

INTRODUCTION

Emerging from language policy (Spolsky 2004) and language socialization (Duranti et al. 2011) studies, family language policy (FLP) research has focused on the role of the family in language transmission: parental strategies in language contact situations (e.g., Lanza 1997) and impact of family type, situation, and context (Fogle and King 2013) on language maintenance and shift. After initial projects focusing predominantly on linguistic practices within Western middle-class two-parent bilingual families (e.g., De Houwer 1990 ; Lanza 1997), attention has been drawn to other, often socioeconomically and socioculturally marginalized types of families in order to better understand how families negotiate language maintenance goals. As a result, in addition to studies of transnational families, a few projects have been devoted to adoptive and single-parent families (e.g., Fogle 2013).

The contemporary multiplicity of family definitions and configurations, however, has not yet been fully considered. Most of the projects examined FLP in relation to class and ethnicity, but linguistic performances can also be inflected by gender (e.g., Gal 1979) or sexuality (e.g., Podesva 2007). Importantly for FLP research, fairly recent developments in reproductive technologies and legal arrangements across the world, including Britain, have led to new groups being granted legal rights to constitute families and new forms of adoption becoming possible. Changes in political arrangements within the European space after the 2004 EU enlargement, digital communication technologies and affordable travel have also enabled new family practices.

Below, we examine these new configurations and experiences of multilingualism by drawing on results from the ESRC-funded Family Language Policy project conducted in Britain in 2017–19. To inform our understanding of these practices and needs and challenges different multilingual families might face in everyday life, we focus on embodied communicative practices within one self-identified LGBTQ+ family with a history of transracial adoption and transnational migration from Poland to South East England. Following emerging research on fatherhood and masculinities in multilingual family research (e.g., Wright 2020 ; Doyle 2018), we seek to understand the family's use of English resources in caregiver-child interactions, both in the immediate context of communicative and bonding needs and the wider context of complex language relations conditioned by political economic subordination and experiences of non-heteronormative masculinities in transnational space. Situating our study in relation to lack of research on multilingual LGBTQ+ families and avoiding exoticizing the studied family type, we show how a focus on issues of “power, struggle and conflict” (Canagarajah 2008) and enactment may foreground the wider need for developing more complex tools for analysis in FLP research. By drawing attention to the role of repertoires other than linguistic ones in “enabl[ing] and structur[ing] the process of becoming a competent communicator” (Duranti et al. 2011 : 11), we propose to see a family as a multifaceted and dynamic sociopolitical unit that is interactionally accomplished by configurations of bodies, continuously assembled and coupled with objects, technology, and nature in the globalized world. We foreground the need for applying a multidimensional and multisensory approach to understanding FLP within LGBTQ+ transnational families that are simultaneously mobile, emplaced, and situated between different sociocultural norms and expectations regarding parenthood.

FAMILY, IDEOLOGY AND TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES

In FLP research, the family is now less often defined as an autonomous, private unit. Neither parental strategies nor child agency are seen as operating in a vacuum. An emphasis is rather put on the family as “a site in which language ideologies are both formed and enacted through caregiver-child interactions” (Fogle 2008). Recent projects on transnational, displaced, and migrant multilingual families have also revealed the role of language ideologies in relation to sociopolitical, legal, historical, and economic forces.

Language ideologies are “cultural system[s]of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 1989 : 255), which can be both “explicitly articulated or embodied in communicative practice” (Kroskrity 2004 : 496). In multilingual immigrant families, they have been linked to particular linguistic markets (e.g., Curdt-Christiansen 2009), where combinations of educational background, immigration experiences, or language status were shown to influence language transmission. They are negotiated between necessity and opportunity, and in some cases, opportunities for learning particular languages might be limited within an ethnic community (Zhu Hua and Li Wei 2016). For example, Chinese complementary schools in the UK teach Mandarin and Cantonese but not Hakka or Hokkien, the two varieties which have significant numbers of speakers in the Chinese diaspora worldwide. Differing multilingual experiences were found even within the same families. Examination of Chinese families in Britain (Li Wei 1994 ; Zhu Hua 2008) shows that divergent values were ascribed to linguistic resources by different generations, pointing to language ideologies’ specific time-space configurations.

Projects based on interview data in diaspora communities, for example, on Korean adoptee-returnees (Higgins and Stoker 2011), have also drawn attention to emerging non-static conceptualizations “of citizenship, ethnicity and linguistic identity.” Ideological struggles in transnational contexts may thus lead to linguistic practices that challenge market-oriented language ideologies. A need to make up for past inequalities together with lack of social acceptance, economic survival, and precarious legal status often contribute to new linguistic practices and language shift (Canagarajah 2008 ; Kulick 1997). Canagarajah (2008) , for example, linked language maintenance practices of Tamil-speaking migrant families in the English-speaking world to macro-social institutions, power, and cultural hegemonies (Gal 1998). The migrants’ increased use of English resources was seen as a way to compensate for unequal past caste and religious relations. In line with global tendencies (e.g., Gal 1979), the role of gender in language shift was evident as young women who resisted gender inequality within Tamil-speaking community and families were observed to be leading the shift. Similarly, ideas about racial difference (Reyes and Lo 2008) often impact what and how linguistic resources are desired and used in transnational families (Fogle and King 2013 ; Shin 2014).

Long-term ethnographic projects examining “complex situated relationships, symbols and orientations” (Duranti et al. 2011) in the family life illustrate that FLP could be linked to parental ideas about children and childhood. There is some evidence showing that FLP is shaped by what it means to be a good parent (King and Fogle 2006 ; Okita 2001), which itself is not a class-free practice (Johnston and Swanson 2003). Understandings of parenting at the intersections of class and race positions might also lead to different communication effects influenced through connections with technology, nature, use of objects, and other nonhuman entities.

Crucially, FLP operates with an assumption of monolingual normativity, which impacts how families make daily decisions regarding language use, literacy, or speech and language therapy. In addition, multilingual families have to negotiate between the desire to raise their children multilingually and the need to develop emotional attachment (Fogle 2013). Such negotiation of linguistic practices within the family often has to do with parental understandings of affect and bonding (Fogle 2013),

which reportedly lead to various practices: from bilingual mothers' shift to the majority language for affective reasons (King and Logan-Terry 2008) through parents' switch to less dominant codes due to accommodation (Kulick 1997) to parallel use of caregiver's and child's respective languages (Gafaranga 2010).

