GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies
Volume x (x) xx

Migrant fathers and non-migrant mothers: Family structures and childhood and adolescent language attitudes in Thailand

ABSTRACT

Attitudes toward language of bi- and multilingual children and adolescents have not yet become a focus of research. Despite rapid growth in the number of bi- and multilingual children and adolescents across the globe, surprisingly few studies have been devoted to this significant phenomenon. Bi- and multilingualism is a major consequence of immigration and cross-cultural marriages. Regardless of whether cross-cultural marriage is involved, the immigration of families has considerable linguistic consequences for children and adolescents. This paper draws on multiple case studies in examining the complex factors determining the attitudinal patterns evinced by bi- and multilingual children and adolescents from immigrant families in Thailand. Five households agreed to participate in this research endeavor and data were also collected from surveys, interviews, observations and field notes acquired through the employment of ethnographic investigative methods. The data collected were analyzed by means of the constant comparative method and content analysis. Findings showed consistent patterns for those bi- and multilingual children and adolescents whose Thai-speaking mother had been linguistically dominant in a family with an immigrant father speaking a minority language. The result is that these children are more likely to perceive Thai as more highly regarded. It was also found that Thai was not as highly regarded by the children of parents if both were minority-language speaking immigrants. It is concluded that the family structure of immigrant families is associated with the language attitudes of their children. By the same token, the type of marriage of immigrant families has long-reaching effects on the development of childhood and adolescent language attitudes. Moreover, data shows that a non-migrant mother's dominant language played a more influential role in contrast to the minimal role played by the father's minority language in the development of childhood and adolescent language attitudes.

Keywords: bilingual; children; cross-cultural marriage; language attitude; Thailand

INTRODUCTION

We find few studies focusing on the attitudes towards languages shown by bi- and multilingual children and adolescents (henceforward BCA). Such is the case of Thailand in particular, where only a handful of previous studies paid significant attention to language attitudes (hereafter LAS) of young adults who were students at Thai universities. (Saengboon, 2015; Sisamouth and Lah, 2015; Snodin and Young, 2015; Ploywattanawong and Trakulkasemsuk, 2014). However, in these papers, LAS of BCA from immigrant families have still remained under-researched. Moreover, most of the existing studies of BCA primarily focused on one-parent-one-language families and the interactional strategies minority language-speaking parents adopt in dealing with their children. These strategies have significant consequences for the proficiency level of the minority language spoken by a bilingual child (Qiu and Winsler, 2017; Takeuchi, 2006; Venables et al., 2014). Still, in these studies, LAS of BCA remain relatively unexplored. For an overview of relevant research, see the literature review section below.

This aim of this study is to shed light on five specific immigrant families in Thailand through exploring the attitudinal patterns of BCA in these families. It was found that there are differences between the families in view of the two types of family structures shown by the

families, viz., those which are cross-cultural marriages (henceforth CCM) and those which are not. Thorough the employment of factor analysis, some underlying reasons for these attitudes were additionally revealed.

BACKGROUND: THE CURRENT LANGUAGE SITUATION IN THAILAND

Thailand is ethnically a melting pot and linguistically a diverse country with an estimated 74 spoken languages (Ethnologue, 2005). In their respective regions, Northern Thai (Lanna or Kam Meuang), Northeastern Thai (Isaan or Lao), Central Thai (Standard Thai) and Southern Thai (Pak Tai) play key roles as regional vernacular languages used in daily communication (Smalley, 1994). The linguistic situation in the southernmost border provinces and that of the numerous hill tribes in the north are essential (There are two distinctive Malay languages in the south used by Muslims, the many Khmer speakers, even in Isaan there are major dialect differences, the many speakers of different Mynamrese languages, the many speakers of Vietnamese, the large number of ethnic languages spoken in the north, etc). Despite the wide linguistic range in Thailand, the Thai government has stipulated that Central Thai shall be the national standard and the only official language used in public domains (notably, government and education). This policy is justified on the grounds that it strengthens national unity. Influenced by the one nation-one language ideology (monoglossic ideology), Standard Thai, the *lingua franca* of Thais with different L1 backgrounds, is thus the most prestigious language. However, ethnic minority languages (e.g., in Isaan) with millions of speakers are not recognized across various public domains (Draper, 2010).

Moreover, globalization has heightened interest in English on the part of those engaged in business, commerce, education, tourism, trade, medicine, scientific research, and journalism among other domains (Lee, 2015). English is taught as a compulsory first foreign language, as stipulated by the Ministry of Education's curriculum for public schools (Draper, 2012). Further, as China, Japan and South Korea deepen economic ties with Thailand, regionally hegemonic languages—Chinese, Japanese and Korean—have become increasingly popular. This is indicated by the fact that the teaching and study of the Chinese (Mandarin) language has been recently skyrocketing (Lee, 2015).

BACKGROUND: THAILAND'S IMMIGRANT COMMUNITY IN THE MAKING OF BI-MULTILINGUAL CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

In broad terms, a cross-cultural marriage (CCM), otherwise known as a transnational marriage, an interracial marriage (Interracial Marriage, n.d.) and a mixed marriage (InterNations, n.d.), refers to marriages of couples from two different countries. However, in the context of Thailand, there are marriages, for instance, between Thai Muslims of Malay descent and Thai Buddhists, or between animistic hill tribe women and Buddhist Lana men in northern Thailand. In recent decades, CCMs and subsequently BCA in immigrant families have increased dramatically.

