Why family language policy is crucial ? Case of France with some new perspectives

Shahzaman Haque

HAL Id: hal-02915400
https://hal.science/hal-02915400

Submitted on 14 Aug 2020

Politique linguistique familiale

Enjeux dynamiques de la transmission linguistique dans un contexte migratoire

Family language policy

Dynamics in language transmission under a migratory context

Sous la direction de / edited by
Shahzaman Haque

Avec le concours de /
with the collaboration of
Françoise Le Lièvre

Foreword by
Jan Blommaert

2019
LINCOM GmbH

Printed in E.C.

Shahzaman Haque

Why family language policy is crucial? Case of France with some new perspectives

1. INTRODUCTION. This final chapter illustrates some points, drawing attention to the essence of family language policy, which has long been overlooked by sociolinguists, particularly in France, where almost no research work has been carried out in this area. The importance of language maintenance, practices and transmission in the family in the context of migration has attracted many researchers in France and in Europe (Varro 1996, Deprez et al. 2014, Zarate 1997, Gohard-Radenkovic 2014), but the intricacies of this maintenance and the choice of other languages in respect of the family language ideology were hardly ever examined. Furthermore, in the absence of long-term ethnographic data observing the family, language policies within the family were never the focal point of researchers, until recently when Deprez (1996) and Spolsky (2012) emphasized their importance, drawing a parallel with language policy at the macro-level and suggesting a similar framework at the micro-level in the household, where family members play an important role in deciding and shaping the family's verbal repertoire. Pleas for an understanding of family language policy from Deprez (1996) and Dreyfus (1996), among the very first researchers of the issue in France, fell on deaf ears and adequate light has not been shed on why the family may be the crucial domain where the future of languages lies.

Family remains an important constituent in the maintenance of traditional and cultural heritage among its members. As argued by Bastardas-Boada (2015), "unlike other social institutions dealing with multilingualism, families appear to promote multidimensional language policy practices driven by the socio-economic context, but also cognitive and emotional aspects". It is in the sphere of family where the children socialize and are addressed in the first language(s) of the parents before they are enrolled in day-care or in a school. In an immigrant context, the parents have to properly weigh the value of their home language, and they must take some decisions in order to maintain their first tongue, if they find it valuable.

Previous studies have shown (Fishman 1991, Haque 2012b, Pérez Báez 2013) that the language of the host country was privileged to the detriment of the parental languages within the family home. The parents generally take many factors into account, such as the central importance of the host language in almost all walks of life, and later the children tend to incline more favorably toward the host language, as in most cases it is the only language of the school. It has also been noted that the children's peer group in the school plays a major role in breaking away from the parental languages and embracing the language of the host country. It has been found in recent studies that, whether they are resistant to the heritage language of the parents (Kopeliovich 2010, Haque 2012b) or they decide themselves the functions of each language and the status of the home language (Tuominen 1999), children play a significant role in articulating family language policies.

My purpose in this chapter is to show why family language policy is a crucial part of the sociolinguistics arena. What are the social, cultural and economic dynamics at play in France when it comes to dealing with family language policy? Is it possible to understand the dynamics of language interaction within the household and in public life, without taking into account family language policy? I believe that research on family language policy as an object of inquiry will provide useful knowledge for policymakers and will have an important bearing on facilitating a state of multilingualism which is inclusive of the languages of migrants, minorities and regional languages in France, or in Europe in general.

2. FROM PRIMARY SOCIALIZATION TO EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS. In a migratory context, the tussle between the host language and the parental language is one of the central components of family language policy. Everything boils down simply to the degree of space and value which a language gets within the family domain. Under the theoretical framework elaborated in the "Introduction" (Haque, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**), it was pointed out that the ideological beliefs of the parents vis-à-vis their own language and towards the language of the host country play an important role in determining the status of transmission of the heritage language. It is in the family that an individual acquires his *Sprachegefühl:* "language" and "feeling", combined, are unique to each family. The usage of particular phonemes, particular speech, along with sociocultural dimensions, is transmitted to the children.[1]

The first dyadic communication between parent and child, which begins as a "restricted code" (Bernstein 1972:467) happens within this domain of the family. This is the context for the family language policy, where the parents or grandparents, uncles, aunts, domestic servants and even nannies may play a significant part in language transmission.[2] Unless it has been pre-planned by both parents that they will not use their own first languages and will choose the host language for communication; or only one language of the parents is privileged alongside the host language in the case of mixed marriages, the automatic choice of parents is to communicate in their own ancestral languages.

---

[1] Even in those families where parental languages are not at all spoken by the children, they may however inculcate the phonemic properties of the first language in their verbal repertoire.

[2] Regarding nannies, in the current volume, see Spolsky (p.31) and Ramonienė (p.148) and for grandparents, see Spolsky (p.26, 29), Haque (p.45), Cognigni (p. 68, 72), Ramonienė (p. 143).

It would be important, however, to take into account the significance of the social class and educational level of the parents, and the language recommendations the parents get at mother-and-child health centers which may influence them. The second socialization of the children begins when they are sent to day-care or later to schools. It is in these places that the children may be exposed for the first time to another language, another expression of sounds and communications, which may be hitherto unknown to them. Viimaranta et al. (current volume, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**) have emphasized the importance of bilingual educational institutions, which may play a pivotal role in formulating family language policies.

