



## Linguistic Socialization in Family and Development of Polylingual Personality

Olga A. Maximova<sup>1</sup>, Lyudmila K. Nagmatullina<sup>2</sup>, Maria Iu. Eflova<sup>3</sup> and Elena N. Rassolova<sup>4</sup>

*Kazan Federal University, Department of Education, Kazan, Russia*  
E-mail: <sup>1</sup><olga\_max@list.ru>, <sup>2</sup><nagmlk@yandex.ru>, <sup>3</sup><mmmmm16@yandex.ru>, <sup>4</sup><hedgehog0593@mail.ru>

**KEYWORDS** Educational Function of Family. Ethnic Solidarity. Language Competence. Language Continuity. Language Orientations

**ABSTRACT** The purpose of the present paper is to investigate the level of language requirement from the representatives of different generations of a modern family. Particular consideration is on the consideration of the circumstances that a family has the capability to provide an educational function for linguistic competence and multilingual personality development. The authors desire to focus on those aspects of the studied problem, which were not previously considered from the perspective of family relations, and the family educational function led to highlight a non-trivial aspect of the study object expressed by language orientations. The empirical basis of the research was composed of materials of in-depth problem-oriented interviews, men and women participated in which from various ethnicities, age groups, with different levels of education, and various marital statuses. The research was carried out during 2018 in the multi-ethnic region of Russia - the Republic of Tatarstan.

### INTRODUCTION

Currently, a multi-ethnic, information-open world, attempting to extend the boundaries of economic and socio-cultural interaction space, basically proposes new requirements for the system of personal qualities and competencies of a person in modern society, which can guarantee its successful and organic development in terms of global competition. In the system of social institutions that is capable of providing the conditions for the implementation and development of these requirements, the essential role refers to the family institution (Schüpbach 2009; Szytniewski et al. 2017; McKinley et al. 2019).

Family upbringing is one of the main elements of the socialization process and includes the development of the necessary skills of modern people, which provides them the possibility to adapt to society for facing emerging challenges. It considerably determines future professional successes, lays the foundation for spiritual development. An extensive range of family socialization tools, supplemented through the investigation of the history and culture of the native people, their language, customs, traditions, en-

riched by language knowledge of other ethnic groups, is an essential condition for multilingual personality development (Gudmunson and Danes 2011; Lanz et al. 2019).

The necessity to develop a qualitatively new position concerning the preservation of the native language, the investigation of non-native languages, the progress of linguistic competence level, the search for mechanisms to maintain interethnic harmony, inevitably prompt the scientists to reconsider the role of family social institution in this process. The abovementioned arguments make the authors of the paper discuss this problem entirely justified, expedient, and relevant. Various fields of language socialization include two extensive fields of interest: socialization to use language, and socialization through the use of language (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2011).

Though they have increased in recent years, most research has concentrated on children, and investigations of the language socialization of adults are comparatively limited within both areas. Studies of adults have mainly concentrated on second language acquisition within the first area – occasionally with some consideration to social factors, but only since they affect speakers' developing competency in the L2.

The second area – socialization through the use of language – has provided more culturally situated examinations of how adults' differing social roles are shown in their linguistic practice (see, for example, the comprehensive literature on gender differences in speech). Studies of secondary language socialization have also considered those specialized linguistic competencies obtained through formal education, however most of the literature concentrates on literacy practices rather than oral speech (Galindo et al. 2019).

One more significant area of research has been the use of language in the workplace, mainly as it associates with the construction of special identities and relations of domination and subordination (Vine 2017). Finally, ethnographies of an extensive range of “communities of practice” have demonstrated how entrance into a new community or sphere of activity regularly indicates the acquisition of new discourse practices (Nag et al. 2019). Nevertheless, few studies have investigated the interplay of various spoken languages within adults' secondary language socialization among these different types of studies (Soler et al. 2018). Investigations in all of these fields have contributed to a perspective of language socialization as a dynamic, mutually-negotiated process extending across the lifespan.

As Duranti (2009) notes, “only recently have researchers started to pay attention to the cultural prerequisites and the cultural implications of language acquisition,” and this is doubly true of language acquisition among adults. Existing researches of adults' secondary language socialization have rarely connected the traditional division between socialization by language and socialization to use language – in other words, to explain how adults' acquisition of second, third, or fourth languages is implicated in the development of identities and the negotiation of changing social relationships, both locally and globally (Tsoi and Liu 2019).

Besides the concentrating fundamentally on children, language socialization research has conventionally cast children as the targets or recipients of socialization, rather than its agents. In opposition to earlier conceptions of children as “blank slates” upon which the linguistic practices of the adults around them were inscribed,

more recent study characterizes children as actively negotiating meanings and relationships in the acquisition of new linguistic competencies (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2011; Vine 2017).