With a growing economy, Thailand has recently been recognized as a 'migration hub' (Huguet and Chamratrithirong, 2011) and the Thailand immigrant community (consisting of 4.5 million international immigrants) has become the eighth largest in the world (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2016). However, the Thailand immigrant community is regarded as a minority community, partly because it forms 6.62 % or less than ten percent of the total population of 68 million (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2015). International immigrants in Thailand have generally displayed a great diversity in country of origin. Most are from the neighboring countries of Myanmar, Laos PDR, and Cambodia, while many are

from Bangladesh, Philippines and further afield. In spite of the importance of these migration trends and patterns, available data and statistics on transnational families, CCM and BCA are largely incomplete.

Estimated at 2.2 million (Thailand Population 2017, n.d.), the Thai immigrant community has exhibited qualities conducive to the fostering of BCA development. It was partly because BCA from immigrant families—i.e., a father who is a migrant with a mother who is a non-migrant or a mother migrant with a father non-migrant or both parents migrants—were more likely to have either one or both parents speak a minority language in Thailand serving as a majority-language dominant host country.

In any event, in this study, the focus primarily falls on Thailand's BCA from the following five major immigrant subgroups: With approximately 15,000 members (Thailand Population 2017, n.d.), the Taiwanese community is regarded as the largest East Asian immigrant community. Comprising a significant number of 5,000 members (Thailand Population 2017, n.d.), the Filipino community is viewed as the largest Southeast Asian immigrant community. Even though there are no current statistics, the Bangladeshi community is estimated to be the largest immigrant community from South Asia, while the Nigerian community–out of 35,000 Africans currently residing in Bangkok—is taken to be the largest African immigrant community.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF BI- AND MULTILINGUAL CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

Attitudes towards languages are regarded as a complex phenomenon. As such, the macro-concept of language attitudes (LAS) is viewed as a vast field in and of itself. The study of LAS has long been a central concern in social psychology, sociolinguistics and related fields (see Edwards, 1999, for a 'bridging' of the study of LAS in social psychology and sociolinguistics). In this paper, the author follows the definition of Garrett (2010), who offers an important insight into the essence of attitudes: "an attitude is an evaluative orientation to a social object of some sort, whether it is a language, or a new government policy, etc." Similarly, this paper concurs with the contention of Myers-Scotton (2011) that "our views about language are scenarios we carry around in our minds that create attitudes towards speakers and the social communities to which they belong" (as cited in Mirshahidi, 2017, 146). LAS research has shown that our views towards any aspect of a language reflect our attitudes towards speakers and users of that language. By the same token, our LAS are tantamount to language-based social evaluations, as well as explicit preferences and judgments of a language and its speakers and users.

In addition, there has been a growing awareness of the importance of adult attitudes towards languages, since adult LAS shape their interactions with those who have different language backgrounds. These LAS experiences are even believed to have long term consequences in respect to decision-making in planning and implementing language and educational policies (Lewis, 1981). Attitudes toward language have also played a crucial role in efforts to maintain, alter, and revitalize endangered and minority languages (Fishman, 1980). Research in LAS in adulthood has shown multiple factors (variables) accounting for varied LAS, including age, gender, geopolitics, socioeconomic status et cetera (Baker, 1992; Dörnyei and Kata, 2002 *inter al.*).

It is scarcely surprising that LAS has not become a major topic of research and public debate in Thailand and elsewhere. The cursory research so far conducted has shown that Thailand-based LAS theorists have been interested in the attitudes of young adults and adults,

who were university students, towards varieties of English. It was found that they harbored little or no interest in non-English languages. Insofar as concerns Thai scholars, it was also found that they viewed idiolects, dialects, and native accents as grounded in ethnicity, country of origin, and group identity, especially socio-economic class and social status (Kinzler, Shutts and Spelke, 2012). For instance, Ploywattanawong and Trakulkasemsuk (2014) investigated Thai university students' attitudes—as measured by acceptance and understandability—toward ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) English usage (e.g., Malaysian English and Singapore English or 'Singlish'). They found that Thai graduate students were 'flexible' and 'adaptive' (p. 142) toward 'non-native features' of ASEAN English (p. 154). Likewise, Saengboon (2015) surveyed Thai university students' attitudes toward varieties of English, otherwise known as World Englishes—i.e., international standard varieties of English spoken in the USA, UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, as well as Thai-accented English. It was revealed that the students preferred American and British English as international Standard English varieties, while denigrating Thai-accented English as undesirable. Snodin and Young (2015) investigated Thai university students' and Thai adults' attitudes towards a model or a target variety of English. Their results suggested that American English was the most preferred, although British English was viewed as another learning model. Australian English was not perceived as a native-speaker model as it was viewed negatively by Thai university students. In another study, Sisamouth and Lah (2015) examined LAS of university students in southernmost Thailand. Their findings revealed that Thai undergraduate students had positive attitudes towards Thai, Patani Malay and English. On the basis of these studies, it can be inferred that Thai young adults and adults, who are university students, generally view American English and British English as socially positive. However, in current LAS literature in Thailand, attitudes towards not only varieties of English but also non-English languages as expressed by children and adolescents is relatively under-researched. While attention has been given to Thai adults' and young adults' attitudes towards languages, the same attention has not been paid to pre-school children's and adolescents' attitudes towards languages in Thailand.