The education of the child has somewhat been a subject of great passion for many centuries. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Émile ou de l'éducation,* written in 1762, emphasizes developing the child's faculty independent of the school's influence. The plea is to make the child learn from his environment in the most natural[3] way, and not from books, because the child will only learn to "imitate" this bookish knowledge, instead of understanding it in a more holistic form. According to Marx (2018), Rousseau's arguments assert that "letters are the foundations of sins" and "absence of documents is absence of vice, as though virtue lay strictly in ignorance". Not going into the complex philosophical ideas here, as it is beyond the scope of this paper, Rousseau's effort was not only to fight the institutions and books of a given period of time, but also to warn humanity of its ill-effects. These daring ideas, penned 250 years ago, were not compatible with Church teaching, for which Rousseau was sanctioned, but we notice that they are still relevant in today's society. Though Rousseau's work didn't focus on "language learning" or the involvement of the parents in the transmission of language, his overall attitude to education may perhaps suggest that he wishes that children should not be confined to "one-parent-one language", or "one school-one language", but should be exposed to the natural environment, so that they are free to obtain knowledge by their own means.[4]

Jiddu Krishnamurti, Indian philosopher and educationist, born in 1895, lays equal emphasis on an alternative education whose purpose is to make oneself observe the world and not depend upon scholarship which is already provided through many resources. According to him (1953), education should not reflect ideology, and children should not go through some kind of idealistic pattern. Krishnamurti criticizes the role of authority in learning: in fact, he says, authority prevents learning, in the sense that learning becomes a process of forced accumulation of knowledge, which does not give the person freedom to cultivate his or her own learning. My own fieldwork on Indian families (Haque 2012b) showed that, in some families, parental authority was explicit in shaping a family language policy where the education and languages were decided systematically for the children, and they just followed these parental rules, without any kind of "self-investigation" (Krishnamurti 1953).

---

[3] It is quite possible that Rousseau might have been influenced in the natural method of teaching which was ancient, and particularly attributed to the Athenians of the 5th century (Clarke 1971).
[4] Puren (1988:25) argues that the term "natural method" was widely used in the 17th century. He narrates the experience of the famous French philosopher of the 16th century, Michel de Montaigne, who learnt Latin with the help of a natural method "without art, without book, without grammar or instruction, without lash and without tears …".

School remains the pivotal institution for educating the child, and nowadays it is inconceivable to think of education without sending the child to school, except if home-schooling[5] is the norm. My point is to emphasize that the parents lay down the family language policy, thinking of enrolling their child in a school. Although the first socialization of the child takes place within the family, the language policy which comes into effect often has in mind a particular kind of school, so the parents may change the type of language which they address to their children, in order to make them comfortable in the school context. During data collection in 2008 in Gothenburg for my PhD dissertation (Haque 2012b), I came across an immigrant couple of Nepali origin who used to speak a few sentences in English every day to their toddler, because they were thinking of enrolling him in a private, English-medium school. Nepali was the home language, but the child was exposed daily to words of the English language, for the sake of his future and career. Even if the parents return to Nepal or settle in any other country, English may continue to play a major role for the child.

The children, once enrolled in the school, may also cultivate a different ideological construction, and become inclined toward the use of a different language. Both languages, parental and host, are, in fact, often carriers of different cultural and traditional practices and values. In the case of immigrant parents whose languages bear cultural values which are normally not widespread in the host country, the parents may feel that the children are becoming alienated from their heritage culture, and consequently from their heritage language. De Fina (2017:194) argued the overarching dominance of host countries' culture-influenced education in Europe, quoting Michaels (1981) and Gee (1989) that "teachers and institutional voices may do some other things by ignoring students' specific cultural traditions" or "by promoting monolingual and monocultural ideologies (Martin Rojo 2010, Rampton 2006)", which seems to be the case in French schools, where, in the latest study by Welply (2017), immigrant languages are considered "inferior, undesirable or illicit".

In France, children, as early as 3 years of age,[6] are exposed to many Christian-related festivals, which are often termed inherent cultural practices, like the celebration of Christmas or play-based activities in public school classrooms, revolving around the Christmas tree and Santa-Claus. However, it may be inconceivable that, in a secular (*laïque*) school[7], other religions of the French republic get as much space as festivals and play activities revolving around Christmas. Zolberg and Woon (1999:34) remarks that the "*laïcité française est indéniablement axée sur le catholicisme*". That children of different faiths and parents with different origins develop not only considerable

---

[5] According to a report, around 25,000 children do not go to school in France. https://www.ouest-france.fr/societe/education-l-instruction-domicile-sera-davantage-controlee-4630716, accessed on 02 May 2018.

[6] French president Emmanuel Macron has rendered schooling obligatory from the age of 3 years, down from the current 6 years. http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid128334/assises-de-l-ecole-maternelle-l-instruction-obligatoire-des-3-ans.html In a tweet posted on March 27, 2018, Macron announced the reasons for making 3 years the mandatory age to start school. https://twitter.com/EmmanuelMacron/status/978597261700628481 Around 97.6% of children are already enrolled in school from the age of 3 in French schools, though in French overseas territories the percentage is around 70.

