

JANICE NAKAMURA

Sagami Women's University, Sagamihara, Kanagawa, Japan
International Christian University, Mitaka, Tokyo, Japan

PARENTS' IMPACT BELIEF IN RAISING BILINGUAL AND BILITERATE CHILDREN IN JAPAN

Impact belief is the conviction that parents have that they can affect their children's language development (De Houwer, 1999). This paper investigates how parents' impact belief is shaped and how it transpires into language management which supports the bilingual and biliterate development of children in exogamous families. Interviews with eight English-speaking parents raising English-Japanese bilingual children in Tokyo, Japan were analyzed using the constructive grounded approach (Charmaz, 2014). The results revealed that the parents' impact belief was influenced by their individual experiences, the support of their Japanese spouses, and peer influence. Specifically, it was positively affected by other parents with older bilingual children. The parents' impact belief was also strengthened by their involvement in 'communities of practice,' i.e., English playgroup and weekend school. Their strong impact belief led to language management efforts which included their insistence on their children speaking English and the regular practice of home literacy activities.

Keywords: bilingualism, biliteracy, family language policy, language ideologies, impact belief, Japan

Introduction

Parents play a central role in fostering bilingualism (Hakuta & D' Andrea, 1992), and active bilingualism may be considered as the direct product of a successful family language policy (FLP) (Schwartz & Verschik, 2013). Central to a successful FLP is the parents' language ideology (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; King, Fogle, & Logan-Terry, 2008). Language

ideology is defined as 'a set of beliefs concerning a particular language, or possibly language in general' (King, 2000, p. 168). Unlike an attitude, which tends to be more specific, e.g., towards a particular language, a language ideology is global in nature and reflects an individual's broad perspectives on society or philosophy of life (Baker, 1992). Shaped by interwoven individual factors, e.g., a missed opportunity to acquire a language (King & Fogle, 2006), and societal influences, e.g., socio-political and economic benefits of language mastery (Canagarajah, 2008; Curdt-Christiansen, 2009), parents' language ideology even leads to the development of lay theories, e.g., early bilingual development is an unconditional benefit for children (Moin, Schwartz, & Leikin, 2013).

However, parents' expression of their language ideologies in surveys and interviews do not necessarily match their home language practices (Baker, 1992). King (2000) explains that such disparities may be attributed to the fact that overt, expressed language attitudes may only represent one of the many language ideologies that minority language speakers may have, and which influence their language behavior. Particularly, the acknowledgment of the family's role in minority language transmission conflicts with the valorization of the societal language for social mobility (Canagarajah, 2008). However, the mismatch between language ideology and language practice may also be attributed to parents' lack of 'impact belief'. The term was coined by De Houwer (1999, p.83) to describe the belief that 'parents can exercise some sort of control over their children's linguistic functioning'. She distinguished parents' impact beliefs from their attitudes toward a particular language, languages in general and bilingualism. Strong impact beliefs refer to parents' conviction that their language use has a direct effect on what their children will learn to say. Conversely, weak impact beliefs describe parents' conviction that they have little control over their children's language development. Baker (1992) has also touched upon this concept. He suggested that language attitude has three components – cognitive, affective and readiness for action. The latter refers to a 'behavioral intent or plan of action' (p.13). This action or conative component of attitude closely relates to impact belief because parents who have strong impact belief arguably demonstrate readiness for action, i.e., they act to realize what they believe in. Therefore, parents' impact belief is an 'enabling' factor of FLP. It reflects their willingness, determination, ability, and confidence in playing an active role in their children's bilingual development.

In her three-tier model, De Houwer (1999) proposed that both parental attitudes and impact beliefs exert influence on their linguistic choices and interaction strategies, which in turn affect children's language development. Therefore, whereas positive attitudes towards the two languages being acquired by the child and to early child bilingualism are a basic and necessary condition for active bilingualism, they are an insufficient condition on their own. She argued

that parents must also have an impact belief regarding their roles in their children's language development. Without an impact belief, there would be insufficient support for the development of active bilingualism.

Some studies lend support to this notion. For instance, Zapotec-speaking parents in the US regarded their Los Angeles-born children as incapable of understanding their native language and addressed them only in Spanish (Pérez Báez, 2013). The parents did not think that they could or should influence their children's language acquisition process and therefore did not engage in language intervention measures to maintain Zapotec in the home. Likewise, Papua New Guinean parents believed that they had no influence on their children's language and spoke very little to them (Kulick, 1992). The lack of impact belief is not necessarily culture-related. Migrant parents from China, Turkey, Iran, and Serbia accepted with resignation that they had minimal control over their children's minority language development after assessing the societal dominance of English in Canada and their children's extended exposure to English in daycare (Chumak-Horbatsch, 2008).

Velázquez's (2013) observations of Spanish attrition and incomplete acquisition in Latino families despite Latino mothers' strong positive attitudes towards the transmission of Spanish also demonstrated how such attitudes are a necessary but insufficient factor for supporting minority language transmission. She likened the gap between a positive attitude towards the minority language and positive actions in fostering bilingualism to other parental beliefs about activities perceived as beneficial to children (e.g., making healthier food choices) and actual, sustained engagement in them. She suggested that parents need to know *how* active bilingualism can be achieved, which arguably relates to beliefs of their own roles in their children's language development. Likewise, the practice of second-generation Turkish parents in the Netherlands of using the minority language to children only until school age despite a strong Turkish maintenance ideology probably indicated a lack of impact belief that they could still affect their children's language development at older ages (Bezioglu-Goktolga & Yağmur, 2018). Parents' impact belief may also vary according to the language in question. Their impact belief on maintaining the minority language may be weak but can be comparatively stronger concerning the acquisition of the majority language (Navarro & Macalister, 2017).