Furthermore, beyond Thailand, we find a general lack of research on attitudes of younger children and BCA towards their languages. It is in spite of a significant number of previous studies on child language acquisition and learning (e.g., see Woan and Tat, 2017). Rosenthal (1974) argued that the majority of previous studies focused on attitudes of adults and older children towards their languages. This implies that there was little discussion concerning younger children and adolescents. Another line of research has focused on parental attitudes towards their children's languages (e.g., see Zhang, 2010), without surveying language-related attitudinal patterns expressed by children themselves. Yet there was a different body of research, conducted almost exclusively by psychologists, on monolingual and bilingual children's social and friendship preferences for different types of monolingual or bilingual speakers (e.g., Kinzler *et al.*, 2012; Byers-Heinlein *et al.*, 2016). Approached from the developmental perspective, this body of psychological research on monolingual and bilingual children's social and friendship preferences generally showed little concern for children's and adolescents' LAS as shown in evaluative comments towards languages and speakers of languages. The dearth of literature in this area was partly because of the widely accepted belief of a number of sociolinguists that 'children do not become aware of dialect differences until about the time of the onset of puberty' (Rosenthal, 1974, 55). In contrast, a large number of past research investigations focused on the need to support the development of minority languages as spoken by bilingual children through the so-called One-Parent-One-Language approach (e.g., see Pena, 2016; and for a review, see Logan-Terry, 2008; and De Houwer, 2009), even though there was little or no discussion of

bilingual children's LAS towards their languages. However, it should be acknowledged that children developed what Rosenthal (1973) termed 'social awareness of language differences' between the ages of three and six when children expressed their preferences for language varieties and social dialects (Kinzler *et al.* 2012). Despite the paucity of studies, recent research in children's LAS has provided a long list of factors that influence children's LAS. These factors include parents, siblings, families, teachers, peers, classrooms, schools, playgrounds and communities, political and sociocultural changes, school instructions, familiarity with the languages, status of the languages in the children's circle of friends, foreign or host country of birth, the number of years spent in the host country, second language support in the host country, the trend of English as the world language, and so forth (Dörnyei and Csizer, 2002; Kinzler *et al.*, 2012; Oliver and Purdie, 1998).

In particular, one avenue of past research on childhood bilingualism partially focused on cross-cultural marriage (CCM) where there was a dominant language-speaking parent and a minority language-speaking parent with their offspring becoming bilingual (Qiu and Winsler, 2017; Takeuchi, 2006; Venables *et al.*, 2014). In some cases, both parents were minority language speakers from the same language background, but not in a CCM but in a L2 dominant environment. Nevertheless, there are few studies of such families which are not CCM.

Taken together, the aforementioned body of research has not yet fully addressed LAS of BCA towards their languages and how their attitudinal patterns emerged in the context of belonging to immigrant families. Given these gaps in the current literature, this study explores the following questions. (1) How do family structures (whether or not involving CCM) influence LAS of BCA? (2) What factors lead to varied LAS evinced by BCA? (3) What are the implications for BCA and LAS research in respect to BCA?

METHOD

This paper investigates the complex interrelationships between the family structures of immigrant families whether CCM or non-CCM and BCA's LAS. The data were derived from a multiple-case and multiple-year study. A focus on routine interactions in the daily lives of five families in Thailand provides insight into the complex nature of the LAS of BCA.

MULTI-SITED APPROACH: SAMPLE AND PARTICIPANTS

With the development of globalization, regionalization and other macro-trends (Lee, 2015), immigrant families—whether or not involved in CCM—have increasingly become common in Thailand. Bangkok Metropolis, Thailand's capital, has the world's fastest growing number of BCA youth. A multiple-case study was carried out on five focal families in Bangkok. These families under study were acquaintances of the author. Children and adolescents were selected through the author's personal network, partly because it was claimed they were raised bilingually from birth, i.e., they are categorized under the rubric of 'bilingual first-language acquisition' (De Houwer, 2009) children. In order to limit variability, all children and adolescents who participated in the current study were born in Thailand, thereby excluding foreign-born BCA participants, and were between the ages of four and 17 (mean age = eight years, median = 10 years) during the time periods at which data were collected.

STUDY 1: FAMILY A

The married couple in family A is in a CCM. Family A consists of a Chinese (Mandarin) speaking father originally from Taiwan, a Thai-speaking mother from Thailand and their Thailand-born five-year-old daughter, Chimlin (pseudonym), who was surveyed and interviewed from the age of two to the age of five. Responses to a questionnaire were recorded and interviews were conducted by Chimlin's mother with the assistance of the author.

STUDY 2: FAMILY B

The married couple in family B is not in a CCM. Family B is made up of a Filipino Tagalog-speaking father and a Filipino Tagalog-speaking mother from the Philippines and their three children, all of whom were born in Thailand. The oldest and the youngest children did not participate in the survey, but their data were reported by their mother through interviews and were observed by the author during researcher-family interactions. The questionnaire completed by their middle daughter, now a 13-year-old adolescent, Jasmine, in 2016, when she participated in this study. She had interacted with and had been observed by the author from the age of 11 to the age of 13.

STUDY 3: FAMILY C

The married couple in family C is not in a CCM. Family C includes a Bangla- or Bengali-speaking father and a Bangla- or Bengali-speaking mother from Bangladesh and their two Thailand-born children. Their younger child, a 1.5-year-old boy, was too young to participate in the questionnaire survey in 2016-2017. However, the questionnaire was completed by the mother in 2016-2017 to report about her older child, a four-year-old boy, Sumon (pseudonym). He also participated in this study from the age of one to the age of four, partly because he interacted with the author and was under observation by the author in the same neighborhood for four years. It should be recognized that the mother reported attitudinal data towards the languages of her older son during interviews with the author.

STUDY 4: FAMILY D

The married couple in family D is in a CCM. Family D consists of a Bangla- or Bengali-speaking father from Bangladesh and a Thai-speaking mother from Thailand and their two children. Their younger child, a 1.5-year-old girl, was too young to take part in the questionnaire survey in 2016-2017. Their oldest child, Barsha (pseudonym), a five-year-old girl, was a participant of the study from the age of one to the age of five. The questionnaire was filled out by Barsha's mother in 2017. It should be acknowledged that the mother reported her two daughters' attitudinal data towards languages during interviews with the author. Data collected by the author was also based on observation, especially because the family lived in the same community with the author for five years.

