interacted with them dual-lingually. However, parents who use monolingual strategies do not report communication failures; neither do the observational examples from children's reactions to MGS or EGS give the impression that communication was hampered.

Parents have different perspectives on their role in children's development and have different general parenting styles, varying between leaving children free to do whatever they like and being quite authoritarian. Parenting styles also affect the degree to which parents use specific strategies. Styles of parenting and corresponding use of strategies may be related to culture. For instance, while EGS is a common caregiver style of interaction in North American middle-class monolingual families, Western Samoan caregivers do not engage it because they tend not to participate in perspective-taking when talking to children (Ochs 1984).

4 BIFIM and Research on Input, Family Language Policy, and Language Maintenance

Our discussion so far has confirmed the importance of Lanza's (e.g., 1997b) foundational ideas on the link between parent-child interaction and children's bilingual production. One would think that this area of research belongs to both the more psycholinguistically oriented field studying language input in bilingual acquisition and the more sociolinguistically oriented field known as Family Language Policy. Surprisingly, neither of those fields pays much attention to it. Ours is the first overarching review of BIFIM. Explanations for why children do not speak a NonSocLang should also interest scholars working on intergenerational language maintenance. Also, in that field there is little attention to BIFIM.

It is quite puzzling that none of the three research fields pay much attention to BIFIM. The reason might have to do with methodological difficulties: After all, strategies can only be studied based on time-consuming observations of natural interaction. Yet, in observational studies (mostly in the bilingual acquisition literature), there is hardly any attention to discourse strategies. Do we find any reference to BIFIM in the general literature on bilingual parenting? We consider this in Section 5.

5 Parental Discourse Strategies in Bilingual Parenting Resources

Bilingual parenting resources have become more widely available than ever before. Many parents refer to them when making bilingual parenting decisions. Such advice can thus influence children's bilingual development. As reviewed above, studies addressing BIFIM have demonstrated how parental discourse strategies can help promote children's active use of the

NonSocLang (in addition to the SocLang). Are parents generally informed that their discourse strategies may affect children's bilingualism?

An important but now-defunct channel, the Bilingual Family Newsletter (see Table 2.2, Part 2.2.1), made very little reference to parental discourse strategies, and none to BIFIM. In contrast, an early internet-based article commissioned by the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington DC (De Houwer 1999, Table 2.2, Part 2.2.4) endorsed monolingual strategies and compared them to other common parental socialization efforts:

If you feel strongly about your children using one particular language with you, encourage them to use it in all of their communication with you. Try to discourage their use of another language with you by asking them to repeat what they said in the preferred language or by gently offering them the appropriate words in the language you want them to use. *It is no more cruel than asking your child to say "please" before giving her a cookie.* [our emphasis]

There are also numerous books on bilingual parenting written by academics and non-academics alike (the latter may be carrying out independent research). Some inform parents of empirical findings from child bilingualism research. Others rely mainly on anecdotes, parent interviews, and/or personal experience. To determine the extent to which BIFIM has been disseminated as bilingual parenting advice, we reviewed 23 English books and 11 books written in Dutch, French, German, Japanese, and Spanish (listed in Table 2.2, Parts 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, respectively). We focused on publications after 2000 to make sure authors had had a chance to refer to Lanza's 1992 and 1997 BIFIM publications.

Only 6 of the 33 books expressly mentioned BIFIM (bold titles, Table 2.2). In her popular book, Elke Montanari (2002) explained how parents can coax young children into responding in the expected language and strongly endorsed the use of MGS. The parents she interviewed also found other methods helpful, such as asking children to please speak language X, because, as they explained to children, it matters to parents. This strategy does not feature in BIFIM, perhaps because Lanza's 2-year-old subjects were too young to understand requests which require a fair amount of metalinguistic awareness. Orioni (2015, 96 ff.) likewise presented MGS as an important strategy for fostering children's speech in two languages. Use of MGS worked well with her children, and they still complied with her use of MGS in their teens. Child bilingualism scholar Barbara Pearson (2008, 149–151) strongly endorsed BIFIM and suggested parents "may have to insist" (p. 151) on children speaking the "right" language, much like when they insist on music lessons. Several parents surveyed for her book reported that their children still readily accepted the fiction that their parents did not understand the language they happened to use. Barron-Hauwaert (2004, 14) suggested that AR would work well with younger children who are

