ORIGINAL PAPER

Check for updates

Family language policy and parental language ideologies among Chinese transnational families in multilingual Luxembourg

Peiru Bai[1] · Andrea Susan Young[1,2]

Abstract

This paper explores family multilingualism through the lens of language ideologies upheld by parents within three Chinese transnational families living in Luxembourg. Following a linguistic ethnographic approach throughout the inquiry and analysis process, this study provides illuminating insights into the Chinese parents' language ideologies regarding their children's multilingualism in relation to multiple languages (i.e. Chinese, Luxembourgish, German, French and English) across various domains (e.g. family, mainstream schools and public linguistic space). Our findings indicate that diverse factors and rationales giving rise to these parental ideologies operate in a dynamic, interrelated way within mechanisms that integrate cognitive, social and discursive aspects. As such, parental language ideologies embody a mosaic of various cognitive constructs, shaped by varying dimensions and degrees of negotiation between human agency, social structures and discursive dynamics. This study argues that the parents' sense- and decision-making of their children's multilingualism arises within a globally, English-dominated, linguistic hierarchy, wherein the market-driven tendency has led to language commodification in a bid to maximise profits. The present paper makes an important contribution to advancing our knowledge about parents' roles as policymakers in engaging in family language decisions and children's language development within a transnational, highly multilingual context—Luxembourg—which involves three official, schooling languages on a nationwide scale.

Keywords Family language policy · Multilingualism · Transnational families · Parental language ideologies · Cognitive, social and discursive mechanisms

✉ Peiru Bai
  peiru.bai@gmail.com

1   Research group 1339 LiLPa (Linguistique, Langues, Parole), University of Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France

2   Research group Language Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Contexts, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Hamar, Norway

_Springer

Introduction

Luxembourg is an interesting European context in which to study multilingual realities, accentuating this phenomenon with its official trilingualism, giving recognition to Luxembourgish, French and German as stipulated by the 1984 language law (see Horner & Weber, 2008). Consistent with this official trilingualism, all three languages are utilised as media of instruction within the education system, with English also being taught as a foreign language in state schools from the second or third year of secondary education. Accordingly, the Luxembourgish education system presents challenges for its students, as they are required to acquire proficiency in multiple languages in order to access the curriculum, compared to students in many other countries who typically follow monolingual, or sometimes bilingual, schooling. Statistics further indicate that students from migrant backgrounds and with low socio-economic status (SES) tend to be disadvantaged in comparison to their Luxembourgish- or German-speaking peers with high SES (MENJE & LUCET, 2015). Foreign nationals constitute 47.1% of the resident population of Luxembourg (Statec, 2023). This has resulted in a substantial presence of multilingual, transnational families, with a consequent impact on the Luxembourgish education system which now accommodates over 40% of students without Luxembourgish citizenship (MENJE, 2023). As demonstrated by numerous studies, families within transnational contexts often grapple with negotiating the intricacies associated with language practices, choices and management, which primarily involve a fine balancing act between the parents' heritage language(s) and the dominant language(s) of the host country (Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza, 2018; Curdt-Christiansen et al., 2023). The complexity and challenges of this process are highlighted for transnational families in Luxembourg who do not utilise the three schooling languages and English at home, as illustrated by the examples obtained from Chinese transnational families residing in multilingual Luxembourg presented in this article.

Over the last decade, the Chinese community has experienced substantial growth in Luxembourg, more than doubling from 1610 persons in 2011 to the latest count of 4142 in 2022 (Statec, 2023). It currently constitutes the largest, non-European Union, foreign community in the country, ahead of populations from other non-European Union countries, including the UK (4104), India (3777) and Montenegro (2855) (ibid.). This surge in the growth of the Chinese community can be attributed to several factors, including the establishment of the European headquarters of several Chinese banks in Luxembourg, increasing internationalisation in higher education resulting in academic mobility, and the trend for both undergraduate and postgraduate students to enter the local labour market. Amidst the increasing significance of the Chinese community in this small country, the present article provides insights into the family language policies (FLP) sense- and decision-making processes within Chinese transnational families—primarily through the lens of parents' language ideologies, with a focus on their navigation between multiple languages at play and how parental ideologies are mediated by human agency and the wider social world. As highlighted by Curdt-Christiansen

(2013, p. 1), conflicts between private domains and public spheres often arise within FLP decisions when families negotiate between the "sociopolitical reality" and their desire for "cultural loyalty and linguistic continuity". Further, assuming that "linguistic practices and exchanges invoke a complex system of power relations" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016, p. 707), the FLP sense- and decision-making processes can be even more intricate as the number of languages involved increases (Ballinger et al., 2022; Hirsch & Lee, 2018). Considering the aforementioned aspects, of particular interest to this contribution is how Luxembourg's multilingual environment brings multiple languages (i.e. Luxembourgish, French, German, English and Chinese), across various domains (e.g. family, mainstream schools, public linguistic space), into the forum of FLP decisions (Spolsky, 2009) and plays a crucial role in shaping the dynamics of these decisions. While FLPs in transnational and multilingual families have constantly received attention in FLP research, rare are the studies conducted in contexts where multiple schooling languages are involved, and children's multilingualism is high on the sociopolitical agenda on a nationwide scale.

FLP and language ideologies

Beyond the pervasive understanding of FLP based on Spolsky's (2009) tripartite model of language policy, FLP is also defined as ranging from highly planned, explicit parental efforts and conscious involvement in fostering linguistic conditions for language learning and literacy development to covert, default practices shaped by underlying ideological convictions in the family domain (Caldas, 2012; Curdt-Christiansen, 2012, 2018; King et al., 2008). FLP research in recent years has increasingly emphasised adopting "a broader view of language development as ideologically shaped social practices" (Curdt-Christiansen, 2018, p. 424). This evolving epistemological perspective has highlighted our advanced understanding of FLP as a dynamic, multi-layered process, interrelated with various internal and external factors within the broader social ecosystem (Chimbutane & Gonçalves, 2023; Curdt-Christiansen & Huang, 2020). Accordingly, by assuming, in line with King (2000), that language ideology serves as "the mediating link between language use and social organisation" (pp. 168–169), we foreground the pivotal position of language ideology for researching FLP.

In view of the agentive role of parents in making language choices and management decisions for their children (Spolsky, 2009), research into FLP has underscored the significant influence that parental language ideologies carry in shaping family-based bi-/multilingualism, language maintenance and shift, educational strategies, children's language development and socialisation, as well as their identity construction (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016; Gogonas & Kirsch, 2016; Lee & Pang, 2021; Palviainen & Bergroth, 2018; Zhu & Li, 2016).

Parental language ideologies driven by cognitive, social and discursive mechanisms

King et al. (2008) argue that "[i]t is within the family unit, and particularly bi- or multilingual families, that macro- and micro-processes can be examined as dominant ideologies intersect and compete with local or individual views on language and parenting" (p. 914). Researchers often find that social structures and individual agency are mutually constitutive in parents' sense- and decision-making processes (Mirvahedi, 2021; Van Mensel, 2018), wherein an array of factors and constructs across domains and levels make up a complex, multifaceted mechanism (Chimbutane & Gonçalves, 2023; Curdt-Christiansen & Huang, 2020; Curdt-Christiansen et al., 2023).

