input from my husband, myself, American relatives and friends, and Disney videos, my children have acquired a high level of English proficiency and are quite capable of expressing themselves exclusively in English when they need to. As a mother, then, I would have liked to see a reflection of our type of family in Yamamoto’s analysis.

As a researcher, however, I realise that Yamamoto’s study concentrated on language use rather than proficiency for a very sound reason: with such a large number of subjects, it is easier to survey and compare language use than it is to accurately test proficiency. I am therefore content to put such personal feelings aside. For I strongly feel that Yamamoto’s many insights into the complex realities of language choice in families living with two languages make Language Use in Interlingual Families well worth reading for researchers and parents alike.

Mary Goebel Noguchi
Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan
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Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice and Childrearing in Intermarried Families

I read this book while on maternity leave, and the other day I complained to my husband that I wasn’t getting any work done and that I was nevertheless exhausted all the time. ‘From playing with baby?’ he replied, with the smugness of someone who has just returned from nine hours in the office. Well yes, come to think of it, childrearing, also known as ‘playing with baby,’ is exhausting and time-consuming. What is more, it is not usually recognized for the work it is – in other words, it is invisible. Toshie Okita investigates how the invisible work of childrearing, much of which is language-related in an urban-industrial context, influences language choice and language development. The resulting book is an outstanding study of childhood bilingualism.
Okita’s research was motivated by the observation that despite a widespread assumption that raising children bilingually in intermarried families is easy, many parents just don’t seem to find it all that easy. She observes that many parents in such families now have easy access to advice literature on how to raise children bilingually (e.g., Cunningham-Andersson & Andersson, 1999; Harding & Riley, 1986). However, this literature is often permeated by the assumption ‘that not raising children bilingually in mixed marriages is in a sense a failure for parents’ (p. 52). As such it can sometimes be more debilitating than it is helpful – something I also found in my own work with a different group of bilingual families (Piller, 2002).

So, how come international couples sometimes ‘fail’ to raise their children bilingually? Using the life history method, Okita interviewed 28 intermarried families in the UK, with a Japanese-speaking mother and a British father. In most cases there were two interviews with the mother, one with the father, and in some cases children were interviewed as well. Okita asked her participants about their background, their marriage, what their ordinary life was like, their childrearing approaches, their language use and their future hopes. The questions about language use included decision factors, the importance of Japanese, changes over time, the children’s development, trips to Japan, and the effects of their language choices on their childrearing practices.

Initially, 12 mothers started out speaking Japanese to their newborn babies, 5 started out speaking English, and 11 did not make a decision at that stage. Those mothers who chose to speak Japanese to their infants did so mainly for two reasons: communicative satisfaction and ‘old hearth ties’. Communicative satisfaction means their desire to enjoy speaking to the baby, and ‘old hearth ties’ refer to their desire to maintain relationships with the family back in Japan. By contrast, the mothers who started out speaking English to their children did so to avoid ‘Japan’: they either no longer had relationships to Japan, or did not like those relationships, or they did not approve of what they saw as the Japanese way of relating to children. They were also more oriented to their British social networks, and anticipated that they would have to ‘force’ Japanese with their children,something they were not prepared to do. These mothers did not want to keep old hearth ties. They just wanted to get on with their life in English. They did not talk about a need to communicate with their child in their own language. Either they did not have that need, or they had another need – to put their life in Japan behind them, and establish a new life in the UK’ (p. 92).

Among the non-decision makers there were some older mothers who talked about the lack of information about childhood bilingualism at the time when they had had their children in the 1970s and 1980s. However, most of the non-decision makers found themselves so overwhelmed by the chaos of initial childrearing that language issues just took a backseat. Like many migrant women they found childrearing extra difficult because of the lack of support from extended family and friends. One woman, for instance, said: ‘It was all I could do to survive. There was no support around me, just telephone calls to Japan’ (p. 95). In other cases, difficult, unsettled babies or babies with health problems meant that there was no time and energy left to deal with language decisions. While the mothers’ decisions (or non-decisions) were made around their own needs, the fathers all said they had been enthusiastically in favor of bilingualism because they felt it was good for their children. They had assumed that their children would learn to speak another
language without much effort and cost, and were enthusiastic about the wonderful advantages of bilingualism. A notion many of the mothers rejected outright: ‘the mothers were more pessimistic because their experience of language-related work was casual, insecure teaching, guiding or interpreting work – women’s work’ (p. 97).