An impact belief is probably best inferred from parents' actions, particularly their efforts in home language management. Parents with a strong impact belief are likely to assume authority as the family's 'language manager' (Spolsky, 2009). They probably make explicit and deliberate efforts to activate their children's bilingualism through the use of discourse strategies (e.g., Juan-Garau & Pérez-Vidal, 2001; Lanza, 2004). Whenever the societal language is used, parents may explicitly request the child to translate or feign non-comprehension so that the utterance is reproduced in the minority

language (Chevalier, 2013 ; Döpke, 1992). Literacy activities are another form of language management which is driven by parents' impact belief that they can develop their children's literacy in the home. Parents with a strong impact belief are likely to invest much time and effort in teaching literacy by making original teaching materials (Saunders, 1988) and engaging creative methods of instruction including drama, costume, puppets, and drawings (Kopeliovich, 2013) to keep children interested and engaged in the language. Enrolling children in minority language playgroups, weekend schools (Spolsky, 2009), minority language tuition (Curd-Christiansen, 2012), and correspondence courses (Okita, 2001) also indicate parents' impact belief in developing their children's biliteracy.

Nevertheless, despite a strong language ideology and impact belief, some parents may find themselves with children who speak only one of their two languages. While many parents may regard the exclusive use of a language in the One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL) setting as the best practice for bilingual childrearing (Piller & Gerber, 2018), the OPOL approach has been criticized for being a 'double monolingualist' strategy which does not consider the flexible multilingual practices that take place in the home (e.g., Danjo, 2018). The OPOL approach does not guarantee active bilingualism (De Houwer, 2007), and neither does literacy instruction (Nakamura, 2018; Smith-Christmas, 2016). Nevertheless, continued use of the minority language by parents may help children speak the language later on. The children in Slavkov (2015) and Uribe de Kellett (2002) successfully regained productive ability in their minority language after a period of non-production. Sustained efforts to speak the minority language despite the lack of child production also indicate parents' strong impact belief that they can encourage their children's active bilingualism at older ages.

Bilingualism in exogamous families in Japan

Since the late 1980s, exogamous marriages between Japanese and non-Japanese people have become increasingly common in Japan. While the percentage of exogamous marriages peaked at 11% of total registered marriages in the year 2007, it has consistently remained between 5% to 6% from years 2011 to 2017 (Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, 2019). The rising number of non-Japanese spouses has the potential to alter the linguistic landscape of a society which has been traditionally known for its linguistic homogeneity. However, non-Japanese parents tend to speak Japanese to their children (Ishii, 2010; Jabar, 2013; Nakamura, 2015; Yamamoto, 2005). Language ideology plays a critical role in minority language transmission, but non-Japanese parents tend to valorize and prioritize the acquisition of Japanese, and evaluate their minority language negatively (Nakamura, 2016; Yamamoto, 2002). For some parents, their language ideology may be driven by their perception of society's negative evaluation of

their minority language rather than actual experiences. In Nakamura (2016), a Thai mother chose to speak Japanese to her children in front of their Japanese kindergarten teacher and grandparents due to her perceived fear that they would be angry if she used Thai. The tendency of non-Japanese parents to attach little value to the acquisition of the minority language contributes to a pro-Japanese FLP and leads to receptive bilingualism or Japanese monolingualism in their children.

Bilingualism is arguably more attainable in Japan when the minority language is English. The language is prestigious because of its prominence in the Japanese education system and the business sector (Fujita-Round & Maher, 2017; Seargeant, 2011). English-Japanese bilingualism is highly valued by Japanese people (Yamamoto, 2001a), and English-speaking parents raising bilingual children are aware of society's favorable perception of the language (Yamamoto, 2005). The high status of English in Japan even motivates non-native English speakers to speak English instead of their native language to their children (Billings, 1990; Nakamura, 2016; Yamamoto, 2002, 2005). Nevertheless, not all children exposed to English end up speaking it. Roughly one in three English-Japanese bilingual children from exogamous families speaks only Japanese (Billings, 1990; Noguchi, 2001; Yamamoto, 2001b). Biliteracy is an even bigger challenge because the task of teaching falls on the English-speaking parent. Therefore, while English enjoys high prestige in Japan, its status is not enough by itself for supporting active bilingualism. Sending children to an English-medium school or having only one child are ways to create a bilingual outcome (Yamamoto, 2001b), but these options may not be feasible for all families. Other variables that support family bilingualism in Japan need to be explored.

The study

Rationale and purpose

The burgeoning body of FLP research has primarily concentrated on industrialized Western societies where parents hail from another industrialized Western country or a non-industrialized, and/or non-Western country (Smith-Christmas, 2017). Only a handful of studies have been conducted on the Asian context. Both Dumanig, David, and Shanmuganathan (2013) and Curdt-Christiansen (2012, 2016) represent ground-breaking FLP work on the multilingual societies of Malaysia and Singapore. As an industrialized Asian country where linguistic and cultural homogeneity still prevails, Japan presents an interesting and unique sociolinguistic milieu for FLP research because efforts in maintaining the minority language need to be initiated and sustained mostly, if not entirely, by the family itself. With support for minority language learning lacking in the Japanese education system (Fujita-Round & Maher, 2017), such family-driven initiatives are necessary

even for a language as prestigious as English. The study of the successful FLPs of parents from industrialized Western countries who speak a language of high global status, i.e., English, in an industrialized East Asian nation with a highly dominant societal language, i.e., Japanese, would provide some valuable insights on minority language maintenance which could benefit other bilingual families in Japan and elsewhere.

