

Grandparents As Language Socialisation Agents: Intergenerational Caregiving, Family Language Policy, and Heritage Language Maintenance in Chinese Multilingual Families

Zhang Ting*, Md Nasir Bin Masran

Faculty of Human Development, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600316>

Received: 21 May 2026; Accepted: 26 May 2026; Published: 23 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how grandparents function as language socialisation agents in Chinese multilingual families, with particular attention to intergenerational caregiving, family language policy, and heritage language maintenance. Recent family language policy research has increasingly questioned parent-centred models of language transmission and has called for more attention to extended kinship, everyday caregiving, emotional relations, and multilingual family ecologies (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025). Drawing on a systematic-style review of studies published from 2022 onward, this article synthesises recent scholarship on Chinese multilingual families, heritage language maintenance, fangyan transmission, minority language maintenance, and intergenerational family communication. The review suggests that grandparents are not merely passive carriers of ancestral languages; rather, they often become practical language planners through daily routines such as feeding, storytelling, homework supervision, festival practices, and digital communication with children (Fang & Yao, 2025; Gong et al., 2025). The paper proposes a qualitative multiple-case methodology for future empirical research, combining semi-structured interviews, family language diaries, home language mapping, and naturally occurring interactional recordings. It argues that intergenerational caregiving should be conceptualised as an interactional site where family language policy is enacted, negotiated, and emotionally evaluated. The article contributes to family language policy and language socialisation research by reframing grandparents as active agents whose caregiving practices mediate children's access to Mandarin, fangyan, minority languages, English, and Chinese heritage languages (King, 2023; Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024).

Keywords: Grandparents; language socialisation; family language policy; heritage language maintenance; Chinese multilingual families; intergenerational caregiving

INTRODUCTION

Family language policy has become an influential framework for understanding how multilingual families manage, interpret, and transmit languages across generations (King, 2023). In Chinese multilingual families, this issue is particularly complex because children may encounter Mandarin, fangyan, ethnic minority languages, English, and overseas societal languages within overlapping family, school, and community spaces (Fang & Yao, 2025; Qin & Zou, 2025). Although parents are often positioned as the main decision-makers in children's language development, recent scholarship suggests that this parent-centred view is insufficient because many

children's daily linguistic exposure is strongly shaped by grandparents and other extended family members (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025).

Grandparents deserve closer attention because intergenerational caregiving is a routine feature of many Chinese families, both in mainland China and in transnational Chinese diasporic contexts (Gong et al., 2025; Yang & Shang, 2026). In many households, grandparents cook meals, supervise homework, accompany children to school, tell family stories, participate in festival rituals, and maintain digital contact with grandchildren across distance (Romanowski, 2026). These caregiving practices are not linguistically neutral. They create repeated opportunities for children to hear, use, resist, or emotionally attach to particular languages or language varieties (Wang, 2023; Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024).

The present article argues that grandparents should be conceptualised as language socialisation agents rather than as background figures in family language policy (Bose et al., 2023). Language socialisation refers to the process through which children learn not only linguistic forms, but also culturally valued ways of speaking, listening, responding, remembering, and belonging (King, 2023). From this perspective, a grandmother who speaks Cantonese during cooking, a grandfather who tells village stories in Hakka, or an overseas grandparent who uses Mandarin in video calls is not simply providing language input; each is shaping the child's understanding of what a language means in relation to kinship, authority, affection, memory, and identity (Fang & Yao, 2025; Lubis, 2024).

This article addresses three research questions. First, how has recent scholarship conceptualised grandparents and extended kin in family language policy and heritage language maintenance research? Second, what roles do grandparents play in Chinese multilingual families' language socialisation practices? Third, how can future empirical research methodologically capture intergenerational caregiving as a site of family language policy enactment? These questions respond to recent systematic reviews showing that family language policy research must move beyond narrow models of parental language management and attend more carefully to distributed decision-making within families (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025).