As the children got older, the initial language decisions had to be tried out in practice, and in most families this meant a greater use of English. It turns out that rearing children bilingually isn’t that easy after all, even for most of the mothers who were initially committed to teaching Japanese to their children. The older the children got, the more the likelihood increased that the mothers switched to English. From age 0-2 some mothers gave up Japanese because they did not want to or were not able to establish Japanese networks. One woman for instance explains: ‘I couldn’t stay at home with [my baby] because it was boring. The more we went out to meet other people, the more we used English. It felt unnatural speaking Japanese’ (p. 113). Other mothers similarly felt strange speaking Japanese to their children in front of English speakers. By contrast, the fathers assumed that bilingualism would come naturally and therefore they failed to support their partners. So, again bilingual education had to take a backseat in the face of more pressing demands on the women: the multiple tasks of childrearing, establishing social networks in the UK, fitting in with their husbands and extended family, or coping with a sense of isolation.

The preschool years often brought a new worry: language delay anxiety. Ironically, this was more of a problem for the very determined Japanese users. Some of the mothers who had up until age 3 or 4 created a Japanese-dominant or even Japanese-exclusive environment, now realized that in the process their child’s exposure to English had been limited, and the context became one in which the child would not learn English ‘naturally.’ Other mothers started to reduce their Japanese at around that time because they found their family life suffered if the children could not communicate (very well) with their English-speaking father. Women who kept going faced new pressures during the early school years when their children were exhausted from school work and extracurricular activities, and Japanese became one more task that had to be fit into a busy day. Children now often had to be reminded to speak Japanese. Mothers who persevered speaking Japanese to their children found that the children often got annoyed at the constant reminders, and feared their relationship with their child was suffering. Other women came to use mostly English. One woman, for instance, says: ‘When [my husband] says it would be good if the children could speak both languages, I think; “Oh yes, and who is going to do it?”’ (p. 125). In sum, teaching their children Japanese was work for all these women. As such it often conflicted with other jobs that had to be done and that often had to take precedence. While most mothers spoke more and more English over the years, not all of them did, and two mothers even switched from English to Japanese. Both of those mothers did so for a rather surprising reason: they wanted to ‘reclaim’ their children from their mothers-in-law, who were major caregivers for their children.

There is an interesting difference between older and younger mothers, i.e. women who had their children in the 1970s and 1980s as opposed to women with young children at the time of the research (late 1990s). The former tended to lack information about bilingualism and had no support networks that would facilitate bilingual childrearing. They mostly played teaching their children Japanese by ear,
and despite – or because of? – their relaxed attitude, they were sometimes highly successfully in raising fluent bilinguals. By contrast, the younger mothers had access to a lot of advice on bilingual childrearing and had heard or read a lot about the supposed importance of starting early, of being consistent, of creating as many domains for the minority language as possible, and all those other ideologies that flood the advice market. However, rather than making things easier, this advice actually created a number of stresses in the lives of the younger mothers. To begin with, the decision to raise their children bilingually, together with the fact that it was the mothers who were the minority parent, resulted in a clear division of labour. While the men became the sole breadwinners, the women became devoted stay-at-home mothers. They saw their primary role as caring for their children and became ‘pro-activist mothers.’ Okita coins this term ‘to describe a tendency in younger mothers which combines a ‘child first’ approach to childrearing with an ‘it has to be now’ or ‘the earlier the better’ approach to the minority language in such a way that it came to define how they viewed mothering’ (p. 142). Pro-activist mothering, together with a heavy emphasis on Japanese support, isolated the women and their children from the wider society and often from their husbands, too. If that was the case, dropping Japanese became tantamount to saving one’s marriage in a few cases.

