

Family Language Policy of the English Speaking Immigrant Community in Israel: Families with Young Children and Their FLP Planning, Management, and Outcomes

Orly Kayam

Zinman College at the Wingate Institute

Netanya, Israel, 42902

E-mail: orlyka@wincol.ac.il

Tijana Hirsch (Corresponding author)

Zinman College at the Wingate Institute

Netanya, Israel, 42902

E-mail: tijana-h@wincol.ac.il

Received: Nov. 6, 2012 Accepted: December 3, 2012 Published: December 31, 2012

doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2631

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2631>

Abstract

This study explores Family Language Policy (FLP) processes of the English speaking families with young children in Israel. This paper is the first in series aimed at describing and exploring the FLP processes and outcomes of this community in detail. FLP includes ideologies and beliefs, planning and management, as well as the linguistic outcomes of those practices. In the current paper we describe our participants' language use and dominance and explore the degree to which planning occurred and through which means. We also look at the FLP outcomes as exhibited through children's language choice and use.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Community languages, Language policy, Heritage languages, Language choice, Language maintenance, Family language policy

1. Introduction

1.1 Family Language Policy

Language Policy is a field examining beliefs and ideologies about language, language practices, and efforts to influence the language practices through various management techniques (Spolsky, 2004). Initially, language policy investigations focused on national language planning and policies, or the 'top-down' process stemming from the politics of specific regions at a particular point in time. Language policies are present and stem not only from the 'top down' national policies but also from institutional policies of the school, the workplace, and from the 'bottom up' sources such as the individuals and the families. Family Language Policy (FLP) is a part of sociolinguistic ecology and one of the language policy domains. It was Spolsky (2009) who argued for the recognition of numerous domains including, among others, the FLP. He pointed out that in each of the domains "...language management occurs, and language policy and its components (practice, ideology, and management) can usefully be studied..." Furthermore he pointed out that "...each identifiable domain has its typical participants, and each participant may have their own beliefs about language choice (Spolsky, 2012)." As Spolsky (2012) explains, "In the family, the key participants are parents (with differences sometimes reported between mothers and fathers), children (with differences according to gender and birth order and age) and significant others (grandparents, domestic servants, and close neighbors). Each of these participants will have different language practices, different beliefs about the values of the varieties that make up the sociolinguistic ecology of the community, and each may attempt to manage or influence the language practices and beliefs of others." King, Fogle, & Logan -Terry (2008) explain FLP as "...bringing together two independent and currently disconnected fields of study: language policy and child language acquisition," which can provide an insight into parental language policy and practice changes. Family members hold different roles in the FLP at different times and in different situations, with parents initiating the stance, but not always staying in charge of the FLP. As children grow and interact with their surroundings increasingly they, perhaps unconsciously, begin to change the FLP to different degrees and in different ways. As children enter the school-age they are influenced by their surroundings, they start forming attitudes toward language use, and begin socializing the parents. Parents, in turn, have been found to respond to this socialization shift by changing their policies (Tuominen, 1999), or resisting change to various degrees. Therefore, within FLP, there are different participants and stages to be examined. Learning about a certain family's FLP at a specific time will yield an insight into experiences, attitudes, and management techniques which will be true for that period of time, but which may certainly change as the participants age, mature, and interact with their surroundings. Just as language is fluid, alive, and malleable so are the FLPs of its users. In the current study our aim was to gain insights into the FLP of the English-speaking immigrant community within Israel, for the period which is believed to be parent-led, as is the case in families with young children. As such, we are interested in the planning, practices, and outcomes of the parent-led FLPs of this particular group at this particular time in their lives and history of this society (For more on beliefs, practices, and outcomes in bilingualism see De Houwer (1999)).

1.2 Socio-Cultural Context: English in Israel

Present study is unique. Israel is perhaps the only place in the world where large numbers of Anglophone immigrants move to from their native English speaking countries to the country where English is not an official or dominant language. Immigrants to Israel include Jewish people moving to Israel through the law of return which grants Jewish people from around the world, to those with Jewish ancestry and their spouses the right to settle and gain citizenship in Israel. As such immigrants from USA, UK, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Ireland, and others, both Jewish and not (spouses), in significant numbers are attempting to call Israel their home. Surprisingly, not many studies have been performed examining the FLP of the English speaking community in Israel. To be exact, related topics were addressed by a single study carried out by Lewin (1987), and to our knowledge never again since then. As such, our study is to mark the onset of investigations into the FLP and related issues occurring within the English speaking community in Israel in this Century.