Parental cognition constructs are critical for explaining the symbolic significance parents attribute to a particular language and specific linguistic behaviours, as well as their FLP decisions. Holden and Smith (2019) draw a temporal distinction between parental cognition constructs: (1) perceptions, beliefs, attitudes and values, considered to be oriented in the present; (2) expectations and concerns, viewed as future oriented. According to the aforementioned researchers, *perceptions* and *beliefs* "reflect what the parent perceives, or believes, to be accurate or the truth, even if it is a biased perception or a baseless belief" (Holden & Smith, 2019, p. 687). For instance, many parents believe that bi-/multilingualism results in a range of cognitive, intellectual, sociocultural, economic and other personal benefits. This belief, regardless of its factual accuracy, often drives parents to promote their children's bi-/multilingualism due to the perceived advantages (Gogonas & Kirsch, 2016; Piller & Gerber, 2021). *Attitudes* and *values* manifest as parents' predispositions or evaluative reactions to the perceived facts about an object or situation (Holden & Smith, 2019). As outlined by Kircher et al. (2022), the evaluation of a language with a positive attitude primarily involves considering either its status associated with "power, economic opportunity, and upward social mobility" (p. 531), or its solidarity dimension, reflecting "feelings of attachment and belonging" (ibid.). Researchers have found that among multilingual and transnational families, pride-based language ideologies—related to values such as ethnolinguistic identity, cultural inheritance and emotional attachment—often motivate parents to actively support heritage language maintenance (Gogonas & Kirsch, 2016; Zhu & Li, 2016). In contrast, pragmatism-based language ideologies, often associated with the instrumental and socioeconomic values of prestigious or societal dominant languages, have led many parents to prioritise public educational demands or orientate towards high-status languages in their children's linguistic repertoires (Ballweg, 2022; Chimbutane & Gonçalves, 2023; Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). *Expectations* refer to the desirable qualities or outcomes parents envision for their children, which can guide their behaviours towards anticipated future goals (Holden & Smith, 2019). Parents often anticipate linguistic choices and linguistic repertoire development (Purkarthofer, 2019), imaging future identities for their children (Seals & Beliaeva, 2023). To achieve envisioned outcomes, parents will consider the types of capital and resources they

need to invest in and how best to allocate them (ibid.). These aspirational FLPs are also subject to negotiations among family members, with children also acting as agents, and can evolve over time (Purkarthofer, 2019; Seals & Beliaeva, 2023). Regarding *concerns*, they may signify issues with the potential to develop into problems, or they may merely reflect anxious thoughts (Holden & Smith, 2019). For instance, in a recent study conducted by Curdt-Christiansen et al. (2023) investigating transnational families in the UK, a Chinese couple changed their home language from Chinese to English due to worries about their child's competency in the host country's mainstream language.

Parental language ideologies not only have cognitive properties, but also social ones. Lanza and Lomeu Gomes (2020) point out that the family functions as "a space along the private—public continuum of arenas of social life" (p. 165). Parental language ideologies appear to arise from individuals' cognitive and mental constructs, whereas these ideologies within the family are not based on parents' free will and intentions, but are indissolubly connected with the sociopolitical, cultural and economic realities in which families situate themselves (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Mirvahedi, 2021; Van Mensel, 2018). Mirvahedi's (2021) study of the FLPs of thirteen mothers in Iran illustrated "how the same circumstances could be interpreted differently by different members of the community, bringing about a distinct behavior" (p. 406). This underscores, as advocated by scholars such as Mirvahedi (2021) and Van Mensel (2018), that a balanced consideration of structural and agentive dimensions is crucial for insightful FLP analysis.

FLP is positioned "at the crossroads between private and public discourses" (Purkarthofer et al., 2022, p. 564). A notion worth mentioning is that of positioning, which is instrumental in providing insights through discursive practices into "a conception of agency that acknowledges both the constructive force of discourse at a societal level as well as the capacity of the person to take up positions for their own purposes" (Burr, 2015, p. 212). In this sense, the positioning of parents is central to understanding how families negotiate with various factors and other actors at different levels, and also effectively act in the world with particular institutional, cultural and social circumstances. Discourse, being power-infused, serves as the medium through which social power relations between individuals, groups, organisations or institutions are created, expressed and reproduced (van Dijk, 2014). Discriminatory discourses about immigrants and minority languages, often camouflaged as endorsements of nationalism or social integration, prevail in sociopolitical and educational discourses (Curdt-Christiansen et al., 2023; Purkarthofer et al., 2022). The market-oriented rationality within neoliberalism discourses, which underscores the instrumental and economic benefits of language as a commodity, has become normalised in both public and private discourses (Duchêne & Heller, 2012; Gogonas & Kirsch, 2016). In certain conditions, individuals may feel compelled to conform to such biased or power-laden discourses in their actions, goals and viewpoints (Chimbutane & Gonçalves, 2023; Curdt-Christiansen, 2016).

Therefore, we argue that FLP research could benefit from the analysis of cognitive, social and discursive mechanisms in order to attain a more nuanced comprehension regarding how parents rationalise and negotiate varying values, roles,

functions and priorities assigned to given languages when conceptualising their children's multilingualism.

The present study

The present study is part of a larger sociolinguistic, in-depth qualitative PhD project, which investigates FLP within three Chinese transnational families in Luxembourg. This article focuses on the Chinese parents' positionings, motives and rationales that underly their sense- and decision-making processes with regard to language learning, practices and management, as well as their children's multilingual repertoires and development. Thus, this article addresses three research questions: (1) What language ideologies do the parents hold regarding their children's multilingualism in Luxembourg (2) On what grounds and according to what rationales do these parental language ideologies develop, and (3) How do these ideologies interact with wider contexts?

Data collection and analysis

We followed a qualitative, linguistic ethnographic approach during the inquiry and analysis process. Drawing on linguistic ethnography provides mutual benefits in that "ethnography can benefit from the analytical frameworks provided by linguistics, while linguistics can benefit from the processes of reflexive sensitivity required in ethnography" (Creese, 2008, p. 232). This aligns with our objective to achieve an in-depth understanding of the dynamic, multifaceted and complex process of FLP, with particular reference to the parental language ideologies within the Chinese transnational families. Furthermore, the epistemological perspective of linguistic ethnography, which considers language activities as embedded in and emerging from social life as well as social structures and rituals (Creese, 2008), enables us to provide valuable insights into the reflexive relationship between small-scale findings and wider societal phenomena.

The leading researcher acknowledges her dual role in conducting this study, both as a member of the Chinese diasporic community in Luxembourg and as a university researcher with educational and life experiences in China, France and Luxembourg. Her community membership facilitates trust and openness among the participants, given certain aspects of their shared experiences, understanding and distinctiveness (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). Lacking experience as a migrant parent, she maintains a certain distance from the research phenomenon. She is aware that her academic knowledge, personal experiences and insights are critical for her reflexivity and have implications on the research process.

The data collection of the current study took place between July 2019 and September 2020. As this article focuses on parental language ideologies, the data presented here were primarily gathered through two semi-structured interviews with both parents in each family and socio-demographic information sheets concerning the participating families' backgrounds.

Following a pre-established guide, the interviews were conceived as "a construction site of knowledge" (Kvale, 2007, p. 21). The parents, thus, engaged in intersubjective interactions with the researcher, contributing to nuanced descriptions and in-depth discussions on issues including the families' language and transnational experiences, their FLPs in Luxembourg, the parents' attitudes and beliefs about multilingualism and given languages, and their views on the Luxembourgish education system. All the interviews were conducted in the participants' choice of language, standard Chinese (*Putonghua*), with lengths varying between 81 and 112 minutes. Subsequently, the interviews were transcribed in Chinese and translated into English.