This paper also makes a novel contribution to the field of FLP by revisiting De Houwer's (1999) concept of impact beliefs, which is arguably a crucial factor in fostering children's active bilingualism. While some previous studies have indirectly indicated the role of parents' impact belief in children's bilingualism, as far as the author is aware, it has never been researched as a topic on its own. There is merit in studying parents' impact belief on its own instead of treating it as part of family language ideology because we may be able to see new perspectives of family bilingualism if we do so. With this in mind, this study sets out to investigate the impact belief of English-speaking parents who are raising English-Japanese bilingual and biliterate children in Tokyo, Japan. The parents' relative success in developing their children's English-Japanese bilingualism and biliteracy in a predominantly Japanese-speaking society makes it worthwhile examining the factors that shaped their impact beliefs and how their impact beliefs transpired into language management practices that supported bilingual development.

Participants

This study involved eight exogamous English-Japanese bilingual families who sent their children to a weekend English school in central Tokyo. The researcher, a Malaysian who is also involved in an exogamous marriage, became acquainted with the families because her child also attended the same school. Table 1 shows the details of the English-speaking parents (pseudonyms used) who participated in the interviews. The participants were long-term residents in Japan with 11 to 29 years of residency.

Table 1. Profile of the English-speaking parents.

Participant	Nationality	Years of residency	Education level	Occupation
Hanna	US	24	College degree	Data analyst
Sheila	US	11	College degree	Full-time housewife
Martin	Canada	17	College degree	High school English teacher
Mel	Australia	25	College degree	Editor
Joyce	US	16	College degree	Part-time English teacher
Brian	US	25	College degree	IT entrepreneur
Jim	Australia	29	College degree	Editor
Gillian	US	20	College degree	Banker

All of the participants were in a heterosexual relationship with a Japanese spouse. Five of them were Americans (Hanna, Sheila, Joyce, Brian, and Gillian), two were Australians (Mel and Jim), and one (Martin) was from Canada. Five participants were mothers (Hanna, Sheila, Mel, Joyce, and Gillian) and three were fathers (Martin, Brian, and Jim). All of the parents had college degrees and were working in Japan except for Sheila who was a stay-at-home mother. Some of them had English teaching and editing jobs (Martin, Mel, Joyce, and Jim). The families were nuclear families except for Sheila's family who lived with the children's Japanese grandmother.

Table 2. Reported language use in the family.

P1	Policy	Age	Children's language use			Parents' language use		
			C > P1	C > P2	C <> C	P1 > C	P2 > C	P1 <> P2
Hanna	MLAT	C1 7	90% E	90% E	-	100% E	100% E	100% E
Sheila	OPOL	C1 7	100% E	100% J	100% E	100% E	100% J	100% J
		C2 1	-					
Martin	OPOL	C1 8	100% E	100% J	100% J	100% E	100% J	100% E
		C2 5	70% E					
Mel	OPOL	C1 13	100% E	100% J	100% J	100% E	100% J	Dual-lingual
		C2 9						
Joyce	OPOL	C1 8	100% E	80% J	100% E	100% E	80% J	Dual-lingual
		C2 6						
Brian	OPOL	C1 9	90% E	100% J	100% J	100% E	100% J	100% E
		C2 3	10% E					
Jim	OPOL	C1 9	10% E	100% J	90% J	100% E	100% J	Dual-lingual
		C2 5	90% E					
Gillian	OPOL	C1 13	0% E					Dual-lingual
		C2 9	50% E	100% J	100% J	100% E	100% J	
		C3 7	0% E					

Note: English (E), Japanese (J), English-speaking parent (P1), Japanese-speaking parent (P2), First child (C1), Second child (C2), Third child (C3), Minority-Language-At-Home (MLAT), One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL)

Table 2 shows the details of the children. Between the eight families, there were 16 children between the ages of 1 to 13. All of them were born and raised in Japan in an OPOL setting where they were exposed to English by their English-speaking parents and Japanese by their Japanese parents. Only Hanna's family practiced the Minority-Language-At-Home (MLAT) policy. Hanna's Japanese husband was a long-term resident in the US. Being a fluent English speaker, he also spoke English to their child. Table 2 also shows

reported language use in the family. Siblings in the same family had the same percentage of English use unless different percentages were given in separate rows in the table. Except for Sheila's second child who was pre-verbal, many of the children were reported by their parents to be active bilinguals who spoke English to their parents. However, Brian's younger child (C2), Jim's older child (C1) and Gillian's first and third children (C1 and C3) were reportedly receptive bilinguals who spoke Japanese to them. All English-speaking parents (P1) reportedly used 100% English (E) to their children.

Except for Hanna's child, the children spoke Japanese (J) to their Japanese parent (P2). For many of the children, Japanese was also the language used between siblings. However, Sheila's and Joyce's children spoke English to each other because the mothers insisted on English being used between siblings. Language use between parents varied. Hanna, Brian, and Martin used English with their Japanese spouses whereas Sheila and her husband spoke Japanese to each other. Mel, Joyce, Jim, and Gillian communicated dual-lingually with their Japanese spouses, i.e., they would speak English, and their spouses would speak Japanese.

The children attended Japanese public schools on weekdays. Most of them could read and write in English to some extent because they were taught by their parents at home and attended the weekend English school. Only siblings who were too young (age 3 and below) or too old (above age 12) were not enrolled in the English school. The school was an independent school ran by the parents. The children were taught to read and write in English by two international school teachers and were streamed in four different classes according to their age and ability. Every Saturday, the children received between an hour to an hour and a half of literacy instruction.

Method

An ethnographic approach was used as a tool of inquiry for this study. Interviews were conducted with each parent to understand their FLP. These ethnographic interviews were distinct from other interview types because they were based on an established relationship between the researcher and the participants (Heyl, 2001). In this study, the researcher had an on-going peer relationship of mutual respect with the parents, which allowed open and genuine sharing of views. Specifically, she had known the participants for more than a year before the study commenced and regularly interacted with them in the weekends. It was a common practice for parents to chat with each other while waiting for their children to finish their English classes and the topic of conversation often revolved around the children's English development. Therefore, the interviews were an extension of the conversations that commonly took place between the researcher and the parents. The ethnographic interviews were unstructured to enable the parents to navigate

the interview in a way that was meaningful to them. They were only guided to talk about their bilingual parenting experiences chronologically and were not asked directly about their impact beliefs. The study of impact belief was not planned and was only investigated after the parents' impact beliefs emerged during the preliminary analysis of the data. Each hour-long interview was audio-recorded. Field notes were also taken and, whenever possible, keyed into a word processor on the same day.