SYSTEMATIC-STYLE LITERATURE REVIEW

Review scope and search strategy

This review focuses on studies published from 2022 onward because recent work has substantially expanded family language policy research toward emotion, agency, digital communication, transnational family life, and child-centred perspectives (Bose et al., 2023; Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). Search terms included “family language policy,” “grandparents,” “heritage language maintenance,” “Chinese multilingual families,” “language socialisation,” “intergenerational caregiving,” “fangyan,” “Chinese heritage language,” and “minority language maintenance” (Chen & Cao, 2025; Qin & Zou, 2025). The review prioritised peer-reviewed journal articles and academic book chapters that directly addressed family language policy, heritage language maintenance, multilingual family practices, or intergenerational language transmission.

The inclusion criteria were fourfold. First, studies had to be published in or after 2022. Second, they had to address family-based language practices rather than classroom language learning alone. Third, they needed to discuss multilingualism, heritage language maintenance, Chinese families, grandparents, or intergenerational transmission. Fourth, they had to offer either empirical evidence or a substantial conceptual contribution to family language policy research (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025). Studies were excluded when they treated language learning only as an individual cognitive process without reference to family practices, or when they focused on formal schooling without discussing family language ecology (Qin & Zou, 2025).

From parent-centred policy to distributed family language policy

A key development in recent family language policy research is the shift from parent-centred models to distributed models of language decision-making (Bose et al., 2023). Earlier family language policy studies often examined how parents designed strategies to maintain a minority or heritage language, but recent systematic reviews argue that this approach risks simplifying family life by overlooking siblings, grandparents, transnational relatives, peers, and children themselves (Chen & Cao, 2025). In multilingual households, language policy is rarely a single rule imposed from above; it is more often a negotiated pattern of everyday practices, emotional preferences, institutional pressures, and intergenerational compromises (King, 2023).

This distributed understanding is especially relevant for Chinese multilingual families because linguistic authority may not align neatly with parental authority (Fang & Yao, 2025). A parent may prefer Mandarin or English because of schooling and social mobility, while a grandparent may use fangyan or a minority language because it is the language of intimacy, memory, and local belonging (Cai & Fang, 2026). Conversely, some grandparents may support Mandarin-only practices if they associate local languages with rurality, low prestige, or limited educational value (Lam et al., 2026). These tensions show that family language policy is not simply a matter of choosing one language over another; it is a negotiation of social value across generations (Gong et al., 2025).

Chinese multilingual families and language hierarchy

Chinese multilingual families are shaped by complex language hierarchies involving Mandarin, fangyan, ethnic minority languages, English, and overseas societal languages (Fang & Yao, 2025; Wang & Liu, 2025). Mandarin is often associated with national belonging, schooling, literacy, and upward mobility, while fangyan may index locality, intimacy, family history, and regional identity (Cai & Fang, 2026). In ethnic minority contexts, minority languages may carry cultural and ancestral significance but may also face pressure from Mandarin-dominant schooling and mobility expectations (Lam et al., 2026; Wang & Liu, 2025). In diasporic contexts, Chinese may become a heritage language competing with English or another majority language in children's everyday lives (Qin & Zou, 2025; Wang, 2023).

Recent studies show that families do not simply reproduce these hierarchies passively; they interpret and manage them through household routines (Fang & Yao, 2025). For example, some families maintain fangyan during meals and family gatherings while reserving Mandarin for homework and formal literacy, creating a functional division of languages inside the household (Cai & Fang, 2026). Other families rely on grandparents to sustain a language that parents value symbolically but do not use consistently themselves (Gong et al., 2025). Such arrangements suggest that grandparents may become the practical custodians of languages that are emotionally important but institutionally vulnerable (Bose et al., 2023).

Grandparents as language socialisation agents

Grandparents' role in language maintenance is often discussed indirectly, but recent studies increasingly suggest that they are central to children's language socialisation (Lubis, 2024; Romanowski, 2026). Grandparents may transmit language through direct conversation, correction, storytelling, religious or festival practices, food preparation, songs, humour, discipline, and family memory (Fatima & Nadeem, 2025). In this sense, their contribution is not reducible to the number of words or hours of exposure they provide; rather, they shape children's affective and moral relationship to language (Wang, 2023).