Numerous studies have been carried out in hopes of examining immigrant language-related experiences in different host countries. FLP is an emerging field, yet in Israel studies have already been carried out examining the FLP processes within different immigrant communities and efforts embedded within the FLP of those communities to maintain and transmit their heritage language (HL) to younger and future generations. Although English language speakers have not been considered as heritage language learners in research literature, in Israel however, where English is not an official language we argue that heritage language learner status can be applied to children born to English speaking parents and we use the general term of heritage language learner as used by Kelleher (2010) in which she explains it as used to “...describe a person studying a language who has proficiency in or a cultural connection to that language.” (For such studies examining the experiences of the Russian speakers in Israel from the former Soviet Union and Amharic speakers from Ethiopia see for example: Shwartz and Moin, 2011; Moin, Shwartz, and Bretkopf, 2011; Golan-Cook and Olshtain, 2011, Stavans, Olshtain, and Goldzwig, 2009, and others). On a more global scale, Canada has been a popular research destination for bilingualism due to the presence of dual official language policy of Canadian English and Canadian French within its borders, with Canadian English being the stronger in terms of number of native speakers. Numerous studies on attitudes, motivation, and language maintenance stem from Canada (Gardner and Lambert, 1959, Clement, Gardner, and Smythe, 1977a). A very popular bilingualism research destination has been the USA, focusing on the experiences of immigrants and maintenance of HL's within the English-only terrain of the USA. USA is a land of immigrants, and as such, a natural laboratory for investigations into language experiences and dynamics. Just like the USA, Israel is a land of immigrants, and as such, another natural laboratory for linguistic research explorations, with different realities of course.

1.3 English in Israel

A world language or a global language, “to achieve such a status, a language has to be taken up by other countries around the world. They must decide to give it a special place within their communities, even though they may have few (or no) mother tongue speakers (Crystal, 2003).”

English is currently the global language, the lingua franca. It is valued, desired, and widely learned and used. People originating from English speaking countries have had a more comfortable existence in the world due to their high level of today's lingua franca. They have not had to learn a second or even third language in order to be understood, in order to feel comfortable during travels, to participate in academic/research dialogues etc. More often than not English speakers are the hosts to the linguistically diverse influx of immigrants.

As mentioned earlier, Israel is unique as it is a country which attracts a relatively large number of native English speakers to settle within her borders and into a new and distinctly different linguistic setting. It is interesting then, how those who have enjoyed the fortune of being born into the language that is sought out throughout the world and throughout disciplines become a minority, albeit an advantaged one. Do they take the change in stride, putting in the effort to learn the majority language or do they rely on the status of English? How do they approach the FLP while having and raising their children in Israel? Unlike with many other immigrant groups around the world, English immigrants in Israel do not face the risk of abandonment of their language. In Israel, English is the language of business, science, research, and social interaction between people from different linguistic communities. Within Israel, the only country in the world where Hebrew is one of the two official languages (Hebrew and Arabic) English is held in high regard. It is one that is widely used, respected, desired, represented, and even required. In Israel, English is part of the state's education curriculum from as early as the first grade in some areas, while in others from grade four. The progress of education in English is checked and assessed in elementary and middle schools at the national level, in grades 5 and 8, with the 'Meitzav' exams. It is again assessed as one of the seven required subjects for matriculation from high school with the Bagrut exam. These two national tests (Meitzav and Bagrut) and their format and content are aimed to reflect the standards and benchmarks of the English Curriculum assessing pupils' performances expressed in the form of tasks and projects. (English Curriculum, 2001)

For acceptance into one of the country's universities, students are once again tested with the Psychometric Entrance Test (PET) in English among other subjects. This test is a high stakes test on which admission to university is heavily weighed. It is administered by the Israeli National Institute for Testing and Evaluation (NITE), much like the SAT, a standardized test for university admissions in the USA.

At the Universities across Israel, a high level of proficiency in the English language is a requirement. Students are, in many classes, expected to read international English textbooks and articles as part of the class curriculum. In Masters and Doctorate programs, use of English (depending on the department and focus) is considered standard and necessary. Furthermore, much of the job-market requires its' workers to be proficient in English, in varying degrees depending on the job, position, etc.

