A case study of a Hungarian-English bilingual girl's language development in English from birth to the age of eleven

" […] angolul úgy hangozik, mintha az 'utál' is szép lenne."

" […] in English 'utál' [hate] sounds as if it were nice too."

Machata Marianna

Supervisor: Nikolov Marianne, DSc

Doctoral Programme in English Applied Linguistics and TEFL/TESOL

University of Pécs

2023

Témavezetői nyilatkozat doktori dolgozat benyújtásához

Alulírott Prof. Nikolov Marianne nyilatkozom, hogy Machata Marianna

A CASE STUDY OF A HUNGARIAN-ENGLISH BILINGUAL GIRL'S LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH FROM BIRTH TO THE AGE OF ELEVEN

című doktori értekezését megismertem, nyilvános vitára bocsátását támogatom.

Dátum: Budapest, 2023.március 11.

témavezető aláírás

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

I would first thank my thesis supervisor Professor Nikolov Marianne. I am grateful to her for her valuable comments on my thesis. Her amazing character and expertise gave me incredible motivation and energy to accomplish my research. Whenever I ran into questions about my research and writing she helped me regain my confidence and find the path to recapture my enthusiasm. Her professionalism, energy and charismatic personality provided high-level inspiration when I felt disappointed, and my enthusiasm started to decline. I am also grateful to her for her patience and support in overcoming numerous concerns and obstacles I have been facing through my research. She steered me into the right way whenever she thought I needed it.

I would like to thank my colleagues for their advice and ideas. They supported my work with incredible commitment, responsibility and helped me get results of better quality. I would like to express my gratitude to the faculty and management of Óbuda University who facilitated my research-related tasks such as consultations, discussions, conference attendances by giving approval to reschedule my classes.

A special thank goes to my family: Sarah for her contribution as the participant of the research. To my husband Csaba and my daughters Dóri and Nani for their invaluable comments, remarks, participation, unfailing support, and continuous encouragement. Without their spiritual support, their passionate participation, enthusiasm, and motivation my research could not have been successfully conducted and accomplished. I am grateful to my daughters for giving their consent to share episodes of their private life with a third party and make them the object of scientific research.

List of abbreviations and acronyms

L1 First language

L2 Second language

RQ Research question

SLA Second language acquisition

FLA First language acquisition

DA Discourse Analysis

ER Ethnographic Research

OTOL One Time of Day One Language

OPOL One Person One Language

TT Thresholds Theory

List of figures and tables

Introduction

The transition and change of regime in Hungary in 1989 brought about the booming demand for spoken foreign languages, motivated individual resources both in formal and informal contexts, directed attention towards autonomous and family-oriented second language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman, 2018; Velasco, 2020) in natural settings. The climate of interculturalism coupled with introducing English as the mostly taught foreign language in public education accentuated the importance of plurilingual competence and generated the need for teaching English to children at an early age even in Hungary where monolingualism used to be the norm. Parents more than ever tended to feel responsible for the pursuit of learning English seeing it as an important investment into their children's future, an intellectual asset to achieve educational success and better life prospects (Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton, 2000; Rokita-Jaśkov, 2015). Supplementary efforts and the strategy of making the most of what one can (Fillmore, 1979) parallel with instructed learning have been deployed to facilitate language learning. The imperative for foreign language proficiency, predominantly for English gave rise to the idea of integrating English in the present author's home and prompted me to research my daughter's Sarah's English development in our own home-established bilingual environment.

The present research, a longitudinal qualitative study, is aimed at understanding my participant's, Sarah's orientation to bilingualism focusing on her reliance on English as a second language (L2) in mediating communicative intent and self perception from birth to the age of eleven. To provide answers to my research questions I applied the discourse analytical approach to analyse Sarah's L2 development between her ages of six months and eleven years. Sarah is 24 years old in 2023, immersed in a Hungarian and English-speaking environment, has been exposed to these two languages from birth. Regarding English she had limited community support for the simple reason that her family is Hungarian and lives in Hungary. English is mediated by her parents, primarily by me, her mother, and other native and non-native speakers of English who belong to the family's extended social network.

To create solid foundation, complete with favourable conditions to facilitate second language acquisition, a carefully established language boundary pattern was

observed inspired by the One Time of Day One Language (OTOL) principle. We all agreed to adjust our home routine so we could use English, the second language, consistently in certain situations and places in consideration of the language competence of those whom we needed to interact (see chapter 6, section 3). The discourse analytic approach to documentation and analysis of language-related episodes within Sarah's free and spontaneous interactional exchanges focuses on (1) her interlanguage development at different levels of linguistic analysis (2) the communicative intentions underlying her code-switching and language preference and (3) her identity formation in the dual language acquisition process.

I collected data in the form of audio-recordings and a diary documenting discourse from (1) the participant's natural speech recorded in natural settings, (2) semi-structured and retrospective interviews I conducted with her, and (3) her own spontaneous reflections. The analysed data exemplify her use of L2 as (1) a complementary set of linguistic forms to convey and differentiate communicative functions and intentions and (2) a social site for organizing, regulating, and negotiating her own and her interlocutor's conduct and language use. When analysing Sarah's English development, patterns have been identified pertaining to her language preference, appeals to L2 and identity transformations, as they are displayed, mediated, and negotiated in bi-directional L1-L2 and L2-Ll code-switches in naturally occurring oral interactional exchanges.

In the process of analysing Sarah's language use in her dual linguistic home environment, I recognised the immense importance of being competent in the field of SLA and decided to delve into this subject matter. My longitudinal single-subject case study research is to reveal how bilingualism complemented Sarah's linguistic repertoire and to what extent it added to enhance communication and negotiating her identity. In my attempt to investigate my participant's L2 development I addressed the following research questions:

(1) How does Sarah's L2 development manifest itself in terms of lexicon, morphology, syntax and pragmatics over ten years in her changing context?
(2) How does Sarah integrate English into her discourse to convey her meaning?
(3) What categories can be identified in Sarah's communicative intentions?
(4) How does her English development shape her identity?

(5) What categories can be identified in Sarah's identity development?

Although descriptions and explanations of inner cognitive and psychological processes and mental representations of language go beyond the scope of my inquiry, the empirical data enabled me to offer an insight into communication strategies. I hope that the analysis of my participant's language use contributes to providing a complex picture of what can happen in SLA. I hope that my single case study offers a better understanding of second language acquisition and sheds light on individual language use. I am convinced that my prolonged observation over ten years gives suitable grounding to explore the formation and development of strategic language use to achieve various communicative functions in developing bilingualism over space and time.

An overview of the dissertation

My dissertation consists of two parts: a theoretical and an empirical part. The theoretical part aims to show how my specific case can be placed in a broader theoretical context. At the beginning in chapter 1 I present the background of the case, the significance, and the rationale of the research. Chapters 2-4 provide the theoretical framework of the investigated topic. In the critical review of the literature, I discuss the most significant conceptualizations of the discussed phenomena, I present definitions of the terms I apply in my study, and introduce taxonomies, on the basis of which my data are analysed.

In the empirical part, in chapters 6-8, I present and discuss the findings of my investigation. According to the foci highlighted in the research questions I attempt to identify important patterns and themes in the analysed data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Duff, 2002) and try to make those patterns evident. Concrete examples retrieved from my participant's discourses are presented to reveal developmental stages at different levels of linguistic analysis. While clarifying specific communicative intentions, I group the analysed utterances and discourse samples labelled as excerpts according to Cekaite and Björk-Willén's (2012), Gafaranga's (2012), Norton's (2000) and Pavlenko's (2006) categories. I trace back the using Cekaite and Björk-Willén's (2012), Gafaranga's (2012), formations, transformations of the participant's identity during the acquisition process Norton's (2000) and Ricento's (2005) reconceptualization of the relationship between second language

acquisition (SLA) and identity formation. At the end of the dissertation, I highlight the implications of the research for language teaching and learning and reveal ideas on how and on what grounds my research can be further developed. The appendices comprise the transcripts and coding of the excerpts I used for analysis in the empirical part of the dissertation.