Table 2.2 Bilingual Parenting Resources Reviewed for Reference to Lanza (1992, 1997b) and/or BIFIM*

2.2.1 *The Bilingual Family Newsletter (BFN)*
 Multilingual Matters published the now defunct quarterly *Bilingual Family Newsletter (BFN)* between 1984 and 2010 (archived in <https://www.multilingual-matters.com/page/bilingual-family-newsletter/>). As also noted by Lanza (2020), it was an important and influential forum for sharing bilingual parenting experiences and disseminating expert advice on bilingual parenting, a function now taken over by blogs and websites. In the 92 *BFN* issues from Volume 5 (1988) to final Volume 27 (2010), there was very little reference to parental discourse strategies, and none to BIFIM. We only found some in early editions, where contributors explained what had worked well for their family: Susanne Döpke did so in 1990 (Volume 7:3) and *BFN* editor George Saunders in 1992 (Volume 9:1–2). An article in 1990 (Volume 7:3) mentioned a study by Leena Huss that had grouped parents' reactions to young Swedish-Finnish children into BIFIM-like categories. Saunders reviewed Döpke's (1992) book with information on strategies in 1994 (Volume 11:2). Finally, in 1999 (Volume 16:4, in an article entitled "You're no fun – I will talk to mom instead") Laura Sager suggests that parental use of MGS may annoy children and make them share their experiences with the other parent instead.

2.2.2 *Books Published in English*
 1.* Baker, Colin. 2014. *A Parents' & Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism*. 4th ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. [2nd ed. published 2000; 3rd ed. in 2007]
 2. Barron-Hauwaert, Suzanne. 2004. *Language Strategies for Bilingual Families*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
 3. Barron-Hauwaert, Suzanne. 2011. *Bilingual Siblings: Language Use in Families*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
 4. Beck, Adam. 2016. *Maximize Your Child's Bilingual Ability*. Hiroshima: Bilingual Adventures.
 5.* Braun, Andreas, and Tony Cline. 2014. *Language Strategies for Trilingual Families*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
 6. Bourgogne, Annika. 2013. *Be Bilingual: Practical Ideas for Multilingual Families*. n/a: Annika Bourgogne.
 7.* Cunningham-Andersson, Una, and Staffan Andersson. 2004. *Growing Up with Two Languages. A Practical Guide*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge. [4th modified ed. by the first author published 2020]
 8. Dippel, Lennis. 2015. *Trilingual by Six: The Same Way to Raise Intelligent, Talented Children*. San Antonio: Lennis Dippel.
 9.* Festman, Julia, Gregory J. Poarch, and Jean-Marc Dewaele. 2017. *Raising Multilingual Children*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
 10. Harding-Esch, Edith, and Phillip Riley. 2003. *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
 11. Jernigan, Christine. 2015. *Family Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
 12.* King, Kendall, and Alison Mackey. 2007. *The Bilingual Edge*. New York: Collins.
 13.* Meisel, Jürgen. 2019. *Bilingual Children. A Guide for Parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 14. Myles, Carey. 2003. *Raising Bilingual Children*. Los Angeles: Parent's Guide Press.