STUDY 5: FAMILY E

The marriage of family E is not a CCM. Family E, at the present time, consists of a Nigerian-accented English-speaking mother and three Thailand-born children. Only her middle son, a 17-year-old boy, Emmanuel (pseudonym), provided answers in the 2016 questionnaire survey, while his mother reported his data (during formal interviews and informal chats) from the age of 15 to the age of 17. Using interview methods, the mother reported attitudinal data

towards languages of her three children, highlighting the experiences of Emmanuel. Data collection was also conducted on the bus and at the workplace, especially since the author shared rides on the bus and worked in the same organization with the mother for five years.

DATA COLLECTION, INSTRUMENT AND ANALYSIS

In examining the LAS of BCA, the author took into consideration languages to which the subjects of investigation were exposed: Bengali, Chinese (Mandarin), International Standard Varieties of English (principally American English and British English) referred to as English, Nigerian-accented English, Tagalog and Thai. These languages were chosen in view of the fact that they had a strong presence in the daily interactions of the five focal families under study. In selecting these languages, it was assumed that potentially significant comparison and contrast results would be generated in respect to BCA attitudes, which in themselves were indicative of the dominating influences of ethnic group affiliation and the effort to achieve greater economic power.

The same guidelines and questions were used for questionnaire surveys and field interviewing. Data for this multiple-case study were gathered by semi-structured interviews: researcher-to-parent or face-to-face interviews, follow-up parent interviews, parents' self-reported responses to a 96-item questionnaire survey, direct assessments and field-notes from naturalistic (e.g., parent-child interactions and sibling-peer interactions) observations by the author. The survey and the interview questions were developed from comparable questionnaires and interviews employed in previous studies (e.g., Draper, 2012; Lai *et al*., 2015; Snodin and Young, 2015). They consisted of demographic information (section I) and open-ended language attitude questions (section II). More specifically, the questionnaire and the interviews asked parents to elicit answers from their children in regards to their attitudes towards international standard varieties of English (i.e., American English or British English) and languages spoken by minority language-speaking parents in addition to perceptions towards regionally hegemonic languages (i.e., Chinese, Japanese and Korean) and the dominant language—the official state language (i.e., Standard Thai). Family visits, field interviews and researcher-family interactions and observations occurred before and after conducting the survey phase of investigation.

During the initial phase of data analysis, data were analyzed by the adoption of the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), open coding and the content analysis convention for categorizing large themes in multiple data. During the second phase of data analysis, the author inferred the presence of specific attitudinal patterns derived from large themes after triangulation with in-depth analyses of survey responses, transcribed interviews, interactions and field notes.

The complex interplay between LAS and types of immigrant family structures (those in and those not in CCM) were classified into three broad patterns as main attitudinal findings (see Table 1), which can in turn be divided into six sub-patterns (see Table 2). Further intriguing patterns (as combinations of sub-patterns) can be obtained if a comparative analysis is conducted across the two subgroups (i.e., families with parents who are not in CCM and those that are).

RESULTS

HOW DO FAMILY STRUCTURES (PARENTS IN OR NOT IN CROSS-CULTURAL MARRIAGES) INFLUENCE THE EXTENT OF LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF BI-/MULTILINGUAL CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS?

The results revealed the unintended consequences of immigrant family structures (i.e., non-CCM and CCM) that largely accounted for the LAS of BCA. Table 1 summarized overall patterns as categorized by non-CCM and CCM, the dominant language, the minority language and English.

Three broad patterns can be observed. First of all, a potentially important but unanticipated result was that the relative exposure to the dominant and the non-dominant language (i.e., language use frequency) was not predictive of LAS (the broad pattern 1). For those BCA in families in which parents were non-CCM more often displayed use of the minority language—thereby being most exposed to the minority language—as compared with those with CCM parents. However, the relative exposure of BCA to first and second languages (as reflected in the frequency of use of each language) may not adequately account for variances in their LAS.

In addition, an unexpected but presumably crucial result emerged (as the broad pattern 2) when a set of analyses was conducted to compare the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English. English was more positively regarded than Thai in families in which parents were in non-CCM in comparison to those in CCM, whereas Thai was more positively regarded than English in these families in which the parents were in CCM as compared with those who were not in CCM.

Finally, the minority language as spoken by migrant parents in contrast to non-migrant parents was less positively regarded across these two types of families.

TABLE 1. Broad patterns (combinations of sub-patterns) of language attitudes across families in and not in cross-cultural marriages

	Children and adolescents in immigrant families
Broad patterns of language attitudes	*Pattern 1.* The relative exposure to the dominant and the non-dominant language (i.e., language use frequency) was not predictive of LAS. *Pattern 2.* English was more positively regarded than the dominant language (i.e., Thai) in families in which parents were in non-CCM than those in CCM, whereas the dominant language (i.e., Thai) was more positively regarded than English in families where parents in CCM as compared with those who were not in CCM. (A non-migrant mother's dominant language played a more influential role than a migrant father's minority language in the development of LAS of BCA.) *Pattern 3.* The minority language (spoken by migrant parents as opposed to non-migrant parents) was less positively regarded across these two types of families.

Three straightforward sub-patterns were found in regard to families with parents in non-CCM. Despite a minority language being reported as being most frequently used reported using the most often (with the most exposure to the minority language), BCA with parents in non-interracial marriages (i.e., both parents were minority language-speaking migrants) expressed that the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English were more positively regarded than the minority language. Furthermore, they exhibited that English was more positively regarded than the dominant language (i.e., Thai).

In addition, another three sub-patterns were consistent from families with parents in CCM. While the dominant language (i.e., Thai) was reported using the most frequent,

positive attitudes were held towards both the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English. Another attitudinal difference was also observed. They displayed that the dominant language (i.e., Thai) was more positively regarded than English. Moreover, the minority language was less positively regarded.