The data analysis proceeded through a two-pronged approach. Thematic analysis was undertaken to capture themes and generate an analytical schema, while discourse analysis, primarily informed by positioning theory (Bamberg, 1997; De Fina & King, 2011), enabled us to investigate the subjectivities that parents constructed within discursive practices and social contexts. After iterative reading of the interview transcripts, the data coding was informed by thematic categories established in previous studies (De Houwer, 1999; Gogonas & Kirsch, 2016), our theoretical interests and an inductive data-oriented method (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Therefore, aligned with the research questions, we identified two major themes: (1) parental language ideologies for (de)valuing particular languages (i.e. Chinese languages, German, French, Luxembourgish and English), (2) factors and rationales for conceptualising children's multilingualism. Further guided by a three-level framework of positioning analysis (Bamberg, 1997; De Fina & King, 2011), we scrutinised parental language ideologies across the whole dataset through: (1) the positionings of figures depicted by the parents in their narratives; (2) the positionings of the parents within interviews, and (3) their positionings in relation to macro-social discourses or prevailing ideologies about languages. However, it is important to note that not all these aspects are present in each excerpt. Through this framework, we aimed to elucidate the meanings constructed and negotiated at the micro-level of the interviews, while also reflecting on the influence of social structural forces in larger contexts. For this purpose, we focused on the argumentation of parents and their use of positioning devices, which are crucial for understanding how interlocutors construct specific world views and attempt to influence others' representations in particular situations (De Fina & King, 2011). Our focus on positioning devices such as evaluation, modality markers (i.e. modal verbs and adverbials) and hedging has proven useful when exploring speakers' commitment to the truth, necessity, desirability and value of the propositional content (Fairclough, 2003). Other aspects, such as temporal markers and pronoun choice, elucidate the way speakers convey meanings related to their representations of time (ibid.), their social identities or positions with regard to other interlocutors as well as to their experiences of the topics discussed (De Fina, 2003).

The participating families

This study involved three families recruited either from a local Saturday Chinese school or through the researcher's personal acquaintances within the Chinese community in Luxembourg. All three participating families are nuclear families and

had been residing in Luxembourg for more than one year at the time of the inquiry (between 2019 and 2020). Each family has at least one school-aged child attending Luxembourgish state schools and both parents are Chinese. Table 1 presents an overview of the participating families' profiles. We refrain from specifying the actual names of the Chinese regional varieties or *fangyans* (see Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018) spoken by participants in order to safeguard their anonymity, as revealing these names would disclose their specific geographical origins and, given the small size of Luxembourg, would render these families more easily identifiable.

The findings: conceptualising children's multilingual development in parental language ideologies

Below are the findings illustrating the parents' language ideologies regarding their children's multilingual development in both the present and foreseeable future. The presentation of these findings is organised according to the functions of the languages involved (e.g. heritage languages, schooling languages), which are either currently part of their children's multilingual repertoires or anticipated in the future. We explore how the parents negotiate and elaborate upon the factors and rationales underlying their positionings towards a particular language and further, how these aspects interact within cognitive, social and discursive mechanisms.

Maintaining standard Chinese (*Putonghua*): pride and profit

Although all the parents in the three families were familiar with their respective *fangyans*, the standard form—*Putonghua*—was the only Chinese variety they declared and observed by the researcher during parent–child interactions. Parent discourse data reveal that the parents portrayed the role of *Putonghua*, rather than *fangyans,* as the symbolic representation of Chinese language, as well as the mother tongue of their children. Mr and Mrs Zhang's case offers an illustration of this aspect:

Excerpt 1

Mr Zhang: 嗯, 比方说在家, 肯定是中文啦。[…]	Mr Zhang: Well, let's say at home, it's certainly Chinese. […]
Researcher: 就普通话是吧?	Researcher: It's *Putonghua*, right?
Mr & Mrs Zhang: 对, 普通话。	Mr & Mrs Zhang: Yes, it's *Putonghua*.
[…]	[…]
Researcher: 你还是觉得在家里面说中文还是很有必要的?	Researcher: Do you still think it's necessary to speak Chinese (*Putonghua*) at home?

Table 1 Participating families' profiles

Family	Zhang	Yan	Liu
Child(ren)/age(s)/Country of birth	Chenxi (girl), 7 years old, China	Yihua (boy), 12 years old, China	Ming (boy), 12 years old, China Yushan (girl), 2 years old, Luxembourg
Child(ren)'s education	1st–2nd year of primary school	4th year of primary school	Ming: 5th year of primary school Yushan: pre-school age
Child(ren)'s linguistic repertoire(s)	*Putonghua*, Luxembourgish, German, *fangyan* A[a]	*Putonghua*, German, English, Luxembourgish, French	Ming: *Putonghua*, Luxembourgish, German, French Yushan: *Putonghua, fangyan* D[b]
Parents/occupations	Mr Zhang: Bank employee Mrs Zhang: Unemployed	Mr Yan: Engineer Mrs Yan: Unemployed	Mr Liu: Restaurant employee Mrs Liu: Restaurant employee; unemployed
Parents' education	Mr Zhang: Postgraduate degree Mrs Zhang: Undergraduate degree	Mr Yan: Undergraduate degree Mrs Yan: Undergraduate degree	Mr Liu: Middle school Mrs Liu: High school
Parents' linguistic repertoires	Mr Zhang: *Putonghua, fangyan* A, English Mrs Zhang: *Putonghua, fangyan* A, English, elementary French	Mr Yan: *Putonghua, fangyan* B, English, elementary French Mrs Yan: *Putonghua, fangyan* C, English, elementary French	Mr Liu: *Putonghua, fangyan* D Mrs Liu: *Putonghua, fangyan* D, English, elementary French
Time in Luxembourg	4 years	Mr Yan: 2.5 years Mrs Yan & Yihua: 1.5 years	Mr Liu: 7 years Mrs Liu & Ming: 5 years Yushan: 2 years

[a,b]The linguistic competences of Chenxi and Yushan in *fangyans* can be attributed to linguistic input from their grandparents

Mrs Zhang: 有必要的。因为她已经脱离了大环境, 而这个对她来说, 我觉着是可以足以为傲的母语。肯定需要, 需要!	Mrs Zhang: Yes, it is necessary. Because she has already been away from the larger [Chinese-speaking] environment, and for her, I believe it's a mother tongue that she can take pride in. It's definitely necessary, it's necessary! (Interview ZHA-P1)

The excerpt begins with Mr Zhang's assertion that Chinese is the language used at home, a statement made with such certainty ("certainly") that it suggests a practice beyond doubt. The mutual agreement between Mr and Mrs Zhang confirms their shared understanding that "Chinese" specifically refers to *Putonghua*. When asked about the necessity of speaking *Putonghua* at home, Mrs Zhang articulates her firm attitude towards and strong desire for her daughter to develop competency in this language/variety by using the qualifier "definitely" and repeatedly emphasising the term of "necessary". She presents two rationales to justify her standpoint. First, she cites contextual evidence, noting that her daughter is away from a larger Chinese-speaking environment. Second, she highlights the aspect of identity heritage, affirming *Putonghua* as her daughter's "mother tongue", a source of pride and a defining attribute of Chinese ethnicity, which situates her daughter's identity. By shifting perspectives ("for her", "I believe") in her argument, she positions herself as credible and authoritative in deciding what is best for her child's language development. We notice that the equating of *Putonghua* with Chinese language constitutes shared ground among all the parents in the study, underscoring their commitment to maintaining *Putonghua* as their family's heritage language in the household. Such perspectives resonate with many Chinese families in mainland China (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018). This widespread stance primarily results from sociopolitical discourse driven by a national monolingual ideology that promotes *Putonghua* as "a marker of unified Chinese identity" and its de facto status as the lingua franca, reinforced by decades of intense promotion (ibid. p.247).