In Chapter 1, I overview the literature to see scholarly opinion about the importance of single case studies in SLA research and explain why my single case is worth investigating. I outline the conceptual framework adopted in this thesis emphasizing that it is a cross disciplinary framework which builds on linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, social and cultural psychology. I argue that in the multicultural world the newly emerging demands for language learning offer a new lens on bilingualism considering individual differences, environmental diversity, strategic language use and the role of intentionality in the process of language learning. Research into the socialization aspects of speech development in SLA (Bialystok, 1991; Dörnyei, 2005; Hamers, 2004, Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006, Watson-Gegeo, 2004) calls for the development of an ethnographic approach to language education. My aim with the present research is to link the sociocultural aspect of language learning with the study of my participant's lived language learning experiences in different settings. To offer a clear understanding of Sarah's language learning context I give a detailed description of the case history where I provide all necessary information about the family, the community, the motives, the doubts, and considerations of making a foundation for Sarah's the dual Hungarian and English language acquisition.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 outline the key concepts and provide definitions of terms. I draw on the literature to clarify the distinctions between acquisition and learning, first and native language, second language and foreign language. Here I deal with the Input Hypothesis of Stephen Krashen (1981) and the 'age effects' approach as the reconceptualization of the Critical Period Hypothesis introduced by Lenneberg (1967). I give an account of the main language acquisition theories to emphasize the interrelationship between first language acquisition (FLA) and second language acquisition (SLA). I accentuate that dimensions of FLA research show close resemblance with those discussed and investigated in SLA research. Pragmatics and discourse analysis provide the theoretical framework for my analysis; therefore, I

describe the philosophy, the scope, and considerations of these two approaches and explain how they are related to one another.

Chapter 3 deals with the conceptualization of bilingualism. Bilingualism is another conceptual framework of my research, as I am concerned with my participant's language development in a dual language environment with a special focus on the functional use of L2. To describe the complexity and diversity of bilingualism, first I draw on both theoretical and empirical research in the field to reveal who is considered bilingual and what constitutes a bilingual person. In my attempt to identify distinguishing features and attributes of a bilingual I discuss bilingualism from three different perspectives, from the competence-based, use-based, and holistic perspectives. Communicative competence, a notion emerging as central to understanding language use either in mono or multilingualism is discussed in the same chapter. I am specifically concerned with certain dimensions, types, and subtypes of communicative competence with particular relevance for my case. A short section is devoted to the discussion of whether bilingual children use their two languages as one unitary or two separate systems by presenting the standpoints of the linguists who do their research into this topic. Code-switching, interference, and interlanguage are also addressed as relevant linguistic phenomena in bilingualism and SLA. I also give a brief overview of child second language acquisition research drawing on findings of diary reports and observations made by researchers, Hungarian and foreign, who studied children's, own or others' dual language acquisition at different levels of language. I highlight the main foci and conclusions of these studies and indicate in what respect my case is different or similar.

Chapter 4 concerns learning and communication strategies as they are reflected in learners' language use and behaviour. By overviewing the related literature, I set out to define, identify and categorize different communication and learning strategies language users and learners apply. I present what distinguishing features are proposed to define strategy. To show the distinguishing criteria for strategy I present the widely adopted definitions and taxonomies. and deal with self-regulation as an alternative term drawing on Dörnyei's (2005) reconceptualization of the construct and show to what extent the two terms are different. As I am concerned with child second language acquisition, I devote a section to children's strategies to cope with linguistic hardships in bilingualism. I base my description of children's appropriating

forms to functions on Hamer's (2004) sociocognitive model of bilingualism and outline children's mapping process in the dual language context. The second part of chapter 4 examines the relationship between language and cognition to the extent that is needed to understand what my child (presented in the empirical chapters 6-8) can do with and knows about her two languages. I label this special linguistic property with the general term of metalinguistic awareness and discuss how metalinguistic awareness is subdivided into two cognitive processes, (1) control of linguistic processes, and (2) analysis of language, according to Bialystok's (1991) conceptualization. I draw on Cekaite and Björk-Willén's (2012), Baker's (2006), Cromdal's (2013), Gafaranga's (2012), Knechtelsdorfer's (2011), Norton's (2000) and Ricento's (2005) research findings on the construction of social identity to ground my empirical study of my participant's bilingual identity formation. I reveal on what basis the researchers describe the individual learner as unique, heterogeneous, and contradictory individuals in bilingualism. I highlight research findings that modified our thinking about how second language learning takes place and why it happens in so many variations.

Chapter 5 deals with the methodological background and is a detailed description of the research design. I place my study in the larger framework of scientific research design. I identify the type of the research and give all the necessary information including the participant, the research questions, and the data collection procedures. I explain why case study is the most appropriate method and genre for my inquiry and why it justifies applying two overlapping methodologies of data collection: (1) the ethnography of communication and (2) discourse analysis. What validates this methodology is that I explored naturally occurring language use, examined intimate language use and elicited learning experiences from a young child who tended to resist inquiry and was sometimes reluctant to be involved in the conversations I initiated. I write about the circumstances of data collection and reflect on how my data collection procedures modified and determined the evaluation methods. The same chapter describes how the family established rules for language separation to facilitate the reader's understanding of Sarah's language choice and behaviour. My task was further complicated by the fact that my participant is my own child, which situation raised ethical concerns, consequently, a few ethical questions are also discussed in chapter 5. I report on the limitations with reference to the internal and

external validity of my research (Duff, 2007) and give an account on my doubts and concerns throughout my work. I describe the challenges and difficulties I faced when I embarked on my study and in the process of research. Also, I emphasize the immense importance of being competent in the field to guarantee that my work fulfils the ethical requirements of scientific research.

Chapter 6 concerns Sarah's L2 development between her ages of eight months and eleven years focusing on her code-switching behaviour, appeals and references to L2 at different levels of mastery and at different levels of language (e.g., morphological, lexical and syntactic). I deal with her English lexicon in the holophrastic stage (8-18 months) and explore her formation of past tense, questions, and negatives. I present examples of several interlanguage (across languages) and intralanguage (within a language) mistakes and illuminate her early code-switches to explore how and why L2 appears in her talk and what levels of language are affected. I focus only on those phenomena that underpin that English in was an integral part of Sarah's communication and provided a complementary set of linguistic forms to compensate for her lower competence in that language. The code-switches presented in chapter 6 are mostly used to compensate for inadequate language proficiency but there are examples of her using code-switching as achievement strategies to enhance communication. The selected examples illuminate that Sarah uses L2 for the regulatory-instrumental functions (Jacobson, 1960; Halliday, 1973) from an early age, as early as the holophrastic phase of language acquisition. Chapter 6 aims to answer to the first research question. Here I call the reader's attention to the fact that in my attempt to answer the first research question, I also relied on the findings reported on in chapters 7 and 8.

In chapter 7 I present communicative intentions mediated through Sarah's bidirectional (L1-L2 and L2-L1) code-switches and identify patterns in them to answer the first, second and third research questions. The discourse pieces labelled as excerpts explore the child's naturally occurring interactions with different interlocutors (parents, siblings, and peers), where communicative intentions are invoked as discursive descriptions of events (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004). The presented categories of the analysed communicative intentions correspond to pragmatic categories. I justify my claim with the fact that communication intention is a central concept in pragmatics theory in the sense that pragmatics views language

as a joint activity of the speaker-hearer, extensively relying on communicative intentions. It must be noted that I do not attempt to go deeper into elaborating communicative intention as a mental state. My analysis focuses on the various code-switches Sarah uses to convey varying communicative intentions. As for code-switching, I discuss them as a part of a broader, multifaceted construct termed as communicative competence and consider code-switches as manifestations of my participant's strategic and actional competence, representing two subcomponents of communicative competence. I base my discussion on the model introduced by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). Like in the previous chapter, this chapter also explores issues of code-switching operated as both reduction strategies and achievement strategies but more elaborately and in thematic categorization (see Figure 4 'Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies'). The presented communicative intentions (excerpts) illuminate that Sarah's code-switches embedded in language-related episodes serve as social sites (1) to regulate, understand, and gain control over her and her interlocutor's language use, emotions, attitudes, opinions, and motivation (2) to seek and find opportunities to practise and improve L2, (3) to negotiate her progress in and orientations to L2 and (4) to get reinforcement, encouragement and reward.