Data were analyzed using the constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014), which is a systematic yet flexible approach towards collecting and analyzing qualitative data. Constructivism builds upon the iterative and comparative approach of traditional grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) but acknowledges the subjectivity and the involvement of the researcher in data construction and interpretation. In the first phase of the analysis, the researcher performed initial line-by-line coding. Table 3 gives an example of the initial coding of a parent's interview transcript. The initial codes on the left column describe the narrative data on the right column. These initial codes follow the data closely. A total of eight codes were constructed from Mel's account about how her English literacy efforts were inspired by *senpai* mothers (mothers with older children) in her playgroup. Following Glaser (1978), coding was done with gerunds (e.g., acknowledging children's agency) to help identify the processes the participants underwent and to ensure that the codes closely reflected the data.

Table 3. Example of initial coding.

Initial codes	Narrative data
Observing other moms teaching literacy	So when I was in the playgroup, I saw a couple of the other mothers, and they were talking about books that they teach. I was like 'Not only can their kids speak English, they were teaching them to read. Oh, I'm going to do that too!'. I didn't set out. I was sort of like inspired and encouraged and supported by <i>senpai</i> parents who were doing more ahead than me because their kids were older. And I think our literacy classes are like that. And if your kid is willing, right? Some kids are not willing, not gung-ho about it; they're not kicking up a huge fuss. But if your kid is willing, it's like 'Oh, how did this mother get her kid to do this?'. 'Sticker charts!'. 'Oh, sticker charts!'.
Feeling impressed by other mothers' literacy efforts	
Deciding to imitate <i>senpai</i> mothers	
Not having the intention to teach literacy at first	
Being inspired and encouraged by <i>senpai</i> mothers	
Acknowledging children's agency	
Acknowledging the potential of working with willing children	
Getting ideas on how to teach from other mothers	

derived from the example in Table 4 were included in three separate memos on ‘peer influence on teaching literacy,’ ‘child agency in language learning,’ and ‘community support in teaching literacy’ together with similar focused codes from other transcripts. In total, 41 memos were written in the following categories: language ideology (6), impact belief (5), language management (23), and language practice (7). Related memos were used to understand how parents’ impact beliefs were formed. Finally, theoretical sampling was performed by retracing the theoretical sub-categories (e.g., peer influence on impact belief) to the data and using the data to explicate them.

Results

Parents’ Language Ideology

The parents’ pro-English ideology was initially driven by their perception that they would be providing the best linguistic input to their children in their native language. In Excerpt 1, Martin explained how his native language was the obvious choice for him. In Excerpt 2, Hanna shared her belief that bilingualism was generally good for her child.

Excerpt 1

Martin: *For me it just makes sense. For, if that is your native language, that’s what you should be teaching, speaking to your kids. The language you know.*

Excerpt 2

Hanna: *We think that it will help him when he becomes an adult. He can become a little bit more global. I guess he would be able to see more than just his surroundings right now growing up in Japan.*

Personal experiences also affected parents’ language ideology. Mel’s lost opportunity to acquire Cantonese when growing up in Australia influenced her decision to raise her children bilingually (Excerpt 3).

Excerpt 3

Mel: *I am half Chinese and was brought up half Chinese, but it was kind of frustrating. I was brought up in a Chinese community, but my mother never taught me Chinese*

The parents’ pro-English language ideology was also influenced by socioeconomic factors, particularly as they started to contemplate education and career choices for their children. Martin felt that knowing English would help his child get into better schools (Excerpt 4). Perceptions that English would provide an academic advantage motivated the parents to develop their children’s reading and writing abilities in English.

Excerpt 4

Martin: *I think that when he (child) is going into junior high school, or high school, knowing English will help him get into better schools. There are schools now that, because his English is a lot higher than most kids, they'll accept him.*

Many of the parents including Jim and Joyce (Excerpts 5 and 6) were also keen for their children to attend high school or college abroad. Their preference for a Western-style education stemmed from their dissatisfaction with the Japanese education system. To enter prestigious junior high schools, high schools, and universities, students in Japan need to attend a 'cram school', an expensive specialized school that teaches an accelerated curriculum after school hours aimed at preparing them for rigorous entrance examinations. Most of the parents disagreed with this practice and preferred to give their children an academic advantage through learning English. Their expectations that their children would transition to an English-focused junior high, high school or college in Japan or in an English-speaking country motivated them to develop a high level of English proficiency in their children. These findings corroborate with previous studies which showed how parental expectations of children's educational and career prospects influenced their FLP (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Bezcioglu-Goktolga & Yağmur, 2018).

Excerpt 5

Jim: *We haven't thought that far ahead but I'd expect that they'd want to go overseas for university. It's kind of like a natural course.*

Excerpt 6

Joyce: *I am thinking about sending her (child) to high school in America. She can stay with my mom or my brother's family. And then go to college in America.*

Parents' Impact Beliefs

Analysis of interview transcripts revealed that the parents' impact belief was determined by four main factors, i.e., their individual experiences, spousal support, peer influence, and community influence.

Individual experiences. The parents' own bilingualism, interest in language and literacy, and profession were individual experiences that affected their impact belief. Hanna, an American of Japanese ethnicity, and her Japanese husband were English-Japanese bilinguals who acquired their two languages in childhood. Their experience arguably gave them confidence that their child could undergo the same process to become bilingual (Excerpt 7). Therefore, both parents decided to speak English to their child, a step that helped maximize the amount of English exposure in the home.