Excerpt 2

Mrs Yan: [...] 就是因为从外国的文化、外国的文字和它的语言里头我们很难选择他的道, 你毕竟是隔了一层。[...] 所以我只能通过中国的字中国的汉字来教他中国的文化。有了这些之后, 嗯我觉得他不会出现像那些黄香蕉那样的孩子那种样子。就什么也没学到, 没有什么优秀的一些品质, 是吧? 就是这个人没有多少人格魅力, 他既不懂中国, 也不懂外国的一些……一些东西。所以这个将来是很糟糕的。就是不管说他会几门语言, 他在职场是没有竞争力的。

Mrs Yan: [...] It's difficult to choose his [Yihua's] path from foreign cultures and foreign languages, because there is always a barrier. [...] So I can only teach him Chinese culture through the Chinese language. With that, I believe he won't turn out like those 'yellow banana' kids. Those kids haven't learned anything and lack good qualities. They lack charisma and they don't really understand China or anything about foreign cultures. So this would be very bad in the future. No matter how many languages they may speak, they won't have competitiveness in the workplace.

[...]

Mrs Yan: 简单点说吧, 我觉得他应该是一个中国的灵魂。嗯, 但是可能会多门语言这个没问题。那语言只是工具是吧, 但是他的灵魂他的思想我就希望他是中国的。

[...]

Mrs Yan: To put it simply, I think he should have a Chinese soul. Well, it's fine if he learns multiple languages. Language is just a tool, but I hope his soul and his mind are Chinese. (Interview YAN-P1)

Through her narrative, Mrs Yan envisions her son's identity, viewing Chinese language proficiency and cultural heritage as central aspects, contrasting this with being simply multilingual without cultural depth. She uses causal connectors "because" and "so" to make her reasoning, indicating the impenetrable barriers of foreign languages and cultures as causal factors and parents as the primary agents responsible for imparting symbolic aspects of heritage cultures and languages to their children. In this respect, Mrs Yan portrays herself as a concerned parent who focuses on what she can effectively provide for Yihua, the cultivation of her son's sense of belonging to a larger value system and cultural group through Chinese language and culture (Vinsonneau, 2002). In her argument, Mrs Yan adopts the derogatory, charged discourse ''yellow banana" to describe Chinese migrant children who show an exterior yellow Asian appearance but have assimilated Western cultural norms, lacking the cultural and spiritual foundation associated with their home country. Her negative framing ("haven't learned anything, "lack good qualities", "very bad", etc.) underscores the perceived deficiencies of these children. By using the pronoun "those", she deploys an intergroup 'othering' identity strategy to distinguish her family's position from that of Chinese migrants who lose linguistic and cultural continuity in child-rearing, thus presenting them as cautionary figures of what she aims to avoid for Yihua. Mrs Yan expects her son to anchor his Chinese identity in what she terms "a Chinese soul", which signifies a profound, spiritual connection with the home country that goes beyond the physical aspects of being Chinese (Smith, 1958). The minimisation of the importance of languages ("just

a tool"), while recognising their instrumental value, highlights Mrs Yan's priority of ensuring her son's inner self ("soul" and "mind") remains rooted in a Chinese ethno-cultural identity.

Pragmatic benefits constitute another key aspect that motivates Chinese parents to advocate for the maintenance of Chinese for their children, as can be seen in Excerpt 3:

Excerpt 3

Mr Zhang: […] 中国的经济体量越来越大, 我相信中国就是超- 取代美国是早晚的事。那嗯……中国这么大一个市场这么大一个经济体量。而且本身我们又是华人, 我如果不学中文, 我如果中文不能达到母语水平, 我就等于我自动地放弃了我将来很大的一个发展空间。	Mr Zhang: […] China's economic scale is growing larger and larger, and I believe it's only a matter of time before China surpasses the US. Well…China is such a big market with a massive economic size. And we are Chinese, if I don't learn Chinese, or if I can't reach a native level of proficiency in Chinese, it's like voluntarily giving up a significant opportunity for my future development. (Interview ZHA-P1)

In contrast to Mrs Zhang and Yan, Mr Zhang's ideological stance regarding Chinese centres on its pragmatic value as symbolic, economic capital in the global linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1982). He references China's growing economic prominence to argue that proficiency in Chinese is essential for future career opportunities. Through conditional reasoning ("if I don't…"), he constructs a hypothetical scenario to illustrate the potential drawbacks of not learning Chinese, thereby highlighting its importance. The frequent use of "I" indicates his proactive involvement in considering his child's future, making his argument more compelling. His viewpoint, effectively, aligns with neoliberal discourse about language commodification, characterised as "an attempt to mobilise language in order to produce wealth", with "consequences not only on the value attributed to languages, but also on the speakers and their socio-economic backgrounds" (Duchêne, 2021, p. 226, our translation). A similar pragmatic rationale is also evident in Mr Liu's discourse regarding his supportive attitude towards maintaining Chinese: "You must learn Chinese well. It will equip you with an additional valuable skillset when facing the competitive society ahead." (Interview LIU-P2).

These parental ideologies collectively reveal results that demonstrate, on the one hand, the commitment to upholding children's cultural and ethnic-national identities, and on the other hand, the pursuit of socio-economic fulfilment, referred to respectively as 'pride' and 'profit' (Duchêne & Heller, 2012). According to the aforementioned researchers, 'pride' describes language as a means of legitimising group membership, a powerful symbol of identity that evokes feelings of pride. 'Profit' arises from the market-driven, globalised economy that tends to commodify language as capital necessary for employability and socioeconomic mobility.

Negotiating between societal dominant, schooling languages

The data demonstrate that the trilingual language-in-education policy in Luxembourg is a key motivating factor behind family-based multilingualism, because the school has emerged as one of the most influential institutions to impact the

family domain by imposing societal dominant languages through its instructional medium and language ideologies (Ballweg, 2022; Spolsky, 2012). The Chinese parents interviewed within the context of the study reveal how they have to navigate their language management and expectations between multiple languages in order to align with or adapt to school educational requirements.

Excerpt 4

Mr Zhang: 中文- 至少中文、德语要达到母语水平。	Mr Zhang: Chinese- at least Chinese and German should reach native-level proficiency.
Mrs Zhang: ((笑声))	Mrs Zhang: ((laughter))
Mr Zhang: […] 而且我我估计她要就是德语达到母语水平应该不是很难。达到母语水平, 一个是说你的词汇量你会语法, 还有一个就是你这方面知识。如果你没有背景知识的话, 你很难达到母语水平。他们现在的话, 就是相当于接受这边教育嘛, 咱们就会把所有的需要的知识都会学到。[…]	Mr Zhang: […] And I think it shouldn't be very difficult for her [Chenxi] to reach native-level proficiency in German. To reach native level, on the one hand, it involves having a good vocabulary and knowledge in grammar, on the other hand, it's about having background knowledge of the language. It's very difficult to reach native-level proficiency without background knowledge. As they [the school children] are now receiving education here, so they will learn all the necessary knowledge. […]
[…]	[…]
Researcher: 那像卢森堡语, 跟法语或者英语, 你们还有什么特别的就是具体的想法?	Researcher: What are your specific thoughts about Luxembourgish, French, or English?
Mr Zhang: 嗯…..法语跟英语, 法语跟-, 英语肯定要学的。德语希望达到母语水平。其他语言就是锦上添花, 学不学不是很重要。	Mr Zhang: Well … French and English, French and-, English definitely needs to be learned. I hope she can reach native-level proficiency in German. Other languages are just bonuses, whether they are learned or not is not very important. (Interview ZHA-P2)