In chapter 8, to answer the fourth and fifth research questions I investigate the dialectic relation between Sarah and her social environment by exemplifying how she constructs and reconstructs her sense of self through two languages. I emphasize the complex and dynamic character of Sarah's identity and reveal the imbalances in her self-perception. Examples of her multiple memberships (Mirzaie & Parhizkar, 2021; Ricento, 2005) and subject positions (Norton, 2000) in various situations are meant to show how her positive and negative identifications and feelings modify and influence her sense of right to speak and group affiliations. To underpin my claim, I exemplify that depending on the numerous effects and feedback she receives from her social environment she develops versatile and sometimes contradictory needs and motivations. She depicts different degrees of self-esteem and shows a heterogeneous identity. Sometimes she positions herself as an incompetent, disregarded individual, whereas in other instances she occupies a much more powerful bilingual subject position.

In the final part of my dissertation, I summarize my conclusions drawn from my case study and identify the significance and innovation of my research. Despite the limitations of the study, I explain to what extent it meets the requirements of internal and external validity. A separate section is devoted to the strategies I applied to meet ethical requirements and my practices of dispersing doubts and imbalances throughout the entire process of the research work. In section 9.2, I outline on what basis I think my research can be further developed. I also summarize the possible implications of my study for second language learning and teaching.

Table 1 – The phases of the research with the relevant focus of analysis

	Research question	Data sources	Method of analysis
Phase 1 – Sarah's L2 development – lexicon, morphology, syntax, pragmatics Exploratory study (2000-2009)	(RQ1): How does Sarah's L2 development manifest itself in lexicon, morphology, syntax and pragmatics?	1.Sarah's naturally occurring discourses 2.Sarah's writings (diary notes, letters)	Discourse analysis Qualitative content analysis
Phase 2 – The integration of L2 in Sarah's discourse (2000-2010)	(RQ2): How does Sarah integrate English into her discourse to convey her meaning? (RQ3): What categories can be identified in Sarah's communicative intentions?	1.Sarah's naturally occurring discourses 2.Sarah's written documents, (diary notes, letters) 3.My observation field notes and reflections 4.Sarah's real-time reflections 5.Sarah's elicited comments 6.Follow-up interviews with Sarah, her siblings, the interlocutors, the informed fellow parents, and teachers	Discourse analysis Speech act analysis Qualitative content analysis

		7.Semi-structured retrospective interviews with Sarah 8.The colleagues' end of research notes and reflections	
Phase 4 – The role of L2 in Sarah's identity (2002-2012)	(RQ4): How does her English development shape her identity? (RQ5): What categories can be identified in Sarah's identity development?	1. Sarah's naturally occurring discourses 2. Sarah's writings (diary notes and letters) 3.My observation-field notes 4.Sarah's real-time views, comments 5.Sarah's metalinguistic comments 6.Sarah's follow-up reflections 7.Semi-structured retrospective interviews with Sarah 8. Follow-up interviews with Sarah, and her siblings 9. My informed colleagues' and friends' end of research notes and reflections	Discourse analysis Speech-act analysis Qualitative content analysis

Part 1 – Introduction and theoretical framework

Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 The aim of the study

My research aims at investigating my participant's, my own child's, L2 development at four different levels of linguistic analysis: morphology, lexicon, syntax, and pragmatics. While focusing on these levels of linguistic analysis I extensively draw on Sarah's L1-L2 and L2-L1 code-switches and present her appeals and references to L2 to demonstrate how she progresses in bilingualism and how she benefits from an early exposure to a second language. The collected data are aimed to illuminate how she utilizes code-switching and generally L2 as a strategic tool to enhance communication (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Cohen, 1998; Dörnyei, 2005; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Oxford, 1990; Tarone, 1977). My dataset underpins that language can be used as a credible source for learning about individual language use by exemplifying how her perceptions (beliefs, opinions, and emotions) are built, expressed, and negotiated in ordinary conversations (Argaman, 2010).

My research is dedicated to exploring my participant's attitude to bilingualism focusing on her reliance on L2 in mediating her communicative intentions and emotional stances. Through the collected data I intend to exemplify and find evidence that she uses L2 as (1) a complementary set of linguistic forms to convey the intended meanings, (2) a social site (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p. 176) for organizing, regulating, evaluating and negotiating her own and the participants' conduct and

language use. I analyse the data to identify the motives of language choice in her language use and attempt to distinguish patterns in them.

In my attempt to understand my participant's identity development and transformations I analyse language-related episodes of her spontaneous utterances and interactional exchanges and identify important patterns and categories in them. In doing so I rely on the categorization and typology of scholarly research (Baker, 2006; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamer, 2004; Knechtelsdorfer, 2011; Pavlenko, 2006; Pawliszko, 2016). These authors listed above have come to the conclusion that contemporaneity is a key element in analysing individual language use from the social psychological dimensions. Analysing authentic real-time speech provides an alternative solution for studying individual motivation, perceptions, and emotions. I have compiled and analysed a dataset taken from Sarah's discourses and commentary to examine how her language preference shows similarities and differences with the patterns the reviewed scholarly literature has identified. The research conducted in various informal settings provides rich contextual information about the case and the participant and allows me to explore the phenomenon in depth and in a holistic manner.

1.2 The scope of inquiry

My research is cross-disciplinary. It builds on previous research-based practice and links different approaches. In other words, I analyse the same element, i.e., my participant's code-switching practice from three different approaches: (1) the sociolinguistic, (2) the linguistic and (3) the strategic perspective. I concluded that these three dimensions were central to explore the individual variation in language performance (Larsen-Freeman, 2018) and contributed to understanding the terms and their relevance in my case.

Linking language use, language user and the social environment seemed to form the cornerstone of research design in this area. Given communication as inseparable from the social environment where it takes place, my research by nature has sociolinguistic aspects and societal concerns. The specific context in which Sarah lives and has acquired her two languages, the background that shaped her interpretations and her positioning herself in bilingualism were of primary significance. To meet the

validation requirements of the findings I added sufficient details and contextualization.

The study has its origin in linguistics. The theoretical framework of my linguistic analysis is pragmatics, which focuses on language in use and on the linguistic behaviour of language users. The purpose of my inquiry is to reveal how the functional level, where all meanings and intentions are expressed, and the formal level, where surface linguistic forms are represented, interact, and are modified in language behaviour. Pragmatics proved to be the relevant theoretical background to analyse the speaker-hearer joint activity, the speakers' messages and the interlocutors' interpretations being as tightly interwoven with and based on the context-embedded situative meanings.

I investigated how my participant's code-switching practice reflected the interplay between her two languages. The fact that I analysed the individual language learner's use of L2 as a strategic tool to facilitate the mediation and interpretation of various communicative intentions and that of her self-perception justified the discussion of communication strategies and communicative competence.

My research also benefitted from psychology and individual differences research. I drew on the social psychological dimensions to investigate my participant's strategic abilities guiding her towards successful and effective communication. I investigated the individual learning process and was dedicated to show the ways in which my participant, as a strategic language user and a dynamic actor benefitted from the dual linguistic system, mediated communicative intent, and negotiated perceptions of her identity.

Researchers in the field (Baker, 2006; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Dörnyei, 2005; Duff, 2007, Griffee, 2012; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamer, 2004; Knechtelsdorfer, 2011; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006) justify further research into autonomous socialized learning trajectories. They argue that only ecological orientations to SLA (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, p. 59) will pave the way for the future. Identifying new variables, seeing bilingual development as a complex system allow for explaining the high individual variation in performance progress in SLA. I attempted the application of such an ecological attitude to the study of individual bilingual development.