English is very present in Israel. Although not an official language of the State of Israel, in examining the Linguistic Landscape of Israel, one will notice English signage everywhere, including street signs, direction oriented signs, shop signs, etc. A field of Linguistic Landscape (LL) within the larger framework of Language Policy examines the representation (or lack

thereof) of different linguistic groups in public spaces juxtaposed against the official policies of those regions. It is interested in uncovering the de-facto policies and symbolic representations of different linguistic groups occupying a single space at the same time, looking at symbolic functions or social realities expressed in those representations or lack thereof. (Landry and Bourhis, 1997) “Linguistic Landscape refers to linguistic objects that mark the public space,” (Ben-Rafael, et al. 2004) posted by official offices (Top Down), as well as those signs posted by private shop owners (Bottom Up). Kind and amount of linguistic representations in markings of public space have been found to have profound effects on individuals and communities. (see Landry and Bourhis 1997) The effects have been found to be far reaching into areas of intergroup perceptions, HL maintenance, etc. (Kayam, Hirsch, and Galily, 2012). English, as mentioned above, is well represented in the Israeli linguistic landscape and otherwise, it is welcoming to English speakers.

In contrast to the LL which is the study of environment and society at large, FLP is a private domain which influences and is influenced by popular beliefs on issues of ‘good parenting’ (King and Fogle, 2006), benefits of bilingualism (Bialystock, 2009), language learning, language maintenance, and overall attitudes of specific contexts to specific non-indigenous languages such as for example English in Israel.

2. The Study

This study is the first in series examining various aspects and attitudes affecting the FLP of the English speaking immigrant community of parents of young children in Israel. The purpose of this study is to examine the FLP: planning, policies, and outcomes of this community. This study contributes to the knowledge base in the field of FLP and provides a unique look into the FLP processes of English speaking immigrants in a new linguistic environment.

2.1 Methods

This study was conducted through a questionnaire created for the current study and was conducted via the Internet, social media channels, and through the use of online data collection tools. We requested participation of parents of young children (up to age 6) who have (themselves or their partner) immigrated to Israel from an English-speaking country, or who spent a considerable amount of time living in an English speaking country prior to their return to Israel.

“The reason for approaching our target population via the Internet is twofold: We wanted to make it as simple as possible for participants to take part in our study. Parents of young children are very busy and asking them to take time out of their busy day, physically, would have made it impossible for some parents to participate. Our suspicion that parents would be more easily reached via the Internet was supported by recent finding which says that parents, particularly mothers, spend more time on Facebook after giving birth (Bartholomew, Schoppe-Sullivan, Glassman, Kamp Dush, and Sullivan, 2012). Making our questionnaire more easily accessible to our target population across Israel made it possible to obtain a more diverse and relatively large sample, strengthening the internal validity of our study. Although the problem of randomization is left unaddressed, psychologists, for example, value internal validity over

generalizability provided by large and diverse samples (Kraut, Olson, M. Banaji, Bruckman, Cohen, & Couper, 2003). Our aim was to reach this linguistic community regardless of their location within the country, and regardless of their immigration status or religious orientation. We wanted to gain an insight into FLP processes within the linguistic community at large: new immigrants, expats, those living in Israel for a very long time, religious, non-religious, Zionist or not, Jewish, non-Jewish, etc. We saw the Internet as the tool which could make this goal possible. By being able to reach different corners of the country during the same time frame, we have removed the temporal distortion from our data. All of the participants participated during the same 3 months and during the same season (for more on how this study was carried out see Kayam & Hirsch, 2012).”

We created the questionnaire using the free of charge Google Documents tool (see docs.google.com) consisting of information about the study prior to the onset of the questionnaire. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous and did not provide any monetary incentives. Participants were reached through different immigrant representing organization's websites, e-mail lists, social media channels such as the Facebook, and others. (For a detailed description of our approach see Kayam & Hirsch, 2012). The questionnaire included demographical questions, language planning questions, experiences, practices, outcomes, and others.

Research questions for the present study were:

- 1) How fluent was the parent immigrant community in Hebrew?
- 2) FLP planning: Did FLP planning take place and to what degree?
- 3) FLP: What are the language use practices and management of our sample (who spoke what to whom within the family)?
- 4) FLP: Outcomes: What was the correlation between parental language assignment and use and children's language use with each of the parents?