In Excerpt 4, with his assertion introduced by the modal verb and modifier ("should", "at least"), Mr Zhang sets high expectations for Chenxi's attainment of "native-level" proficiency in German and Chinese. His wording ("it shouldn't be very difficult") implies confidence in Chenxi's ability to achieve a comprehensive command of German, given its status as the primary literacy language in Luxembourgish schooling—a distinction not shared by French and Luxembourgish. Driven by the native-speaker/mother-tongue ideology, he specifies that achieving native-level proficiency depends not only on linguistic competencies but also on sociocultural competencies, which he considers a crucial criterion. Mr Zhang's discourse reveals the distinct roles or priorities he assigns to different languages, reflecting his positions towards them. He attributes symbolic values and significance to German and Chinese, while also stressing the crucial necessity of acquiring English, as indicated by the qualifier "definitely". However, he downplays the role of Luxembourgish and French by referring to them as "other languages" and "bonuses", considering their acquisition as nonessential and thus relegating them to a marginal, subordinate position.

In the following excerpt, Mrs Yan expresses a position and perspective similar to that of Mr. Zhang regarding the roles and values of German and French in her child's multilingualism:

Excerpt 5

Mrs Yan: […] 因为一个是, 那个卢森堡语跟德语比较相近。第二德国毕竟是大国, 是吧?以后有可能去德国学习的可能性也是比较大的。嗯唔, 然后他对德语还是比较感兴趣, 因为他一来就学的德语, 他有一种先入为主的一种感觉。所以, 所以我暂时想就是德语打造成他的第二母语。然后呢那个法语呢, 当然这话不能跟他说啊, 就是法语能交流能听, 其实就可以了 ((笑声)), 对是吧?	Mrs. Yan: […] Because for one thing, Luxembourgish is quite similar to German. Secondly, Germany is after all a big country, right? There is a high possibility for him [Yihua] to study in Germany in the future. And he is quite interested in German, because he started learning it when he came here, so he seems to prioritise it. So, my temporary plan is to make German his second mother tongue. As for French, of course, we can't tell him this, being able to communicate and understand French would be sufficient ((laughter)), right? (Interview YAN-P2)

The salient aspect of Mrs Yan's discourse is the multifactorial perspective, which is demonstrated through sequential reasoning ("for one thing", "secondly") behind her consideration and aspiration to develop German as Yihua's "second mother tongue". From a pragmatic standpoint, she emphasises the linguistic proximity between German and Luxembourgish, which facilitates the learning of the latter. Through the lens of the language-nation relationship, she further situates German within the broader context by evoking Germany's status as a significant sociopolitical and economic power. The shift in her argumentative focus becomes visible in the frequent use of the pronouns "he" and "him", through which she tailors her argument to Yihua's specific situation by taking into consideration his interest and future educational prospects. Of note is her acknowledgement of her son's agency alongside her parental authority in FLP decision-making. Mrs Yan's strong tendency towards German is likely driven by its predominant status in Luxembourgish primary education, where her son faced linguistic challenges as a newcomer. In contrast, she attributes considerably lower priority to French by stating that basic communicative competences in the language would suffice.

Unlike the parents in the Zhang and Yan families, Mrs Liu places French in first place, and English comes second, while German is given a lesser priority:

Excerpt 6

Mrs Liu: […] 应该我觉得是法语还比较重要的。因为它第一首先它是官方语言, 然后就是说它也是世界上的就是说第三大语言, 对吧?	Mrs Liu: […] I think French is quite important. Firstly, it's the official language of the country, and it's also the third most spoken language in the world, right?
[…]	[…]

Mrs Liu: 你就是说就整个世界而言的话, 那是英语是比较重要的。但是如果是……如果是像我们如果是生活在国内的话, 我是觉得首先要先学英语。[…] 但是我们情况不一样。我们是生活在欧洲哦, 一开始就有优先的条件有优势。那我是觉得首先应该是把他们现在的官方语言学好, 然后其次的话就是说再去学英语。	Mrs Liu: In terms of the whole world, English is more important. But if…if we live in China, I think it's more important to first learn English. […] However, our situation is different. We live in Europe, we have the advantage of being here. So I think that the first thing should be to learn the official language of the country, and then learning English should be secondary. (Interview LIU-P2)

Noteworthy in this excerpt is Mrs Liu's negotiation of positionings towards different languages in her argumentative construction. Her discourse unfolds through a process that begins with an initial assertion ("French is quite important"), proceeds with a counterargument ("English is more important" globally) and concludes with a rebuttal that prioritises French over English by contextualising her family's situation. As illustrated, she prioritises French over other languages primarily because of its official status in Luxembourg and, secondly, due to her belief that it is the third most spoken language worldwide. Although the latter reason is not factual, it reflects her appreciation for the prestigious, powerful status of French in the global linguistic market. The recurrent use of "important" indicates the value placed on both French and English, with the comparative form ("more important") used to differentiate their roles from local (Luxembourg) and global perspectives. German is conspicuously absent from her discourse and, evidently, not equally valued compared to French, despite its official status in Luxembourg. Mrs Liu's differential dispositions towards French and German may be explained by the hierarchised utilitarian values attached to them in Luxembourg's de facto multilingual practices. French functions as a primary communication medium in public settings, including workplaces where it predominates (Heinz & Fehlen, 2016). It also manifests prevailing usage patterns in cross-border mobility with bordering countries (i.e. France, Belgium) and in communication between immigrants and native Luxembourgers (Hawkey & Horner, 2022).

As with the Zhang and Yan families, in the Liu family, the construction of a 'second mother tongue' for the children also emerges in the parents' language ideologies, as illustrated in Excerpt 7:

Excerpt 7

Mrs Liu: […] 那你卢森堡语的话肯定是要会的。因为这是你的-…….就相当于我们是像我们这种, 像我们这种的就是说居住在国外的哦就是说, 其实卢森堡语就是对Ming他们而言就是卢森堡语就是他们的母语了。所以我是觉得还蛮重要的。	Mrs Liu: […] Well, you definitely need to know Luxembourgish. Because this is your-…it's like for us, for those of us who live abroad, Luxembourgish is the mother tongue of children like Ming. So I think it's quite important.
[…]	[…]

Mrs Liu: 我是觉得哦除了就是-.......因为毕竟我们是在这里生活的话, 我是觉得卢森堡语呢会说就行了, 也不要那么精哦。就像他学中文一样, 会说会看基本上就是普通的就是说日常生活中可以用到就可以了。	Mrs Liu: I think besides- … Because after all we live here, I feel that as long as he can speak Luxembourgish, that's enough, he doesn't have to be highly skilled at it. It's like when he learns Chinese, being able to speak and read at a basic level is sufficient for daily life. (Interview LIU-P2)