Another interesting finding relates to the recommendation to use child-centered communication styles for bilingual development that is commonly found in the advice literature. By contrast, mothers who were able to draw a line as to what was reasonable to be expected from them as mothers or who were prepared to force their children to do things were actually those whose children became proficient bilinguals. Okita draws the conclusion that ‘success in the project ultimately depended on being able to resist pressures towards child-centredness’ (p. 188).

In sum, Okita’s research illustrates that raising children bilingually is emotionally demanding work, and it is demanding on the mothers. This aspect of bilingual childrearing has to date been largely, if not completely, overlooked in the literature on childhood bilingualism, which tends to tout the wonderful advantages of bilingualism. How is it that such a fundamental aspect could have been ignored in the research and advice literature for so long? Because, like other emotional work in the family, it is invisible. It is invisible even to a group of Okita’s participants – unsurprisingly, the fathers (not all of them, I hasten to add). Indeed, one of the reasons why bilingual childrearing became so stressful for the women in this study is because their partners failed to recognise their work and support them. Recognition of the invisible work of bilingual childrearing by researchers and professionals is also called for. As Okita clearly demonstrates, advice and recommendations to intermarried families to raise their children bilingually without the recognition of the demands this places on the minority mother ‘lead to disempowerment, intensified pressure, guilt and personal trauma’ (p. 230).

This book testifies to the merits of interdisciplinary work. With its bases in family studies and ethnic studies, along with the sociolinguistic literature on childhood bilingualism, it is able to elucidate the context in which language choices are made in a depth that has, to the best of my knowledge, never before been achieved in the literature on childhood bilingualism. It is a must-read for anyone involved in childhood bilingualism as a researcher or practitioner. It is also an important contribution to the emergent field of gender and bilingualism research (see Pavlenko et al., 2001). Bilingual childrearing is inextricably intertwined with gendered family and
parenting practices. Okita advocates for the recognition, by researchers, professionals and partners alike, that mothers have aspirations other then bilingual children, 'for themselves (including personal and professional development, as well as maintaining or developing relations with their partner), for their children (including having time to relax and play with friends), and for their relationships with their children (including quality communication and, especially, stress-free interaction)' (p. 232).

Ingrid Piller
Linguistics, University of Sydney
(ingrid.piller@linguistics.usyd.edu.au)
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Identity and the Young English Language Learner

This book adds to a few ethnographic studies that focus on young language learners. As such, it contributes to our understanding of the crucial role of classroom social relations in constructing identity positions for classroom members and of their effect on learners’ access to language. While highlighting young language learners, Elaine Mellen Day’s work offers insights for understanding language learning more generally and, like a growing number of second language researchers from the past decade, draws on Bakhtinian and Vygotskian sociocultural theories of language and learning. Day’s analysis of classroom relations is particularly influenced by Lave and Wenger’s (1991) approach to (situated) learning as participation in communities of practice.

Even while viewing language learning as a socioculturally situated practice, Day’s attention to identity positions and practices helps her to avoid losing sight of the individual learner. In fact, Day looks primarily at the experiences of one Punjabi-speaking boy during his year in a Canadian English-medium kindergarten class. In considering the critical interaction between identity and language learning, she agrees with researchers such as Norton (2000) who argue that one’s identity is socially situated and is, therefore, dynamic, complex and marked by power struggles. But Day found that examining the identity positions made available to the focus student in his social interactions could not always explain why he resisted or took up these positions. For this reason, she draws on psychoanalytic theories which foreground the role of affect and the unconscious in the creation of identity. Contemporary psychoanalytic theories have been relatively unexplored in second language research (see Ibrahim, 1999, for an exception), and Day argues that in order to under-