### Objectives

The main target of the current study is to investigate the level of language requirement from the representatives of different generations of a modern family.

### METHODOLOGY

The investigation of theoretical concepts and methods, applied aspects of the problem of studying the family role in the development of a multilingual (bilingual) personality, and also the attitudes of ethnic tolerance in a multilingual picture of the world, leads to note the multi-faceted nature and multidimensional nature of the studied processes, which necessitate an interdisciplinary approach, considering the knowledge in the fields of sociology, psychology, pedagogy, philosophy, linguistics, and many other sciences. Several areas of research interest should be considered.

The sociolinguistic aspect of bilingualism allows analyzing it in terms of social ethnic and linguistic contacts; it is the product of which. The application and extrapolation of the main provisions of language policy concept (Fishman 1991; Skapoulli 2006; Schüpbach 2009) in connection with the Microscopium of the family leads to analyze the problems of language skills among interlocutors and their relationships, determined by the type of interaction, language transfer in a family, and the ways of family communication organization in a multilingual society. The authors of the research comprehensively form the idea of language management, study, and discussion in families about how parents explain, formulate, and defend their family language policy (Lanza and Curdt-Christiansen 2018), by analyzing and describing the area of family language policy, defined as explicit and open planning concerning the use of language in the family among family members (Melo-Pfeifer 2015; King and Fogle 2017).

The sociological aspect of bilingualism is similarly related to the sociolinguistic aspect;

nevertheless, it defines individuals, social groups, and communities as the carriers of several languages and as research dominant. The subject of this type of studies can be one of the following terms: the family ability to raise a bilingual personality, intergenerational linguistic continuity required to preserve languages, the factors that preserve and alter the intergenerational language in a family, the role of parental relationships and their beliefs in association with language, bilingualism and language learning (Schwartz and Verschik 2013; Smith-Christmas 2014), and also the public and educational responses to multilingualism (Tuominen 1999). However, the authors believe that inadequate attention is paid to the investigation of development features of individual linguistic competence in terms of family education tasks, from the standpoint of condition analysis that a family can provide.

The empirical basis of the research was composed of materials of in-depth problem-oriented interviews ( $n = 12$ ), men and women participated in which from various ethnicities, age groups, with different levels of education, various marital statuses, and narrative essays of the young generation of family representatives ( $n = 762$ ). The research was conducted during 2018 in the multi-ethnic region of Russia - the Republic of Tatarstan.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The obtained results allowed the authors to study the world of opinions from the representatives of various generations of a modern family, to analyze the assessments, viewpoints, and priority positions in connection to the discussed problems. The analysis of the research results made it possible to declare certain facts, considerations, and conclusions concerning the level of the modern family linguistic request, and its role in the development of a multilingual personality and the attitudes of ethnic tolerance.

The nature of interethnic relations in the region of residence is one of the circumstances that determine the effectiveness and success of linguistic competence development and the study of several languages in the process of intra-family socialization.

A variety of processes between a family and its social environment leads to affect and form specific patterns of behavior among the representatives of different generations of a family to master languages. The practice of cohabitation of peoples reveals the formation of a sympathetic, friendly, and comfortable socio-psychological atmosphere between the representatives of various ethnic groups in a region with a multilingual population.

The state of interethnic relations is not only a potent consolidating factor working for interethnic stability and ethnic tolerance but also a powerful motivating factor to learn the languages of peoples who live in the same territory. Therefore, the study made it possible to record the highest assessments of interethnic relation state in the Republic of Tatarstan in the answers to the corresponding question: "Everything in Tatarstan is peaceful, quiet, and calm. It is very pleasing that the Russians and Tatars live in peace. Even if take my surroundings, I have a lot of Tatar friends who are purebred Tatars, but the difference of nations does not prevent us from communication, nor our children (Tsoi and Liu 2019).

It is very good that in our republic this situation is peaceful now, let it continue" (female, 45 years old); "We have a unique Republic, so many nationalities, it seems to me that we all get along very well, there is no such division and ethnic conflicts. I believe that we have rather good relations between people of different nationalities" (female, 38 years old); "... we were the calmest republic and remained such, and that's good" (female, 34 years old); "... So they are generally perfect. You can't compare them with any republic, absolutely" (male, 56 years).

A person's intentional decision to learn a language is affected by several factors, one of which for bilingualism and multilingualism development is the degree to which the social institution of a family is involved in this process. The formation of linguistic competence mainly depends on the circumstances that a family can provide by implementing an educational function (Vine 2017).

The families of our informants perform various models of language education, which are very different in their focus, and it seems that this strategy is effective. Accordingly, for in-

stance, one group of families provides full independence and freedom in making decisions on learning languages to children, including native ones.