The concept of grandparents as language socialisation agents helps explain why heritage language maintenance is often stronger when children associate the heritage language with meaningful relationships rather than only

formal instruction (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). A child may resist weekend Chinese classes but still use Chinese with a grandparent because the language indexes affection, obligation, humour, or family belonging (Wang, 2023). Similarly, a child may understand a fangyan passively because grandparents use it during recurring caregiving routines, even if the child responds in Mandarin or English (Fang & Yao, 2025). These patterns suggest that receptive competence, partial participation, and emotionally situated language use should be taken seriously in heritage language research (Qin & Zou, 2025).

Intergenerational caregiving as implicit language policy

Intergenerational caregiving can be understood as a form of implicit family language policy because caregivers repeatedly organise the contexts in which children encounter language (King, 2023). When grandparents choose a language during feeding, bathing, walking, shopping, storytelling, or homework support, they are participating in language management even if they do not describe their actions as “policy” (Chen & Cao, 2025). Such practices may be more influential than explicit parental statements because they occur frequently, emotionally, and in embodied interaction (Gong et al., 2025).

This view expands the meaning of family language policy beyond explicit rules such as “speak Chinese at home” or “use Mandarin with grandparents” (Bose et al., 2023). In practice, family language policy may emerge through habitual patterns: a grandmother scolds in fangyan, a grandfather praises in Mandarin, a parent translates into English, or a child replies in the dominant school language (Fang & Yao, 2025). These micro-practices reveal how language ideology is enacted through ordinary family life rather than only through conscious planning (King, 2023).

Digital communication and transnational grandparenting

Digital media has become increasingly important in intergenerational language maintenance, especially for transnational families separated by migration (Romanowski, 2026). Video calls, voice messages, family group chats, digital storytelling, and online festival greetings may help grandparents remain linguistically present even when they are geographically distant (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024). In Chinese diasporic families, such digital exchanges can provide children with opportunities to hear Mandarin, Cantonese, Hokkien, Hakka, Shanghaiese, or other Chinese varieties beyond the immediate household (Qin & Zou, 2025).

However, digital contact does not automatically guarantee heritage language maintenance (Romanowski, 2026). Children may respond minimally, switch to English, rely on parents as translators, or treat video calls as ceremonial rather than conversational events (Wang, 2023). The effectiveness of digital grandparenting depends on the emotional quality of the relationship, the child’s receptive competence, the frequency of contact, and whether the interaction includes meaningful shared activities rather than only formulaic greetings (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). This suggests that digital intergenerational communication should be analysed as a social practice, not merely as technological access (Romanowski, 2026).

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR EMPIRICAL STUDY

Research design

A qualitative multiple-case study design is proposed to investigate how grandparents participate in language socialisation across Chinese multilingual families (Bose et al., 2023). This design is appropriate because the research questions focus on practices, meanings, ideologies, relationships, and interactional routines rather than on measuring language proficiency alone (King, 2023). A multiple-case approach would allow comparison

across different family types, including Mandarin-fangyan families, Mandarin-minority language families, and transnational Chinese heritage language families (Fang & Yao, 2025; Qin & Zou, 2025).

Research setting

The study may be conducted in multilingual Chinese family contexts where grandparents are regularly involved in childcare (Gong et al., 2025). Suitable settings include urban Chinese households in regions where Mandarin coexists with fangyan, ethnic minority areas where Mandarin interacts with minority languages, and overseas Chinese families where Chinese functions as a heritage language (Fang & Yao, 2025; Wang & Liu, 2025). The research setting should be selected according to linguistic diversity, accessibility, and the presence of sustained intergenerational caregiving (Yang & Shang, 2026).

Participants and sampling

Purposive sampling should be used to recruit 12 to 18 families in which at least one grandparent provides regular caregiving or maintains frequent digital communication with the child (Chen & Cao, 2025). Each family should ideally include one grandparent, one parent, and one child aged between 4 and 12, because this age range captures children who are old enough to participate in multilingual interaction but still strongly influenced by household caregiving routines (Hollebeke et al., 2023). Sampling should aim for variation in language repertoire, migration background, caregiving intensity, family structure, and educational expectations (Bose et al., 2023).