Additionally, but equally importantly for this project, family practices are also "located within an assumption of heterosexuality" (Carlile and Paechter 2018), where particular expressions of femininity are perceived as qualities of personality (Giddens 1992) and where iconic status is assigned to the (birth) mother (Carlile and Paechter 2018). Historically, ideologies of motherhood and fatherhood were based on traditional and imagined gender roles in the family life (Butler 1990). Consequently, motherhood is usually associated with a particular femininized body as a bearer of children (Johnston and Swanson 2003), while fatherhood "as a more distant, less caring, but also more physically boisterous practice" (Carlile and Paechter 2018 : 24). These ideas in turn have an impact on circulating assumptions about mothers' and fathers' relationship with schools and other institutions and engagement with family life. Heteronormative understandings of gender roles within the family are also often popularized in childcare manuals and assumed by institutions of the nation-state as national tax, legal, or medical systems are structured around the heteronormative family (Browne 2011).

Non-heteronormative families can be variously situated in relation to such structures and hence might need to make conscious choices to parent differently from the assumed norms (Moore and Brainer 2013). Swarr and Nagar (2003) showed that in rural India, lesbian parents' ideas about their offspring's future financial independence led the mothers to stay away from conventional cultural practices such as arranged marriages for their daughters or adopting a son. Gay families have also often been observed to challenge conventional understandings of masculinity, parenthood, fathering roles and 9781350189898_pi-316.indd 58 781350189898_pi-316.indd 58 04-Sep-21 15:45:21 4-Sep-21 15:45:21 MAKING A FAMILY 59 paternity (Carlisle and Paechter 2018). Research on parenting styles in such families, however, is fairly limited, with gay men in Western contexts being reported to parent similarly to heterosexual men (Bigner 1999) and co-parent in ways more often reported for women (Biblarz and Sarci 2010).

Recent studies of LGBTQ+ families also stress the role of the state for family members' life chances and of race and ethnicity for everyday life and possibilities of family formation (Moore and Brainer 2013). Most research on LGBTQ+ families has centered on upper-income white Western gay couples despite the fact that such couples are least likely to choose parenting (Rosenfeld 2010). Researchers' sampling and data collection methods have shaped what we know about such families often ignoring families with working-class and racial minority background. It has been, thus, argued that intersectional studies of non-Western parenting, especially in migration contexts, can expose limits of existing research models (Moore and Brainer 2013) and help better understand parenting goals and practices as embedded within systems of inequality.

This chapter departs from the "additive models of structural location" (Moore and Brainer 2013 : 146) that, as seen in the literature review, sideline non-heteronormative and single-parent families in FLP research. We argue that instead of looking for "different practices" within LGBTQ+ families and treating them through the lens of additive structures (class + race + gender), the focus must be put on practice and enactment of making a family that unite all the family types. Such an approach has the capacity to shed light on the role of linguistic resources and workings of bodily affectivity foregrounding meaning-making processes and allowing for the expertise to emerge from participation. As language socialization within all families, heteronormative or non-heteronormative, is collaboratively (Goodwin 2006) and relationally accomplished, both parents and children play

agentive roles in shaping FLP. The study of linguistic signs used within the family must hence acknowledge that the signs do not carry fixed meanings but are rather part of ever-changing complex social semiotic systems (Eckert 2012). Importantly, in all families, linguistic signs co-occur with other embodied phenomena that are “not simply a supplement to language but a basic element of communication” (Bucholtz and Hall 2016 : 184), which also constitutes the meaning of a family and actively shapes embodied family knowledge. Therefore, agency within the family must be studied as “produced through a network of entities” (Bucholtz and Hall 2016)—human and nonhuman, corporeal, semiotic, and material, where touch, sensation, and intimate mixing (Blackman 2008) play an important role. This, as we show, is especially evident in the context of adoption. The translanguaging perspective, which recently developed in applied linguistics, aptly captures the role of clusters of signs rather than “bounded languages” in family making and consequently complexifies understanding of FLP. Drawing on two rather different but complementary fields of enquiry, bilingual education, and distributed cognition, this perspective foregrounds the fluid, dynamic, embodied, and culturally embedded nature of communicative practices (e.g., Li Wei 2018).

Below, apart from examining how the parents explain their FLP, we focus on the ways in which their bodies attune to significances in their surroundings in interaction. By doing so, we demonstrate how the family members engage in complex social and affective embodied practices that make nonheteronormative transnational fatherhood and family. However, before focusing on the integrated and organic unfolding and weaving of the LGBTQ+ Polish-English-speaking family through available linguistic, semiotic, corporeal, and other material resources, we review the history of legal underpinnings of family-making in Britain.

ADOPTION: TRANSNATIONAL, TRANSRACIAL, NON-HETERONORMATIVE

Adoptive families provide perhaps most visible examples of how parenthood, childhood, and legitimacy of families are constituted through embodied interactional moves in everyday life. In such families, the public most evidently intersects with the private, at the same time often questioning hegemonic ideas about belonging and family relations. Studies of adoptive families also point to the ways in which law, cultural change, and public policy are intimately intertwined in family interactions. “Adoptive talk” as used by Fogle (2008) , therefore, provides a window to understand “the way we use language to communicate [as] a model for making sense of how we feel and of how we experience the world” (Costa et al. 2015 : 5) “through increasingly complex conceptual representations” (de Zulueta 2006 : 329).

Apart from studies considering psychological, legal, or cultural identity issues, especially in the United States (Javier et al. 2007), research on adoptive family linguistic practices has only recently received increased attention (e.g., Fogle 2013 ; Shin 2013 ; Nofal and Seals, this volume). Most projects consider transnational adoptive families in Western contexts, which emerged largely due to international conflicts and economic global inequalities in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Smith Rotabi 2013). Thanks to these projects, adoptive parents have been shown to often parent their offspring differently from biological parents (Fogle 2013). Most studies focusing on linguistic aspects were done in North American families where children had disparate linguistic resources from their parents. These studies often looked at older children who fall “at the intersection between monolingual and bilingual FLP” (Fogle 2013 : 85). Fogle (2012) , for example, examined how children (four to seventeen years old) in three adoptive families were socialized into their second languages in everyday practices. Culture keeping practices were widely reported (Jacobson 2000) and birth language maintenance was claimed to smooth adoptees’ transition to new contexts (Fogle 2012). Projects on adult adoptee-returnees further argued for the importance of knowledge

of birth language for the adoptees' development of a sense of belonging with their wider ethnic community (Higgins and Stoker 2011), while Shin (2013) posited that visible racial difference may require "engagement with birth language." Crucially, in the context of adoptive talk, parental decisions to maintain children's languages are made in the light of available language tuition, public discourse about adoption and experts', therapists', and teachers' advice about children's language development (Jacobson 2008).