2.2 Participants

Two hundred and thirty two participants completed our questionnaire, 192 (83%) Female (mothers) and 40 (17%) Male (fathers). Our participants were highly educated with 74% of the participants possessing a Bachelors degree or higher (37% Masters Degrees and 6% PhD). Partners were also highly educated with 71% possessing a Bachelors degree or higher (25% Masters degree and 9% PhD). Participants rated their family income as above average in 49% of the cases, average in 34% of the cases, and below average in 3% of the cases. Most of the participants were married (84%), 4% were not married but were living with their partners, 7% were single, and 4 % divorced. Participant's parents lived abroad in 73% of the cases, while partner's parents lived in Israel in 68% of the cases. Most participants did not grow up in a bilingual home, with 26% having been brought up bilingually. Most families had 1 or 2 children.

3. Results

3.1 Hebrew Language Fluency among Parents

Participants in our study reported a high level of Hebrew language proficiency for themselves and their partners, with more partners being rated at the highest level of fluency. Specifically, males (fathers) tended to be rated higher in Hebrew proficiency and tended to be more often native Israelis or native Israelis who returned to Israel after a prolonged stay abroad. A high level of Hebrew language proficiency was self reported by our participants with 89 (38.5%) of the participants reporting highest level of fluency and 58 (25 %) of the participants reporting one level below the highest level of fluency. In rating their partner's level of fluency in the Hebrew language, a high level was reported with 160 (69.3%) participants rating their partners at the highest level of fluency and 23 (10%) as one level below "Fluent."

3.2 Family Language Policy Planning

On a scale from 1-5 where a rating of 1 corresponded with "Not at all" and 5 corresponding with "To a large extent" parents were asked to answer FLP planning questions.

3.3 FLP Planning: Discussions, Reading, Consulting Professionals, and Discussions with Friends

To a statement "My partner and I discussed our initial language choice. (We spoke about which language we should use with our child/children at home and/or in schooling.) 50% of all participants reported discussing their initial family language choice substantially (a rating of 4 or 5), approximately 32% of all participants reported not discussing their initial family language choice, and about 18% reported having some discussions on the subject.

To a statement "I/we have read literature on bilingualism in order to help me/us decide which language to use at home and in schooling" 53% of the participants reported not reading literature on bilingualism, 26 % reported a high degree of reading, and 21% reported some reading on the topic.

To a statement "We consulted a professional regarding our choice in language selection at home and/or schooling environment" 89% reported not having done so, 4% reported consulting a professional, 4 % reported having consulted a professional to a great degree.

Our participants did not seek opinions of friends regarding the language choice with their children in 67% of the families, 21% reported discussing it somewhat, and 12% reported discussing it with their friends a lot.

When asked to what extent the choice of communication language with their child was made spontaneously, 53 % responded in affirmative stating that it did occur spontaneously, 34% rated it as not occurring spontaneously, and about 13% were in the middle of the spectrum.

3.4 Family Language Policy

In order to get a clear picture into the FLP of our sample we asked our participants to rate language use dominance in different relationships between family members on the following

scale: English Only, Predominantly English, English and Hebrew equally, Predominantly Hebrew, and Hebrew Only. We ran the frequencies and the results are as follows: most of our participants spoke English with their children, with 121 (52.4%) using English Only with their children and 61 (26.4%) using Predominantly English with their children.

The picture of partner's language use was split, with English Only and Predominantly English chosen by 57 (24.7%) and 40 (17.3%) of the participants respectively and Hebrew Only and Predominantly Hebrew chosen by 50 (21.6%) and 37 (16%) of the participants respectively.

Between each other, parents reported using English Only or Predominantly English in 47% and 12% of the cases respectively, 11% reported using English and Hebrew equally, and 9% and 9.5% reported using Hebrew Only or Predominantly Hebrew respectively. Therefore, English was the dominant language in adult relationships of our FLP sample.

Children were reported to speak to the parent who filled out the questionnaire in English Only in 27% of the cases and Predominantly in English in 22% of the cases while with their partners the rating was more evenly split between English Only (22%) and Predominantly English (15%) and Hebrew Only (22%) and Predominantly Hebrew (11%).

3.5 FLP and Planning: Discussions between Partners

In order to examine the relationship between FLP planning and the actual FLP in terms of language use within the family we ran the interactions between the FLP planning variables as described above and the actual language use in different relationships between the family members as reported by our participants.