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Families should be included if the child is exposed to at least two languages or language varieties, the grandparent participates in caregiving at least three times per week or maintains regular digital contact, and the family is willing to participate in interviews, language diaries, and selected interactional recordings (King, 2023). Families should be excluded if grandparental contact is only occasional, if the household is functionally monolingual, or if participants are uncomfortable with any form of recording (Gong et al., 2025). These criteria ensure that the study examines sustained intergenerational caregiving rather than symbolic family contact alone (Lubis, 2024).

Data collection

Data collection should combine four methods: semi-structured interviews, seven-day family language diaries, home language maps, and naturally occurring interactional recordings (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024). Interviews with grandparents and parents should explore language beliefs, caregiving routines, perceived responsibilities, schooling pressures, intergenerational disagreements, and hopes for children's linguistic futures (Fang & Yao, 2025). Children may also be interviewed through age-appropriate activities such as language portraits or family language drawings to capture their perspectives on who speaks which language and when (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026).

The seven-day language diary should record who speaks to the child, which language or variety is used, what activity is taking place, and how the child responds (Hollebeke et al., 2023). Home language maps should document the spatial organisation of languages in the household, including kitchen talk, bedroom storytelling, homework spaces, video-call locations, and family gathering areas (Nie & Wang, 2025). Interactional recordings should focus on naturally occurring routines such as mealtime conversation, homework support, storytelling, play, festival preparation, or video calls with distant grandparents (Romanowski, 2026).

Interview protocol

The interview protocol should include questions such as: "Which language do you usually use when caring for the child?" "Are there situations in which you change language?" "What language do you hope the child will

use with grandparents?” “Have parents and grandparents ever disagreed about language use?” and “What does this language mean to your family?” (King, 2023). These questions are designed to elicit beliefs, practices, and management strategies, which are the central dimensions of family language policy (Chen & Cao, 2025). They also allow participants to discuss language as emotion, identity, obligation, and memory rather than as a neutral communicative tool (Wang, 2023).

Data analysis

Data analysis should proceed in three stages. First, interview transcripts and diaries should be analysed thematically to identify recurring patterns related to language ideology, caregiving authority, emotional attachment, schooling pressure, and intergenerational tension (Bose et al., 2023). Second, selected interactional excerpts should be coded for language choice, code-switching, correction, translation, repetition, teasing, praise, repair, and child response (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024). Third, cross-case comparison should be conducted to identify how different family structures and language ecologies shape grandparental agency (Fang & Yao, 2025).

The coding framework should include five major categories: language choice, language ideology, caregiving routine, socialisation practice, and child participation (King, 2023). Language choice codes identify which language or variety is used in specific activities. Language ideology codes capture beliefs about usefulness, prestige, intimacy, purity, shame, identity, or educational value. Caregiving routine codes classify mealtime, homework, storytelling, play, festival activity, digital communication, and discipline. Socialisation practice codes capture correction, translation, prompting, repetition, praise, humour, and narrative framing. Child participation codes identify acceptance, resistance, silence, partial response, code-switching, or metalinguistic comment (Fang & Yao, 2025; Gong et al., 2025).

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness should be established through triangulation, member checking, reflexive memo writing, and cross-case comparison (Bose et al., 2023). Triangulation would compare what participants say in interviews with what they record in diaries and what occurs in interactional recordings. Member checking would allow participants to review interview summaries and clarify interpretations. Reflexive memo writing would help the researcher document assumptions, especially when analysing family conflict, language shame, or intergenerational authority (King, 2023). Cross-case comparison would support analytical generalisation without claiming statistical representativeness (Chen & Cao, 2025).