[7] 'School' here refers to educational institutions for pupils up to 18 years of age.

knowledge and vocabulary in the host language, but a kind of attachment or great interest in Santa-Claus or the Christmas tree, has been noticed; because, in the eyes of the children, the school authorities consider these practices valid and valuable.[8] Sicard (2013) observed a "Christmas meal" in a French school where, at the end, all the children were given a packet of candies with a Santa-Claus chocolate. Questioning the ideals of French secularism in the school space, Sicard observed that French religious festivals, such as Christmas or Easter among others, are subject to common beliefs, so they are assigned value, whereas the beliefs of Muslim pupils are mocked and termed "stupid".[9]

The Jules Ferry laws of 1881 on the subject of education recommended the mandatory, free and secular character of education in public schools, but from 1996 onwards, Béraud et al. (2008:51) remarked that religious doctrines seeped into the French school curriculum in the name of broadening knowledge of cultural heritage. Biblical texts were introduced in the *sixième* (7th grade) and in the same year (1996), the origins of Christianity and the presentation of the Mediterranean world in the 12th century were introduced in the *seconde* (11th grade). In the midst of all these curriculum innovations for pupils from different cultural backgrounds, and particularly those from a non-Catholic background, or even for non-believers, the risk of alienation from one's own heritage becomes wider for the second generation. Under such circumstances, what consequences can follow for the relationship between child and parents? Spolsky (current volume, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**) has argued that "the school has turned out to be one of the most powerful institutions attempting to influence the family domain by proclaiming the need for everyone to speak the language chosen as the instructional medium".

With the risk that use of parental languages will diminish with the schooling of children, where French becomes the major language in most cases, and that the cultural heritage of the parents will be swept away, what could be the potential ripples in the lives of the family members? Varro (1992:142) pointed out that only case studies could throw light on the status of children in schools. These case studies could be carried out within the framework of family language policy, interviewing the parents and children, and, for a holistic view, further extending the research to the child's school premises.

3. A DIALECTICAL FRAMEWORK. Among Heidegger's writings, one of the most influential on social science is the "dictatorship of they", emerging from the broad concept of "being-with-others" (Bolt 2011:28-29), which in my view, could contribute strongly to the field of sociolinguistics. The theory of "dictatorship of they" posits that our actions are determined by how "they", or in other words, "others", want us to behave, act, live, in society and it has rarely been our own choice (Belloq 2010). We

---

[8] We see many examples of "Santa Claus" in the paper by Anderson-Levitt (1987) on education in the first grades in French public and private schools. Though the author wrote this article over 30 years ago, the trend of dissemination of French cultural and religious knowledge in public schools remains the same.

[9] The research work of Sicard (2013) was most probably carried out in two French high schools, although she didn't explicitly mention this. A generalization cannot be made out of these two case studies, but many other studies (Barthoux 2008, Robert 2016) point toward the excessive zealousness of Christian festivals in French public schools.

succumb to the others' will and desire. In terms of family language policy, the parental narration on language ideologies, practices and choices has a strong influence of the "dictatorship of they".

This has not been exploited from the viewpoint of Heidegger's understanding. We assume that the parent's reporting or the children's reporting on their language use is their own position and we tend to ignore the unseen influence of "others" on their mind. In this regard, George Orwell's novel *1984*, set in a dystopian milieu, may serve also as a datum, demonstrating the method of disseminating hegemonic beliefs by an authoritarian regime. Though the novel was written in 1949, it still bears relevance in today's political ambience around the world, where "fake news[10]" tends to capture the attention and propagate false information among the public which demagogues have always fetishized. The film, 1984, based on the novel of the same name, shows how perpetual announcements on the big screens, addressed to workers, serve as a propaganda tool to make people believe in an alternate world, with one protagonist whose duty was to revise history in accordance with the ideology of the repressive, totalitarian regime. Children born in our occidental or many oriental societies are more or less subject to a dominating influence which assumes certain beliefs and heritage or traditional practices; and they are further supposed to carry the torch of their family's identity to future generations. Though the purpose here is not to make an analogy between the *modus operandi* of parents and the authoritarian regime of Orwell's novel 1984, nevertheless, it manifests a resemblance in the sense that pre-conceived convictions in matters of language and other cultural beliefs are pivotal in the upbringing of the children. The constant and almost pervasive exposure to such ideological parental beliefs shows some parallels to the Orwellian fictional macrocosm.

I may now postulate the idea that there is external pressure on the families - either on the parents or on the children - which motivates, stimulates or drives the preference toward a particular language. These external pressures are often not reported explicitly in precise detail during fieldwork, but we hear simple reasons from the parents or from the children in the form of tokens[11] and, besides these tokens, there are some ideological beliefs, either very concrete or in a vague form. Similar patterns have emerged among the families with which I conducted longitudinal analysis on language policies (Haque 2012b, Haque 2009). Parents and children both manifested certain ideological stances for the language choices and practices within their household and in their professional or student lives. These beliefs tend to have rationalized the link between linguistic forms and social categories, which Omoniyi and White (2006:5) consider as second-order indexicality, and which is, in fact, a linguistic ideology, according to Milroy (2004:167). Assigning languages to their social categories, such as "powerful", "weak", "prestigious", aligns with what the "others" want us to believe. Family language policy may provide a perfect platform to understand and measure the gravity of such pressure if the family is under the influence of the "dictatorship of they", but only if the research is conducted on a long-term basis at micro level.

---

[10] See Allcott and Gentzkow (2017) for a complete discussion on the impact of 'fake news' or false stories on the U.S. Presidential election of 2016.

[11] By tokens, I mean some kind of indication, such as "my parents have told me that this particular language may be useful for my career because they see some benefits attached to it".

4. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS OF LANGUAGE. The Industrial Revolution, which began in England in the 18th and 19th centuries, changed the pattern of lives of hundreds and thousands of people, first in Europe and the United States, and then all over the world. It not only brought radical changes in the configuration of the economy, but it introduced the system of capitalism in many countries. Many markets emerged for the flow and consumption of goods. Language became an important and unavoidable source of communication between the traders, manufacturers and consumers. Around a century earlier, in 1648, the year of the Treaty of Westphalia not only brought an end to thirty years of war between Catholics and Protestants, but also gave rise to the concept of sovereignty, where rulers were the sole sovereign power in their particular territory or domain. Another landmark event was the formation of the Nation-States[12], with the rise of vernaculars replacing or cutting off the umbilical cord with Latin in Europe. These vernaculars were needed to symbolize and embody the ideological beliefs of the newly formed nation-states. They were codified and rendered prestigious by the sovereign rulers. Such was the case of the French language, hitherto a *patois* of Latin, which became the full-fledged standard language of France in the nation-state.