TABLE 2. Sub-patterns of language attitudes of bi-/multilingual children and adolescents

	Father Migrant – Minority Language Speaking Parent	**Father Non-Migrant - Dominant Language Speaking Parent**
Mother Migrant - Minority Language Speaking Parent	Parents in a Non-cross-cultural Marriage *Sub-pattern 1.*Although the minority language used the most frequent, it was less positively regarded. *Sub-pattern 2.*English was more positively regarded than the dominant language. *Sub-pattern 3.*The dominant language and English were more positively regarded than the minority language.	Parents in a Cross-cultural Marriage (No available data from the present study)
Mother Non-Migrant - Dominant Language Speaking Parent	Parents in a Cross-cultural Marriage *Sub-pattern 4.*The dominant language used the most frequent, partly leading to more positive attitudes towards it. *Sub-pattern 5.*The dominant language was more positively regarded than English. *Sub-pattern 6.*The minority language was less positively regarded.	Parents in a Non-cross-cultural Marriage (No available data from the present study)

Accordingly, the one exception was found in study 5. Data derived from Emmanuel, a 17-year-old adolescent from family E, was difficult to analyze partly because he showed that he most liked the dominant language (Thai) even though he perceived the dominant language (i.e., Thai) as the least useful.

HOW FACTORS LEADING TO VARIED LANGUAGE ATTITUDES EMERGED FROM BI-/MULTILINGUAL CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS?

There were several possible interpretations of these results, as well as a number of factors affecting LAS of BCA towards their first and second languages. The broad patterns (Table 1) and sub-patterns (Table 2) can be explained in the following fashion.

FAMILY STRUCTURES: GENDER ROLES OF PARENTS (EXPLANATIONS FOR THE BROAD PATTERN 1)

To further explicate the results of the broad pattern 1, a combination of sub-pattern 1 and 4 (i.e., relative exposure to the dominant versus non-dominant language was not predictive of LAS), the author more closely analyzed the data across study 1-5. When asked which language was most frequently used, it was not surprising that BCA with parents in a non-CCM (i.e., where both were minority language-speaking migrants) spoke the minority language (i.e., their parents' first language) more frequently obviously concomitant with greater exposure than those with parents in a CCM. When examining the interplay between language use frequency and LAS, data revealed that the more positive attitudes were held towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English than the minority language for families in which both parents were migrants in a non-CCM. This was the case in spite of the

fact that the minority language was reported to being used most frequently in families in which both parents were migrant parents (non-CCM) in stark contrast to families with one migrant parent and one non-migrant parent (CCM).

Study 1 attributed the higher use frequency of the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and the more positive attitudes towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) than the minority language (i.e., Chinese) due to the roles of parents for Chimlin, a five-year-old Chinese-Thai bilingual girl. In family A, Chimlin's dominant language-speaking Thai mother has been largely responsible for taking caring of her with minimal assistance from her minority language-speaking migrant father, a Chinese speaker originally from Taiwan (Chimlin's father was preoccupied by heavy duties at his workplace). A fairly similar child-care arrangement can also be observed in family D in which the dominant language-speaking (i.e., Thai) mother has been the main caregiver for two daughters including Barsha, partly because the minority language-speaking (i.e., Bengali) migrant father has been absent from daily family routines.

Studies 2, 3 and 5 demonstrated that BCA spoke their respective minority languages more frequently than the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English in the absence of any dominant language-speaking parents, partly because both minority language-speaking parents are migrants from the Philippines in family B, Bangladeshi in family C and Nigeria in family E, respectively. For instance, Jasmine, a female English-Thai-Tagalog multilingual adolescent from family B (both parents are migrants from the Philippines), reported that she most frequently spoke Tagalog. A similar pattern was observed in study 3. Sumon, a four-year-old Bengal-English-Thai multilingual boy from family C (both parents are migrants from Bangladesh), reported that he most frequently spoke Bengali. Even though they reported using their respective minority languages most frequently, thereby incurring greater exposure, Jasmine and Sumon still exhibited more positive attitudes towards English than Tagalog and Bengali, respectively.

Let us turn to Emmanuel, a 17-year-old male adolescent, for an analysis of the broad pattern in 1. Unlike Jasmine and Sumon who reported speaking the minority language most frequently, Emmanuel reported using American English more frequently than the minority language (i.e., Nigerian-accented English) and the dominant language (i.e., Thai), despite the fact that both of his parents were minority language (i.e., Nigerian-accented English)-speaking migrants from Nigeria. Further, Emmanuel reported that Thai was the language he liked the most in comparison to American English, the language he most frequently used. It has thus become apparent that Nigerian-accented English was less positively regarded.

The overall picture, nonetheless, was that these BCA (across family B, C and E) held more positive attitudes towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English than the minority language (namely, Tagalog, Bengali, and Nigerian-accented English, respectively). Not surprisingly, Jasmine more positively regarded English, since it was the language she liked the most and thought most useful in comparison to Tagalog, Thai, Chinese (Mandarin), Japanese and Korean. Since Sumon thought English more useful, he exhibited more positive attitudes towards English in invidious comparison to Bengali, Thai, Chinese (Mandarin), Japanese and Korean.

This suggested that LAS of BCA were more complex and nuanced than expected. On the one hand, BCA did not merely hold more positive attitudes towards the language to which they were most exposed and used most frequently. On the other hand, BCA did not simply view less-frequently used languages less positively. One interpretation of this result was that some significant sociocultural variables (e.g., the status of the dominant vis-à-vis the non-dominant language) largely affected LAS rather than the highest degree of exposure and the most frequently used language.