Ethical considerations

The study should obtain informed consent from adult participants and assent from children where appropriate (King, 2023). Participants should be informed that they may withdraw, refuse specific recordings, or request deletion of sensitive excerpts. Pseudonyms should be used, and identifying information such as school names, village names, workplaces, or exact locations should be removed or modified (Bose et al., 2023). Because family language practices may involve conflict, shame, migration pressure, or educational anxiety, the researcher should avoid positioning any participant as responsible for “failed” language transmission (Wang, 2023).

Analytical Synthesis

Grandparents as practical language planners

The reviewed literature suggests that grandparents often operate as practical language planners even when they do not explicitly formulate language rules (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025). Their influence comes from

repeated caregiving participation rather than formal parental authority. When grandparents spend long hours with children, they may determine the language of everyday routines more consistently than parents who are occupied with work or schooling-related responsibilities (Gong et al., 2025). This practical authority is particularly important in Chinese multilingual families where the language of school, the language of parents, and the language of older kin may differ (Fang & Yao, 2025).

Grandparents' language planning is often implicit and embodied in care (King, 2023). A grandfather who tells stories in a local variety may be preserving family memory, while a grandmother who switches to Mandarin during homework may be aligning with school expectations (Cai & Fang, 2026). These practices show that language policy is not always deliberate or verbalised; it may be sedimented in habits, routines, and emotionally familiar forms of interaction (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024).

Caregiving routines as socialisation infrastructure

Caregiving routines function as socialisation infrastructure because they provide repeated, predictable, and emotionally meaningful occasions for language use (King, 2023). Mealtimes, bedtime stories, school pick-up conversations, festival rituals, and family visits create conditions in which children learn when and why certain languages are used (Romanowski, 2026). In Chinese multilingual families, these routines may sustain language varieties that are otherwise marginalised by schooling or public life (Fang & Yao, 2025).

This infrastructure is particularly significant for heritage language maintenance because children's attachment to a language often depends on whether that language is embedded in valued relationships (Wang, 2023). A child may not perceive a heritage language as useful in school, but may still associate it with grandparents, food, humour, family stories, and affection (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). Such emotional grounding can support receptive competence and selective use even when active fluency is uneven (Qin & Zou, 2025).

Intergenerational tension and negotiation

The literature also shows that grandparents and parents may hold competing language ideologies (Fang & Yao, 2025). Parents may prioritise Mandarin or English because these languages are associated with education and socioeconomic mobility, whereas grandparents may prioritise fangyan, minority languages, or Chinese heritage varieties because they index family continuity and cultural memory (Cai & Fang, 2026; Wang & Liu, 2025). However, the reverse may also occur: grandparents may discourage local varieties if they associate them with limited mobility, while parents may attempt to reclaim them as cultural resources (Lam et al., 2026).

These tensions should not be understood simply as obstacles to successful language maintenance (Gong et al., 2025). They are also important sites where family members negotiate what kind of multilingual subject the child should become. A child's language repertoire may emerge from compromise, translation, selective response, and situational switching rather than from a stable family consensus (King, 2023). This perspective moves family language policy research away from success-failure models and toward a more relational understanding of multilingual development (Bose et al., 2023).

Children's agency in grandparent-led language socialisation

Children are not passive recipients of grandparental language practices (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). They may respond in another language, translate for parents, resist correction, imitate grandparents' expressions, or use the heritage language only in emotionally marked situations (Wang, 2023). Such responses reveal that children actively interpret the social meanings of language and participate in shaping family language policy (Chen & Cao, 2025).

In Chinese multilingual families, children's agency may be especially visible in code-switching between Mandarin, fangyan, English, and other languages (Fang & Yao, 2025). A child may understand a grandparent's fangyan but answer in Mandarin; another may use English with siblings but Chinese with grandparents during video calls (Qin & Zou, 2025). These practices show that heritage language maintenance should be understood as a dynamic repertoire rather than a binary distinction between maintenance and loss (King, 2023).