Family as a domain was added to the nation-states' considerations relevant to language policy (see Spolsky, current volume, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**). At the micro-level, the language choices in terms of transmission by the parents, or usage by the children, have been found in many cases to have a direct effect on "Nation-States" policies, through the concept of the "Linguistic market". The combination of these two phenomena (Nation-States and Markets) has led to what Hymes (1973) stressed as the coercive and power-laden forces through which some languages and forms of talk thrive, while others fail to thrive or decline (cited by Philips 2004:474). The escalation of inequality as a resultant of capitalism has also made speakers unequal in terms of language, either keeping in mind the benefits which one language can have, or preferring to keep the traditional language at home. Therefore, in a migratory context, languages are in most cases, as shown in many research papers on family language policy (Curdt-Christiansen 2009, Chatzidaki & Maligkoudi 2013, Haque 2012b) chosen and privileged according to the kind and weight of prestige and power they possess in the market. It is also noteworthy that, to have the privilege of speaking or learning powerful or prestigious languages, is not in the reach of everyone. In developing countries, many parents toil hard to send their children to an English-medium private school, and the whole hope of parents is not necessarily focused on a good education facility, but rather on an English-oriented education, which they see as guaranteeing success in a career.

Conversely, preserving and promoting traditional values through the practice of a heritage language at the cost of more privileged languages shows determination and faith in one's own cultural lineage. Speakers are aware of the economic value of the respective languages and they tend to focus more on those languages with highest values. Bourdieu (1977:652) argued that "Language is considered to be cultural capital which rises in value with its economic growth in the societal linguistic marketplace and at the same time with the value of its speakers". Duchêne & Heller (2012:4-7) proposed

---

[12] Extra and Yağmur (2004:15) locate the birth of nation-states "in the German Romanticism at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century (Fishman 1973, Edwards 1985)".

a new framework from a sociological and discourse analysis viewpoint of "pride" and "profit" to analyze the role and function of languages in late capitalism. Their main argument lay in the fact that "there is a widespread emergence of discursive elements that treat language and culture primarily in economic terms". As the authors show that both notions are "intertwined in complex ways", I have shown in earlier works (Haque 2017, Haque 2014), notably among Indian immigrants that they encourage and emphasize the English language, rather than their own heritage language, just for the sake of better career prospects for their children. The father of an Indian-origin family in Sweden, was extremely conscious of the Swedish accent and competency of their four children; according to him, if someone rang at his home, and if the children picked up the phone and spoke Swedish, they should speak in such perfect Swedish that a native caller should not suspect that they had called an immigrant's home. The family language policy might have focused on the "linguistic market" of Sweden, as prestigious languages, such as Swedish, English and then Spanish, were privileged to the detriment of the heritage languages of parents, such as Punjabi, Hindi or Haryanvi. The narratives of the family members (of parents and the eldest child interviewed) laid emphasis on the "power" and "prestige" of the language, but we find equally the notions of "pride" and "profit" in the narrative discourses, although the eldest child also blamed the parents for not doing much to transmit the Punjabi language to her and her siblings. "Pride" was not unilaterally related to the powerful language, such as Swedish in that migratory context, but also to the heritage language, in terms of assigning value to one's own cultural lineage.[13]

5. DEMOGRAPHIC LINGUISTIC CHALLENGE IN FRANCE AND THE SECOND-GENERATION IDENTITY QUESTION IN EUROPE. Recent data from INSEE[14] (2015) have shown that there are 9.1 million immigrant families in France, with an average of 3 children per household. Research into family language policy can make an immense contribution to understanding the dynamics of language practices and ideologies in these households, and further, comprehending the impact and repercussions of family language policy on the family itself and on the society in general. Filhon (2006) observed that a survey of language was never a concern for demographers or statisticians in France. According to her (op. cit., 20), one of the reasons would be (quoting Blanchet et al. 2005) that it might be a French taboo to make a full account of the linguistic diversity in a supposedly monolingual State (Niel 2007). Filhon reminds us that two historical linguistic surveys known in France were by Henri Jean-Baptiste Grégoire in 1791 and by Victor Duruy, Minister of Public Instruction, in 1864. Both surveys were ideologically motivated: to eradicate local idioms in favor of French (for Grégoire); or to make an inventory of the language practices in France (for Duruy), in order to facilitate French as the sole language of the Republic. It was only 19 years back, in 1999, that a national survey was conducted by INSEE and INED[15] under the name of *Étude de l'histoire familiale* (mentioned in this volume by Filhon & Zegnani, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**) on the trajectory of immigrant families, in which some questions on language usage were asked. The issue of language transmission within

---

[13] Swedish, being the de facto official language of Sweden, there are five national minority languages. They are Finnish, Sami, Torne valley Finnish or Meänkieli, Romani and Yiddish.

[14] https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/1521331, accessed on 28th April, 2018.

[15] https://www.ined.fr/fr/, accessed on 28th April, 2018.

immigrant families since the 20th century has been the focus of interest for French sociolinguists (Héran et al. 2002, Deprez 1996, Condon & Régnard 2010, Betrucci 2008). Though all these papers made a great contribution to the study of intergenerational language transmission, only Deprez showed an interest in analyzing the interplay of language dynamics within the purview of the family language policy.