3.5.1 Discussions and Language Selection for Communication with Children

Overall, more participants reported having discussed their initial family language choice than not. Out of those who discussed their initial language choice to a large extent, and therefore those who reported planning their FLP via discussions, chose English only (52%) or Predominantly English (68%) in communication with their children. Approximately half as many of those who reported having discussed their initial language choice to a high degree reported speaking Hebrew only (32%) and Predominantly Hebrew (48%).

Those who reported not discussing their initial language choice but who ended up speaking English to their children were the second highest group overall with 63% speaking English only and 32% speaking predominantly in English with their children.

Fourth largest group were those who reported not having discussed their initial language choice and who spoke Hebrew to their children, with 32% using Hebrew predominantly and 32% using Hebrew only in their communication.

3.5.2 Discussions and Language Selection for Communication of Partners with Children

The picture was different for partners. In those families in which the initial language choice was discussed to a high degree, most partners spoke Hebrew to their children (48%), followed by English (28%), and the next largest group were those who spoke English and Hebrew equally (24%). In families where the initial language choice was not discussed, partners tended

to speak English. In those families in which initial language choice was not discussed 51% of the partners spoke English to their children and 29% spoke Hebrew.

3.5.3 Discussions and Language between the Parents

Most participants reported speaking and being spoken to in English with their partner (66%), with most of those having discussed their initial language choice to a great degree (47%), and the second largest group having not discussed it at all (37%). Of those who reported having discussed their initial language choice to a great degree, second largest group (after English), reported speaking Hebrew (28%). Only 10% of the participants reported using both English and Hebrew equally in their communications with their partners.

3.6 FLP Planning and Management

3.6.1 Reading and Language Use

In looking at frequencies of FLP Planning variables asking about the degree to which our participants relied on having read literature on bilingualism prior to having children in helping them make their decision regarding the language choice, most participants reported not relying on the literature in FLP planning (111 participants), while approximately half as many reported as having read to a high degree prior to their initial language choice (54 participants). Whether having read or not, most of our participants reported choosing English only or Predominantly English in their communication with their children and amongst themselves, followed by those who chose Hebrew only or Predominantly Hebrew. For partners the picture is similar, with most of the partners speaking English or Hebrew with their children. Some did, however, report using English and Hebrew equally (25%) with their children. This was not the case with the participants who filled out the questionnaire on behalf of their family. They, as mentioned above, tended to fall into the English only or predominantly English category.

3.6.2 Professional Consultation and Language Use

An overwhelming majority of our participants did not consult a professional such as a teacher, a speech therapist, etc. in helping them make their FLP planning decisions (88%). Only 3.9% reported consulting a professional to a large extent. Partners were once again mostly divided between the English and Hebrew poles, with few reporting the equal use of English and Hebrew. Partners who spoke to each other in English reported, in an overwhelming degree not having read any literature prior to their initial Language Choice.

3.6.3 Discussions With friends

Our participants reported not relying on discussions with their friends regarding their initial language choice and FLP planning. Majority reported not discussing their FLP planning with their friends.

3.7 Family Language Policy Outcome

3.7.1 Child Language Use

Most participants in our survey reported their children speaking English to them. To be exact,

94 participants reported their children using English only or predominantly English in addressing the participant. In those families in which the initial language choice was discussed to a great degree, most children spoke to the participants in English, with the Hebrew following closely behind (51 % vs. 44%). With partners the language use in children was almost equally divided between Hebrew and English in families which discussed their choices to a great degree. In families in which the initial language choice was discussed to a great degree 35% of the children spoke Hebrew to the partner, and 33% spoke English. In those families in which there was virtually no discussion about the initial language use, the outcome was as following: In 55% of such families children are reported to be speaking English to the participants and 35% of the children are reported to be speaking Hebrew. With partners, 54% reported their children speaking English and 29% Hebrew. Speaking English and Hebrew equally was not reported in many cases with the participants who filled out the survey, but it was reported to be the case with the partner in 29 % of the families.

Most of our participants speak English only with their children. In 48% of the cases where participant reported speaking in English only, the child was reported to respond in English only, in 21% of the cases children spoke in English predominantly, in 10 % predominantly Hebrew, in 7% English and Hebrew equally, and in 2% Hebrew only. In cases in which the participant reported speaking predominantly in English, children were reported to respond in English predominantly in 41% of the cases, 33% in English and Hebrew equally, 5% in English only, 3% in Hebrew predominantly, and 2% in Hebrew only.