DISCUSSION

This article contributes to family language policy research by arguing that grandparents should be theorised as central language socialisation agents in Chinese multilingual families (Bose et al., 2023). Their role is not limited to preserving old languages or representing tradition. Rather, grandparents participate in everyday language planning through caregiving routines, emotional alignment, correction practices, storytelling, and intergenerational negotiation (Gong et al., 2025). This argument extends current scholarship by placing intergenerational caregiving at the centre of family language policy analysis (Chen & Cao, 2025).

The article also contributes to heritage language maintenance research by showing that language transmission cannot be reduced to input quantity or formal instruction (Wang, 2023). Children's orientation to a heritage language is shaped by the emotional, relational, and moral meanings attached to that language in everyday life (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). Grandparents may strengthen heritage language maintenance precisely because they connect language to care, memory, food, humour, family belonging, and cultural continuity (Lubis, 2024; Romanowski, 2026).

For Chinese multilingual families, the analysis highlights the need to examine how Mandarin, fangyan, minority languages, English, and heritage Chinese varieties are socially ranked and situationally negotiated (Fang & Yao, 2025). Mandarin may function as the language of schooling and national mobility, while fangyan or minority languages may function as languages of intimacy and place-based identity (Cai & Fang, 2026). In diasporic contexts, Chinese may become both a valued heritage resource and a source of emotional pressure for children and parents (Qin & Zou, 2025; Wang, 2023). Grandparents often stand at the intersection of these competing meanings (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024).

The proposed methodology offers a way to study these processes empirically without relying only on parental self-report (King, 2023). Interviews can reveal beliefs and ideologies, but diaries and interactional recordings are necessary for observing how language policy is enacted in ordinary family life (Bose et al., 2023). Home language maps and child-centred visual methods can further show how children themselves understand the linguistic organisation of family space (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). This multi-method design is therefore better suited to capturing the complexity of intergenerational language socialisation (Chen & Cao, 2025).

Implications

The first implication concerns research design. Future studies of Chinese multilingual families should include grandparents as participants rather than treating them as background variables reported by parents (Bose et al., 2023). Research instruments should ask not only what language parents want children to learn, but also who actually spends time with children, who tells stories, who supervises homework, who participates in digital calls, and who controls emotionally significant routines (Chen & Cao, 2025). This would produce a more accurate account of how family language policy operates in practice (King, 2023).

The second implication concerns heritage language education. Schools and community language programmes should recognise that grandparents may be powerful allies in heritage language maintenance (Qin & Zou, 2025). Instead of treating heritage language learning as only a matter of classroom literacy, educators could encourage

intergenerational storytelling, family oral history projects, home-language interviews, and digital exchanges with older relatives (Romanowski, 2026). Such practices may connect formal learning with children's lived family relationships (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026).

The third implication concerns family support. Parents and grandparents may benefit from reflective conversations about language expectations, especially when schooling pressures conflict with heritage language maintenance (Fang & Yao, 2025). Rather than imposing rigid language rules, families may develop flexible routines that allow different languages to serve different emotional, educational, and cultural functions (Cai & Fang, 2026). This approach avoids framing multilingual family life as a problem and instead recognises it as a negotiated resource (King, 2023).

Limitations And Future Research

This article is limited by its reliance on recent literature and its methodological orientation rather than original empirical data (Bose et al., 2023). Although the review identifies clear patterns in current scholarship, future studies should collect primary data from grandparents, parents, and children across different Chinese multilingual contexts (Chen & Cao, 2025). Comparative research could examine whether grandparents' language socialisation practices differ across urban mainland families, ethnic minority communities, internal migrant families, and transnational Chinese households (Fang & Yao, 2025; Yang & Shang, 2026).

Future research should also examine children's perspectives more directly (Gorter & Berardi-Wiltshire, 2026). Children may experience heritage language practices as affection, pressure, embarrassment, obligation, or pride, and these emotional interpretations can influence whether they continue using the language with grandparents (Wang, 2023). Longitudinal studies would be especially valuable because children's language practices may change as they enter school, develop peer networks, and renegotiate relationships with older family members (Qin & Zou, 2025).