In many adoptive families, the relationship between families' senses of belonging and children's language differs from other transnational and multilingual contexts. However, so far, most studies examined parents that had to make decisions whether they wanted to learn their children's languages, while speaking their society's dominant language. In this chapter, we focus on another type of transnational adoption: a family where children speak the dominant language, English, and parents' birth language is a nondominant language, Polish. As the UK context differs from that of most existing studies of adoptive talk, we briefly discuss the historical context below.

Although adoption has always existed in Britain, it was legalized only in 1926 (Keating 2017). Due to strict protection laws, initial records as to why parents decided to adopt or how children experienced adoption were limited. In the second half of the twentieth century, due to improved birth control and changing public attitudes, numbers of children for adoption decreased. Today, most children are adopted from "local authority care because their birth family situation placed them at risk; a few are adopted from overseas but the figures for this remain low" (Keating 2017). In 2019, there were 78,150 children looked after by local authorities through combination of adoption, foster care, and children's homes¹ (<https://coram-i.org.uk/asglb/data>). In 2011–12, 77 percent of adopted children were from care. Authorities do not track information about language profiles of such children (Costa et al. 2015).

In Britain, most children in care are classified by Census-measures as White British—78 percent (Costa et al. 2015). However, historically, due to structural inequalities and other factors, Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME)² children have been overrepresented proportionally since the 1950s, statistically least likely to be adopted and allegedly waiting the longest for placement,³ followed by children of mixed parentage (Barn and Kirton 2012). Significant numbers of adoptions are also made into white families. In Britain, transracial adoption became legal only in the 1960s. However, the UK continued with ethnic matching policies till 2014 when so-called color-blind adoption policies were introduced whereby race and ethnicity are not fully prioritized. Research has found that issues of race may become important "during late adolescence and adulthood" (Baden and Steward 2000).

Since the introduction of Adoption and Children Act 2002, which came into force in 2005, it has also been legal for non-heteronormative families in Britain to adopt children. Overall, LGBTQ+ families remain in minority both worldwide and in Britain (Carlile and Paechter 2018). In 2019, same-sex families made 1.1 percent of all families, with same-sex cohabiting couples being most common followed by a growing number of same-sex married couples since the introduction of the Marriage (Same-Sex Couples) Act 2013 (Office for National Statistics 2019). Every year, the number of children adopted by LGBTQ+ families grows. It has been argued that LGBTQ+ families are well equipped with coping skills necessary for adoptive families and "the mindset to view adoptive families as 'real' families" (Boyer 2007), often leading to children becoming more tolerant of difference. However, worldwide, LGBTQ+ parents have been reported to encounter "considerable amount of social prejudice as they form families" (Crespi 2001). Additionally, as adoption family laws were created "with heterosexual families in mind" (Boyer 2007), adoption agencies do not always have policies for

LGBTQ+ families, and there is a greater chance for adoption if a child is older, has special needs, or is from another country.

Importantly, LGBTQ+ families often have to cope with social and legal vulnerability (Lynch and Murray 2000). As the parents in the studied family come from Poland, it is worth mentioning that despite an estimated population of two million (out of the total thirty-eight), the LGBTQ+ community in Poland has no legal protection. However, it is estimated that due to changes happening in the family life over the last few decades, ⁴ approximately fifty thousand ⁵ children are now living in families of choice, where parents are LGBTQ+. Traditionally, in the Polish romantic tradition, sexual minorities and feminists have been portrayed as competition (Janion 2004). Today, some projects report a “persistent move towards acceptance over the last 10 years,” but other studies argue “that acceptance has recently fallen.” ⁶ Most recently, the LGBTQ+ community has been attacked by the current right-wing authorities and the Catholic Church, showing sharp divisions in Polish society, and in 2016, UN criticized Poland for lack of protection for LGBTQ+ citizens and decreasing initiatives in sex education. To our knowledge, neither in Britain nor in Poland, multilingual or “multicultural issues in LGBTQ family research” (Boyer 2007) have been investigated.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The data come from the ESRC-funded Family Language Policy project, a multilevel investigation examining language ideologies and practices in multilingual transnational families with links to Poland, Somalia, and China, but living in Britain. The project investigated questions surrounding the role of mobility and sociocultural change for FLP across and within transnational communities including ethnographic fieldwork in ten families of different types from each community.

At the family level, we recruited ten families with at least one person exhibiting knowledge of Polish. The recruitment was carried out in relation to official statistics for the Polish community in London and Britain in order to account for differences in density of local Polish population, class, family type, history of local ethnic relations, and type of neighborhood. To represent a wide range of family types, the LGBTQ+ family was recruited from our personal networks based in Poland with links to LGBTQ+ activist groups. All families were first contacted by phone. During the first visit, Kinga introduced the project, data collection methods, and secured ethical consent from all family members. The total number of hours recorded in the LGBTQ+ family was approximately 12 hours and 30 minutes. Fieldnotes were also made after any additional encounter. Most were recorded among family members, but some visits included others, for example, another Polish-speaking LGBTQ+ family with adopted children.

Our overarching methodology is ethnography. As during any ethnographic process, we go “from reflectivity to reflexivity, that is from observation, description, introspection, to making connections between what has been observed in the present case and our knowledge of other cases” (Zhu Hua and Li Wei 2016 : 657–8). This includes reflection on our own positioning as researchers who have worked with transnational multilingual speakers in Britain but, importantly, who are not members of the LGBTQ+ community nor were we raised by LGBTQ+ parents. We also have no direct experience of parenting in a transracial family. We are both cisgender women, with Zhu Hua also being a parent. Kinga, who conducted the ethnographic fieldwork, comes originally from Warsaw and has lived and worked in Brighton. Her networks include close friendships with Polish and international LGBTQ+ community members. Such a positioning stresses the reliance on the emergent themes and connections to observations in other families that we studied rather than researchers’ assumptions.

Our data include field notes, audiovisual recordings of daily family interactions in and outside the home, extensive qualitative interview, photography, published TV and press materials about the family, and our own multimodal informal exchanges with the participants. The materials were analyzed in NVivo and Elan by means of discourse, multimodal, and Moment Analysis (Li Wei 2011). We first analyze the parental discourse on adoption, family life, and FLP. Later, our analysis focuses on linguistic and nonlinguistic aspects of interaction, including bodily movement, use of gestures, and objects examining “what prompted a specific action at a specific moment in time and the consequences of the action” (Zhu Hua and Li Wei 2016) for family life. We employ the Moment Analysis for the interactional data to understand the process of family making. Below, we discuss observed family language practices, history, and networks before presenting the interview and interactional data.