On the national sample of intergenerational linguistic transmission in France, Soehl (2016) writes that the findings show that language transmission in a migratory context is insufficient, and almost none of the children who grew up with the parental language or who experienced some exposure to the language, use it in their daily lives. The only domain where the heritage language may find a use is within the family. Some indications on family language policy have been obtained from the studies done by Héran et al. (2002), cited by Rouard & Moatty (2006:63), indicating that 26% of adults reported that their parents were speaking to them in other languages, associated or not with French, and in half of these cases, these were regional or border languages. Calvet (2016:46) noted some precision on intergenerational language transmission from the same source (Héran et al. loc. cit.): 86% among the Turks, 25% for Polish, 45% for Alsatian and 10% for Breton languages.

The scholarship on identity from the language viewpoint has been immense (Omoniyi & White 2006, Joseph 2004). However, it seems that much work has to be done when it comes to the emerging field of family language policy, such as how it merits concern and how the speaker owns or disowns the language through the prism of identity. It is in the family where we develop the sense of identity related to a language. So, even if one does not speak the parental language, as has been shown in an immigrant context, a strong feeling of attachment is present among the second generation (Billiez 1985). The family language policy has an important role in understanding how a particular identity is constructed or ascribed by others. In the case of a Norwegian-based Indian family, the eldest son reported his identity as Islamic (Haque 2012a), because he didn't know much about his country of origin, India, and he didn't speak Indian languages with much fluency. As for Norway, though he had studied there throughout his schooling, and spoke perfect Norwegian, he couldn't assimilate totally in the Norwegian culture as there were many constraints coming from a practicing Muslim family. With Arabic as the language of prayer and Urdu as the sole language of communication within the family premises as a part of the management of languages, he found himself possessing Islamic identity, an identity[16] "which remains identical either in India or in Norway" (as reported by the eldest son himself).

---

[16] Ten years after my initial fieldwork, I re-interviewed the eldest son, Rafid, in 2017, who reported himself as an atheist. His own transformation has much to do with his own self-interrogation and search for epistemological truth, which led him to lead another life. Married to a Russian woman, and having learnt Russian during his stay in Moscow, Rafid has now settled in Norway after doing his bachelor studies in Canada. It would be interesting to note how he attributes his identity in his post-Islamic period. We spoke in Urdu during the interview and he emphasized that Urdu is a part of his identity. Omoniyi and White (2006:2) summarized six common points on the research of identity in their volume; among them, they mentioned that "identity is not fixed and more than one identity may be articulated in a given context in which case there will be a dynamic of identities management". We see the same pattern of change in the identity of Rafid and his manifestation of multiple identities as Norwegian, as Indian in origin and as an Urdu speaker.

In the current volume (p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**), I showed how a Hmong family articulate and conceptualize their identity through practices related to their cultural beliefs, like shamanism, even after the loss of the Hmong language among the children. Second-generation immigrant children are adopting new roles and identities, as has not only been seen elsewhere in Europe (Crul & Schneider 2012), but also in France, particularly in political careers, where many successful women politicians, like Rachida Dati, Najat-Vallat Belkacem, Rama Yade, to name a few, are among the second-generation children visible in the mainstream. Though there may also be some political motives in portraying these women of Maghrebi origin, without veils, as assimilated role models, the youth of the French suburbs remain disenchanted in the assimilation process and carving out a separate identity under the attacks of political discourse[17], which has largely problematized the Islamic culture as ill-fitting in European civilization. The identity factor remains pivotal for second-generation children, seen under the labels of different identities, the suburban, the Islamic, the immigrant kid etc.; it is, then, important to know how family language policy articulates and shapes such identities.

6. Voices of modernity in a post-modern world. In frameworks described as modern, post-modern, and post post-modern, the role and status of languages has been different in relation to different stripes of national vs regional ideologies, artistic movements etc. The immigrant communities in Europe are mostly from traditional societies, where traditional values in terms of religion and language, and then holy languages, are vital for the social upbringing of the children, but also in the daily lives of the migrant. There is a kind of clash in understanding between the migrant's own cultural heritage and the host country, where there is another civilization, combined with a heavily industrialized society which has made manifold leaps forward in terms of progress. Wallerstein (2006:21) pointed out that countries like China, India, Persia and the Arab World were called "grand civilizations" in the 19th century, but were, however, not considered "modern" from the viewpoint of the West, because these countries were not as powerful in terms of their military or technological capacity in comparison to the pan-European world. He argued further (idem:22) that, according to the orientalists, there was something in these unique cultural civilizations which has "immobilized" their history, resulting in the blockage of all evolution toward a modernity which the Christian World possesses. The consequence of such an understanding is that these countries, or others like them, need the help of European nations in order to modernize themselves. Such hegemonic, ethnocentric beliefs[18] had a huge impact till the late 20th century, when European languages like English or French,

---

[17] Omoniyi (2006:16) documented briefly the riots which spread in the French suburbs in the month of November 2005, which exposed the marginal role of the French administration toward its North African immigrant population. The then Home Minister, Mr. Nicolas Sarkozy, came up with inflammatory and derogatory remarks, terming the rioters *racaille*, considered more pejorative than "scum" by the British media. https://www.theguardian.com/news/blog/2005/nov/08/inflammatoryla, accessed on 26th April, 2018.

[18] In a stimulating and fresh write-up, "Western philosophy is racist", Norden (2017) argues that Western philosophy has ignored and disdained the thought traditions of China, India and Africa. He wrote that European intellectuals systematized views of white racial superiority that entailed that no non-Caucasian group could develop philosophy. I emphasized philosophy because it is one of the first non-empirical sciences which has transformed human thoughts.

were considered powerful tools, thanks in part to the colonization which had left its linguistic legacies in many countries.