Excerpt 7

Hanna: *We both grew up with Japanese, but we were in an English-speaking environment, so we just naturally spoke both languages as we grew older. We thought it would be great for our child to grow up in a similar environment.*

Mel believed that bilingualism is the norm for everyone because of her bilingual work environment (Excerpt 8). Her own bilingualism and interest in languages also convinced her that she could help her children become bilingual too. Mel, Jim, Martin, and Joyce were involved in English-related jobs as teachers and editors. The nature of their work may have also provided them with the skills and the confidence to foster bilingualism in their children. Mel's and Joyce's interest in bilingualism also led them to read books on the subject before their children were born. While books that promoted the benefits of bilingualism encouraged a pro-bilingualism ideology, they also strengthened the parents' impact belief when the parents obtained specific advice on how to achieve their goal. In Excerpt 9, Mel decided to expose her children to mostly English books and TV after reading some books on bilingualism.

Excerpt 8

Mel: *I majored in languages, so I studied French, German and Japanese at university. And another thing is, at work, I am in a bilingual environment. I work for an international news agency, so, to me, it is 'atarimae' (obvious) that everybody is bilingual and function in both languages to some degree.*

Spousal support. Due to the exogamous nature of the families, the English-speaking parents were largely responsible for fostering their children's bilingualism. However, language-related family decisions inevitably involved their Japanese spouses, for example, the kind of TV programs that children should watch or the places where they should go for holidays. Therefore, Japanese spouses' approval and cooperation were required for home language management practices to be implemented successfully. Some parents discussed with their Japanese spouses about raising their children bilingually before their children were born. Informed by general literature on bilingualism, Mel negotiated with her husband to create an English environment at home (Excerpt 9). His cooperation arguably strengthened her impact belief because it gave her more control over their children's language exposure.

Excerpt 9

Mel: *After reading some books, I also agreed with my husband that to increase the chances of the kids having strong English, most of the storybooks and most of their TV time until at least when my eldest hits school would be in English.*

Spousal support also included language support. Hanna's Japanese husband was highly fluent in English, so the couple agreed to make English as the language of the home to maximize their child's exposure to it. In Excerpt 10, Martin also shared how his Japanese-speaking wife would speak English occasionally to their children to show her support for their bilingualism.

Excerpt 10

Martin: *My wife and I speak mostly English to each other, and there were times when she would speak English to the kids to show them that the mother can speak English as well.*

However, not all of the English-speaking parents had the full support of their spouse. Gillian revealed in Excerpt 11 how her husband was indifferent to bilingual parenting. The lack of support from him may have made it more difficult for Gillian to foster active bilingualism in her children.

Excerpt 11

Gillian: *When you look at other families who decided on stricter rules about language in the house, you would probably see that they have spouses who are more supportive about language...It doesn't matter to my husband. He doesn't really mind. He doesn't say anything about supporting the language.*

Peer influence. The parents' impact beliefs were reinforced when they observed the bilingual development of other children. Jim knew that it was possible for his children to become bilingual because he saw how the children of his friends had undergone the process (Excerpt 12). At the pregnancy stage, Mel was already influenced by other expecting mothers who were keen on bilingual parenting. Later on, she was inspired by *senpai* parents in her playgroup who were teaching their children to read English (Excerpt 13). *Senpai* parents positively affected her impact beliefs and raised her initial goal of bilingualism to biliteracy. The experiences of *senpai* parents were probably more influential than the bilingual books that Mel had read because they were real examples of bilingual parenting in circumstances which were very similar to herself. The presence of *senpai* parents was also empowering because Mel had access to their knowledge and experience whenever they were needed.

Excerpt 12

Jim: *I have friends who have had children go through schools here and have been bilingual.*

Excerpt 13

Mel: *So when I was in the playgroup, I saw a couple of the other mothers and they were talking about books that they teach. I was like 'Not only can their kids speak English, they were teaching them to read. Oh, I'm*

going to do that too!'. I didn't set out. I was sort of like inspired and encouraged and supported by senpai parents who were doing more ahead than me because their kids were older.

Community support. Some parents' impact beliefs became stronger after participating in a parent-run English playgroup when their children were younger. The playgroup was a 'community of practice' (Wenger, 1998) because parents took turns to organize weekly sessions of crafts, games, and book-reading to support their children's English development. Mel experienced the "power of the community" when she started taking her first child to an English playgroup (Excerpt 14). She attributed her child's progress in speaking English to the interaction she had with other children and their parents. Mel became convinced that playgroups were important for developing bilingualism and even set up her own English weekend playgroup when she returned to work. Hanna also felt that participation in English playgroups helped her child's English production (Excerpt 15). When the children started English playgroup, they were very young and were only starting to speak English. The parents were probably concerned about their children's bilingual development, so they were reassured when the social interaction and additional English exposure in the playgroup setting encouraged their children's English production.

Excerpt 14

Mel: She could see all the kids speaking English. And it all started. She started speaking in full sentences and saying more.

Excerpt 15

Hanna: It helped him to speak a lot. It helped him to sing English songs. It also helped him to express himself more in English. He just had a lot of fun with the kids.

Not all of the children joined playgroups when they were younger, but most of them studied at the weekend English school. The school was also a community of practice that benefited not only the children but also the parents. Teaching reading and writing at home was challenging, but the parents' biliteracy goal for their children became more reachable due to the support that they received from the teachers and other parents in the school. The teachers gave spelling, reading and writing assignments that the parents helped their children to complete during the week. Parents such as Martin and Brian found this helpful because they were guided by the teachers as to what to teach at home (Excerpts 16 and 17). Similar to the playgroup, the parent-run weekend school functioned as a community of practice because there was mutual engagement (e.g., interaction between parents), joint enterprise (e.g., volunteer roles), and a shared history of engagement (e.g., organizing Halloween and Christmas parties). Membership of this community

of practice reinforced the parents' impact belief because the parents who sent their children to the weekend English school were mutually interested in biliteracy and interacted with each other about ways in which English reading and writing could be fostered. For instance, Brian found it helpful to get ideas from other parents on teaching resources (Excerpt 17).