SOCIAL ISOLATION AND INTRA-ETHNIC NETWORK

This consistent pattern can be partially explained by the relative social isolation of immigrant families with both parents as minority language-speaking migrants (non-CCM). Jasmine from family B reported most frequently speaking Tagalog with her immediate family (both parents are minority language-speaking migrants) and members of the Filipino community rather than other languages. Due to dense intra-ethnic networks, Sumon from family C showed that he most frequently spoke Bengali with his Bangladeshi family (both parents are minority language-speaking migrants), relatives and family friends in the Bangladeshi community in lieu of other languages. However, a different pattern was observed in study 5. Emmanuel from family E said that he spoke Nigerian-accented English less frequently than English and Thai with his Nigerian family (Emmanuel's mother speaks Nigerian-accented English to him), family friends from his mother's workplace, church members (family E attended a Nigerian church). In contrast, CCM families (A and D) with one dominant-speaking parent (i.e., Thai-speaking non-migrant mothers) from the mainstream Thai society had children who spoke the dominant language (i.e., Thai) more frequently than any other language.

FAMILY STRUCTURES: GENDER ROLES OF PARENTS (EXPLANATIONS FOR BROAD PATTERN 2 AND 3)

In this case, sociological factors are explanatory of the broad pattern 2, a combination of sub-patterns 2 and 5 (i.e., English was more positively regarded than the dominant language in families in which parents were in non-CCM than those in CCM, where the dominant language was more positively regarded than English.

BCA differed in their attitudes towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English. Chimlin, a five-year-old girl, from family A, and Barsha, a five-year-old girl from family D, reported the dominant language (i.e., Thai) as the most useful (more useful than English), whereas Jasmine, a 13-year-old female adolescent from family B, and Sumon, a four-year-old boy from family C, claimed English to be the most useful language. To justify this claim, studies 1-5 attributed the varied attitudes towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) and English to family structures and traditional gender roles, particularly in regards to the mother's role (across CCM or non-CCM families). Both Chimlin from family A and Barsha from family D (in which a dominant language-speaking non-migrant mother married a minority-speaking migrant father in a CCM) exhibited more positive attitudes towards the dominant language (i.e., Thai) rather than English. In contrast, Jasmine from family B and Sumon from family C (where both minority language-speaking parents are migrants) expressed more positive attitudes towards English than their counterparts from families A and D. In general, the mother is the care giver in studies 1-5 (families A-D).

ETHNIC MAJORITY GROUPS VERSUS ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS

An alternative explanation emerged when considering the ethnic and cultural groups to which these BCA belonged. It has become even more apparent that a dominant language (i.e., Thai)-speaking mother accounted largely for Chimlin (family A) and Barsha (family D) to consider themselves as members of the mainstream Thai group (as native Thais), even while in the presence of a minority language-speaking father. In contrast, the apparent lack of a dominant language-speaking parent largely accounted for Jasmine (family B), Sumon (family C) and Emmanuel (family E) to consider themselves as outsiders in the host country as Filipino, Bengali and Nigerian, respectively, in the presence of both migrant parents from Philippines,

Bangladeshi and Nigeria. Perhaps another possible explanation was the clear evidence derived from data that Jasmine, Sumon and Emmanuel turned to English for a sense of security in the absence of a dominant language-speaking parent. Yet, it became apparent that CCM—see the cases of families A and D, respectively and jointly, where one minority language-speaking migrant father married to a non-migrant majority language-speaking mother—played a key role in influencing the extent to which the dominant language (i.e., Thai) was more highly regarded than English. However, the status of non-CCM in which both parents are minority language-speaking migrants affected the extent to which English was more higher regarded than the dominant language (i.e., Thai) by their children.

Nonetheless, family structures in relation to traditional gender roles in immigrant families cannot alone adequately account for LAS. Some complementary interpretations of the results involve the effects of the medium of instruction in formal language training.

EFFECTS OF MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION AT SCHOOLS

In addition to family structures, considerable attention has been paid to taking cognizance of and analyzing the school experiences of BCA. As active learners of English in formal school settings, Jasmine, Sumon and Emmanuel are enrolled in predominantly English-medium international schools, largely due to the fact that they are foreigners with both migrant parents and are not allowed to enroll in Thai public schools) displayed higher positive attitudes towards English than those who were non-active learners of English (i.e., Chimlin is enrolled in a predominantly Thai-medium school while Barsha is enrolled in a Thai-English bilingual school, because they are Thai citizens with non-migrant Thai mothers and migrant non-Thai fathers). The medium of instruction in formal schooling settings has been a powerful force that did more than merely language use (communication) in the classroom setting, since it has shaped the experiences of BCA with English and Thai both inside and outside of the classroom. Those who were educated in English (i.e., Jasmine, Sumon and Emmanuel) were more likely to hold positive attitudes towards English outside the classroom than those who were educated in Thai or Thai-English (i.e., Chimlin and Barsha). In order to further build an alternative perspective and to develop an argument concerning the effects of the medium of formal language instruction, let us turn to family A for some clues. Despite the fact that Chimlin's migrant Chinese-speaking father communicated with her non-migrant Thai-speaking mother in English, study 1 demonstrated that she displayed little understanding of English. Her Thai-medium schooling experiences in conjunction with her majority language-speaking (non-migrant) Thai mother were more pertinent to Chimlin's situation and for the present analysis.

Furthermore, considerable attention has been paid to identifying and examining factors that contribute to relatively negative LSA towards the minority language used by BCA. As a complement to the above-mentioned factors such as the gender roles of parents, the present study attributes the less positive attitudes towards a migrant father's minority language to the development of BCA social relationships.

EFFECTS OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS (EXPLANATIONS FOR THE BROAD PATTERN 3)

Studies 1 and 4 revealed that there has been a tendency for relatively less positive attitudes towards the minority language to be associated with BCA with a minority language-speaking father and a dominant language-speaking mother rather than by not having a dominant language-speaking mother. An important consideration is that the presence of a minority language-speaking migrant father in a family may not result in more positive attitudes towards the minority language by his child or children.