THE FAMILY

Marek and Błażej are a gay couple in their forties, originally from large cities in Central and Central-Western Poland. They had met in Poland. Both moved to other urban areas in Western and Northern Poland before moving to Britain, where Marek had come during his studies. They both settled in Brighton in 2009. Research points to the possible importance of geographies of sexualities (Brown 2012): Brighton is often described as the UK’s LGBTQ+ city where the largest pride festival takes place every summer.

Initially, only Marek knew English. Błażej spoke Polish and some Russian, but learnt English only after two years. The parents arrived after the 2004 EU enlargement, which allowed Polish citizens to legally settle and work in Britain. Today, they hold dual citizenship and are married. One has his own cleaning company, the other runs a hair studio. Both jobs involve contact with English. At the time of our research, they mainly communicated with each other in Polish.

They were introduced to the idea of LGBTQ+ adoption through a Polish speaking gay friend in Brighton. After Błażej improved his English skills by attending a course in a local language school voluntarily in order to ease the process of adoption, the couple successfully qualified for adoption and attended required training which was offered in English. The parents intended to adopt children of Polish descent and eventually were matched with two brothers, Jan and Benjamin, whose biological mother was originally from Poland and whose fathers were of African origin (limited data due to protection laws). The brothers joined the new family at ages 4.5 and 2.5, respectively. Based on the parents’ accounts, the contact with the biological mother ended early, with the older child being in care on and off from the age of one. The boys also had three other siblings born in Poland and Britain, and maintained occasional contact with two of them. At the time of the fieldwork, the boys were eleven and nine years old and have lived with the parents for six years. They predominantly use English to communicate with each other, their parents, and all other interlocutors. Literacy in Polish was not taught, but the brothers have communicative knowledge of Polish, with production limited to single word/phrase utterances. During the fieldwork, they usually did not initiate interactions in Polish, with Jan being least likely to do so. He only once spontaneously called the family dog in Polish. Both brothers were observed to respond to some Polish phrases and commands. The only Polish input the boys had was from their parents and, occasionally, TV. The parents mainly used Polish resources when speaking to Polish contacts. Based on the visual material we watched, when the boys attended a family wedding in Poland, they primarily communicated in English. The boys reportedly relied on some Polish expressions and occasionally nonverbal communication. The family also have relatives from Poland in Brighton with whom the boys speak English.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE FAMILY, NONHETERONORMATIVE MASCULINITY AND ETHNICITY

Below, we examine how the parents explained their FLP. The interview was situated at the end of the fieldwork. It was conducted in Polish, lasted 1 hour and 59 minutes and covered twenty-three questions that we had prepared for all families about family history, migration, language, social networks, ideas about parenting, or self-identification.

The parents talked at length about the adoption process and situated their linguistic practices and language maintenance goals in relation to it. Similarly to previous studies, the adoptive status of the children was used by the parents to explain the role of trauma, potential abuse, and problematic history “to set the adopted child apart from other children with similar language learning experiences” (Fogle 2013 : 90).

First, the parents attributed their children’s preference to speak English to their experiences in care and limited contact with their biological mother. In Excerpt 4.1, Marek referred to the ethnic matching of the parents and children as Polish and the complexity of the relationship between language and their ethnic identification.

Excerpt 4.1.

Marek: tutaj w foster care oni wszyscy po angielsku mówią, to si ę tak ludziom wydaje, o Polacy, nie je żeli dzieci si ę tutaj urodziły i zostały odebrane rodzicom, są przez jakiś czas w foster care, to raczej mówią w języku, który tutaj jest językiem urzędowym

here in foster care they all speak English, some people think that oh they’re Polish, no, if children were born here and taken away from their parents, they spend some time in foster care, then they speak a language that is the official language here

In the quote, the father mixed the reality of the care system in Britain, where foster parents most often speak to children in English, with circulating discourses on ethnic identity which equate it with one language. Hence, he linked his children’s current limited performance in Polish to the reality of the foster care system which rarely provides opportunities for birth language maintenance.

The parents also explained the children’s deficient early linguistic development in Polish in relation to experts’ advice, as they were explicitly instructed not to introduce the language immediately after meeting the children. Consequently, they claimed that they did not have any further explicit discussions of FLP between themselves but planned to gradually introduce Polish. In Excerpt 4.2, Błażej explains how as a result of the experts’ advice, they prioritized the children’s well-being and accommodated to their needs linguistically.

Excerpt 4.2.

Błażej: chodziło o to, żeby dzieciom nie wprowadzać za dużo zmian, bo nagle jak wyskoczę z językiem polskim, a dziecko nigdy nie miało kontaktu, to może być dodatkowy stres dla dziecka

the idea was not to introduce too many changes because if I suddenly start speaking Polish and the child has never had any contact with it, it could be additional stress for them

The children were also reported not to self-identify as Polish and observed to occasionally instruct the parents to speak English during family interactions. During the interview and fieldwork, the parents repeatedly asserted that, at the beginning, Jan had a negative attitude to anything

connected with Poland. Excerpt 4.3 comes from a longer passage in which Błażej listed Polish activities that Jan did not want to do himself 8 after joining the family.

Excerpt 4.3

Błażej: na początku odrzuca 1wszystko co polskie, czy to by 1 o jedzenie, czy mówienie po polsku, nie chciał mieć z Polską nic do czynienia, on jest Brytyjczykiem i koniec

at the beginning he refused to do anything Polish, whether it was food, or speaking Polish, he didn't want to have anything to do with Poland, he was British and that was it

The parents explained that in the initial stages of adoption, they prioritized nonlinguistic forms of communication such as gaze, corporeal cues, and proxemics as instructed by experts to establish rapport and build trust. While corporeal cues were extensively used in caregiver-child interactions, the experts' advice was also incorporated into the design of the physical space, where cushions with family pictures from the foster-care period, material elements from shared travels, and photos were present. The family members also often documented and shared their activities through communication technologies.

However, the parents did not stop speaking Polish to each other and intended for children to speak Polish in the future, with proficiency dependent on the children's wishes. The parents did not actively plan to develop children's literacy in Polish. Importantly, they did not express a wish to send the boys to a Polish Saturday School due to the fact that such schools and other Polish organizations are mocno wsiaknięte w tą Polskość "deeply rooted in this Polishness," with which they did not entirely identify themselves (Excerpt 4.4).