Excerpt 16

Martin: *It (weekend English school) gives more focus. We have a lot of workbooks, writing things at home but not a lot of focus.*

Excerpt 17

Brian: *It helps me personally as the father who is trying to teach the child because there's structure. There's a little bit of homework. There is interaction. We like that, and then it helps me. There are websites I can look into, or I am talking to parents like you, and we are interacting about different programs that are going on – homework, websites, or books.*

Language Management

The parents' descriptions of their language management practices in the home revealed a strong impact belief. Two common aspects of the parents' efforts in developing active bilingualism and biliteracy were their insistence on their children speaking English and their regular practice of home literacy activities. Some parents were highly aware that production was necessary for fostering active bilingualism and consistently prompted their children to speak English to them. Joyce was particularly firm about her children's use of English. When her children spoke Japanese to her, she would ask for it to be rephrased in English (Excerpt 18). Joyce's use of the 'instruction to translate' discourse strategy (Chevalier, 2013; Döpke, 1992) at the very beginning helped her to establish English as the home language. She did not need to make such requests later because her children became accustomed to using English. Likewise, Martin firmly told his child not to use Japanese and explained that he did not understand it (Excerpt 19). Meanwhile, Mel took an intermediate approach. She rephrased her children's Japanese utterances in English or asked for them to do so (Excerpt 20).

Excerpt 18

Joyce: *It is the same as saying please and thank you. If they ask for something and they don't say please, they don't get it. So, if they say something in Japanese, "No, say it in English". With my first child, I was quite strict, and then that was established, when my second one started speaking, it was already established that they only speak English.*

Excerpt 19

Martin: *I'll say to T (child) 'Listen, don't talk to me in Japanese. I don't know what you're saying.'*

Excerpt 20

Mel: *I never pretended I didn't understand Japanese. I don't really believe in that. I always made sure she heard an English version. I never pushed her to say something to the point that she would cry or something. It was like 'okay, so how do you say that in English?'*

However, unlike the other parents, Gillian and Jim allowed their children to speak Japanese to them. Gillian admitted that she was lenient about language use and reported that her children did not speak much English even though she used it consistently with them (Excerpt 21). When she realized that they were mostly speaking Japanese, it was difficult to get them to speak English. Gillian's reluctance to prompt her children to speak English in the beginning suggests a lack of impact belief. Her experience also indicated that it was important to encourage English production from early on because it would be hard to do so once the children were already accustomed to speaking Japanese. Likewise, Jim felt it was difficult to ask his older child to speak English because he was already used to speaking Japanese to him.

Excerpt 21

Gillian: *I was pretty lenient because I didn't want to force what language they want to speak in. And for a little while, I thought maybe I needed to be stricter, but it didn't work. It just caused more tension. So then I just kinda got into it again.*

Joyce and Sheila (Excerpt 22) also insisted on English being the language used between siblings. From the very beginning, they required their first child to speak English to their younger sibling. The children's use of English with each other helped Joyce and Sheila tremendously because they could provide each other with English input and interaction instead of relying on their mothers. Joyce's, Martin's and Mel's insistence on their children speaking English is an extension of their OPOL approach. They spoke English consistently and expected their children to reciprocate in the same language. While the parents' insistence on English being used by the children may be regarded as a monolingualist approach to bilingualism (e.g., Danjo, 2018; Piller & Gerber, 2018), it was what the parents perceived as an effective way to promote the active use of English. It demonstrated their strong impact belief that they could affect their children's choice of language.

Excerpt 22

Sheila: *I told her (first child) even before H (second child) was born, you have to speak to her in English.*

The parents' strong impact belief was also evident in their home literacy efforts (Excerpts 23, 24 and 25). They helped their children complete their spelling or writing homework for their weekend English school and even gave them additional homework to do. The parents also helped their children with their daily reading, which was required by their teacher. Some parents made it a habit of reading aloud to their children every night. This practice continued even when their children got older. The parents' reading of long chapter books provided the children with much richer English input than in everyday conversation and enhanced their English literacy skills.

Excerpt 23

Joyce: *We read long chapter books, and usually I would read a page, and she (child) would read a page.*

Excerpt 24

Jim: *So probably six out of seven (nights) we do reading. Sometimes it might only be ten minutes if I am tired. It takes at least 30 and typically 45 minutes to an hour.*

Excerpt 25

Mel: *I read the whole Harry Potter series. Actually, I am in the middle of Book Seven still with K (child), but I read the whole thing.*

Discussion

The perceived benefit of English-Japanese bilingualism heavily influenced the language ideology of the English-speaking parents in this study. In particular, the parents had the perception that English could give their children an academic advantage in the future. Their valorization of a Western type of education and their disagreement with the Japanese education system led them to consider sending their children to English schools in Japan or abroad in the future. These expectations of their children's future education influenced their FLP. However, the parents' efforts to raise English-Japanese bilingual and biliterate children were also guided by a strong impact belief that their actions would influence their children's linguistic outcome. The parents' strong impact belief was not directly elicited from interviews but emerged from their reported efforts in bilingual parenting. Specifically, the parents' insistence on their children's use of English and the time they spent reading to their children every evening indicated their determination in developing their children's bilingualism and biliteracy.