This guidance is done by the following principles: “learn, if you like,” “he will learn if he likes it”: “... if they have a desire, then I will not mind, but in principle, this is their business, let them decide if they want it or not ...” (male, 45 years old); “Naturally, I want my children to know the Tatar language, speak it and pass this knowledge on to their children, too, but I’m a fairly democratic mother, so I give them the right to choose, that is, these are my desires, but I do not force children” (female, 38 years old).

This situation can be probably described by the evidence that some parents want to be in the trend of modern educational concepts and show a high level of their “democracy” in connection to the younger generation at present. However, they completely forget about the requirement to fully implement the educational function of responsibility for the very content of the educational process.

Certainly, the desire to understand and learn languages cannot be imposed artificially. However, the optimal organization of language training, including the mother tongue in a family indicates the presence in this method of not only a constant language background but also purposefulness and systematicity, a certain degree of perseverance on the part of parents and enthusiasm on the part of students. As it mentioned in Galindio et al. (2019), the result is achieved in this context only as developed linguistic competencies - a person’s ability to master numerous languages at a quality level that would lead to free interpersonal and professional communication (Galindio et al. 2019).

Some informants adhere to this viewpoint: “Maybe children need to be forced, because if they are given the right to choose, they all refuse, they need a minimum load, and if they are given such a choice, then naturally the children will refuse, many will refuse” (female, 38 years old); “Children perceive the world as it is, if their parents teach the Tatar language, they learn, if not, then they don’t learn, then it depends more on the parents” (male, 45 years old); “Yes, the children do not understand yet, they think that this will not be useful to them. We study Tatar ...

simply because we say “it is necessary”, “you must” (female, 37 years old).

Such declarations combine the second group of families, which seeks to realize its parental, educational resource completely and insist on learning the native language in contrast to the first group. Furthermore, the option of early language development is preferable in the combination of the family capabilities and preschool educational institution, as informants believe in this context.

The following abilities can form a bilingual and multilingual personality: gaining new knowledge, applying efforts to this, the activation of motivation mechanisms for learning languages, the creation of conditions for mastering languages within family and educational institutions.

Contrary to the first and second, the third group of families is completely counting on the capabilities of the educational institution and the development of the linguistic competencies for the young generation. Considering that it is necessary to seek the most effective techniques of teaching languages, including native ones, it would give tangible outcomes: “... something needs to be changed, children can’t cope, children are overloaded, there is no efficiency, we don’t speak Tatar” (female, 38 years); “But now everyone is very busy at school, there is a lot of subjects, in general, it’s good, of course, to know several languages, but physically the children just do not have time” (female, 45 years old).

Meanwhile, individual families in the space of intra-family communication practice more the following model of linguistic behavior: “Although we are Tatars by nationality, we communicate exclusively in Russian, the Tatar language leaves our lives. My grandparents and aunts speak and speak the Tatar language” (female, 20 years old); “For me, Tatar will always be my native language, and Russian will be the spoken language, which does not contribute to the perception of my native language value” (female, 20 years old).

Therefore, the generations of families destroy a well-thought-out, reliable mechanism to preserve the basic, traditional values of the family, including national ones, through violating linguistic continuity (Szytniewski et al. 2017; Galindio et al. 2019).

The globalization of the modern world and its market environment have provided to the shift in the priorities of the young generation of family representatives in connection to language mastering. Youth associate's language mastery with hopes for a successful life, determined by a prestigious and well-paid job because of preferring to study foreign languages - English, French, Chinese, etc.

Thinking purely materially and pragmatically, and operating with market categories: "demand", "offer", "prestige", "profit", "convenience", some representatives of young generations of families, unfortunately, do not recognize the prospects provided by their knowledge of their native language anymore: "I would like my children to speak English and French in addition to the Russian language, but besides these languages, Chinese is very widespread in the world, the knowledge of which would give a good advantage in life" (male, 20 years old); "I believe that the knowledge of two languages is good if this language has demand and popularity. If it is irrelevant, then there is no point in learning it" (female, 20 years old).

The fact that it is difficult to restrict linguistic knowledge to the structure of the native language in modern conditions is completely explainable. Simultaneously, there is the prevention of the complete replacement of the mother tongue knowledge by foreign ones and the circumstances "when ethnic native speakers refuse to study the Tatar language. Here at school faced the problem that completely ethnic native speakers of the Tatar language refused to study the Tatar language, that is, it is deplorable, this is a big problem" (female, 34 years old), can be formed by an educational system of the family, guaranteeing compliance with the proportions in language mastering (Szytniewski et al. 2017).