1.3 Justification of the research

A great number of scholarly literature in the field of language acquisition deals with the diversity of language use and investigate the relationship between language and their users. Researchers in the field conclude that it is impossible to cover all situations and admitted that there will always be unknown aspects (Dörnyei, 2005, p.4). This fact validates explorative qualitative studies which provide in-depth interpretations of single cases offering greater insights in individual differences. Single case studies explore new, previously obscure, or unknown contexts and profiles (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Duff, 2012; Griffee, 2012). Being familiar with these new scenarios we can identify a lot of factors affecting the language learning process, which will finally lead us to better understanding of the topic and, consequently, may change language socialization and language teaching into a more successful endeavour. Marginal or extreme cases are instructive and invaluable in this respect because due to their specificity they shed light on phenomena considered unimportant earlier and help us to see things in proportion and complexity (Mackey & Gass, 2016).

1.4 Significance of the study

English is a prerequisite for academic and career success nowadays, as international communication has become an integral part of our everyday life. Although multiculturism and multilingualism are not new phenomena, it is still difficult for people living in a monolingual country to cope with the new communicational challenges of the multicultural environment. The imperative for speaking foreign languages in the global era imposes new tasks and responsibilities on parents and educators when it comes to socializing children into using two or more languages besides their mother tongue. Globalization, job migration and transnational cooperation have propelled the need to simultaneously learn and use foreign languages and increased the value of foreign language knowledge. This situation has generated a demand for teaching foreign languages to children as early as possible and has directed attention towards second language acquisition in the learners' daily life. These circumstances justify further research into teaching English to young learners and encourage parents to raise their children in two languages concurrently even in countries where monolingualism used to be the norm. The fact that the

contexts and purposes of foreign language learning are so versatile and also the language learners' attitudes show distinctness encourages research into the role and impact of individual differences in the learning process (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, p. 65; Nikolov & Szabó, 2015, p. 202; Medgyes & Nikolov, 2014, p. 520).

Empirical studies of language teaching at kindergarten and primary school are timely and supported by European documents on the recommendations on early language learning (Commission of the European Communities, 2003). Early learners are more open towards and more interested in others, early start lays the foundations for later language learning. It is the period when basic social skills are acquired and key attitudes towards the languages and cultures are formulated (Commission of the European Communities, 2003, p.16).

My study, an in-depth analysis of a particular case, can provide further data for scientific research into the topic of individual differences in second language acquisition. Due to its uniqueness, it illuminates a special aspect of second language acquisition and commences a naturalistic and as well as rare language learning context. Due to its unusual character, it also sheds light on new aspects, which so far have been out of sight or overlooked; nevertheless, they are worth consideration. When analysing my data, I found that recurring patterns and categories became evident in Sarah's L2 use.

1.5 An introduction of Sarah's case

My thesis is based on qualitative research into my child's, Sarah's language development. The study spans over ten years. Sarah, twenty-three years old in 2022, has been raised in a dual language environment (Hungarian and English) since birth, the second language (further on L2) has been integrated in the first socialization. Further on in my dissertation I refer to the established dual language environment as 'bilingualism' and call my participant 'bilingual'.

The reason for grounding bilingualism in Sarah's life is that in our neighbourhood there is a family of mixed nationality, the husband is American, the wife is Hungarian. Their youngest son, Brendon is of the same age as Sarah. Due to our frequent encounters, mutual sympathy, shared background, and family responsibilities even before our youngest children's birth we had developed a particularly good relationship with the family, especially with the wife, Kati. Later

Brendon and Sarah were in the same group in the kindergarten and between 2006 and 2014 they attended the same primary school in the same year but not in the same class.

These coincidences led us to the decision of including English as a second language in child raising. During the years the circle of our friends has expanded with other English-speaking families and foreign people who also speak English as a second language. Some of those foreign people are associates of multinational companies in Székesfehérvár or in the region. In addition, being an English teacher my part-time employment at some of those companies, and my and my husband's interpersonal contacts with foreigners and our experiences in multicultural settings encouraged us to take advantage of the situation and integrate English as a second language in Sarah's upbringing. The fact that my husband and my older daughters (aged 32 and 36 in 2023) have good levels of language proficiency in English has created a favourable prerequisite and gave motivation for our bilingual plan. Also, this situation encouraged me to do my research in child second language acquisition.

Although we have a lot of English-speaking friends, we have realised that our occasional encounters with them do not provide sufficient language input for my child to acquire the language. To maintain a dual language environment, we had to establish a sort of 'labour division', a language boundary between the two (Hungarian and English) languages. Hungarian is dominant since it is our mother tongue, English was used only in our home or informal settings, mostly in child-mother interactions during family-oriented activities (e.g., free time activities, joint reading and playing). Also, we spoke English in the presence of certain in-group friends and foreigners. We tried to keep up the established language use patterns to make Sarah feel comfortable in L2 settings. We formed our language use pattern considering Sarah's and our two older daughters' attitude and willingness for cooperation, so Sarah accommodates herself to this practice.

As a result of the unbalanced exposure to her two languages, Hungarian showed dominance over English. By the end of data collection (the year of 2012), Sarah's English production was limited but she developed B1 competence in listening comprehension. Her utterances gave evidence of a successful operation of using English to shade meanings and convey specific communicative functions. (see

chapters 7-8). I give a detailed description of her current proficiency in the 'Final conclusions'.

Having been aware of the drawbacks, constraints, and limitations of L2 input due to insufficient community support in terms of L2, we anticipated asymmetry in Sarah's two languages at the expense of English. Our assumptions regarding the outcomes seemed to be justified. By the age of eleven, Sarah's English knowledge was proportional to the ratio of time she was immersed in the English-speaking environment. With an estimated B1 English proficiency level she felt comfortable in the dual language context, her language preference and alternation were a true reflection of the community-specific use (Hornáčková, 2017) of her two languages. The fact that by the age of ten she could carry a conversation about any of the familiar issues of her life is an acknowledgement of our efforts and gave evidence that bilingualism is a wonderful gift for her (See excerpt 52).

The clear definition of reasons and goals at the outset facilitated compliance with our predetermined plan and contributed to sustaining congruency in both of my roles, as a parent and a L2 mediator. To make the long-term project of bilingual socialization a controlled and informative process I subdivided it into short-term plans, so called daily and weekly schedules allocating sufficient time for follow-up discussions. Although we were persistent in maintaining natural settings and circumstances for our bilingual plan, we were determined to display a thoughtful and strategic approach to allow monitoring. To eliminate biases and subjectivity I recurrently consulted my teachers, friends, colleagues, authorities on the subject e.g., my supervisor and revisited multiple perspectives and interpretations. I obeyed, analysed, and reconsidered the grounded ethical requirements in an ongoing fashion. Adaptation to Sarah's and all participants' actual needs and personality rights was a mandatory prerequisite throughout the research to avoid abuse and reduce risk to privacy to minimal.

1.6 Research questions

In my study the following central research questions are addressed:

RQ1 How does Sarah's L2 development manifest itself at four different levels of linguistic analysis: lexicon, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics over ten years in her changing context?

RQ2 How does Sarah integrate English into her discourse to convey her meaning?

RQ3 What categories can be identified in Sarah's communicative intentions?

RQ4 How does Sarah's English development shape her identity?

RQ5 What categories can be identified in Sarah's identity development?

1.7 Summary of chapter 1

In Chapter 1 I wrote about the rationale and significance of the study to justify the importance of ethnographic single-case studies in SLA research and explain why my case is worth investigating. I outlined the conceptual framework adopted in this thesis emphasizing its cross- disciplinary nature, which builds on linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, social and cultural psychology. In the multicultural world the newly emerging demands for language learning offer a new lens on bilingualism taking into account individual differences, environmental diversity, strategic language use and the role of intentionality in the process of language learning. My aim with the present research is to link the sociocultural aspect of language learning with the study of my participant's lived language learning experiences in different settings. In order to add to the ecological validity (Hammond,1998; Larsen-Freeman, 2018) of my inquiry, in the case history section I give circumstantial information about the family, the community, the motives, the doubts and considerations of making a foundation for Sarah's dual (Hungarian and English) language acquisition. Finally, the addressed research questions are identified.