Partners were reported to speak Hebrew more often to their children. In 82% of the cases in which the partner was reported to speak in Hebrew only, the children spoke back in Hebrew. If the partner was reported to speak in Hebrew predominantly, the child was reported to respond in the same way in 41% of the participants. In 75% of the cases in which the partner spoke English only with the child, the child responded by speaking in English only and in 19% of the cases the child responded predominantly in English.

4. Discussion

Our sample consisted of parents of young children (0-6 years old) who immigrated to Israel from an English speaking country (USA, Canada, UK, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand), for the first time or as a returning citizen of Israel. The participants who answered the questionnaire tended to be the mothers and most often native English speakers moving to Israel for the first time. The partners tended to be the fathers, some of whom were native Israelis, some who had spent considerable amount of time living abroad, in an English speaking country before returning to Israel, and some who moved to Israel from an English speaking country for the first time. In other words, most families consisted of a couple with one of the partners having lived in Israel before (or all along), most often the man.

This study is first in series examining FLP, attitudes, motivations, choices, and experiences of English speaking immigrants in Israel. With the increasing number of such immigrants it is important to understand their experiences within this new linguistic society, the choices they make for their children, and the outcomes of such choices, both on the emotional level, and the linguistic vitality level. Haaretz Newspaper for example reported “Aliyah (immigration) from

North America rose from 3,720 during 5770 (Jewish year corresponding to about 2 years ago - 2010) to about 4,070, an increase of about 9 percent.” Immigrants from English speaking countries are most often not underprivileged and are in Israel entirely by choice. They are not seeking asylum of any sort and have a true possibility to leave Israel if they choose to, whether to their country of origin or a different English speaking (or other) country. They are a unique group, as they come with the privilege of possessing the world's lingua franca: English, which is very much sought after in Israel, as in the rest of the world. With this backing they are automatically put into a position, perhaps not entirely consciously, in which they can choose their stance toward integration of their family into Israeli society. They simply have more possibilities but also a bigger burden of making the 'right choice' for themselves and their children. As English is viewed positively in Israel and as it is widely known and used by her citizens, in the business world, in education, etc. new English speaking immigrants have the option of opting out of integration, to a certain degree. Since Israel as a country is unique in that it attracts large numbers of English speaking immigrants, it is also a natural laboratory for examination of the globally linguistically dominant group's functioning as a linguistic minority within their country of residence.

This work is concerned with uncovering the FLP of a segment of this community which is in the midst of decision and policy making for the younger generations and who at the moment have the power to influence the next generation, in some cases first generation of Israeli born English speakers (Americans, Canadians, South Africans, Australians, etc.) and their sense of belonging, language mastery and all that comes with it. We are concerned first and foremost with the question of FLP, or who speaks what to whom within these families. We are interested in the planning degree and type and the resulting choices. Also, we are interested in the results of the parent-led FLPs outcome in terms of language used by the child.

As reported in the results section, we found that English speaking immigrant parents of young children either planned their FLP through discussions with their partner to a great degree or not at all. This could mean that some were truly concerned with the future of their home linguistic environments, while others perhaps felt it to be an obvious choice. Most reported their initial language choice occurring spontaneously. In examining the frequencies, we found that most participants spoke English with their children, with the great majority falling into the English only category. Partners were split between English and Hebrew dominance in their communication with their children, and most couples spoke English amongst themselves. In planning their FLP most who did plan ahead relied on discussions with partner and did not focus on literature on bilingualism, consulting with professionals, and/or discussions with friends. Couples seem to have brought their own experiences, feelings, and opinions into discussions, relying on them in making decisions for their growing families. Participants who filled out the survey (mostly mothers) and who had planned their FLP through discussions mostly spoke English to their children, while a greater number of the partners (mostly fathers) chose to speak Hebrew with their children. This outcome is not surprising considering the fact that partners tended to have previous connection to Israel and Hebrew. The outcome of the FLP in terms of language use of children confirms what is already known in the linguistic studies and that is that children reap the language they sow (Prevoo, Mesman, Van Ljzendoorn,

and Pieper). Children tended to use the language in which they are spoken to. The language practices between the parents communicate the reality of these couples. More often than not, they met and established their relationships and linguistic practices abroad and simply moved them to a new location.