In contrast to the Zhang and Yan families, who conceptualise German as their child's second mother tongue, the Liu family opts for Luxembourgish. Mrs Liu values the mastery of Luxembourgish as crucial for her son's identification and integration in Luxembourg. Luxembourgish holds symbolic significance for her, through which she positions her son—as well as the descendants of other transnational families—as belonging to the host country, as evidenced by her shift from using "us" to "those of us". This echoes the prevailing public discourse in Luxembourgish society, which advocates Luxembourgish, the national language, as a core identity marker of the country (Horner & Weber, 2008). By contrasting the statement "definitely need to know Luxembourgish" with the moderation "doesn't have to be highly skilled at it", we can see that Mrs. Liu's argument is structured to emphasise the necessity of learning Luxembourgish while clarifying that impeccable oral and written proficiency is not required. This implies that, unlike Mr Zhang and Mrs Yan, she does not subscribe to an imagined ideal of proficiency in one's mother tongue(s) (Yildiz, 2012). Instead, she aligns with another aspect of the mother-tongue ideology, which emphasises the mother tongue as a defining factor of an individual's identity. The shared role she attributes to Luxembourgish and Chinese suggests that she envisions a dual identity for her son within a transnational context. In the Yan family, although Luxembourgish is prioritised less than other prestigious European languages (i.e., German and French), the parents are aware of its significance for local integration. Their considerations are also based on the legitimacy of Luxembourgish as the national language and the 'mother tongue' of Luxembourgish people.

The Zhang family holds a markedly different stance towards Luxembourgish, with the parents attaching little weight to this language:

Excerpt 8

Mr Zhang: […] 它也不考试什么的。他们现在只说, 连读都不教, 只是听和说, 没有读没有写。[…]	Mr Zhang: […] There are even no exams for it [Luxembourgish]. Now they just focus on speaking, they don't even teach reading. It's only listening and speaking, without reading and writing. […]
[…]	[…]
Mr Zhang: 还是中国传统的应试思想。((笑声))	Mr Zhang: It's still the traditional Chinese exam-oriented mindset. ((laughter))
Mrs Zhang: 嗯……应试思想。而且-……	Mrs Zhang: Yes… the exam-oriented mindset. And- …

| Mrs Zhang: 而且还有一点就是说, 本身我们认为, 卢森堡语它使用频率太差。可以完全可以舍弃。全球只有大概二三十万人说卢森堡语, 无所谓。 | Mr Zhang: And another point is that we think Luxembourgish has a very low usage frequency. It can be completely abandoned. Globally, only around two to three hundred thousand people speak Luxembourgish, so it doesn't matter. (Interview ZHA-P1) |

This excerpt first illustrates the shared position of both parents, who perceive Luxembourgish as marginalised within Luxembourg's education system, particularly due to its absence from the formal teaching of written forms and examinations. They attribute this pragmatic mindset to their experiences rooted in Chinese educational culture that puts emphasis on examination requirements. Such a viewpoint aligns indeed with prevalent educational discourse, which foregrounds the pivotal role of the written medium in affording the main languages of schooling "a privileged and often unique role in establishing knowledge of subjects in a school context" (Coste, 2014, p. 20). Mr Zhang pursues his argument by pointing to the low global usage frequency of Luxembourgish as a constraint on its value. His hyperbolic statement that "it can be completely abandoned" reflects a potential, absolute stance, further signalling the Zhang family's disinterest in their child's learning of Luxembourgish. Throughout the excerpt, the use of modifiers "just" and "only" also contributes to frame the minor importance Mr Zhang assigns to Luxembourgish in both the local and global linguistic markets.

The predominance of English competing with schooling languages

Although English does not hold an official status and is not part of trilingual schooling in Luxembourg, parents among all the participating families consider English an indispensable language for their children to master. The following excerpts reveal the noteworthy priority assigned to English, to the extent that it competes, to various degrees, with the three schooling languages among all three families.

Excerpt 9

| Mrs Yan: […] 另外一个想法我是觉得, 虽然现在是德语、法语、卢森堡语都很重要, 但是从未来来说还是英语最重要。因为为什么英语最重要?因为我听他们说全世界70%……97%好像还是95%的论文都是用英语写, 很少用法语和德语写论文。[…] 他能往研究生、博士那个方向走, 甚至能当科学家或者当什么的, 那他英语是其实还是比较重要的。[…] 所以有一段时间, 我们就想把他送到国际学校去, 有一段时间啊。但是现在他因为在那个学校学得也还可以, 所以也暂时先看看吧看看他的状况, 嗯看看他学法语、德语的状况。但是对孩子来说确实有点多。 | Mrs Yan: […] Another idea I have is that although German, French and Luxembourgish are all important now, English is still the most important for the future. Why is English the most important? Because I've heard that globally, 70% …maybe 97% or 95% of academic papers are written in English, and very few papers are written in French and German. […] If he [Yihua] can pursue a master or a PhD, or even become a scientist or whatever, then English is actually quite important. […] For a while, we considered sending him to an international school. But for now, he's okay in his current school, we will observe his situation and see how he progresses with French and German. However, it is indeed a bit too much for the child. (Interview YAN-P2) |

As illustrated above, Mrs Yan's prioritisation of the three languages of schooling and English hinges upon a differentiation marked by the temporal indicators of "now" and "the future". Although she perceives German, French and Luxembourgish as "all important", she places English at the top of the hierarchy when the host country's educational requirements are factored out, as revealed through the superlative "the most important". She justifies her stance by highlighting the dominant role of English in academic and higher education settings, where it is utilised "as the main vehicle for the exchange, dissemination and publication of scientific knowledge on a global scale" (Plo Alastrué, 2015, p. 3). At this point, she engages in reproducing the prevailing discourses that endorse the instrumental values tied to English. Also noteworthy is the way Mrs Yan associates English with her son's future educational and career opportunities. The modal verb "can" she uses indicates future possibilities, through which she conveys high expectations for her child's future development. Additionally, she mentions that she and her husband have considered enrolling their son in an international school with an English-medium curriculum. Such a consideration seemingly arises from their aspiration for their child to achieve high proficiency in English and concerns about the challenges posed by the trilingual educational policy. In taking an agentive role in negotiating language choices for their child's schooling, they use temporal markers like "for a while" and "for now", further reflecting their flexible stance towards FLP that adapts to current circumstances.

The Yan family is not the sole case that takes an ambivalent stance between Luxembourgish trilingual schooling and a potential English-medium education. The Zhang family also finds itself in a similar predicament:

Excerpt 10

| Mr Zhang: […] 我也现在有点纠结。因为从实用角度来讲，嗯唔……你只需要学一门外语，就是英语。[…] 但是我是希望她能比我们更进一步能掌握多语言。这样……我觉得对她思维是会有帮助的。[…] 我也不知道我们是否已经到了需要做取舍这个。[…] 但是我现在还是希望再给她一些时间让她-……就是看吧。 | Mr Zhang: […] I feel a bit conflicted right now. Because from a practical perspective, umm … you only need to learn one foreign language, which is English. […] But I do hope she [Chenxi] can go further than us and master multiple languages. This … I believe it would be helpful for her cognitive abilities. […] I don't know if we're at the point where we need to make choices yet. […] But for now, I still hope to give her some more time to- … let's see. (Interview ZHA-P1) |

This excerpt revolves around Mr Zhang's internal struggle regarding his positioning vis-à-vis the language-learning choices and trajectory for his daughter. His self-disclosure, as well as his hesitancy throughout the discourse, frames the tensions between realistic and idealistic visions. On the one hand, he perceives focusing solely on English as a practical approach due to its pragmatic values and his concerns about his daughter's academic challenges within the Luxembourgish trilingual schooling. On the other hand, by using aspirational and positive expressions such as "I do hope", "go further than us" and "helpful for her cognitive abilities", he expresses a strong desire to nurture his daughter's multilingualism, which he believes is beneficial for her personal development—including, for example, the

cognitive benefits he mentions. His uncertain wording ("I don't know if…" and "let's see") indicates that he has not ruled out the possibility of transitioning to a monolingual English-medium education. Essentially, Mr Zhang's conflicting ideologies reflect tensions between the widely popularised idea of 'bi-/multilingual advantages' (King & Mackey, 2007; Piller & Gerber, 2021) and the 'monolingual mindset' that places English above all other languages for its universality and efficacy (Clyne, 2005).