- 15.* Pearson, Barbara Zurer. 2008. *Raising a Bilingual Child. A Step-by-Step Guide for Parents*. New York: Living Language.
16. Raguenaud, Virginia. 2009. *Bilingual by Choice: Raising Kids in Two (or More!) Languages*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey.
17. Rosenback, Rita. 2014. *Bringing Up a Bilingual Child*. Surrey: Filament.
18. Soto, Roxana A., and Ana L. Flores. 2012. *Bilingual Is Better*. United States of America: Bilingual Readers.
19. Steiner, Naomi, and Susan Hayes. 7 *Steps to Raise a Bilingual Child*. New York: Amacom.
20. Thomas, Claire. 2012. *Growing Up with Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
21. Tokuhama-Espinosa, Tracey. 2001. *Raising Multilingual Children*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
22. Wang, Xiao-Lei. 2008. *Growing Up with Three Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
23. Wang, Xiao-Lei. 2011. *Learning to Read and Write in the Multilingual Family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 2.2.3 *Books Published in Languages Other than English*
- DUTCH
- 1.* Montanari, Elke Burkhardt, Jeroen Aarssen, Petra Bos, and Erin Wagenaar. 2004. *Hoe Kinderen Meertalig Opgroeien* [How Children Grow Up Bilingually]. Amsterdam: PlanPlan.
2. Orioni, Marinella (2015). *Meertalig Opvoeden: Uw kind Zal U Dankbaar Zijn* [A Bilingual Upbringing: Your Child will be Grateful to You!]. Amsterdam: Van Gennep. [reprinted 2016]
- FRENCH
- 3.* Abdellah-Bauer, Barbara (2008). *Le Défi des Enfants Bilingues: Grandir et Vivre en Parlant Plusieurs Langues* [The Challenge of Bilingual Children: Growing Up and Living with Several Languages]. Paris: Éditions La Découverte.
- GERMAN
- 4.* Montanari, Elke. 2002. *Mit zwei Sprachen groß werden: Mehrsprachige Erziehung in Familie, Kindergarten und Schule* [Growing Up with Two languages: Bilingual Education in the Family, Preschool and School]. München: Kösel. [frequently reprinted up to 2017]
- JAPANESE
5. Oda, Setsuko (小田 せつこ). 2019. 子どもの未来を広げる「おやこえいご」: バイリンガルを育てる幼児英語メソッド [‘Parent-Child English’ to Broaden Your Child’s Future: English Methods for Raising Bilingual Children]. Tokyo: Petite Lettre.
6. Oketani-Lobbezoo, Hiromi (桶谷仁美). 2007. 家庭でバイリンガルを育てる: 0歳からのバイリンガル教育 [Raising Children as Bilinguals: Bilingual Education from Age Zero]. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.
7. Sakae, Yoko (栄 陽子). 2019. 子どもを“バイリンガル”にしたければこう育てなさい! [If You Want Your Children to be Bilinguals, Raise them Like This!]. Tokyo: Fusosha.
8. Sampei, Mari (三幣真理). 2016. バイリンガルは5歳までにつくられる [Making Bilinguals up to the Age of 5]. Tokyo: Gentosha.

(Continued)

Table 2.2 (Continued)

9.	Takahashi, Nagako (高橋 良子). 2019. <i>びりちゃんのパイリンガル日記: 日本語と英語を自由に使える子どもの育て方</i> [Bilingual's Bilingual Diary: The Way to Raise a Child Who Can Use English and Japanese Freely]. Tokyo: Bungeisha.
	SPANISH
10.*	Ada, Alma Flor and Colin Baker. 2001. <i>Guía Para Padres y Maestros de Niños Bilingües</i> [A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism]. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
11.*	Ada, Alma Flor, F. Isabel Campoy, and Colin Baker. 2017. <i>Guía Para Padres y Maestros de Niños Bilingües</i> [A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism]. 2.a edición. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
2.2.4	<i>Online Resources</i>
1.	Beck, Adam. 2013. "What to do when your bilingual child won't speak your language." March 29. http://bilingualmonkeys.com/when-your-bilingual-child-wont-speak-your-language/
2.	Blin, Jessica. 2020. "How to deal with the bilingual rebellion." Accessed April 8 2020. http://thebilingualadvantage.com/advice-for-parents-2/#howtodeal
3.	Calabrese, Ana. 2020. "What your kid really understands when you say 'I don't understand.'" January 28. https://mariterodriguezbellas.com/what-your-kid-really-understands-when-you-say-i-dont-understand/
4.*	De Houwer, Annick. 1999. "Two or more languages in early childhood: some general points and some practical recommendations." ERIC digest. EDO-FL-99-03, ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics. http://www.cal.org/resource-center/resource-archive/digests/(offset)/105
5.	Heller, Corey. 2020. "Top 10 reasons why your children aren't speaking your language." Accessed April 8 2020. http://www.multilingualliving.com/2010/05/18/top-10-reasons-your-children-not-speaking-your-language/
6.	Limacher-Riebold, Ute. 2019. "Code switching, what to do, when should I worry?" Accessed on May 16 2019. http://www.utesinternationalounge.com/code-switching-what-to-do-when-should-i-worry/
7.*	Marian, Viorica. 2019. "How to raise a bilingual child: Seven strategies for success." March 15. https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/language-and-mind/201903/how-raise-bilingual-child-seven-strategies-success?fbclid=IwAR1mV84s7yz4gLTLDofn6HJYX25SjkeTsCaSBjiSqmaG-amNSB7Cp0WcEwQ
8.	Rosenback, Rita. 2014. "12 things parents raising bilingual children need to know." February 26. https://multilingualparenthood.com/2014/02/26/12-things-parents-raising-bilingual-children-need-to-know
9.*	Sorace, Antonella and Bob Ladd. 2004. "Raising bilingual children. Series: Frequently Asked Questions." Linguistic Society of America. https://www.linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/Bilingual_Child.pdf

* Starred resources are (co-)authored by academics [with varying expertise in child bilingualism]; Titles in bold expressly mention BIFIM.