In this paper we address the FLP practices and outcomes in terms of children's language use but we also believe that in order to form a whole picture of this subgroup of the English speaking community, we need to continue the research and uncover the not always apparent feelings, attitudes, and motivations, as well as the choices made on behalf of children outside of the home environment: language environment of the preschool or nanny and the reasons behind these choices. We plan on doing just that. We also urge researchers in this field to examine FLP experiences and practices of other age groups within this community in order to complete the picture of the experiences of English speaking immigrants in Israel. Understanding of the experiences of this linguistic immigrant community will help the rest of Israeli society understand this group better and it will help the new comers be understood, on a local level. In a research community at large, it will form an interesting point of comparison between an English speaking minority versus the studies carried out in the English dominant multilingual, multicultural societies such as the USA and others.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the participants for taking the time to answer our survey. In helping us reach the participants we would like to thank all the immigrant and related organizations for English speakers in Israel who helped by including our questionnaire on their websites, in their e-mailing lists, and/or newsletters. Thank you to Telfed, City Kids, ESRA, and others. A special thank you to Mr. Dorron Klein from Telfed for his sincere willingness and effort in helping us connect with English-speaking immigrant organizations and offices across Israel, and for helping us reach the South African community in Israel. Furthermore, we would like to thank Aviva Zeev and Michal Arnon for their help with the data analysis. Thank you for your time, discussions, and all the help.

References

- Bartholomew, Schoppe-Sullivan, Glassman, Kamp Dush, & Sullivan (2012). New Parents' Facebook Use at the Transition to Parenthood. *Family Relation Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 61(3), 455-469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00708.x>
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Amara, M.H., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2004). Linguistic Landscape and Multiculturalism: A Jewish-Arab Comparative Study. Tel Aviv: Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research.
- Bialystock, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12(1), 3-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1366728908003477>
- Clement, R., Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977a). Inter-ethnic Contact: Attitudinal consequences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 205-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0081625>

Crystal, D. (2003). English as a global language. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>

De Houwer, A. (1999) Environmental factors in early bilingual development: the role of parental beliefs and attitudes. Bilingualism and Migration, ed. By Guus Extra and Ludo Verhoeven, 75-96. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959) Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0083787>

Golan-Cook, P., & Olshtain, E. (2011). A Model of Identity and Language Orientations: The Case of Immigrant Students from the Former Soviet Union in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(4), 361-376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.579128>

Haaretz Newspaper: Aliyah numbers up from N. America, Tuesday, September 04, 2012 Elul 17, 5772 <http://www.haaretz.com/weekend/anglo-file/aliyah-numbers-up-from-n-america-1.386171>

Kayam, O., & Hirsch, T. (2012). Using Social Media Networks to Conduct Questionnaire Based Research in Social Studies Case Study: Family Language Policy. *Journal of Sociological Research*. 3:2, 57-67.

Kayam, O., Hirsch, T., & Galily, Y. (2012). Linguistic Landscape: Investigation of Linguistic Representations of Cape Town. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 4:3, 71-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2197>

Kelleher, A. (2010). Who is a heritage language learner? *Heritage Briefs*. Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

King K.A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907-922. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x>

King, K. A., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 96, 695-712. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/beb362.0>

Kraut, R., Olson, J. S., Banjai, M. R., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J., & Couper, M. (2003). Psychological Research Online: Opportunities and Challenges. American Psychological Association.

Lewin, B. (1987). Attitudinal Aspects of Immigrants' Choice of Home Language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 8(4), 361-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1987.9994297>

Moin, V., Shwartz, M., & Breitkopf, A. (2011). Balancing between heritage and host languages in bilingual kindergarten: viewpoints of Russian-speaking immigrant parents in Germany and in Israel. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 19(4), 515-533. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2011.623530>

Prevoo, M.J.L., Mesman, J., Van IJzendoorn, & Pieper, S. (2011). Bilingual toddlers reap the language they sow: ethnic minority toddlers' childcare attendance increases maternal host language use. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(6), 561-576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.609279>

Shwartz, M., & Moin, V. (2011). PArents' assessment if their preschool children's bilingual development in the context of family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 35-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638078>

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511626470>

Spolsky, B. (2012). Family Language Policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 3-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638072>

Stavans, A., Olshtain, E., & Goldzweig, G. (2009). Parental Perceptions of Children's Literacy and Bilingualism: The Case of Ethiopian Immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(2), 111-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434630802307916>

Tuominen, A. K. (1999). Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 140, 59-76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1999.140.59>