To understand more clearly the nuances of modernity, I will turn to Rampton (2006), who quoted Zygmunt Bauman's (1992) paper "A sociological theory of postmodernity[19]", in order to highlight the major differences between modernity and post-modernity around twenty years ago which, in my view, still permeate thinking, in order to understand the migrants, whose origin is traditionally in countries stuck with "modernity"; whereas the destination is in Western Europe, where many intellectuals, philosophers and theorists have contributed to altering the pattern of thinking, making it primarily a post-modern world.

Among some differences which I will describe here (for details, see Rampton, 2006:13) will be those from the viewpoint of the first-generation or new migrants, who have absorbed the ideas of modernity. Two of the major differences which may portray the traits of migrants from a modern society are: 1) Modernity: "Social groups monitor our behavior and keep us in line." Post-modernity: "We're desperate for reassurance that we've made the right choices, and in shaping and showing who we are, we rely a lot on both expert and popular opinion". (Bauman 1992:195-196). 2) Modernity: "Our bodies are externally regulated, drilled and disciplined at school, in factories, etc." (id.:194). Post-modernity: "We devote a lot of time to cultivating our bodies as showcases for the identities we desire". (id.:194). Both the points about Modernity outlined by Bauman resemble, at first sight, the Heideggerian theory of "dictatorship of they", which I have mentioned earlier in this paper, and it seems that the degree of such influence is greater in a traditional society.

An upbringing in modernity is associated with a highly structured pattern of life, with pre-defined concepts and objectives of life laid down by parents and peers, who, in turn are simply imitating the rules of the society. Identity depends upon where the person is born, in which religious and economic milieu she or he is raised, and hence, languages are transmitted accordingly. One has to think with this sort of proviso in this structured society and a deviation from the norm is disdained. In contrast, in post-modernity, the formulation of one's identity, one's choices and re-examination of the fundamentals of social conditions are continuous processes.

There are, however, some gray zones in the postmodern European countries, where homogeneity, a trait of modernity, is sought as an ideal part of the cohesion of social fabric. This has been the case of nation-states in affluent, Western European countries where the official, national or *de facto* official languages, not only identified their respective nations, but became emblematic of the cultural heritage as its sole carrier, seriously undermining all other languages, which were crushed and whose scope was made limited.

---

[19] Published in "Intimations of Postmodernity". See references for further details.

Language becomes a unifying factor[20], with many EU countries making a language test mandatory in order to qualify for full citizenship rights. In a similar vein, the debate on multiculturalism and Islam in Europe was launched when David Cameron, former prime Minister of the United Kingdom, made an incisive attack saying that "state multiculturalism has failed[21]".

With regard to migrants, and, particularly, to migrants from Islamic countries, one may witness the two faces of postmodernity in Europe: one, incorporating the specificities of modernity "universality, homogeneity and monotony" (Bauman p.13) and the second, the attributes of postmodernity itself "plurality, variety, contingency and ambivalence" (Bauman p.13). It seems that no research work has been carried out to investigate the viewpoint of migrants and their attitudes from this perspective. It may be promising here that a study on the lines of hermeneutic sociology, with tools such as participant observations, ethnography and open-ended interviews could help to understand the long-term interplay of languages in a social and cultural context. Such a study could also elucidate how traditional families voice their linguistic concerns in the late-modernity; how the ideological beliefs related to languages are altered in the new environment; and what challenges for them remain unacknowledged at the macro-level.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS. In this chapter, I have attempted to provide fresh perspectives and new conceptualizations in order to explore crucial aspects of family language policy at the micro-level, which has ramifications and substantial effects in forming an individual's identity and verbal repertoire and, hence, his or her relationships and interaction in society. The mechanism of how languages are acquired, transmitted, valued, appropriated and conceptualized falls into this emergent focus of family language policy, whose concept will endure as long as language remains a "sociocultural construct" (Silverstein 1998) for communication among human beings. People's dialectical process on language usage reflects their ideological beliefs assigning different characteristics to different languages, ascribing a hierarchy among them in terms of prestige and power.

The main proposition in this chapter is the impetus for implementing family language policy as a recognized target of research practice, which has various forms of stakes at the social level, since it offers researchers the means to understand and explore the crux of the problem of language practices and ideologies in the family. From the dialectical arguments on the influence of others through "the dictatorship of they" as expressed by Heidegger, or Rousseau's and Krishnamurti's views on the role of schools, these components have not been explored in the framework of family language policy. As Rampton (2011) points out, "in late modernity, disciplinary boundaries are much more porous than they used to be"; I believe that the field of family language policy should draw ideas and guiding assumptions enacting interdisciplinarity going beyond "child

---

[20] On 15 November 2017, the French education minister tweeted that "there is only one French language, only one grammar, and only one Republic". http://www.rtl.fr/actu/politique/ecriture-inclusive-grammaire-blanquer-7790989158

[21] The polemical speech of David Cameron found favorable echoes from his counterparts, Nicolas Sarkozy and Angela Merkel. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1355961/Nicolas-Sarkozy-joins-David-Cameron-Angela-Merkel-view-multiculturalism-failed.html

language acquisition, early second language learning, language planning and policy, and multilingualism' (see Liu & King, this volume, p.**Error! Bookmark not defined.**) to demography, philosophy, historical linguistics, sociology etc., aiming for a holistic overview with a close empirical focus on the family.