Chapter 2 – First and second language acquisition

2.1 Terms and definitions

The topic of my research is broad and far-reaching and has aspects in broader and interrelated fields of linguistics, pedagogical linguistics, psychology, anthropology, and sociolinguistics as discussed earlier. I draw on the literature from these different but related fields to the extent that is necessary to explore terms and terminological differences. In the present section I discuss the most comprehensive and frequent terms used in the dissertation and later in the relevant chapters I give an overview of what has been discussed and revealed about them and explain other related constructs. A detailed discussion of all the terms is beyond the scope of this chapter.

I use operational terms to handle terminological abundance and overview the intricacy of constructs and definitions. Narrowing the research lens meant the first hardship in my study. Coping with terminological differences seemed to be a real challenge for me as the literature on second language acquisition and bilingualism

often applies different terminology for the same or similar phenomena. The fact that my topic has its origin in broader fields, and the terms and concepts I use are differently defined by the scholars under review, further complicated my situation. Choosing the topic of my dissertation was challenging too, as second language acquisition has extensive literature with several focal points and perspectives I could have gone deep into and that would have deserved attention. For the sake of clarity, I have restricted the scope of my study to the strategic use of L2. The definition of strategy is discussed later in Section 4.2, 'Learning and communication strategies'.

2.1.1 Acquisition and learning

In second language acquisition, two terms, acquisition and learning, appear regularly. I start the discussion with Krashen's (1981) and Paradis' (2004) conceptualization who argue that acquisition and learning are two independent systems in second language learning that language learners operate.

Language acquisition, the process children go through when they acquire their first language, is an unconscious process of absorbing a language, which occurs naturally in informal settings. In contrast, language learning, a conscious process of gaining language knowledge happens in an institutional environment. Children during their first language acquisition and learners acquiring a language naturally (e.g., at home, in the target language community) tend to resort to procedural or implicit memory and rely on the "knowing how" process. Language learners (e.g., adults) learning their second language in institutional settings rely mostly on declarative or explicit memory and focus on the "knowing what" method (Morgant-Short et al., 2014; Paradis, 1994). Children and younger learners who use language in natural settings as a tool for interpersonal interactions show a functional approach, whereas adults learning their second language in institutional settings have more awareness of grammar and the structure of language. They pay more attention to linguistic categories and tend to apply a more analytical, rule-based structural approach. Adults and older learners often focus on form rather than meaning, they tend to rely on frequent and powerful quality check, termed as 'monitor' in Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982, p.15). The monitor operates in instructed learning including a great deal of error correction and demonstration of explicit rules. Krashen (1982) in his Input Hypothesis emphasizes comprehensible input as a prerequisite of

both acquiring and learning arguing that the success of language acquisition depends on the learner's ability to understand what other people are saying, thereby it is inevitable that the language environment which learners are exposed to provides meaningful language.

The acquisition-learning dichotomy proposed by Krashen is supported by Oxford (1990) and Cohen (1998). In their view conscious knowledge of language rules results from learning and formal instruction but does not necessarily lead to conversational fluency. Acquisition is identified as an unconscious and spontaneous process, which leads to conversational fluency and is originated from naturalistic language use.

Some researchers adopting the position of 'language socialization' (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003) criticize the dichotomous distinction of acquisition and learning proposed by Krashen (1981) and avoid differentiating acquisition and learning. They reject the idea that acquisition occurs almost exclusively in naturalistic (e.g., non-school) environments and learning happens in formal (classroom) settings. They support the view according to which the process of getting the ability of performing a language is constructed in and shaped by the sociocultural context whether it takes place at home or school. School just as well is an inherent part of social life and instructed learning can be part of acquisition in informal in naturalistic settings as well.

Although younger learners acquiring a language spontaneously and older learners seem to develop their linguistic skills in two independent ways, neither process is better than the other and both have their advantages and disadvantages. In my dissertation I use both acquisition and learning but the awkward terms 'acquire' and 'acquirer' are replaced by 'learn' and 'learner'.

2.1.2 First language – second language – foreign language

Second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) are key concepts in my dissertation. Baker (2006) uses second language to refer to the situation where the language being learned is spoken by the community the learner belongs to as opposed to foreign language, which is a language other than the learners' first language and does not belong to the circle of languages spoken in the learner's natural environment either.

Cohen (1998) introduces the term target language (TL) to replace the term second or foreign language to bridge the *second-foreign* dichotomy. He argues that the term target language is justified because it refers to any new language being learned whether it is second or foreign. Based on the above conceptualizations in my case study English can be labelled as both a second and a foreign language. It constitutes the main feature of second language with reference to the chronological ordering of learning with English coming after Hungarian even if Sarah's regular exposure to the second language occurred soon after her birth. At the same time, English can be considered a foreign language for Sarah because learning takes place in an environment where English does not belong to the circle of the naturally spoken languages in her wider community. For the sake of clarity, I use the term second language broadly as a general cover term, no matter whether learning occurs in a second or foreign language environment. I give a detailed description of Sarah's language environment and the chronological order of her two languages in section 5.2.1.

2.1.3 Transfer, interference, code-switching

In multilingual settings multiple languages are integrated in conversation. Alternation of codes tells a lot about what speakers do with languages when they use more than one language variety. Learning how to use one code or another under given circumstances is essential to achieve the desired communicative function. Analysing code-switching, code-mixing and transfer seems to be an appropriate analytical framework to study of language development in bilingualism and explore some of the reasons for language alternation. Researchers (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021; Velasco & Fialais, 2018; Wei & Lin, 2019; Wei 2011) use the term *translanguaging* to refer to the strategic use of one language to support the learning of another. *Translanguaging* is viewed as multilinguals' systematic technique utilized in coping with communication difficulties stemming from second language knowledge imprecision. In their conceptualization, the systematic and functional use of two languages, moving between and beyond language boundaries offer a unique linguistic repertoire to communicate effectively.

Authors (Fabbro, 1999; Meisel, 1994; Paradis, 2004) looking into bilingualism from the neurolinguistic perspective have investigated code-switching to reveal how

languages are organized, processed, and represented in the bilingual brain. Going deep into the neurofunctional model of bilingualism is beyond the scope of my dissertation, instead I focus on the social aspect and explore how Sarah integrates English in her language use. I look for patterns and rules that determine the relationship between Sarah's two languages and investigate her code-switching practices as a specific manifestation of bilingualism (Paradis, 2004).

Weinreich (1953) in his book *Languages in Contact* discusses how two language systems relate to each other in the mind of individual bilinguals. The key concept in his discussion is interference. He defines interference as deviation from the norms of the individual's language as a result of the individual's familiarity with more than one language (Weinreich, 1953, p.1). Interference, as Weinreich's argumentation goes, happens in two dimensions: (1) in the actual speech of the bilingual and (2) in the bilingual's knowledge of language (p. 11). Weinreich focuses on knowledge as a static phenomenon ignoring how interference changes over time and how personality develops during the process of language acquisition. He is more concerned with the *concept-word*, i.e., the *signifier-signified* relationship between the bilingual's two languages.

Relative to the bilingual's system of storing and retrieving their two languages, Weinreich distinguishes coordinate, compound, and subordinate bilingualism. Coordinate bilingualism means that the two languages exist side by side without a direct link between them, i.e., in the bilingual's mind there are two separate words for each concept. The state of compound bilingualism is when a single concept is related to two different words and in two languages. In this case the two languages are related with a single concept. The third type, subordinate bilingualism, describes the case when the bilingual is not able to connect a concept directly to the L2 word, but indirectly via the L1 word. This type suggests that the two languages coexist separately, and L2 is derived from L1. This distinction was later criticised and dismissed by several linguists (McLaughlin, 1987; Grosjean, 1982; Romaine, 1989), arguing that connections between concepts and words are a more complex relationship than that.