Excerpt 4.4

Błażej: ja się czuję Polakiem

Marek: obywatelem świata

Błażej: źle powiedzia 1 em jestem obywatelem świata

Błażej: I feel Polish

Marek: a citizen of the world

Błażej: I said it wrong I'm a citizen of the world

Excerpt 4.4 also points to the complexity of the men's relationship with Polishness and their positioning as gay men. After Błażej's initial self-identification as Polish with some hesitation, both parents settled on defining themselves as citizens of the world. When describing their experiences of nonheteronormative masculinities in Poland, both acknowledged the presence of divisions within Polish society: compared with more open and tolerant urban areas, in recent years, rural areas in South-Eastern Poland reported hostility toward LGBTQ+ with an increased number of LGBTQ-free zones. The parents claimed that they did not encounter extreme reactions in the urban areas in which they had lived. Overall, they wished Poland well but had not felt accepted there, which they linked to lack of legal recognition and homophobic discourses circulating in parts of Polish society (Excerpt 4.5).

Excerpt 4.5

Błażej: nie masz praw, musisz płacić podatki jak każdy obywatel w Polsce, ale nie masz praw, uważają cię za chorego psychicznie, bo jesteś gejem

you don't have any rights, you have to pay taxes like all other citizens in Poland, but you have no rights, they think you are mentally ill because you're gay

Despite reporting occasional homophobia in Brighton, they enjoyed the legal protection of their family. They also argued that the Polish “mentality” did not allow them to imagine that as gay men, they could have a family and that their decision to have a family has important consequences for their positioning in the world and resulting practices. As the children have no Polish citizenship and as the Polish law does not recognize their family, they do not intend to move to Poland. They travel to Poland only occasionally to visit relatives and friends. Such rationale is presented in Excerpt 4.6.

Excerpt 4.6

Marek: nie chcemy żyć jak obcy ludzie wobec siebie i udawać, że jesteśmy obcy, tak? [...] w Polsce nagle stajemy się dla siebie obcymi osobami według polskiego prawa

we don't want to live like foreign people and pretend that we are foreign, right? [...] in Poland we suddenly become foreign people to one another, according to the Polish law

When taking a negative stance toward “Polish mentality,” the fathers also listed physical attributes such as “being white, having blue eyes and blond hair” as being imagined to be defining features of Poles for some members of Polish society. Błażej also recalled a fierce attack on what he called his own more “Mediterranean” looks when growing up in Poland, which points to awareness of issues surrounding racial difference and dominant discourses on Polish ethnic identity. Strong racialization processes in Poland have been reported to have an impact on self-identification and experiences of Polishness of mixed-race children and individuals (Balogun 2020). Observations from our project also suggest that racial difference might be one of the factors impacting language choice. In contrast to reported lack of awareness of race-related issues among Western LGBTQ+ white parents (Hicks 2011), the family traveled to Africa and talked about race. The parents reported instances of racism in the children’s school and their own post-Brexit-vote experiences of discrimination, which led them to emphasize the importance of coping skills that they intended to pass on to their children through travel and other opportunities. Therefore, when asked about the children’s future (Excerpt 4.7), they listed happiness, respect, and openness and did not confine the children’s future to any particular geographical area, valuing multilingualism as a way to be open.

Excerpt 4.7

Marek: żeby sobie jak najlepiej w życiu poradzili, przede wszystkim żeby byli zdrowi i szczęśliwi [...]

Błażej: pouk ł adani psychicznie [...]

Marek: [...] żeby si ę wzajemnie szanowali, fajnie b ędzie jak b ęd ą na jaki ś stanowiskach, [...] czy to b ędzie Hollywood

Błażej: czy Bollywood

Marek: to do well in life, most of all be healthy and happy[...]

Błażej: mentally healthy[...]

Marek: [...]to respect one another it'll be cool if they have some positions[...] [...]whether it'll be Hollywood

Błażej: or Bollywood

Finally, the parents also explained the presence of English in relation to the changing linguistic landscape of the Polish-speaking diaspora and Poland. Their networks were mixed, including both Polish-speaking and non-Polish-speaking contacts.

BONDING, BODILY AFFECTIVITY AND TRANSLANGUAGING

We now redirect the focus to multimodal and moment analysis of everyday interactions to demonstrate that while the interview centered around “bounded languages” and suggested almost exclusive use of English in the family practices, in everyday interactions, Polish and English resources remained in constant relation to one another jointly building the family life in complex ways. Additionally, when caregivers and children interacted, they did not rely solely on linguistic resources: multilingual bodies were rather assembled by the coming together of various entities—human and nonhuman, semiotic, corporeal, and material—all of which participated in family making.

The use of Polish resources was tightly linked to participation frameworks and functional demands. Apart from addressing each other in Polish during some multiparty conversations, the parents often addressed the children with Polish gender-neutral endearment terms such as *misiu* “little bear” or English names with Polish diminutive endings. They also used short Polish directives and expressions when addressing the brothers. The children did not respond in Polish, but often performed actions without translation to English. The everyday family interactions were situated and centered around particular practical activities, with each family member’s contribution being meaningful only in relation to the whole interactional event and family’s history of repeated actions, narratives, and habitual body routines (Wetherell 2012). We now examine one event from our fieldwork in order to highlight the processes through which events shape FLP and vice versa and how especially in the context of adoption, linguistic cues are employed through embodied participation and cannot be fully understood on their own.

During one field visit, the family took a walk in a local valley (Excerpt 4.8). The transcript focuses on the moment when the family were walking down the slope with the family dog. Benjamin’s sudden fearful refusal to walk prompts a series of actions in which the family engage in the situated reorganization of multimodal, multisensory, and multilingual resources including bodily movement, touch, and speech. The importance of the corporeal cues and their role in shaping family relations comes to the fore when Marek begins his intervention with the iconic gesture of extended arms after noticing that Benjamin is not moving.