“absorbing language” and MGS and EGS are more suited to older children to get them to speak more of the NonSocLang. King and Mackey (2007) gave a lot of attention to BIFIM but mainly highlighted the discrepancy between parents’ stated usual language choice and the reality in actual conversation. They suggested in a very non-committal way that Lanza’s monolingual strategies are “worth a try” (p. 198). Child bilingualism scholar Meisel (2019, 121), however, did not recommend MGS, which he mainly interpreted as parents pretending not to understand a language. He argued that this may not reflect parents’ bilingual reality and that children may feel “deceived” once they discover their parents are bilingual.

We also reviewed a few online sources (see Table 2.2, Part 2.2.4). Apart from De Houwer (1999), these did not mention BIFIM at all. Even bilingualism scholars with easy access to Lanza’s work did not mention it (see the information leaflet of the Linguistic Society of America written by Sorace and Ladd [2004] and a blog by Marian [2019]). Thus, BIFIM has hardly been disseminated in bilingual parenting resources.

However, many sources provided some advice on how to deal with children’s inappropriate language choices. Like Meisel (2019), many cautioned against the use of MGS (but offered no empirical data that warrants such negative advice). Parents are mostly advised to just continue using the NonSocLang when children speak the SocLang. Baker (2014, 94) even warned that “it is often impossible and unwise to compel a child to speak a language”. This opinion also appeared in Spanish editions of his influential book (Ada and Baker 2001; Ada, Campoy, and Baker 2017). Some sources suggested not responding to children or even punishing them for speaking the “wrong” language. Needless to say, we do not endorse such practices. On the other hand, some sources suggested praising children for speaking the right language. Generally, advice is given without much attention to children’s developmental stage.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

In 1988 Lanza wrote: “Careful study is needed of different parents’ discourse strategies and how parental strategies change over time in relation to the child’s language development” (p. 83). More than three decades hence we have only about 20 case studies that looked at strategies used with BFLA children, Park et al.’s (2012) longitudinal structured observations of 64 families, and Chumak-Horbatsch’s (1987, 1999) suggestive study of ten families. Even though this database of observational studies of dyadic parent–child interaction with children aged 1 to 12 is still quite limited, our review has confirmed BIFIM’s validity and the predictions it makes for active bilingualism in both younger and older children.

Lanza (2001, 227) wrote that “developmental and interactional perspectives are essential for determining the extent to which parental discourse strategies have an impact on the child’s language choice” and that children

are “active, creative social agents” (2004, 333). Bornstein’s (2009) transactional model recognizes that both parents and children bring distinctive characteristics to each interaction and change as a result of it. The bidirectionality of interactions implies that children employ strategies of their own to socialize parents into using the language of their choice: Children’s agency may influence the degree to which parents will use particular strategies, which in turn affects children’s language choice. The degree to which child agency plays a role probably relates to parents’ general parenting beliefs and language-related impact beliefs.

Further research is needed to understand how both parents and children simultaneously engage strategies to negotiate language choice from the early stages onwards. Yet is it the transactional nature of the developing parent–child relationship *within an evolving environment affecting all parties* that is likely the reason why monolingual strategies are often (1) hard to put into practice, and (2) may fail to produce lasting results. It is difficult to combat children’s developing attitudes favoring the SocLang as a result of schooling (De Houwer 2020). The role of these developing attitudes needs further investigation.

Research so far has only scratched the surface of the transactional dynamics of discourse strategies in bilingual families. Many important issues remain unexplored. For instance, how decisive are earlier patterns of parent–child interaction for later child bilingual use? We know that pre-schoolers may be socialized into speaking two languages when earlier they spoke mainly one. Is it possible to reverse older children’s single language use at home? Or is child agency just too strong after, say, age 5? Developmental perspectives are rarely discussed, even though MGS may work differently with 2-year-olds than with 10-year-olds. Most studies so far have focused on strategies used by one parent in mostly dual-parent households. What about the other parent’s role? Especially in multi-party family interaction, the other parent’s role may be quite fundamental (Venables, Eisenclas, and Schalley 2014). Furthermore, most studies are limited to families mainly using 1P/1L. Do monolingual strategies work similarly when the same parent uses them in different languages (and in different settings)? Another issue relates to sibling rank. Home interaction patterns and family dynamics change when a sibling is born. How does this affect strategies used with firstborns, with younger children, and, later, among siblings? Many more questions remain.