I hope these propositions can generate new insights in the field of family language policy for a deeper understanding of this inquiry, and more particularly, contribute to a humanistic approach, for the ecological balance of languages, and for the linguistic and cultural needs of allochthonous speakers, in order to aim for reduction of inequalities, which can have an impact on life on a broader sense.

REFERENCES

ALLCOTT, HUNT, and MATTHEW GENTZKOW. 2017. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31.211-36.

ANDERSON-LEVITT, KATHRYN M. 1987. Cultural knowledge for teaching grade: an example from France. *Interpretive ethnography of education at home and abroad*, ed. by GEORGE DEARBORN SPINDLER, and LOUISE S. SPINDLER, 171-92. New York: Psychology Press.

BARTHOUX, GÉRARD. 2008. *L'école à l'épreuve des cultures*. Paris: PUF.

BASTARDAS-BOADA, ALBERT. 2015. *Language (self)organization in linguistically mixed families: Some preliminary results*. Unpublished speech delivered at GLOBLINMED Workshop, 6th February 2015, University of Barcelona.

BAUMAN, ZYGMUNT. 1992. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge.

BELLOQ, CÉLINE. 2010. *Être soi avec Heidegger*. Paris: Groupe Eyrolles.

BÉRAUD, CÉLINE, BÉRENGÈRE MASSIGNON, and SÉVERINE MATHIEU. 2008. French students, religion and school: The ideal of laïcité at stake with religious diversity. *Encountering religious pluralism in school and society: A qualitative study of teenage perspectives in Europe*, ed. by THORSTEN KNAUTH, DAN-PAUL JOZSA, GERDIEN BERTRAM-TROOST, and JULIA IPGRAVE, 51-80. Waxmann: Münster.

BERNSTEIN, BASIL. 1972. A sociolinguistic approach to socialization: with some reference to educability. *Directions in sociolinguistics. The ethnography of communication*, ed. by JOHN J. GUMPERZ, and DELL HYMES, 465-97. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

BETRUCCI MARIE-MADELEINE. 2008. Le plurilinguisme des enfants de migrants en milieu scolaire. *Migrations et plurilinguisme en France*, dir. par Claire Extramiana, et Jean Sibille,16-24. Cahiers de l'observatoire des pratiques linguistiques, 2.

BILLIEZ, JACQUELINE. 1985. Langue comme marqueur d'identité. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 1.95-105.

BLANCHET, PHILIPPE, LOUIS-JEAN CALVET, DAMIEN HILLÉREAU, et EWEN WILCZYK. 2005. Le volet linguistique du recensement français de 1999. Résultats et analyse appliqués à la Provence et au provençal. *Marges linguistiques* 10.

BOLT, BARBARA. 2011. *Heidegger reframed: Interpreting key thinkers for the arts*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.

BOURDIEU, PIERRE. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social science information* 16.645–68.

CALVET, LOUIS-JEAN. 2016. Pratiques des langues en France. Oui, mais de quoi parlons-nous? *Langage et Société* 155.39-60.

CHATZIDAKI, ASPASSIA, and CHRISTINA MALIGKOUDI. 2013. Family language policies among Albanian immigrants in Greece. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16.675-89.

CLARKE, MARTIN LOWTHER. 1971. *Higher education in the ancient world*. Oxon: Routledge.

CONDON, STÉPHANIE, and CORINNE RÉGNARD. 2010, Diversité des pratiques linguistiques. *Trajectoires et origines. Enquête sur la diversité des populations en France*. Documents de travail 68.31-7.

CRUL, MAURICE, and JENS SCHNEIDER. 2012. Comparative integration context theory: participation and belonging in new diverse European cities. *The European second*

generation compared. Does the integration context matter? ed. by MAURICE CRUL, JENS SCHNEIDER, and FRANS LELIE, 19-38. Amsterdam: AUP.

CURDT-CHRISTIANSEN XIAO LAN. 2009. Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy* 8.351-75.

DE FINA, ANNA. 2017. Diversity in school. Monolingual ideologies versus multilingual practices. *Diversity and superdiversity. Sociocultural linguistic perspectives*, ed. by ANNA DE FINA, DIDEM IKIZOGLU, and JEREMY WEGNER, 191-208. USA: Georgetown University Press.

DEPREZ, CHRISTINE. 1996. Une politique linguistique familiale: le rôle des femmes. *Éducation et Sociétés Plurilingues* 1.35-42.

DEPREZ, CHRISTINE, BEATE COLLET, and GABRIELLE VARRO. (dir) 1996. Familles plurilingues dans le monde. Mixités conjugales et transmission des langues. *Langage & Société* 147.7-22.

DREYFUS, MARTINE. 1996. Politiques linguistiques familiales et individuelles: quels modèles? *Les politiques linguistiques, mythes et réalités*, dir. par CAROLINE JUILLARD, and LOUIS-JEAN CALVET, 175-81. Paris: AUF Editions.

DUCHÊNE ALEXANDRE, and MONICA HELLER. (eds.) 2012. *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. Routledge: New York.

EDWARDS, JOHN. 1985. *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

EXTRA, GUUS, and KUTLAY YAĞMUR. (eds). 2004. *Urban multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant minority languages at home and school*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

FILHON, ALEXANDRA. 2006. Les langues dans les enquêtes de la statistique publique: bilan et perspectives. *Langage et Société* 155.15-38.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. 1991. Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. 1973. *Language and nationalism. Two integrative essays*. Rowly Mass: Newbury House.

GEE, JAMES, P. 1989. Two styles of narrative construction and their linguistic and educational implications. *Discourse Processes* 12.287-307.