Cook (1993) embraces Weinreich's definition of bilingualism as 'the practice of alternately using two languages' (Weinreich, 1953, p.1) seeing it as a straightforward and practical definition. Cook also admits Weinreich's remarkable contribution to

bilingualism research, however, he claims that it would be narrow-mindedness to compel language contact phenomena as a manifestation of abnormal language use. Code-switching from the sociolinguistic perspective serves as a consciously selected strategy to enhance multilinguals' communication, and as such greatly contributes to multi-competence (Cook, 1993, p. 244). With reference to Weinreich's (1953) view, the distinction between coordinate, compound and subordinate bilingualism has implications on interlingual relationships in bilinguals. Paradis (2004) claims that coordinate organization of languages means no interference or a minimum number of borrowed elements, compound corresponds to bidirectional interference and subordinate organization incorporates unidirectional interferences.

Paradis (1994) introduces two further types: static and dynamic interference in his discussion. Static interference refers to the speaker's systematic use of an element of one language in both production and comprehension. This phenomenon refers to the contents of the grammar of the language in question and not to the way the two languages are stored in the brain. The extent to which a bilingual masters two language systems is irrespective of the organization of language within the brain, he argues. Dynamic interference is due to an accidental intrusion of an element of one language in another. In this case, an element of one language gets activated instead of the element of the other language. Speakers often recognize such errors and repair them if enough attention is drawn to them. Paradis (2004) introduces a working hypothesis, the 'null hypothesis' which assumes that 'there is nothing in the bilingual brain that differs in nature from anything in the unilingual brain.' Bilingual brain needs no additional or supplementary components that are not already present in the unilingual brain. The only difference is that different types of bilinguals use various parts of the language processing system in different ways. In other words, the activation thresholds of certain parts within the system differ with individuals, however, all parts are equally available for both bilinguals and unilinguals. Paradis concludes that the choice of foreign elements in one of the languages can be attributed to temporary word-finding difficulties (greater availability) or deliberate choice. The choice of which language to use in an utterance is governed by the same mechanism as in unilinguals' choosing the register to be used. The governing rule behind the choice is appropriateness (Baker, 2006; Pavlenko, 2005, 2006).

Meisel (1994, p. 414) uses the term language mixing to refer to all instances where features of two languages appear within or across sentence boundaries. If such mixing originates from grammatical incompetence, that is from failure to separate the two languages involved, it is called fusion. According to Meisel, fusion occurs when the young bilingual integrates parts of the grammar of L1 into the grammar of L2. Meisel simply labels this type of fusion as a premature stage. As opposed to fusion, code-switching is defined as a specific skill relating to the bilingual's pragmatic competence, the ability to select the language according to the interlocutor, the context, the topic of conversation, etc. without violating specific grammatic constraints (Kecskés, 2016). While both code-switching and fusion lead to language mixing, it is their relevance to grammatical constraints that define their nature. In fusion the speaker uses elements from both of their languages regardless of the grammatical characteristics of either language. In fusion, interspersals, either conscious or unconscious, generally display a kind of interlingual deviance due to the speaker's linguistic incompetence. For example, children's using the English word 'puddle' for the Hungarian 'pedál' (pedal) in a Hungarian context exemplifies fusion and shows the child's handling cross-linguistic formal similarities between the Hungarian 'pedál' and the English 'puddle'. In code-switching the alternate use of L1 and L2, whether conscious or unconscious, in most cases are not attributed to the insufficient level of language proficiency. It is more likely expected to serve the speaker's demand to convey communicative intentions more appropriately, for example, Sarah's resorting to the English word 'tiger' to replace the Hungarian [tɪgrɪʃ] to camouflage her improper pronunciation of the [ʃ] sound in Hungarian.

In Meisel's (1994) terminology, code-switching is dependent upon the notion of language separation. Based on his extensive research into bilingual children's language development he found that there is a two-stage development: an initial prefunctional stage until the age of 2;4, when the child is working with a single syntactic system discussed (see Section 3.8. Living with two languages – Unitary system vs. separate system). This is the stage when they are unable to obey language specific rules or constraints. In this case L2 elements in L1, or vice versa, do not constitute code-switching, they rather fall under the category of fusion in support of the single system hypothesis (see section 3.9). In the second stage, which is a qualitative shift, children can differentiate their languages and use appropriate

mixings termed as conscious or pragmatically based code-switches in Meisel's terminology. The present thesis focuses on such pragmatically based or conscious code-switches.

Altarriba and Heredia (2008) use the term 'cross-linguistic transfer' with reference to the integration of two languages in the same utterance. Although they primarily identify transfers as violations of structural constraints, they sustain that transfer is a much more complex phenomenon, which call for further research.

Pavlenko (2005, 2006) and Baker (2006) in line with Meisel (1994) concluded that the key element in language choice is appropriateness. The palette varies with individuals. Based on their own empirical data these researchers argue that the emergence of L2 elements or references to L2 in L1 give evidence that individuals use their L2 as a complementary set of forms and an additional resource of self-expression. In the analysis of my participant's transfers, I refer to both structural and functional influence of L2 on L1. When I reveal examples in my dataset, I also add thick contextualization because the underlying meaning of a concrete transfer is impossible to understand without this additional information.

From the sociolinguistic perspective (Baker, 1995; Cook, 1993; Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982, 1985; Murphy, 2014; Pavlenko, 2006; Poplack, 1980) code-switching is a natural phenomenon, the manifestation of a unique mode of communication, that is the bilingual mode of communication. It can be considered as a special linguistic skill that is extensively and frequently used with specific goals and demands. Medved Krajnović (2003) following Hamers and Blanc's (2004), Romaine's (1989), and Poplack's (1980) classification distinguishes three types of code-switching: (1) *extra-sentential* (i.e., the insertion of a tag from one language into an utterance in another language); (2) inter-sentential (i.e., a switch at a clause or sentence boundary where Gumperz one clause is in one language and the other clause is in the other language); (3) *intra-sentential* code-switching (i.e., switches of different types which might occur within a clause or even within the word boundary). Research into the sociolinguistic aspect of bilingualism underpins that code-switching is a proof of bilinguals' strategic moving across languages and that of their ability to enhance their communication playing on subtle differences between their two languages (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008; Baker, 2006, Cook, 1993; Hamers, 2004; Pavlenko, 2006, 2007; Poplack, 1980). Studies of child code-switches (Genesee,

1989; Lindholm & Padilla, 1978) suggest that children's behaviour does not differ greatly from adults' usage and have found that children's switches serve both sociolinguistic and communicative strategies. In contrast to Weinreich's (1953) assumption Bialystok (1991) and Genesee's (2003) argue that code-switching cannot be treated as an absence of linguistic differentiation or a lack of control in maintaining linguistic separation. On the contrary, it is suggestive of metalinguistic awareness.

Velasco and Fialais (2018) emphasise that translanguaging supports the development of young children's metalinguistic awareness and creating translanguaging spaces for them. Translanguaging spaces foster comparisons and metalinguistic understandings of different languages (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021, p.19; Wei, 2011). 'Translanguaging' or 'fluid languaging', the latter grounded in the work of García and Wei (2014) are interpreted as scaffolding and support for language learners, for example children, who are less advanced in their language competence. Authors (Baker, 2011; Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021; Velasco & Fialais, 2018; Wei & Lin, 2019) argue for the relevance of translanguaging seeing it an effective practice to maximise language learners' linguistic capability (Baker, 2011, p.288). In this conceptualization translanguaging is viewed as functional use of two languages, a natural practice of bilingual speakers in their daily life. Translanguaging or fluid languaging reflect the fact that language is constituted socioculturally; therefore, it is no longer viewed as a disadvantage in the learning of a second language.

Empirical studies into child bilingualism (Baker, 2006; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Knechtelsdorfer, 2011; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006) have underpinned that code-switches play an important role in defining group boundaries, establishing identity and power relations, signalling levels of intimacy and emotional charge and are strategic tools to convey a range of communicative intentions. Code-switching is a marked choice understood as "the speaker's strategic (conscious or unconscious) use of a new code in order to superimpose a message on a communicative act" (Herbert 2001, p. 230).