Excerpt 4.8

((Marek, Błażej, Jan, Benjamin and Kinga are walking down the slope in a local valley; Marek and Błażej have just talked about the dog in Polish))

1. Jan: it's not so bad \no:w ((looks back towards Benjamin, holding his hand on Marek's arm))
2. Marek: ((looking at the dog addresses Błażej)) no to się nie rozpędza tylko [sobie so it's not going fast but
3. Jan: [I just-
4. Marek: \człapie is lumbering
5. Jan: I just have to learn not to look \back
6. Błażej: ((looking at the dog)) człap człap\człap ((turns his head back towards Benjamin))
lumber, lumber, lumber
7. chodź \B((name))lulku ((turns his head in the direction of walking, walks after the dog)) \chodź come Benjamin come
8. Marek: ((drops Jan's arm, turns his whole body towards Benjamin, stops, faces Benjamin, extends his arms)) /pysio ((waiting with open arms)) endearment term
9. Jan: this is FINE [now
10. Marek: [pi pi pi pi pi pi pi \pi((begins drawing his arms together))
beep beep beep beep beep beep beep beep
11. Benjamin: ((stops moving entirely))
12. Marek: ((stops, his arms stop moving))
13. Błażej: \look everyone is watching \you even doggie is watching \you whatcha gonna \do
14. Benjamin: ((starts walking, puts the bottom of his hoodie onto his head, wind blows))
15. Marek: ((resumes the movement of arms))
16. Benjamin: ((stops again))
17. Marek: the faster you go the warmer it 'is (.) go \faster ((opens his arm again))
18. if you go slow it's \cold ((Jan puts his hand on Marek's arm)) go /faster
19. Jan: ((laughter)) \whatever ((walks towards Benjamin, his hands in his pockets))
20. Benjamin: ((turns back to everybody))
21. Jan: ((inaudible due to wind)) I'll just- ((walks down towards Marek, turns his body back to Benjamin, leans on Marek and walks away towards Błażej))
22. Benjamin: ((turns his head up, takes the hoodie out of his head))
23. Marek: ((extends his arms fully)) one more\chance
24. Benjamin: ((points his hand upwards)) \GOATS ((pointing the finger, smiles at Marek, starts running towards Marek, Benjamin and Marek embrace each other for 3sec, turn towards the path and start

27.		<i>running towards Marek, Benjamin and Marek embrace each other for 3sec, turn</i>
28.		<i>towards the path and start walking with Marek's hand on Benjamin's back; following</i>
29.		<i>short exchange about the clouds between the brothers and Marek in English is omitted))</i>
30.	Benjamin:	<i>((whispers)) °cuddle \cuddle°</i>
31.	Marek:	<i>no chodź cuddlisiu ((leans down towards Benjamin and hugs him)) come on my cuddl-VOC</i>
32.		<i>((starts straightening his body)) cuddly, cuddly ((straightens his body fully))</i>
33.	Benjamin:	<i>((looks around, moves his head)) °cuddle°</i>
34.	Marek:	<i>((hugs Benjamin and kisses his head))</i>

Jan walks between the fathers holding his hand on Marek's arm. The fathers have a short exchange about the dog that Błażej is walking on a lead. They produce a sequence of turns in Polish, both looking ahead. Between the fathers' turns, Jan asserts in English that walking down the slope is not so bad now, as he was afraid of it from the beginning of the walk. At the same time, he briefly looks back toward Benjamin. While the fathers discuss the dog's walking pattern in Polish, Jan inserts his next turn in English, asserting that he cannot look back, again signaling fear. Meanwhile, Benjamin stays approximately 10 m behind others. In turn 6, responding to Marek's assertion about the dog in Polish, while imitating the sounds of the dogs' feet in Polish, Błażej turns his back toward Benjamin and produces a Polish directive *chodź* "come." He completes his turn by means of prosody and embodiment and pronounces Benjamin's name in a diminutive form with a Polish vocative case ending, showing an affective stance toward Benjamin's sudden lack of movement. Simultaneously, Błażej turns his head in the direction of walking uttering one more Polish directive *chodź*, "come." Subsequently, Marek drops Jan's hand, which is still on his arm, turns toward Benjamin, stops and produces an iconic gesture: extends his arms sideways and addresses Benjamin with a Polish endearment term *psyio* (see Figure 4.1).

He establishes eye contact with Benjamin and shows that he is paying attention to the child's problem. While Marek waits for Benjamin, Jan produces his next English turn asserting that walking down is fine now, signaling safety to his brother. In turn 9, Marek produces a series of onomatopoeic syllables used to signal attention in Polish and begins to slowly draw his arms together. As Benjamin hears and sees it, he stops moving. In response, Marek's arms stop moving as well. As a result, Błażej also turns his body toward Benjamin and addresses him in English confirming that everybody is watching him, including the dog. Benjamin puts the back of his hoodie on his head and starts walking toward Marek who is standing with extended arms, without uttering a word. The wind blows strongly and Marek starts drawing his arms again. As Benjamin sees it, he stops moving again. Marek encourages Benjamin to walk toward him in English not to be cold (turn 16). As the interaction unfolds, Jan unsuccessfully intervenes, which results in Benjamin turning his body back toward everybody. Afterwards, as Benjamin begins to turn his body back with the head directed up toward the top of the slope, the father extends his arms again and utters in English one more chance. Benjamin extends his hand upwards, raises his voice for the English GOATS as he looks at the clouds, smiles, and starts running toward Marek (see Figure 4.2).



FIGURE 4.1: Marek with open arms facing Benjamin; Jan waiting on the left-hand side

Benjamin and Marek embrace each other for three seconds, then turn their bodies in the direction of walking and start moving with Marek holding on Benjamin's arm. After a short exchange about the clouds in English, while walking in Marek's embrace, Benjamin whispers an English directive cuddle. Marek leans toward Benjamin, produces a Polish particle *no*, followed by a Polish directive *chod ź* and English stem *cuddl-* combined with a Polish diminutive ending in a vocative case and a series of English *cuddly, cuddly*. After the hug, Benjamin looks around and repeats *cuddle*. Again, Marek and Benjamin interact nonvocally (hugging, kissing) and the walk continues without further tension and fear (see Figure 4.3).