As Section 5 shows, Lanza’s seminal ideas about BIFIM have not been given much attention in bilingual parenting resources. Some writers seem to be unaware of BIFIM and the studies which support it. This may explain the common advice to parents to simply continue speaking the NonSocLang in response to children speaking the SocLang. Thus, the authors are actually advising the use of MOS, a bilingual strategy, which in fact does not encourage NonSocLang use. At the same time, the advice to continue speaking the NonSocLang is important encouragement because if parents switch to the SocLang, children will be even less likely to use the NonSocLang. However,

while modeling the NonSocLang is necessary, it is insufficient to support children's active NonSocLang use, particularly when parents frequently use MOS (Nakamura 2018).

Parents who expose their children to two languages from birth usually expect them to speak both languages. The advice to keep speaking the NonSocLang and use MOS may lead to disappointment once parents find children unable or unwilling to speak the NonSocLang. Even so, some authors of bilingual parenting books reassure parents (without giving any evidence) that receptive bilingualism can be activated at an older age, for instance, through travel (Cunningham-Andersson and Andersson 2004; Jernigan 2015 in Table 2.2, Part 2.2.2). While there are two case studies of active-turned-receptive bilingual children who reactivated the NonSocLang on trips to the country where this language was the SocLang (Slavkov 2015; Uribe de Kellett 2002), not everyone has the chance to make such trips. Furthermore, it is hard to encourage NonSocLang production when active bilingualism has not been established from the beginning (Nakamura 2018).

More than four decades ago, many parents in Arnberg (1979) complained there were insufficient bilingual parenting resources. Parents now have access to much more bilingual parenting information. However, the importance of monolingual strategies that Lanza identified for supporting bilingual development is still insufficiently recognized. The lack of coverage means that parents are inadequately informed about the role of BIFIM. Gaps between bilingual parenting books and research findings also exist for other aspects of family bilingualism (Nakamura 2021). As Lanza (2020) has also pointed out, further research is needed to determine to what extent research evidence is reflected in bilingual parenting advice. Given the likely influence of bilingual parenting resources on parental language practices and thereby on the language outcomes of many young children raised in bilingual settings, researchers and authors of parenting resources need to communicate research-based insights to parents. The Harmonious Bilingualism Network (www.habilnet.org) is one of just a few initiatives disseminating research-based findings, including those of BIFIM, to the general public. However, more outreach work is needed to help families raise bilingual children.

Note

- 1 All terms that are ambiguous as to whether they relate to language, citizenship, or nationality refer to *language* unless otherwise indicated.

References

- Arnberg, Lenore. 1979. "Language Strategies in Mixed Nationality Families." *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 20 (1): 105–112. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.1979.tb00689.x

- Bornstein, Marc H. 2009. "Toward a Model of Culture↔Parent↔Child Transactions." In *The Transactional Model of Development: How Children and Contexts Shape Each Other*, edited by Arnold Sameroff, 139–161. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chevalier, Sarah. 2013. "Caregiver Responses to the Language Mixing of a Young Trilingual." *Multilingua* 32 (1): 1–32. doi:10.1515/multi-2013-0001
- Chevalier, Sarah. 2015. *Trilingual Language Acquisition: Contextual Factors Influencing Active Trilingualism in Early Childhood*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tilar.16
- Chumak-Horbatsch, Roma. 1987. "Language Use in the Ukrainian Home: A Toronto Sample." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 63: 99–118. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1987.63.99
- Chumak-Horbatsch, Roma. 1999. "Language Change in the Ukrainian Home: From Transmission to Maintenance to the Beginnings of Loss." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 31 (2): 61–74.
- Cruz-Ferreira, Madalena. 2006. *Three is a Crowd? Acquiring Portuguese in a Trilingual Environment*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Curd-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2013. "Negotiating Family Language Policy: Doing Homework." In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 277–295. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8
- De Houwer, Annick. 1983. "Some Aspects of the Simultaneous Acquisition of Dutch and English by a Three-Year-Old Child." *Nottingham Linguistic Circular* 12: 106–129.
- De Houwer, Annick. 1999. "Environmental Factors in Early Bilingual Development: The Role of Parental Beliefs and Attitudes." In *Bilingualism and Migration*, edited by Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 75–95. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110807820
- De Houwer, Annick. 2007. "Parental Language Input Patterns and Children's Bilingual Use." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28 (3): 411–424. doi:10.1017/S0142716407070221
- De Houwer, Annick. 2009. *Bilingual First Language Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- De Houwer, Annick. 2017. "Early Multilingualism and Language Awareness." In *Language Awareness and Multilingualism* (Vol. 6, *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*), edited by Jasone Cenoz, Durk Gorter, and Stephen May, 83–97. Berlin: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-02240-6_6
- De Houwer, Annick. 2019. "Language Choice in Bilingual Interaction." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 324–348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316831922
- De Houwer, Annick. 2020. "Why Do So Many Children Who Hear Two Languages Speak Just a Single Language?" *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 25 (1): 7–26.
- Deuchar, Margaret and Rachel Muntz. 2003. "Factors Accounting for Code-mixing in an Early Developing Bilingual." In *(In)vulnerable Domains in Multilingualism*, edited by Natascha Müller, 161–190. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/hsm.1