Analysis of the interview data showed that several factors shaped the parents' impact beliefs. Firstly, it was determined by individual experiences such as the parents' own bilingualism, interest in language and literacy, and English-related professions. Parents such as Mel, Hanna, and Joyce were fluent English-Japanese bilinguals who saw bilingualism as being replicable

by their children based on their own experiences. The parents' knowledge and expertise in their professions as English teachers and editors also made them more willing and confident in encouraging their children's bilingualism. Secondly, given that the families were exogamous, parents' impact beliefs were affected by the extent to which their Japanese spouses supported their FLP. Those with cooperative spouses had more conviction about their bilingual parenting because they had more control over the home language environment. Supportive spouses also help improve the 'status' of English in the home by speaking it. Peer influence also determined the parents' impact belief. Previously, Baker (1992) explained human modeling as an influential source of attitude change, that is, imitating the attitudes of positive role models can reinforce one's beliefs. In this study, the parents' impact belief was strengthened by the presence of *senpai* parents whose older children were already demonstrating higher English skills (e.g., reading independently). *Senpai* parents shared their experience and gave advice to parents with younger children. Lastly, the parents' impact belief on promoting biliteracy was reinforced by their communities of practice, namely their involvement in the English playgroup and the weekend English school their children attended.

These findings indicate that external factors played a critical role in strengthening the parents' impact beliefs over time and that seeking out support from peers or a community with common interests was important for fostering children's bilingualism and biliteracy. In addition to these factors, the parents' impact belief also seemed to have evolved as a result of their children's bilingual development, i.e., it was self-reinforcing. Seeing their children develop bilingually gave some parents greater conviction that they were able to make an impact. Jim noticed the cognitive benefits of bilingualism in his children and continued his efforts to read aloud to them because he wanted to "see more of it". Conversely, Gillian's impact belief weakened because her children were not speaking much English. Consequently, she felt that language was something that "comes when you need it more than when you try to force it". Just as the parents' pro-English ideology grew stronger as they pondered educational options for their growing children, their impact beliefs also changed based on their actual parenting experiences. The parents' experiences confirmed the bidirectionality aspect of De Houwer's (1999) three-tier model where the children's language development can inversely affect parents' language practices and consequently reshape their language attitudes and impact beliefs.

Nevertheless, the extent to which the parents were able to foster bilingualism and biliteracy also depended on the children themselves. Previous studies show that children play an agentive role in determining their own bilingualism (e.g., Said & Zhu, 2017; Tuominen, 1999). Likewise, bilingualism in some children in this study did not turn out as their parents desired. The success of the parents in raising bilingual and biliterate

children seemed to have depended on a combination of their impact belief and their children's willingness to go along with it. Mel admitted that her bilingual parenting was successful because her children were quite "malleable" and enjoyed learning English but noticed that some other children were less willing to study English and had other interests such as sports. Jim's older son spoke very little English despite being able to read and write to some extent. Jim acknowledged his child as being "fixed" in his ways and did not insist strongly that he speaks English. Nevertheless, Jim kept reading aloud to him and his younger sibling every night with the conviction that the English input would help their language development. While children also affect their own linguistic outcome, Jim's experience shows how parents' impact belief is crucial for keeping the possibility of active bilingualism open. A strong impact belief made it possible for Jim to maintain his English literacy practices even when his child was comprehending but not speaking much English.

While this paper contributed to FLP research in its investigation of the role of parents' impact beliefs in raising bilingual and biliterate children, it is necessary to mention some of its limitations. Given the fact that the findings relied on interview data, there is a possibility that the parents may have presented themselves favorably to the researcher during the interviews, and their narratives may not be an accurate account of their actual home language practices. Nevertheless, the variables that influenced the parents' impact belief probably did not deviate far from reality because they were specific accounts of their individual and family conditions (e.g., spousal support) as well as their actual involvement with other parents and the community (e.g., the weekend English school). Another limitation is that the research focused on only eight exogamous families in Tokyo, Japan. The English-speaking parents had similar educational and professional background, and their children attended the same weekend English school. While it was useful to investigate the impact belief of parents who had some degree of success in raising bilingual and biliterate children, the findings on their impact belief may not necessarily apply to parents of different backgrounds. Specifically, parents who do not live in urban areas probably do not have access to playgroups or weekend language schools. Organizing playgroups for young children may also be a Western concept which is foreign to parents from non-Western countries. Moreover, the findings on English-Japanese bilingualism in this study may not be relevant to other forms of bilingualism in Japan given the high status of English in Japanese society. Nevertheless, these results give us a better understanding of the necessary conditions for the successful maintenance of a minority language in Japan. Specifically, *senpai* parents are a potentially important influence on parents' impact belief. Just like the English-speaking parents in this study, parents who speak other minority languages may be more motivated and encouraged to raise their children bilingually if they have access

to a positive role model. The sharing of first-hand experiences in bilingual parenting by successful *senpai* parents might be a useful addition to an outreach program aimed at educating parents on minority language maintenance.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to extend her most sincere thanks to the families who participated in this project and to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback on an earlier version of this paper.

References

- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bezioglu-Goktolga, I., & Yağmur, K. (2018). Home language policy of second-generation Turkish families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(1), 44–59. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2017.1310216
- Billings, M. (1990). Some factors affecting the bilingual development of bicultural children in Japan. *Association of Foreign Wives Journal*, 93–108.
- Canagarajah, S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(2), 143–176. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00361.x
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd edition). London: Sage.
- Chevalier, S. (2015). *Trilingual language acquisition: Contextual factors influencing active trilingualism in early childhood*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (2008). Early bilingualism: Children of immigrants in an English-language childcare center. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 12(1), 3–27. doi:10.2478/v10057-008-0001-2
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8(4), 351–375. doi:10.1007/s10993-009-9146-7
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2012). Private language management in Singapore: Which language to practice and how. In A. S. Young, E. L. Brown, & C. Lee (Eds.), *Communication and language: Surmounting barriers to cross-cultural understanding* (pp. 55–77). Charlotte: Information Age.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2016). Conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices in Singaporean multilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(7), 694–709. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2015.1127926