As the interaction unfolded, the multilingual bodies (dis)aligned from one another through active work of multiple parties to the interaction in ways related to the requirements of the activity. Through appropriate facing



FIGURE 4.2: Marek and Benjamin hugging



FIGURE 4.3: Marek, Benjamin and Jan walking down the hill; Marek and Benjamin embracing each other as they walk

formations (Kendon 1990), structures of control organizing family life (Goodwin 2006), and unfolding of utterance sequences, the family members attuned to others and displayed affective stances. Motivated by participation frameworks and function, Polish and English resources wove the activity in dynamic and fluid ways in the context of available resources and past relational histories. Crucially, the family not only built the event through speech but also relied heavily on the role of gesture, gaze, touch, bodily configurations, and objects. The attunement of and intimacy among masculine bodies was also infused with sociocultural and personal history where the importance of gaze, touch, and intimate mixing had been emphasized through expert advice and parental goals to create a welcoming and safe space in the adopted family. The translanguaging perspective helps to demonstrate that the linguistic activity is intrinsically multimodal with embodied participation actively shaping the act of speaking and family life, which in the case of adoption has short-term and long-term important consequences for building relations. The translanguaging practices also enable new forms of transnational fatherhood to emerge and weave the transnational LGBTQ+ family in

dynamic ways, challenging the cause-effect-oriented research paradigms that operate within simple binaries, where bounded languages are either added or lost.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter links the FLP to legal and sociocultural changes in family definitions and arrangements and child adoption in transnational space and examines how a multilingual LGBTQ+ family with adopted children bonds and communicates. It provides an account of complexities and contradictions of the FLP. First, our interview data shows a clear FLP. The dominance of English in caregiver-child interactions was attributed to multiple factors: experts' advice, the perceived need to create "safe and welcoming space" for adopted children, complex ethnic identification and non-heteronormative masculinities, the lack of legal protection in the country of origin, and cosmopolitan values associated with English and multilingualism.

Our moment analysis, however, demonstrates that the use of English and Polish resources in everyday life is far more complex, fluid, and simultaneously present actively contributing to the emergence of a "site of creativity and power" (hooks 1990 : 154) where interactions are always multisensory and multimodal in addition to being multilingual. More precisely, it is through the translanguaging practices that the family achieves bonding. Showing the relational co-occurrence of communicative resources, we hope to highlight the importance of looking at FLP as an outcome of affects between the interacting elements and shifting the analytical focus from distinct codes to processes in which individuals engage to create, deploy, and interpret signs for communication. The tension between articulated ideologies and practices and the contradictions between the desired language choice and everyday practices call for a nuanced analysis and understanding.

Breaking with the taboo relationship between the gay father and a son that has incited fear in Western tradition for far too long, the study argues that the focus on enactment and practice also enables a closer examination of the ways in which non-heteronormative masculine bodies and families achieve intimacy and bonding through embodied sociolinguistic practices, and emerging vulnerabilities and tenderness allow to model new ways to be a father in transnational space. The focus on family as a moving and changing political unit that is collectively accomplished by various types of bodily connections open to be affected and affect other aspects of the physical space, objects, and so on also allows us to better link language practices to the constantly changing "recruitment, assemblage and entanglement of huge social, cultural and material infrastructures" (Haraway 2004). These changes in family definitions and arrangements also point to the embedding of emerging meanings of linguistic choices and language maintenance goals in relation to history of power relations between and within communities in transnational space, as well as politics of adoption, gender, and sexuality.

**APPENDIX 1: AN INVENTORY OF TRANSCRIPT
SYMBOLS; BASED ON JEFFERSON (2004), ATKINS
HERITAGE (1986), GUMPERZ AND BERENZ (1993),
TRANSLATION IN ITALICS**

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
—	Nuclear accent
\	Fall
/	Rise
∨	Fall-Rise
=	No break/gap
(.)	Brief pause
-	Truncated phrase
[Overlap onset
I	Overlap end
((comment))	Transcriber's comments
:	Lengthening of the sound before the colon (the more colons, the longer the lengthening)
WORD	Loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk
°word°	Softer relative to the surrounding talk

NOTES

1 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/850306/Children_looked_after_in_England_2019_Text.pdf.

2 The term BAME does not include Polish and other non-white ethnicities in the UK. No data for the Census category “Other white” can be found.

3 This remains under researched and conflicting results that have been reported with Kirton arguing that children from some “ethnic groups least likely to be adopted spent the shortest average time in care.” <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/thecharacteristic-that-dare-not-speak-its-name-removing-the-ethnicity-clause-in-thechildren-and-families-act-2014/>.

4 https://www.kph.org.pl/publikacje/raport2010_teczowe_rodziny.pdf.

5 http://rodzinywyboru.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Raport_Rodziny-z-wyboruw-Polsce.-Zycie-rodzinne-osob-nieheteroseksualnych.pdf.

6 <https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/gender-ideology-and-the-crisis-of-care-in-poland/?fbclid=IwAR07QpywzFstSwNq0ux5weKsM9GtJNrmBrycX72oEaDDDbhZ85WYIbfnKk>.

7 All names are pseudonyms. Marek and Błażej—parents, Jan—older child, Benjamin— younger child.

8 Polish was present in the early family life as the parents communicated in Polish between themselves.

REFERENCES

- Baden, A. L., and Steward, R. J. (2000), "A Framework for Use with Racially and Culturally Integrated Families: The Cultural-Racial Identity Model as Applied to Transracial Adoption," *Journal of Social Distress & the Homeless*, 9(4): 309–37.
- Balogun, B. (2020), "Race and Racism in Poland: Theorising and Contextualising 'Polish-centrism.'" *Sociological Review*, 68 (6): 1196–211 .
- Barn, R., and Kirton, D. (2012), "Transracial Adoption in Britain: Politics, Ideology and Reality," *Adoption & Fostering* 36 (3/4): 25–37 .
- Biblarz, T., and Savci, E. (2010), "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Families," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72 : 480–97 .
- Bigner, J. (1999), "Raising Our Sons: Gay Men as Fathers," *Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 10 (1): 61–77 .
- Blackman, L. (2008), *The Body: The Key Concepts*, London : Bloomsbury.
- Boyer, C. (2007), "Double Stigma: The Impact of Adoption Issues on Lesbian and Gay Adoptive Parents," in *Handbook of Adoption: Implications for Researchers, Practitioners and Families*, ed. R. Javier, A. Baden, F. Biafora, and A. Camacho-Gingerich, SAGE, accessed online.
- Brown, G. (2012), "Homonormativity: A Metropolitan Concept That Denigrates 'Ordinary' Gay Lives," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59 : 1065–72.
- Bucholtz, M., and Hall, K. (2016), "Embodied Sociolinguistics," in *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*, ed. N. Coupland, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2008), "Language Shift and the Family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (2): 1–34.
- Carlile, A., and Paechter, C. (2018), *LGBTQI Parented Families and Schools: Visibility, Representation, and Pride*, Abingdon : Routledge.
- Costa, B., Dioum, M., and Yorath, S. (2015), "My Languages Matter: The Multilingual Outlook for Children in Care—a White Paper."
- Crespi, L. (2001), "And Baby Makes Three: A Dynamic Look at Development and Conflict in Lesbian Families," *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 4 (3– 4): 7–29.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. (2009), "Visible and Invisible Language Planning: Ideological Factors in the Family Language Policy of Chinese Immigrant Families in Quebec," *Language Policy*, 8 (4): 351–75.
- De Houwer, A. (1990), *The Acquisition of Two Languages: A Case Study*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