The mastering of languages in the modern world is transforming into a continuous process requiring the participation of different social institutions, several generations of the modern family, and the repeated fulfillment of the linguistic personality resource with the purpose of solving emerging practical problems in the space of modern multilingual exchange. Accordingly, the application of the multi-faceted family potential, providing immersion in the language environment, the formation of motivational attitudes

to language mastering, including the native language, can alter the language skills qualitatively, while maintaining interest in the cultural and linguistic values of the native ethnic group (Vine 2017).

The formation of conditions in the family space for multilingual personality development, considering the language requirements among the representatives of different generations of the family, and establishing the correct coordinate system of language behavior appears to be a proper strategic line for the education of young generations. The relationships of peoples based upon the principle of unity of diversity, language symphony, and ethnic tolerance, provide a reliable future in which the knowledge of several languages, including the native language, and the creation of language competence, is the only opportunity to take its rightful place in it.

## CONCLUSION

Consequently, the inability of individual families to fully guarantee the linguistic continuity and inculcate the correct attitude to the mother tongue in the younger generations makes it essential to search and duplicate the most suitable family practices concerning the investigation of native languages. Grandparents and parents can initiate the practical implementation of the main tasks of language education for youth, commencing from childhood, throughout the period when the impact of the family considerably exceeds other educational influences, and the person is most susceptible to the assimilation of vast amounts of language information. Furthermore, such a positive experience exists in the families of informants.

In the current paper, the authors desire to focus on those aspects of the studied problem, which were not previously considered from the perspective of family relations, and the family educational function led to highlight a non-trivial aspect of the study object expressed by language orientations. The empirical basis of the research was composed of materials of in-depth problem-oriented interviews, men and women participated in which from various ethnicities, age groups, with different levels of education, and various marital statuses. The research was carried out during 2018 in the multi-ethnic region of Russia - the Republic of Tatarstan.



### RECOMMENDATIONS

In the current study it was tried to investigate the level of language requirement from the representatives of different generations of a modern family. It was recommended to investigate the effect of linguistic socialization in different culture.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is conducted according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University. The reported study was funded by RFBR and Government of the Republic of Tatarstan.

### REFERENCES

- Duranti A 2009. *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. New Jersey, United States: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fishman JA 1991. *Reversing Language Shift- Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Galindo C, Sonnenschein S, Montoya-Ávila A 2019. Latina mothers' engagement in children's math learning in the early school years: Conceptions of math and socialization practices. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47: 271-283.
- Goodwin MH, Kyratzis A 2011. 16 peer language socialization. *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. New Jersey, United States: Wiley.
- Gudmunson CG, Danes SM 2011. Family financial socialization: Theory and critical review. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 32(4): 644-667.
- King KA, Fogle LW 2017. Family language policy. *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, 10(1): 315-327.
- Lanza E, Curdt-Christiansen XL 2018. Multilingual families: Aspirations and challenges. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(3): 231-232.
- Lanz M, Sorgente A, Danes SM 2019. Implicit family financial socialization and emerging adults' financial well-being: A multi-informant approach. *Emerging Adulthood*, 12: 24-38.
- McKinley E, Acott T, Stojanovic T 2019. Socio-cultural dimensions of marine spatial planning. In: J Zaucha, K Gee (Eds.): *Maritime Spatial Planning*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, P. 169.
- Melo-Pfeifer S 2015. The role of the family in heritage language use and learning: Impact on heritage language policies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1): 26-44.
- Nag S, Vagh SB, Dulay KM, Snowling MJ 2019. Home language, school language and children's literacy attainments: A systematic review of evidence from low and middle income countries. *Review of Education*, 7(1): 91-150.
- Schüpbach D 2009. Language transmission revisited: Family type, linguistic environment and language attitudes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1): 15-30.
- Schwartz M, Verschik A 2013. *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, Volume 7. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media
- Skapoulli E 2006. Language policy: Key topics in sociolinguistics: B. Spolsky. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2): 274-278.
- Smith-Christmas C 2014. Being socialised into language shift: the impact of extended family members on family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(5): 511-526.
- Soler J, Björkman B, Kuteeva M 2018. University language policies in Estonia and Sweden: Exploring the interplay between English and national languages in higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(1): 29-43.
- Szytniewski BB, Spierings B, Van der Velde M 2017. Socio-cultural proximity, daily life and shopping tourism in the Dutch- German border region. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(1): 63-77.
- Tsoi L, Liu F 2019. Translation, culture and politics: Implications of political slogans in Hong Kong. *Translation Spaces*, 8(2): 280-299.
- Tuominen A 1999. Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 140(1): 59-76.
- Vine B 2017. *The Routledge Handbook of Language in the Workplace*. UK: Routledge.

**Paper received for publication in October, 2019**  
**Paper accepted for publication in December, 2019**