The present study attributes this complex phenomenon to the development of social relationships (as explanations for the broad pattern 3, a combination of sub-patterns 3 and 6) of BCA. Consider the participant Chimlin (family A) in study 1, for example. It has become apparent that the benefits of developing personal social relationships (i.e., the teacher-child relationship and peer relationships during the first two years of school) were based on Chimlin's Thai speaking ability rather than being based on her father's minority language. By the same token, the dominant language (i.e., Thai) enabled her to participate socially both inside and outside the classroom by virtue of her familial affiliation. She, nonetheless, claimed that Chinese (Mandarin) was not useful, partly because she only communicated in Chinese (Mandarin) with her minority language-speaking migrant father. Something similar occurred in regards to Barsha (family D). In contrast, there was a general lack of social support, participation and affiliation with Thai communities on the part of Sumon (family C) and Emmanuel (family E), both of whom having non-Thai migrant parents (non-CCM).

DISCUSSION

Overall, this paper was among the first to investigate the extent to which BCA's LAS were influenced by family structures, particularly with regards to the parental type of non-CCM and CCM. It might well be that the data do not replicate the data of previous studies.

In general, the result reported as the broad pattern 2 provided a more complex view of variables that contributed to LAS of BCA, thereby indicating that previous studies may or may not be replicated. Across previous studies, the author found no evidence that factors such as family structures (i.e., CCM and non-CCM) affected BCA's LCA towards English and the dominant language.

Nevertheless, some previous results were replicated. The broad pattern 3 further confirmed numerous existing studies that have shown that minority languages have undergone language shifts and endangerment in immigrant communities across the globe (Fishman, 1980; Lee, 2014). Moreover, the present study confirmed previous studies (e.g., Dörnyei and Csizer, 2002) in regards to the effects of language instruction (i.e., positive attitudes were held by children towards languages used as the medium-of-instruction in their educational settings). Nevertheless, there remained questions regarding parental roles and social preferences versus LAS.

PARENTAL ROLES

The findings did not totally disconfirm the frequent observation made in the body of literature concerning parental roles in children's language learning and language use. When exploring late English-Korean bilingual adolescents in New Zealand, Kim and Starks (2010) argued that "the language use of Korean mothers is not associated with their children's patterns of language use or their children's L1 proficiency." They went on to claim that "parental language use plays a minimal role in the adolescent L2 acquisition." The present study is in agreement with Kim's data by virtue of having shown that just because BCA have a longer exposure to their parental languages, this does not entail that they will hold positive attitudes towards the languages used at home. On the one hand, the present study agrees in part with Kim's analysis of migrant fathers who play a minimal role in respect to the language practices of their children. On the other hand and contrary to Kim's assertions, the current study reveals that a non-migrant mother's dominant language played a more influential role than a migrant father's minority language in the development of childhood LAS of BCA.

SOCIAL PREFERENCES VERSUS LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

The literature dealing with social preferences no longer suffices in addressing the attitudinal patterns of BCA. It might be due to familiarity that BCA preferred to associate with minority language speakers who spoke one of the minority languages to which these children were exposed (e.g., Kinzler et al. 2012; Byers-Heinlein et al, 2016). Regardless of social preferences, the present study warns us that BCA may not evince prohibitive attitudes toward these minority languages.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In sum, LAS of BCA were influenced to a large extent by familial structures (i.e., those with or those without CCM), and, to a lesser extent, relative exposure, i.e., the frequency of use of each language. The factor of familial structure in relation to the gender roles of parents carries high explanatory value, since it exerts a much greater degree of influences on children and adolescents in contrast to communities and societies.

Simply to believe that BCA who have greater exposure to their minority language-speaking fathers will likely develop positive attitudes towards their fathers' minority language would be mistaken. Across existing studies, the effects of migrant fathers on the LAS of BCA have received little recognition. To provide recommendations for future researchers, a minority language-speaking parent's role (particularly a migrant father's role) on the LAS of BCA deserves further investigation.

WHAT IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FIELDS OF BI/MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES EMERGED FROM THE VOICES OF BI-/MULTILINGUAL CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS?

The implications of these findings are discussed in this section. In recent years, BCA studies and bi- and multilingualism at both the family and the country level have increased and continue to attract the attention of policy makers, researchers and parents. Despite these efforts, the success of BCA remains a crucial challenge. The findings of the study can inform policy makers, researchers, teachers, educators, practitioners and parents.

These findings are strong indicators that issues that were identified by both CCM and non-CCM immigrant families regarding children's LAS should not be treated separately. This is partly because the variables that are addressed are inextricably linked with one other. These results have implications at the family, country, national and transnational, educational and policy levels. It has become apparent that the complex interplay and interaction of factors among types of immigrant family, types of CCM, parents' first languages, parents' gender roles, the dominant versus non-dominant parental language in the face of English, the effects of formal language instruction at schools, and largely monolingual or largely bilingual communities were factors of paramount concern for BCA when their LAS emerged.

For BCA who are raised in predominantly monolingual minority language families with both migrant parents (non-CCM), they need language-support programs for learning the dominant (majority) language. However, for BCA who are raised in predominantly bi-multilingual families whether or not they are typical one-parent-one-language families (one migrant parent versus one non-migrant parent in CCM), they need language-support programs to learn and maintain the minority language of their migrant parents. In a predominantly L2 monolingual environment (such as Thailand), minority language-speaking parents' attempt to forge a minority language environment at home remains a crucial challenge. Yet, increasing positive attitudes towards the minority language is preferred and

supported by minority language-speaking parents (e.g., Chimlin's father) for family language planning and practice in the long term.