Although the Liu family have not considered enrolling their children in an English-medium education, English still holds a notable position compared to other official languages in Luxembourg. Referring back to Excerpt 6, we find that, when making sense of language priorities in individual multilingualism, Mrs Liu prioritises English after French but before German and Luxembourgish, primarily based on its status as a hegemonic, international language.

Discussion and conclusion

Data presented in this article provide illustrative evidence to demonstrate how the component of FLP—parental language ideologies—emerges as a multi-layered and stratified construct with "varying dimensions and scopes of operation as well as varying degrees of accessibility to consciousness and agency" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 160). By unpacking the parents' conceptualisation of children's multilingualism among three Chinese transnational families in Luxembourg, we find that the parents manifest noticeable differentiated, overlapping and conflicting aspects of language ideologies while confronted with an array of languages (potentially) shaping their children's multilingualism. They engage in positioning themselves and others within social and discursive practices, as well as navigating across different domains when balancing heritage language maintenance, school language requirements and the global hegemony of English. These processes prove to be increasingly complex in a highly multilingual environment such as Luxembourg.

Firstly, our findings indicate that perceptions, beliefs, values, attitudes, expectations and concerns are all integral cognitive facets of the Chinese parents' ideologies, significantly shaped by identity, socio-political, economic, instrumental and ideological factors. We have observed that the parents tend to perceive standard Chinese (*Putonghua*) as a symbolic identity marker, or as a crucial means for cultivating the cultural heritage and spiritual essence that anchor Chinese identity. The parents' strong commitment to maintaining their heritage language for their children is also underpinned by socioeconomic interests associated with the Chinese language. This dual identity-pragmatism rationale echoes Duchêne and Heller's (2012) insights that revolve around the notions of 'pride' and 'profit'. Furthermore, our findings demonstrate that present- and future-oriented parental cognitive constructs (Holden & Smith, 2019) co-constitute the parents' conceptualisation of their children's multilingualism within the FLP sense- and decision-making processes. Illustrative in this respect is that the parents' present perceptions, beliefs and evaluative views regarding a particular language often shape their future expectations concerning the

competency, function and goals associated with this language in their children's language development.

Furthermore, our findings demonstrate that parental language ideologies derive from the interplay between human agency and social structures, in which "the power of parents as policy actors is contingent upon societal factors of a structuring nature" (Mirvahedi, 2021, p. 406). The data reveal that the Chinese parents' sense- and decision-making processes testify as to how individuals act from a rational position within discursive practices to interpret and to appropriate *top down*, imposed, institutional policies and dominant ideologies, or *bottom up*, personal and everyday experiences, socially shared and circulated representations (van Dijk, 2006). Among these parents, conceptualising children's multilingualism, in line with Seals and Beliaeva's (2023, p. 517) findings, is contingent both on "the dynamic sociopolitical context in the home country" and their "diasporic realities". Often, the latter is greatly influenced by the public educational demands and the social linguistic environment in the host country. Moreover, consistent with Mirvahedi's (2021) argument, the data reveal variations in how different members of the diasporic community interpret and react to the same official trilingualism. For example, Mr Zhang and Mrs Yan prioritise German primarily for its function as the literacy language in schooling, but assign less importance to French. Whereas, Mrs Liu values French over German, given the former's prevalence in the de facto linguistic situation in Luxemburg and its global widespread use. The roles, values and functions of Luxembourgish also manifest distinctive, or nuanced, patterns within the parents' ideologies. Drawing from the insights of Hawkey and Horner (2022), such differentiated interpretations can be understood as a consequence of the 'strategic ambiguity' in Luxembourgish policy discourse that allows for the negotiation of multilingual practices and shapes the linguistic habitus of speakers in specific settings. Thus, it is through these interrelations between individual agency, social structures and discursive dynamics that we have witnessed how the officiality of German, French and Luxembourgish are discursively reproduced, upheld or discarded by the Chinese parents (Hawkey & Horner, 2022) while negotiating between these languages in their children's multilingual development.

The evidence from this study also indicates that all the families hold English in high regard, with certain parents taking an ambivalent 'wait-and-see' stance regarding whether to enrol their children in an English-medium schooling programme. This observed phenomenon can be understood against the backdrop of the transnational families' need to meet the educational requirements within Luxembourg's trilingual schooling amidst a globally, English-dominated, linguistic hierarchy. As demonstrated, a tension arises between the parents' aspirations for a multilingual ideal and their potential concession to English as the sole linguistic choice (alongside their heritage language). Implicitly embedded within this tension are traces of a 'monolingual mindset' (Clyne, 2005) that underlies their conceptualisation of children's multilingual development. Additionally, the parents' language ideologies foreground the neoliberal, market-driven tendency in the new globalised economy, where language is increasingly considered as symbolic capital convertible into economic capital (Bourdieu, 1982). Thus, the parents navigate their positionings between local and global linguistic markets, while defining distinct roles, values

and priorities for different languages. For instance, the role of Luxembourgish in facilitating integration into the host country suggests a locally grounded appreciation, while the emphasis on the mastery of English underscores a globally oriented perspective. This tendency leads to language commodification in a bid to maximise profits (Duchêne, 2021) and, will also potentially reinforce a particular language (i.e. English) as a symbolic marker of power relationships in language learning and use.

This article contributes to FLP research by foregrounding the intricate, multi-faceted nature of parental language ideologies within diasporic and multilingual contexts. It enriches current understanding with insights from the highly multilingual context of Luxembourg. As shown, the parental language ideologies index mixed, nuanced views and competing ideas that interact with the larger socio-political, cultural, ideological and economic realities, as well as the embedded symbolic power relations within them. In addition to illustrating the role of parents as policymakers at the family level, the findings may encourage other policy actors to promote collaboration between families, communities and schools with a view to empowering parents—often caught in confusions, contradictions and powerlessness. A possible avenue for future studies would be to adopt a comparative perspective from different diasporic communities within the same multilingual context, further advancing our knowledge of FLPs at the community level.

Declarations

References

Ballinger, S., Brouillard, M., Ahooja, A., Kircher, R., Polka, L., & Byers-Heinlein, K. (2022). Intersections of official and family language policy in Quebec. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 43*(7), 614–628. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1752699

Ballweg, S. (2022). Anticipating expectations. Family language policy and its orientation to the school system. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 19*(2), 251–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2033756

Bamberg, M. G. W. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7*(1–4), 335–342.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire*. Fayard.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Caldas, S. J. (2012). Language policy in the family. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 351–373). Cambridge University Press.

Chimbutane, F., & Gonçalves, P. (2023). Family language policy and language shift in postcolonial Mozambique: A critical, multi-layered approach. *Language Policy, 22*, 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09658-3

Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's Language Potential*. University of New South Wales Press.

Coste, D. (2014). Plurilingualism and the challenges of education. In P. Grommes & A. Hu (Eds.), *Plurilingual education. Policies—Practices—Language development* (pp. 15–32). John Benjamins.

Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic ethnography. In K. King, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: research methods in language and education* (Vol. 10, pp. 229–241).

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy, 8*(4), 351–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9146-7

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2012). 潜移默化—Implicit learning and imperceptible influence: Syncretic literacy of multilingual Chinese children. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 13*(3), 348–370. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798412455819

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2013). Family language policy: Sociopolitical reality versus linguistic continuity. *Language Policy, 12*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9269-0

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2016). Conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices in Singaporean multilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 694–709. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1127926

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2018). Family language policy. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning* (pp. 420–441). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190458898.013.21

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Huang, J. (2020). Factors influencing family language policy. In A. C. Schalley & S. A. Eisenchlas (Eds.), *Handbook of home language maintenance and development: Social and affective factors* (pp. 174–193). De Gruyter Mouton.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Lanza, E. (2018). Language management in multilingual families: Efforts, measures and challenges. *Multilingua, 37*(2), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0132

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2023). Pride, prejudice and pragmatism: Family language policies in the UK. *Language Policy, 22*, 391–411. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09669-0

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Wang, W. (2018). Parents as agents of multilingual education: Family language planning in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 31*(3), 235–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1504394

De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. John Benjamins.

De Fina, A., & King, K. A. (2011). Language problem or language conflict? Narratives of immigrant women's experiences in the US. *Discourse Studies, 13*(2), 163–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610392135

De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and migration* (pp. 75–95). De Gruyter Mouton.

Duchêne, A. (2021). Marchandisation. *Langage et Société. Dictionnaire de la Sociolinguistique*, *Hors série* (pp. 225–228).

Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. Routledge.

Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Gogonas, N., & Kirsch, C. (2016). In this country my children are learning two of the most important languages in Europe: Ideologies of language as a commodity among Greek migrant families in Luxembourg. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(4), 426–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1181602

Hawkey, J., & Horner, K. (2022). Officiality and strategic ambiguity in language policy: Exploring migrant experiences in Andorra and Luxembourg. *Language Policy, 21*, 195–215. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-021-09602-3

Heinz, A., & Fehlen, F. (2016). Sur les langues au travail. In *Regards N°11*. STATEC.

Hirsch, T., & Lee, J. S. (2018). Understanding the complexities of transnational family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 39*(10), 882–894. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1454454

Holden, G. W., & Smith, M. M. (2019). Parenting cognitions. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: being and becoming a parent* (Vol. 3, pp. 681–721). Routledge.

Horner, K., & Weber, J. J. (2008). The language situation in Luxembourg. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 9*(1), 69–128. https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp130.0

King, K. A. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 167–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050008667705

King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family language policy. *Linguistics and Language Compass, 2*(5), 907–922. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x

King, K., & Mackey, A. (2007). *The bilingual edge: Why, when, and how to teach your child a second language*. HarperCollins.

Kircher, R., Quirk, E., Brouillard, M., Ahooja, A., Ballinger, S., Polka, L., & Byers-Heinlein, K. (2022). Quebec-based parents' attitudes towards childhood multilingualism: Evaluative dimensions and potential predictors. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 41*(5), 527–552. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X221078853

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. Sage Publications.

Lanza, E., & Lomeu Gomes, R. (2020). Family language policy: Foundations, theoretical perspectives and critical approaches. In A. C. Schalley & S. A. Eisenchlas (Eds.), *Handbook of home language maintenance and development* (pp. 153–173). De Gruyter.

Lee, H., & Pang, M. E. (2021). Educational discourse and knowledge construction in family language policy: The case of a Korean transnational family. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1996581

Ministry of National Education, Childhood and Youth of Luxembourg (MENJE), & Luxembourg Centre for Educational Testing (LUCET). (2015). PISA 2015—Rapport national Luxembourg. Retrieved January 3, 2024, from https://www.pisaluxembourg.lu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/pisarapport2015_fr.pdf

Ministry of National Education, Childhood and Youth of Luxembourg (MENJE). (2023). Education system in Luxembourg: Key figures 2022–2023. Retrieved January 3, 2024, from https://men.public.lu/fr/publications/statistiques-etudes/themes-transversaux/22-23-enseignement-chiffres.html

Mirvahedi, S. H. (2021). Examining family language policy through realist social theory. *Language in Society, 50*(3), 389–410. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404520000287

Palviainen, Å., & Bergroth, M. (2018). Parental discourses of language ideology and linguistic identity in multilingual Finland. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 15*(3), 262–275. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1477108

Piller, I., & Gerber, L. (2021). Family language policy between the bilingual advantage and the monolingual mindset. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24*(5), 622–635. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1503227

Plo Alastrué, R. (2015). Debates and discourses on English as an academic and research language. In R. Plo Alastrué & C. Pérez-Llantada (Eds.), *English as a scientific and research language: Debates and discourses. English in Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 3–8). De Gruyter Mouton.

Purkarthofer, J. (2019). Building expectations: Imagining family language policy and heteroglossic social spaces. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23*(3), 724–739. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916684921

Purkarthofer, J., Lanza, E., & Berg, M. F. (2022). Discourses between the public and the private: Transnational families at the crossroads. *Applied Linguistics, 43*(3), 563–586. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab053

Seals, C. A., & Beliaeva, N. (2023). Aspirational family language policy. *Language Policy, 22*, 501–521. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09674-3

Smith, D. H. (1958). Chinese concepts of the soul. *Numen, 5*(3), 165–179.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy—The critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(1), 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638072

Statec. (2023). Population par nationalités détaillées au 1er janvier. Retrieved from December 5, 2023, from https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?fs[0]=Th%C3%A8mes%2C1%7CPopulation%20et%20emploi%23B%23%7CEtat%20de%20la%20population%23B1%23&pg=0&fc=Th%C3%A8mes&df[ds]=ds-release&df[id]=DF_B1113&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=%2C2022&dq=.A&vw=tb

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

van Dijk, T. A. (2014). Discourse-cognition-society: Current state and prospects of the socio-cognitive approach to discourse. In C. Hart & P. Cap (Eds.), *Contemporary critical discourse studies* (pp. 123–148). Bloomsbury.

Van Mensel, L. (2018). 'Quiere koffie?' The multilingual familylect of transcultural families. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 15*(3), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1477096

Vinsonneau, G. (2002). *L'identité culturelle*. Dunod.

Yildiz, Y. (2012). *Beyond the mother tongue: The postmonolingual condition*. Fordham University Press.

Zhu, H., & Li, W. (2016). Transnational experience, aspiration and family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(7), 655–666. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1127928

Peiru Bai holds a joint PhD degree in Sociolinguistics from University of Luxembourg and University of Strasbourg. She is currently a post-doctoral researcher at the Faculty of Education and Lifelong Learning (INSPÉ) and in the LiLPa (Linguistique, Langues, Parole, UR 1339) Research Group, University of Strasbourg, France. Her research interests include family language policy and multilingualism, with a focus on transnational experiences, plurilingual education, language acquisition/learning and (inter)cultural identities.

Andrea Susan Young works at the Faculty of Education and Lifelong Learning (INSPÉ) at the University of Strasbourg where she is a Full Professor of English and co-leader of the Language(s) and Society Unit of the LiLPa (Linguistique, Langues, Parole, UR 1339) research group. She is currently also a Guest Professor at the Faculty of Education at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences and member of the Language Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Contexts research group. Her research and teaching interests include teacher education for the support of multilingual learners, home/school educational partnerships, teacher language awareness and plurilingual and intercultural education.