GOHARD-RADENKOVIC, ALINE. 2014. Les mauvaises langues au croisement de la Grande Histoire et de la petite histoire. *Heteroglossia* 13.

HAQUE, SHAHZAMAN. 2017. Place de l'anglais chez des familles indiennes immigrantes en Europe occidentale: notions de prestige linguistique et chronotope. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LXII. 23-37.

HAQUE SHAHZAMAN. 2014. Place des langues sacrées chez des immigrants indiens en Europe: quelles compétences, quels rôles et quels usages? *Langage et Société* 150.117-35.

HAQUE, SHAHZAMAN. 2012b. *Étude de cas sociolinguistique et ethnographique de quatre familles indiennes immigrantes en Europe: pratiques langagières et politiques linguistiques nationales & familiales*. Thèse non publiée. Université de Grenoble.

HAQUE, SHAHZAMAN. 2012a. Toward an identity stress. Language and religious affiliations of an immigrant adolescent in Norway. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 2.224-31.

HÉRAN, FRANÇOIS, ALEXANDRA FILHON, et DEPREZ CHRISTINE. 2002. La dynamique des langues en France au fil du XXe siècle. *Population & Sociétés* 376.1-4.

HYMES, DELL. 1973. Speech and language: on the origins and foundations of inequality among speakers. *Daedalus* 102.59-80.

MARTIN ROJO, LUISA. 2010. *Constructing inequality in multilingual classrooms*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

JOSEPH, JOHN E. 2004. *Language and identity. National, ethnic, religious*. UK: Palgrave.

KOPELIOVICH, SHULAMIT. 2010. Family language policy: A case study of a Russian-Hebrew bilingual family: Toward a theoretical framework. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education* 4.162–78.

KRISHNAMURTI, JIDDU. 1953. *Education and the Significance of Life*. New York: Harper.

MARX, WILLIAM. 2018. *The hatred of literature*. Traduit par NICHOLAS ELLIOTT. USA: Harvard University Press.

MICHAELS, SARAH. 1981. Sharing time: Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society* 10.423-42.

MILROY, LESLEY. 2004. Language ideologies and linguistic change. *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections*, ed. by CARMEN FOUGHT, 161-77. Oxford: OUP.

NIEL, FRÉDÉRIQUE. 2007. *Les vicissitudes de l'État linguiste où comment les langues minoritaires deviennent l'objet d'une politique sociale linguistique: contribution à une sociologie historique du capital informationnel d'État*. Thèse de doctorat. Amiens: Université de Picardie.

NORDEN, BRYAN W. VAN. 2017. Taking Back Philosophy: A Multicultural Manifesto'. Foreword by JAY L. GARFIELD. New York: Columbia University Press.

OMONIYI, TOPE. 2006. Hierarchy of identities. *The sociolinguistics of identity*, ed. by TOPE OMONIYI, and GOODITH WHITE, 11-33. London: Continuum.

OMONIYI, TOPE, and GOODITH, WHITE. 2006. Introduction. *The sociolinguistics of identity*, ed. by TOPE OMONIYI, and GOODITH WHITE, 1-10. London: Continuum.

PÉREZ BÁEZ, G. 2013. Family language policy, transnationalism, and the diaspora community of San Lucas Quiaviní of Oaxaca, Mexico. *Language Policy* 12.27.

PHILIPS, SUSAN, U. 2004. Language and social inequality. *A companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. by ALESSANDRO DURANTI, 474-95, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

PUREN, CHRISTIAN. 1988. *Histoire des méthodologies de l'enseignement des langues*. Paris: Nathan.

RAMPTON, BEN. 2011. A neo-Hymesian trajectory in applied linguistics. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. Paper 78.

RAMPTON, BEN. 2006. *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROBERT, LUDOVIC. 2016. Distinguer le culturel du religieux: l'École Internationale Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur. *Eurostudia* 11.45–57.

ROUARD, FRANÇOISE, et MOATTY FRÉDÉRIC. 2016. Langues de travail et pratiques langagières dans les enquêtes statistiques. *Langage et Société* 155.61-89.

SICARD, FRÉDÉRIQUE. 2013. Faudra-t-il brûler le sapin de Noël? La laïcité dans l'espace scolaire, *EMPAN* 90.24-30.

SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1998. Contemporary Transformation of Local Linguistic Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27.401-26.

SOEHL, THOMAS. 2016. But do they speak it? The intergenerational transmission of home-country language in migrant families in France. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42.1-23.

SPOLSKY, BERNARD. 2012. Family language policy - the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33.3-11.

TUOMINEN, ANNE. 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140.59–76.

VARRO, GABRIELLE. (dir.) 1996. *Les couples mixtes et leurs enfants en France et en Allemagne.* Paris: Armand Colin.

VARRO, GABRIELLE. 1992. Les langues immigrées face à l'école française. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 16.137-162.

WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL. 2006. *Comprendre le monde. Introduction à l'analyse des systèmes-monde*. Paris: La Découverte.

WELPLY, OAKLEIGH. 2017. 'My language … I don't know how to talk about it': children's views on language diversity in primary schools in France and England. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 17.1-18.

ZARATE, GENEVIÈVE. 1997. Pour l'amour de la France: la constitution d'un capital pluriculturel en contexte familial. *Les situations plurilingues et leurs enjeux*, dir. par MARIE-LOUISE LEFEBVRE, et MARIE-ANTOINETTE HILLY, 25-34. Paris: L'Harmattan.

ZOLBERG, ARISTIDE R., et WOON, LONG LITT. 1999. Islam et espagnol: l'intégration culturelle en Europe et aux États-Unis. *La religion et l'intégration des immigrés*. 29-58. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.