REFERENCES

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byers-Heinlein, K., Behrend, D. A., Said, L. M., Girgis, H., & Poulin-Dubois, D. (2016). Monolingual and Bilingual Children's Social Preferences for Monolingual and Bilingual Speakers. *Developmental Science* (2016), 1–12.

De Houwer, A. (2009). *Bilingual First Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2002). Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a Longitudinal Nationwide Survey. *Applied Linguistics, 23* (4), 421–462.

Draper, J. C. (2010). Inferring Ethnolinguistic Vitality in a Community of Northeast Thailand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 31* (2), 135-147.

Draper, J. (2012). Reconsidering Compulsory English in Developing Countries in Asia: English in a Community of Northeast Thailand, *TESOL Quarterly, 46* (4), 777-811.

Edwards, J. (1999). Refining Our Understanding of Language Attitudes. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18* (1), 101-111.

Ethnologue (2005). Ethnologue: Languages of the World (15th ed). Dallas: SIL International. Retrieved November 30 2012 from http://www.ethnologue.com/web.asp.

Fishman, J. A. (1980). Minority Language Maintenance and the Ethnic Mother Tongue School. *The Modern Language Journal, 64* (2), 167–172.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago.: Aldine.

Huguet, J. W., &Chamratrithirong, A. (eds.) (2011). *Thailand Migration Report 2011*. Bangkok: IOM.

Kim, S, H, O., & Starks, D. (2009). The Role of Fathers in Language Maintenance and Language Attrition: The Case of Korean–English Late Bilinguals in New Zealand. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13* (3), 285-301.

Kinzler, K. D., Shutts, K., & Spelke, E. S. (2012). Language-based social preferences among children in South Africa. *Language Learning and Development, 8* (3), 215–232.

InterNations (n.d.). Common issues in mixed marriages. Retrieved May 14, 2017 from https://www.internations.org/magazine/international-marriage-and-relationships-15294/common-issues-in-mixed-marriages-2

Interracial Marriage (n.d.).International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family. Retrieved May 14, 2017 from http://www.encyclopedia.com/reference/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/interracial-marriage

Lai, C., Zhu, W., & Gong, G. (2015). Understanding the Quality of Out-of-Class English Learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 49* (2), 278-308.

Lee, H, Y.-H. (2014). Losing Chinese as the First Language in Thailand. *Asian Social Science, 10* (6), 176-193.

Lee, H, Y.-H. (2015). Theorizing Globalization and Minorities in Asian Cities: Viewed from the Language Contact Zone of Thailand in the Making of Languages and Minorities. *Journal of Applied Sciences, 15* (2), 329-342.

Lewis, G. E. (1981). Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. Oxford: Pergamon.

Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Review of Raising Children Bilingually through the 'One Parent-

One Language' Approach: A Case of Japanese Mothers in the Australian Context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30* (2), 267–268.

Mirshahidi, S. (2017). I Find You Attractive but I Don't Trust You: The Case of Language Attitudes in Iran. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 38* (2), 146-159.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2011).The Multidimensionality of Attitudes toward Language Varieties' Review of Attitudes to Language, Key Topics in Sociolinguistics by Peter Garrett. *Linguistics and Education, 22*(4), 458–460.

Oliver, R., & Purdie, N. (1998). The Attitudes of Bilingual Children to their Languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19* (3), 199-211.

Ploywattanawong, P., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2014). Attitudes of Thai Graduates toward English as a Lingua Franca of ASEAN. *Asian Englishes, 16* (2), 141-156.

Qiu, C., & Winsler, A. (2017) Language Use in a 'One Parent–One Language' Mandarin–English Bilingual Family: Noun versus Verb Use and Language Mixing Compared to Maternal Perception. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20* (3), 272-291.

Rosenthal, M. S. (1973). *The Acquisition of Children's Awareness of Language Differences.* Doctoral Dissertation. Georgetown University.

Rosenthal, M. S. (1974). The Magic Boxes: Pre-School Children's Attitude toward Black and Standard English. *The Florida FL Reporter*, 12, 55-62.

Saengboon, S. (2015). An Exploratory Study of Thai University Students' Understanding of World Englishes. *English Language Teaching, 8* (11), 131-154.

Sisamouth, W. K., & Lah, S. C. (2015). Attitudes towards Thai, Patani Malay, and English of Thai Undergraduates: A Case Study at Prince of Songkla University Pattani campus, Thailand. *Procedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 240-250.

Smalley, W. A. (1994). *Linguistic Diversity and National Unity: Language Ecology in Thailand*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Snodin, N. S., & Young, T. J. (2015). 'Native-Speaker' Varieties of English: Thai and Attitudes. *Asian Englishes, 17* (3), 248-260.

Takeuchi, M. (2006). The Japanese Language Development of Children through the 'One Parent–One Language' Approach in Melbourne. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27* (4), 319-331.

Thailand Population 2017 (n.d.). *World Population Review*. Retrieved May 10 2017 from http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/thailand-population/

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2016). *International migration report 2015: Highlights* (ST/ESA/SER.A/375). New York: USA.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2015). *World population prospects: The 2015 revision, key Findings and advance tables.* Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP.241. New York: USA.

Venables, E., Eisenchlas, S. A., & Schalley, A. C. (2014). One Parent-One-Language (OPOL) Families: Is the Dominant Language-Speaking Parent Instrumental in the Minority Language Development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17* (4), 429-448.

Woan, L. H., & Tat, L. S. (2017). Assessing Children's Native Language in Mandarin Using the Adapted New Reynell Developmental Language Scales-Mandarin (NRDLS-M). *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *17*(2), 123-145.

Zhang, J. (2010). Parental Attitudes toward Mandarin Maintenance in Arizona: An

Examination of Immigrants from the People's Republic of China. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 7* (4), 237-269.