Murphy (2014) states that bilingual children appeal to code-switch for two reasons: (1) with the aim of gap-filling and (2) for pragmatic effect. Code-switching applied to fill a gap is explained by the fact that bilingual individuals experience different situations unequally and differently in their two languages, with the implication that

they are unlikely to acquire the same knowledge in both of their languages, e.g., the equivalent elements in terms of lexis and morphosyntax for every experience in each language. In such cases they code-switch because they lack the equivalent of certain elements in the other language. Code-switching for pragmatic effect is of a different nature, it has a sociocultural explanation. Children tend to operate this type of code-switching for potentially greater emphasis in their effort to reach a goal they do not achieve using only one language. Bilingual children's code-switching behaviour is strongly associated with parental and community input patterns and is formulated by the local social norms. Empirical studies underpin that language alternation is utilized as a strategic tool for family, community, or pragmatic influence (Murphy, 2014, p.33).

2.1.4 Interlanguage

In my thesis the term interlanguage recurrently emerges with reference to Sarah's incomplete language development or erroneous language to indicate the temporary nature of her language. My interpretation is based on Corder's (1971, 1981) definition seeing interlanguage as language learners' insufficient language to emphasize that learners' competence is transitional and changes with progress. During the learning process the language learner speaks an idiosyncratic dialect, i.e., at any time, the learner operates a self-contained and independent language variety, a quasi dialect, but it is much more unique or 'idiosyncratic' to the individual speaker. Nemser (1971) describes the learner's interlanguage or intermittent language as approximative language emphasizing that the language being learned is only more or less equivalent to the target language.

The term interlanguage (IL) (Cook, 1993, p.18) introduced by Selinker (1972) has become widely accepted to label the L2 learner's independent language system ever since. Selinker considers interlanguage a central construct in second language acquisition and uses the term to describe the learner's developing and instable knowledge of the target language drawing attention to the fact that the learner's language system is neither that of the mother tongue, nor that of the second language. Interlanguage is an autonomous language containing features from both languages and it is neither of them. If we accept that there is a continuum between the initial knowledge of second language and the knowledge of the target language, the learner

speaks an interlanguage at any stage of development. Translanguaging, Larsen-Freeman's (2018) argumentation goes 'is an emic version of code-switching - is now recognized to be a social practice of language use' (p.61).

2.1.5 Pragmatics and discourse analysis

Studies on the interpretation of language use are traditionally conducted in the framework of pragmatics, which considers language and meaning as grounded in context, constituted in interactions, modified according to the speaker's intention (Grice, 1957; Kecskés, 2016). In my study pragmatic and discourse analysis are equally applicable and best suited to analysing the kind of data I have.

Pragmatics and discourse analysis (DA) are two overlapping and inseparable conceptual frameworks to analyse language use in operation and their objectives lie very close if not shared (Schiffrin, 1994; Tannen, 1984, 1993). Within this pragmatic discursive framework language is considered as part of socially constructed, dynamic interactive processes (Arndt & Janney, 1991). It is the object of analysis that explains the difference between these two theoretical approaches. Pragmatics is generally defined as the study of language at sentence/utterance level to investigate how meanings are performed and interpreted by means of context. The core area of pragmatics is smaller units i.e., the sentence or the utterance to investigate how the speaker and listener beyond their structural and linguistic knowledge (e.g., grammar, lexicon, etc.), decode situative meanings relying on the context of the utterance, their prior knowledge about those involved and on the inferred intent of the speaker.

The sociocultural-interactional approach offers an alternative way to think about pragmatics regarding intention as a post-factum construct that is achieved jointly through the dynamic co-constructing of pragmatic meaning with the interlocutor. In developing bilingualism, the lack of full control over L2 language skills may lead to a more conscious approach to what is said, and how it is said. The fact that language is created ad hoc by individuals during interaction affects the way speaker production and hearer comprehension are interpreted. Language behaviour enhanced with a conscious, often monitored endeavour of the speaker contributes to making the interlocutor cooperative in discourse (Kecskés, 2016, p.4).

The central idea of pragmatics is that words do not have a one-to-one relationship to the ideas a speaker wants to express. A single utterance can convey a range of meanings depending on to whom it is directed and in what specific circumstances. Pragmatics views language in social interactions and interprets meaning as the language outcome of a joint activity between the speaker and the hearer, which involves the exchange of communicative intentions. Grice (1957) in his cooperation principle describes the rules that make a social interaction successful and sets up preconditions of reaching mutual understanding. In his implicature, Grice defines four maxims, which serve as prerequisites of successful cooperation between the speaker and the hearer. These are: the maxim of relevance, the maxim of mode, the maxim of quantity and the maxim of quality. The speaker is expected to keep to these maxims so that the hearer could find out his or her intended meaning. The concept of implicated meaning comes from Grice's theory of implicature.

The term implicature refers to any meaning that is conveyed, communicated, implied, or implicated, but not said. According to the Gricean conception the meaning of words in a particular speech event is determined by the speaker's intention. What is said must be distinguished from what is implied, which fact justifies the differentiation of two kinds of meanings, the semantic and pragmatic meaning. Semantic meaning shows the relationship between signs and their referent, i.e., how signs are related to the objects they refer to. Pragmatic meaning shows how stable, literal, and conventional meanings relate to the speaker meaning, the meaning a person wants to communicate by means of the word they utter in a particular situation (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 19-29). Thus, from the pragmatic point of view the study of meaning in context heavily relies on the speaker's interpretative strategy, their orientation towards three central concepts of pragmatic theory: context, intention, and inference. In summary pragmatic analysis goes beyond the literal meaning of a message to find out the speaker's intended meaning (communicative intention) and articulates that all our utterances produced to achieve a goal can be considered as speech acts.

Although both pragmatics and DA are generally defined as the study of language in use in some specific context, DA seems more relevant to satisfy ecological validity (Hammond, 1998; Larsen-freeman, 2018,) and reveal the complexity of social interaction, examining language use from linguistic, anthropological, sociological,

psychological, and philosophical perspectives. DA goes beyond the sentence level and puts the emphasis on the flow of the conversation which is none more than a sequence of sentences or utterances in use. The aim of DA is to give a comprehensive account of the socio-psychological characteristics of the interlocutor. As such, discourse analysis cannot be restricted to the description of language use independent of the purposes and functions which it serves.

2.1.6 Speech act theory

My interpretive study justifies the application of speech act analysis to complement the discourse analytic approach. To have insights in the implied meanings underlying speakers' utterances the speech act theory (Austin, 1962) offers an appropriate approach. Within the speech act theory framework some utterances are more than simple statements of saying something, they do not only describe or report something, but can be considered as part of doing something, and identified as acts performed in speech, i.e., the individual language user's linguistically performed social activities (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 50). Searle (1969, pp.66-67) distinguishes five classes of speech acts: representatives (e.g., asserting), directives (e.g., requesting), commissives (e.g., promising), expressives (e.g., thanking), and declaratives (e.g., appointing). Schiffrin adds that understanding the specific condition that defines what the act "counts as" is essential, without that knowledge we might fail to identify the illocutionary force of a speech act (Schiffrin,1994, p.58; Schlegoff, 1988).

When analysing speech acts several linguistic connections are to be taken into consideration: (1) what the speaker means; (2) what the uttered sentence means; (3) what the hearer understands from what is meant (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 19). Searle's principle of expressibility (1969, pp.18-21) refers to the speaker's ability to find an appropriate linguistic tool to express themselves in a way that can successfully mediate the intended meaning towards the hearer. From this point of view speech acts are not used to state things, they cannot be assessed as true or false, but only as appropriate or inappropriate.

In Searle's (1962) conceptualization, the language user simultaneously can do three acts when uttering a sentence. The first one is the locutionary act, the formal representation, the orthographic or acoustic appearance of a linguistic unit (a word, a sentence, an utterance) comprising phonetic and syntactic aspects. Thus, the

locutionary act is related to the basic linguistic analysis of an utterance. The effect of an utterance, i.e., what the speaker does with a particular utterance is central to speech act theory. The effect of an utterance, e.g., denoting a request, command, threat etc., is the illocutionary force. When all conditions of performing a speech act are satisfied, that is the interlocutor understands what is meant, and behaves accordingly, the speech act is recognized as intended. In other words, the act of perlocution is fulfilled. To sum up, pragmatics offers a relevant theory for the study of meanings in context and provides a theoretical background for speech act analysis, which looks for speaker meaning putting emphasis on the generative power of a particular utterance.