- Filipi, Anna. 2015. "The Development of Recipient Design in Bilingual Child-Parent Interaction." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48 (1): 100–119. doi:10.1080/08351813.2015.993858
- Gafaranga, Joseph. 2010. "Medium Request: Talking Language Shift into Being." *Language in Society* 39 (2): 241–270. doi:10.1017/S0047404510000047
- Gyoji, Eiko. 2015. "Children's Agency in Language Choice: A Case Study of Two Japanese-English Bilingual Children in London." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18 (6): 749–764. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.956043
- Haskell, Dale. 1998. "The Influence of Context and Parental Input on Language Choice and Mixing in Bilingual Language Acquisition." *Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism* 4: 33–53.
- Juan-Garau, Maria and Carmen Pérez-Vidal. 2001. "Mixing and Pragmatic Parental Strategies in Early Bilingual Acquisition." *Journal of Child Language* 28 (1): 59–86. doi:10.1017/S0305000900004591
- Kasuya, Hiroko. 1998. "Determinants of Language Choice in Bilingual Children: The Role of Input." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2 (3): 327–346. doi:10.1177/136700699800200304
- Kheirhah, Mina and Asta Cekaite. 2015. "Language Maintenance in a Multilingual Family: Informal Heritage Language Lessons in Parent–Child Interactions." *Multilingua* 34 (3): 319–346. doi:10.1515/multi-2014-1020
- Kuo, Eddie Chen-Yu. 1974. "The Family and Bilingual Socialization: A Sociolinguistic Study of a Sample of Chinese Children in the United States." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 92: 181–191. doi:10.1080/00224545.1974.9923096
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1987. "Code-mixing and Code-switching in the Bilingual Infant's Discourse." Paper presented at the Fourth International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Lund, July.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1988. "Language Strategies in the Home: Linguistic Input and Infant Bilingualism." In *Bilingualism and the Individual*, edited by Anne Holmen, Elisabeth Hansen, Jørgen Gimbel, and J. Normann Jørgensen, 69–84. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1990. "Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1992. "Can Bilingual Two-Year-Olds Code-switch?" *Journal of Child Language* 19 (3): 633–658. doi:10.1017/S0305000900011600
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1997a. "Language Contact in Bilingual Two-Year-Olds and Code-switching: Language Encounters of a Different Kind?" *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1 (2): 135–162. doi:10.1177/136700699700100203
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 1997b. *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2001. "Bilingual First Language Acquisition: A Discourse Perspective on Language Contact in Parent-Child Interactions." In *Trends in Bilingual Acquisition*, edited by Jasone Cenoz and Fred Genesee, 201–229. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tilar.1
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2004. *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2020. "Digital Storytelling: Multilingual Parents' Blogs and Vlogs as Narratives of Family Language Policy." In *Språkriser. Festskrift til Anne*