- Danjo, C. (2018). Making sense of family language policy: Japanese-English bilingual children's creative and strategic translanguaging practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, doi:10.1080/13670050.2018.1460302
- De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and migration* (pp. 75–95). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Houwer, A. (2007). Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28(3), 411–424. doi:10.1017/S0142716407070221
- Döpke, S. (1992). *One parent one language: An interactional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dumanig, F. P., David, M. K., & Shanmuganathan, T. (2013). Language choice and language policies in Filipino-Malaysian families in multilingual Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(6), 582–596. doi:10.1080/01434632.2013.784323
- Fujita-Round, S., & Maher, J. (2017). Language policy and education in Japan. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 491–505). Cham: Springer.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick: Aldine.
- Hakuta, K., & D'Andrea, D. (1992). Some properties of bilingual maintenance and loss in Mexican background high-school students. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 72–99. doi:10.1093/applin/13.1.72
- Heyl, B. S. (2001). Ethnographic interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 369–383). London: Sage.
- Ishii, K. (2010). Japanese children with Thai mothers: The identity of Japanese-Thai mixed-ethnic children in Japan. *Nagoya University of Commerce and Business Administration Journal of Economics and Information Science*, 54, 13–23.
- Jabar, M. (2013). The identity of children of Japanese-Filipino marriages in Iota, Japan. *Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism*, 19, 28–39.
- Juan-Garau, M., & Pérez-Vidal, C. (2001). Mixing and pragmatic parental strategies in early bilingual acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 28(1), 59–86. doi:10.1017/S0305000900004591
- King, K. (2000). Language ideologies and heritage language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(3), 167–184. doi:10.1080/13670050008667705

- King, K., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712. doi:10.2167/beb362.0
- King, K., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907–922. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x
- Kopeliovich, S. (2013). Happylingual: A family project for enhancing and balancing multilingual development. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful family language policy: Parents, children and educators in interaction* (pp. 249–275). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lanza, E. (2004). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare. (2019). Table 9-18. Trends in marriages by nationality of bride and groom: Japan. *Vital statistics of Japan*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/>
- Moin, V., Schwartz, L., & Leikin, M. (2013). Immigrant parents' lay theories of children's preschool bilingual development and family language ideologies. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7(2), 99–118, doi:10.1080/19313152.2011.651397
- Nakamura, J. (2015). Nonnative maternal input: Language use and errors in a Thai mother's interactions in Japanese with her child. *Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism*, 21, 10–26.
- Nakamura, J. (2016). Hidden bilingualism: Ideological influences on the language practices of multilingual migrant mothers in Japan. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(4), 308–323. doi:10.1080/19313152.2016.1206800
- Nakamura, J. (2018). Parent's use of discourse strategies in dual-lingual interactions with receptive bilingual children. In E. Babatsouli (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic research in monolingual and bilingual speech* (pp. 181–200). Chania: ISMBS.
- Navarro, D., & Macalister, J. (2017). Adrift in an Anglophone world: Refugee families' language policy challenges. In J. Macalister and S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world: Opportunities, challenges and consequences* (pp. 115–132). New York: Routledge.
- Noguchi, M. G. (2001). Bilinguality and bicultural children in Japan: A pilot survey of factors linked to active English-Japanese bilingualism. In M. G. Noguchi & S. Fotos (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism* (pp. 234–271). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Okita, T. (2001). *Invisible work: Bilingualism, language choice, and childrearing in intermarried families*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pérez Báez, G. (2013). Family language policy, transnationalism, and the diaspora community of San Lucas Quiavini of Oaxaca, Mexico. *Language Policy*, 12(1), 27–45. doi:10.1007/s10993-012-9270-7
- Piller, I., & Gerber, L. (2018). Family language policy between the bilingual advantage and the monolingual mindset. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi:10.1080/13670050.2018.1503227
- Said, F., & Zhu, H. (2017). “No, no Maama! Say ‘Shaahir ya Ouledee Shaahir!’” Children’s agency in language use and socialization. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. doi:10.1177/1367006916684919
- Saunders, G. (1988). *Bilingual children: From birth to teens*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Schwartz, M., & Verschik, A. (2013). Achieving success in family language policy: Parents, children, and educators in interaction. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful family language policy: Parents, children and educators in interaction* (pp. 105–125). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Seargeant, P. (2011). Introduction. In P. Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization* (pp.1-12). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Slavkov, N. (2015). Language attrition and reactivation in the context of bilingual first language acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), 715–734. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.941785
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2016). *Family language policy: Maintaining an endangered language in the home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2017). Family language policy: New directions. In J. Macalister and S. H. Mirvahedi (Eds.), *Family language policies in a multilingual world: Opportunities, challenges and consequences* (pp.13–29). New York: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuominen, A. K. (1999). Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 140(1), 59–76. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1999.140.59
- Uribe de Kellest, A. (2002). The recovery of a first language: A case study of an English/Spanish bilingual child. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(3), 162–181. doi:10.1080/13670050208667753
- Velázquez, I. (2013). Maternal attitudes toward Spanish transmission in the U.S. Midwest: A necessary but insufficient condition for success. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 7(3), 225–248. doi:10.1558/sols.v7i3.225
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Yamamoto, M. (2001a). Japanese attitudes towards bilingualism. A survey and its implications. In M. G. Noguchi & S. Fotos (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism* (pp. 24–44). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Yamamoto, M. (2001b). *Language use in interlingual families: A Japanese-English sociolinguistic study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Yamamoto, M. (2002). Language use in families with parents of different native languages: An investigation of Japanese-non-English and Japanese-English families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(6), 531–554. doi:10.1080/01434630208666484.
- Yamamoto, M. (2005). What makes who choose what languages to whom?: Language use in Japanese–Filipino interlingual families in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(6), 588–606. doi:10.1080/13670050508669070.