- De Zulueta , F.(2006), *From Pain to Violence*, London : Whurt.
- Doyle , C.(2018), “ ‘She’s the Big Dog Who Knows’—Power and the Father’s Role in Minority Language Transmission in Four Transnational Families in Tallinn,” *Philologia Estonica Tallinnensis* 3.
- Duranti , A. , Ochs , E. , and Schieffelin , B.(2011), *The Handbook of Language Socialization*, Wiley , accessed online.
- Eckert, P. (2012), “Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87–100.
- Fogle , L.(2008), “ Home-School Connections for International Adoptees: Repetition in Parent-Child Interactions,” in *Child’s Play? Second Language Acquisition and the Younger Learner*, ed. J.Philp , R. Oliver , and A. Mackey , Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Fogle , L.(2012), *Second Language Socialization and Learner Agency: Adoptive Family Talk*, Clevedon, UK : Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle , L.(2013), “ Parental Ethnotheories and Family Language Policy in Transnational Adoptive Families ,” *Language Policy*, 12 (1): 83–102.
- Fogle , L. , and King , K.(2013), “ Child Agency and Language Policy in Transnational Families ,” *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19 : 1–25.
- Gal , S.(1979), *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*, New York : Academic Press.
- Gal, S. (1998), “Multiplicity and Contestation among Linguistic Ideologies,” in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, ed. K. Woolard and B. Schieffelin, 317–31, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gafaranga , J.(2010), “ Medium Request: Talking Language Shift into Being ,” *Language in Society*, 39 (2): 241–70 .
- Giddens, A. (1992), *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* , Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goodwin , M.(2006), “Participation, Affect and Trajectory in Family Directive/Response Sequences.” Available online: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/goodwin/Goodwin_Participation_Affect_Trajectory.pdf.
- Haraway , D.(2004), *The Haraway Reader*, New York : Routledge.
- Hicks, S. (2011), *Lesbian, Gay and Queer Parenting: Families, Intimacies, Genealogies* , New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Higgins , C. , and Stoker , K.(2011), “ Language Learning as a Site for Belonging: A Narrative Analysis of Korean Adoptee-Returnees ,” *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 14 (4): 399–412 .

hooks , b.(1990), *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge [e-book].
Irvine , J.(1989), “ When Talk Isn’t Cheap: Language and Political Economy ,” *American Ethnologist*, 16 : 248–67.

Janion, M. (2004), “Po_zegnanie z Polskaz. Jeszcze Polska Nie Umarła ...,” *Krytyka Polityczna* 6: 140–51.

Javier, R., Baden, A., Biafora, F., and Camacho-Gingerich, A. (2007), *Handbook of Adoption: Implications for Researchers, Practitioners and Families* , SAGE, accessed online.

Johnston , D. , and Swanson , D.(2003), “ Invisible Mothers: A Content Analysis of Motherhood Ideologies and Myths in Magazines ,” *Sex Roles*, 49 (1/2): 21–33.

Keating , J.(2017), “History of Adoption and Fostering in the United Kingdom,” www.oxfordbibliographies.com .

Kendon , A.(1990), “ Spatial Organization in Social Encounters: The F-formation System,”in *Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Encounters*, ed. A. Kendon , 209–38 , Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

King , K. , and Fogle , L.(2006), “ Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents’ Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism ,” *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 9 (6): 695–712.

King , K. A. , and Logan-Terry , A.(2008), “ Additive Bilingualism through Family Language Policy: Ideologies, Strategies and Interactional Outcomes ,” *Calidoscópico*, 6 (1): 5–19.

Kroskity , P.(2004), “ Language Ideologies ,” in *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. A. Duranti , 496–517 , Malden, MA : Blackwell.

Kulick , D.(1997) *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Lanza , E.([1997] 2004), *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*, Oxford : Oxford University Press .

Li , Wei.(1994), *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*, Clevedon, UK : Multilingual Matters.

Li , Wei.(2011), “ Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain ,” *Journal of pragmatics*, 43 : 1222–35.

Li , Wei.(2018), “ Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language ,” *Applied Linguistics*, 39 : 9–30.

Lynch, J. M., and Murray, K. (2000), “For the Love of the Children: The Coming Out Process for Lesbian and Gay Parents and Stepparents,” *Journal of Homosexuality* , 39(1): 1–24.

Moore , M. R., and Brainer , A.(2013), “ Race and Ethnicity in the Lives of Sexual Minority Parents and Their Children ,” in *LGBT-Parent Families*, ed.A. Goldberg and K. Allen , 133–48 , Los Angeles : University of California Press .

Office for National Statistics (2019), “Sexual Orientation, UK: 2019,” <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2019>.

Okita , T.(2001), *Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice and Childrearing in Intermarried Families*, Amsterdam : John Benjamins.

Podesva , R.(2007), “ Phonation Type as a Stylistic Variable: The Use of Falsetto in Constructing a Persona ,” *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11 (4): 478–504.

Reyes , A. , and Lo , A.(2008), *Beyond Yellow English: The Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*, Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Rosenfeld , M.(2010), “ Nontraditional Families and Childhood Progress through School ,” *Demography*, 47 : 755–75.

Shin , S.(2014), “ Language Learning as Culture Keeping: Family Language Policies of Transnational Adoptive Parents ,” *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8 (3): 189–207 .

Shin , S. J.(2013), “ Transforming Culture and Identity: Transnational Adoptive Families and Heritage Language Learning ,” *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 26 (2): 161–78.

Smith Rotabi , K.(2013), “ Adoption: Intercountry ,” *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, Washington, DC : National Association of Social Workers Press and Oxford University Press(online resource).

Spolsky , B.(2004), *Language Policy*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Swarr , A. , and Nagar , R.(2003), “ Dismantling Assumptions: Interrogating ‘Lesbian’ Struggles for Identity and Survival in India and South Africa ,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 29 : 491–516.

Wetherell , M.(2012), *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*, London : SAGE.

Wright , L.(2020), *Critical Perspectives on Language and Kinship in Multilingual Families*, London : Bloomsbury Academic.

Zhu , Hua(2008), “ Duelling Languages, Duelling Values: Codeswitching in Bilingual Intergenerational Conflict Talk in Diasporic Families ,” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40 : 1799–816 .

Zhu , Hua, and Li , Wei(2016), “ Transnational Experience, Aspiration and Family Language Policy ,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37 : 655–66 .