- Golden, edited by Guri Bordal Steien and Lars Anders Kulbrandstad, 177–192. Sofiemyr: Novus forlag.
- Meng, Hairong and Tadao Miyamoto. 2012. “Input and Output in Code Switching: A Case Study of a Japanese–Chinese Bilingual Infant.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15 (4): 393–415. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.665826
- Meyer Pitton, Liliane. 2013. “From Language Maintenance to Bilingual Parenting: Negotiating Behavior and Language Choice at the Dinner Table in Binational-Bilingual Families.” *Multilingua* 32 (4): 507–526. doi:10.1515/multi-2013-0025
- Mishina, Satomi. 1999. “The Role of Parental Input and Discourse Strategies in the Early Language Mixing of a Bilingual Child.” *Multilingua* 18 (4): 1–30. doi:10.1515/mult.1999.18.4.317
- Mishina-Mori, Satomi. 2011. “A Longitudinal Analysis of Language Choice in Bilingual Children: The Role of Parental Input and Interaction.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (13): 3122–3138. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.016
- Montanari, Simona. 2009. “Pragmatic Differentiation in Early Trilingual Development.” *Journal of Child Language* 36 (3): 597–627. doi:10.1017/S0305000908009112
- Nakamura, Janice. 2018. “Parents’ Use of Discourse Strategies in Dual-Lingual Interactions with Receptive Bilingual Children.” In *Crosslinguistic Research in Monolingual and Bilingual Speech*, edited by Elena Babatsouli, 181–200. Chania: ISMBS.
- Nakamura, Janice. 2019. “Parents’ Impact Belief in Raising Bilingual and Biliterate Children in Japan.” *Psychology of Language and Communication* 23 (1): 137–161. doi:10.2478/plc-2019-0007
- Nakamura, Janice. 2020. “Language Regrets: Mixed-Ethnic Children’s Lost Opportunity for Minority Language Acquisition in Japan.” *Multilingua* 39 (2): 213–237. doi:10.1515/multi-2019-0040
- Nakamura, Janice. 2021. “English Parenting for Japanese Parents: A critical review of advice in self-help books for raising bilingual children in Japan.” *English Today*. doi:10.1017/S0266078421000286
- Nibun, Yukari and Gillian Wigglesworth. 2014. “Early Pragmatic Differentiation in Japanese and German: A Case Study of a Developing Trilingual Child in Australia.” *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11 (1): 76–96. doi:10.1080/14790718.2013.837910
- Ochs, Elinor. 1984. “Clarification and Culture.” In *Georgetown University Roundtable 1984: Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, 325–341. Washington, DC: Georgetown University.
- Palviainen, Åsa and Sally Boyd. 2013. “Unity in Discourse, Diversity in Practice: The One Person One Language Policy in Bilingual Families.” In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children, and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 223–248. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8
- Park, Heejung, Kim M. Tsai, Lisa L. Liu, and Anna S. Lau. 2012. “Transactional Associations Between Supportive Family Climate and Young Children’s Heritage Language Proficiency in Immigrant Families.” *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 36 (3): 226–236. doi:10.1177/0165025412439842
- Quay, Suzanne. 2012. “Discourse Practices of Trilingual Mothers: Effects on Minority Home Language Development in Japan.” *International Journal of*

- Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15 (4): 435–453. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.665828
- Said, Fatma and Hua Zhu. 2017. “No, no Maama! Say ‘Shaatiir ya Ouledee Shaatiir’! Children’s Agency in Language Use and Socialization.” *International Journal of Bilingualism* 23 (3): 771–785. doi:10.1177/1367006916684919
- Sinka, Indra and Christina Schelleter. 1998. “Morphosyntactic Development in Bilingual Children.” *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2 (3): 301–326. doi:10.1177/136700699800200303
- Slavkov, Nikolay. 2015. “Language Attrition and Reactivation in the Context of Bilingual First Language Acquisition.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18 (6): 715–734. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.941785
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2016. *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language at Home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137521811
- Taeschner, Traute. 1983. *The Sun is Feminine: A Study on Language Acquisition in Bilingual Children*. Berlin: Springer Verlag. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-48329-5
- Takeuchi, Masae. 2000. “Japanese Parents’ Discourse Strategies in Response to Inappropriate Language Choice by their Children.” *Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism* 6: 20–44.
- Uribe de Kellett, Angela. 2002. “The Recovery of a First Language: A Case Study of an English/Spanish Bilingual Child.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 5 (3): 162–181. doi:10.1080/13670050208667753
- Venables, Elizabeth, Susana A. Eisenclas, and Andrea 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. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.816263
- Zhan, Ying. 2020. “The Role of Agency in the Language Choices of a Trilingual Two-Year-Old in Conversation with Monolingual Grandparents.” *First Language*. doi:10.1177/0142723720923488