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that grandparents should be understood as language socialisation agents in Chinese multilingual families because their caregiving practices shape children's everyday language exposure, emotional orientation, and cultural belonging (King, 2023). Through feeding, storytelling, homework support, discipline, festival activities, and digital communication, grandparents participate in the practical enactment of family language policy (Romanowski, 2026). Their role is particularly important in families where Mandarin, fangyan, minority languages, English, and Chinese heritage languages coexist under unequal social conditions (Fang & Yao, 2025).

By synthesising recent research from 2022 onward, the article has shown that intergenerational caregiving is a crucial but still under-examined site of heritage language maintenance (Bose et al., 2023; Chen & Cao, 2025). The proposed methodology offers a way to investigate this phenomenon through interviews, language diaries, home language maps, and naturally occurring interactional recordings. Such an approach can move family language policy research beyond parental intention and toward a richer understanding of how multilingualism is lived, negotiated, and emotionally sustained across generations (Tse Crepaldi & Mirvahedi, 2024).

REFERENCES

1. Bose, P., Gao, X., Starfield, S., Sun, S., & Ramdani, J. M. (2023). Conceptualisation of family and language practice in family language policy research on migrants: A systematic review. *Language Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09661-8>

2. Cai, Y., & Fang, F. (2026). "Fangyan is a necessity of my child's life": Navigating language ideologies and family language planning in urban Chinese families. *Language Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-026-09772-y>
3. Chen, M., & Cao, X. (2025). The roles of decision-makers in family language policy process: A systematic review of research since 2013. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12734>
4. Fang, F., & Yao, X. (2025). Intergenerational transmission and multilingual dynamics: Exploring language policies in Chaoshan families through a contextual lens. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2410517>
5. Fatima, S., & Nadeem, M. U. (2025). Family language policy and heritage language transmission in Pakistan—the intersection of family dynamics, ethnic identity and cultural practices on language maintenance. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1560755/full>
6. Gong, Z., Pan, L., & Liu, Y. (2025). Negotiating harmony in a bilingual family: A case study of language practice in a Chinese multigenerational household. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2502543>
7. Gorter, M., & Berardi-Wiltshire, A. (2026). Heritage language maintenance and family relationship dynamics: A children's perspective. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241311547>
8. Hollebeke, I., Dekeyser, G. N. M., Caira, T., Agirdag, O., & Struys, E. (2023). Cherishing the heritage language: Predictors of parental heritage language maintenance efforts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069221132630>
9. King, K. A. (2023). Family language policy. In *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003082637-6/family-language-policy-kendall-king>
10. Lam, S. F., Vong, K. I. P., & Wei, B. (2026). The malaise of preserving a minority language in multilingual homes in southwest China: A family language policy perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2451042>
11. Lubis, I. S. (2024). Loving your grandparents: Family relationship in shaping language policy. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386248077_Loving_Your_Grandparents_Family_Relationship_in_Shaping_Language_Policy
12. Nie, P., & Wang, S. (2025). Homescape, parental agency and family language policy: How Yi parents utilize semiotic resources to facilitate language maintenance. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2025.2487290>
13. Qin, P., & Zou, Y. (2025). A systematic review of Chinese heritage language learning in Europe: Trends, challenges and potentials. *European Educational Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041251387009>
14. Romanowski, P. (2026). Heritage language revival: Digital media's role in grandparent-grandchild interactions. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2026.2614753>
15. Tse Crepaldi, Y., & Mirvahedi, S. H. (2024). Language ideologies and practices in flux: The case of an Italian-Chinese transnational family. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2355019>
16. Wang, Y. (2023). Speaking Chinese or no breakfast: Emotional challenges and experiences confronting Chinese immigrant families in heritage language maintenance. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069221126043>

-
17. Wang, Z., & Liu, C. (2025). A survey of family language planning in Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture in the context of new language education policies. *Languages*, 10(12), 303. <https://www.mdpi.com/2226-471X/10/12/303>
 18. Yang, L., & Shang, G. (2026). Plurilingual family language policy of internal immigrant families in Suzhou, China: Capital, identity and agency. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2542481>