2.1.7 Direct and indirect speech acts

Speech acts can be performed directly and indirectly. In other words, what is said does not always determine the illocutionary point of an utterance explicitly. We can make a request by means of making a statement whereas commands can be performed by way of asking a question. For example, the utterance ’Mom, come here, there is a spider on the wall.’ is a statement, but embedded in a particular context may become a request ’Mom, can you take the spider off the wall?’ with the illocutionary force of inviting the interlocutor to perform an action.

As seen from the example above, apart from distinguishing speech acts according merely to their function (e.g., request, offer, command, reprimand, etc.), they can be differentiated in terms of their structure and directness. When there is a direct relationship between the communicative function and the structure of an utterance, e.g., ’Open the window, please.’ it is a direct speech act. When the form of a speech act shows no or little correspondence with its surface structure and literal meaning, as in ’It is hot in here.’ equivalent with ’Open the window’, it is seen as an indirect speech act. Searle (1962, p.68) defines an indirect speech act as an act performed in such utterances that can do more than one thing at a time, i.e., they can serve multiple functions, because one act s performed by means of another one (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 60).

To perform and recognise an indirect speech act certain preconditions must be satisfied. The speaker is able to perform an indirect speech act if they can assume that the hearer: (1) relies on their shared knowledge of speech acts and takes into

consideration the general principles of cooperative conversation (Grice, 1957) (see Section 2.1.5), (2) has shared information with the speaker, (3) has understanding of the specific circumstances underlying the speech act, and (4) has a general ability to draw on inferences (Schiffrin, 1994, p.59).

2.1.8 Discourse

Below I present how linguists (Grice, 1975; Fasold, 1990; Norton, 2000; Schiffrin, 1994) define discourse, context, and their relevance in discourse analysis. Norton (2000) in her critical discourse research identifies discourse as 'complexes of signs and practices that organize social existence and social reproduction… and as such, a discourse is a particular way of organizing meaning-making practices.' (Norton, 2000, p.14).

Emphasizing the importance of internal validity of discourse analysis studies, Schiffrin (1994) in line with Norton, recommends interpretive efforts to reveal individual speakers' linguistic solutions affected by the perceived circumstantial elements. In Fasold's (1990) conception the study of discourse is a study of any aspect of language use (p.65). Schiffrin (1994) defines discourse as systematic language use, a socially and culturally organized way of speaking, through which functions are realized (p.32). Broader and narrower analyses, according to Shiffrin's conceptualization, clearly reflect two different paradigms of the conception of language use. Linguists supporting a narrower view of language use place higher priority on the role of code in communication and tend to apply quantitative approaches to look for recurrences of certain linguistic elements in computer-readable corpora. Linguists representing a broader perspective focus on language use within a particular context and interpret social, cultural, and personal meanings prefer qualitative approaches (Schiffrin, 1994, p.42). There is little consensus on what is considered the basic unit of discourse. Should it be 'utterance' or 'sentence'? Schiffrin concludes that a practical and viable way of eliminating the utterance-sentence dichotomy is identifying 'utterances' as contextualized or context-bound 'sentences' or as particular linguistically realized actions (p.61). Utterances whether spoken or written, whether at sentence level or over the sentence constitute verified basis for language analysis. The utterance-sentence distinction is justified and expected only if we want to clearly differentiate the two different functional and structural approaches to language analysis (p, 41).

The definitions above assume that discourse is central to identifying patterns of talk formulated for certain purposes in particular contexts including the information about the relationship between the participants and their setting. I have found that discourse is a relevant basis for identifying patterns of Sarah's language use and consider discourse analysis a relevant approach to show the wholeness of her discourse.

2.1.9 The role of context

Different approaches to discourse analysis view context differently. Pragmatics and the Speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1957; Searle, 1979) view context as 'knowledge', which is incorporated in linguistic and communicative competence. These approaches offer a broad contextual framework for the analysis of utterances, but as opposed to sociolinguistic or ethnographic approaches below, they focus on individual, intention-based meanings and not to the social and cultural ones. According to Grice (1975), contextual information is necessary to understand inferences about the speaker meaning. When we calculate implicatures, we rely on the context of the utterance (p.50).

Sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982) and ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972, p.56; Lazaraton, 2002) consider context as situation (including knowledge of both the here and now, and the knowledge of the broader social context). What is said is always incorporated in a larger social and cultural reality, any aspect of form or function needs the understanding and interpretations of the overall framework where those forms and functions are created. Events and situations stand in a dependency relationship with functions. Thick description identified in Geertz's (1973) and Creswell (2003, pp.181-182) terminology, as part of the ecology of SLA is a strong predictor of understanding the changing relationships between the learning process and the individual learner (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, pp. 59-60).

Conversation and discourse analysts (Garfinkel, 1974; Schlegoff, 1980, 1988; Levinson, 1983; Heritage, 1984) look for ways to discover ordinary, everyday procedures that construct personal language use. Their focus is on the way language is shaped in context, and on the way, language shapes context. The common element in the approaches above is that discourse is part of culture, and culture in broader and narrower sense, is the framework in which communication becomes meaningful. The ecological theory (Larsen-Freeman, 2018) describing SLA as a complex dynamic

system emphasizes that all internal and external components that constitute and/or affect the context of learning are interconnected. ‘SLA does not take place in static isolation from what is happening in the temporal and spatial environment in which it is situated.’ (p.59).

2.2 Similarities and differences between L1 and L2 learning

2.2.1 Language acquisition theories

Some researchers (e.g., Houmanfar, Hayes & Herbst, 2005; MacWhinney, 2008) argue that the history of the first language (L1) is a participatory factor in the acquisition of the second language (L2), they assert that the L2 learning strategies are basically similar to those of the L1. Although both first and second language acquisition are discussed in the same theoretical framework a number of studies (MacWhinney, 2008; Nemati & Taghizadeh, 2013; Selinker, 1972) investigate the similarities and differences between first language acquisition and second language acquisition in terms of issues like the critical period hypothesis, age, mechanisms-learning, order of L1 and L2 acquisition-learning, context, input and self-identity. In the section below I aim to explore in what ways L1 provides a foundation for L2 development and try to capture instances of the interplay between the two language systems in the L2 acquisition-learning process.

At the theoretical level, researchers of first language acquisition (Bruner, 1975, Chomsky, 1959; Clark, 2003; Hamers, 2004; MacWhinney 1987a; Piaget, 1964; Slobin, 1973; Skinner, 1957) attempted to produce a single theory that would offer a framework for both first and second language acquisition. In the 60s, the study of child language was dominated by the behaviourist approach proposed by Skinner in his book *Verbal Behaviour* (1957). According to this approach, language is not a mental phenomenon, it is simply behaviour. Habit formation plays a crucial role, which means that children only imitate what they hear and through getting reinforcement and reward from their social environment their language more and more approximates the desired adult language. Skinner claims that the child’s verbal behaviour is shaped or conditioned until the child’s behaviour coincides with the adult model.

The inadequacy of the behaviourist approach is that it examines child language from the perspective of the adult's language**.** The behaviourist view of first language acquisition was challenged by Chomsky' s (1959) innatist theory. Chomsky claims that besides imitation there must be a more complex underlying system at the child's disposal that enables them to create an infinite number of sentences they never heard before. The child must have internalized a system of linguistic rules and the ability of making transformations with the help of which they can generate new sentences and thus construct a language that in many respects differs from the adult language. The fact that children pass through similar sequences in acquiring their language and that they can construct their own rule system until they finally acquire the adult system made researchers believe that children are born with an innate capacity for acquiring language. The term for this capacity is the 'Language Acquisition Device.' According to Chomsky's conceptualization, first language acquisition is partly a result of general cognitive capacities and general language processing mechanisms labelled as linguistic competence. Linguistic competence refers to children's capacity of internalizing abstract linguistic representations, which is a cognitive process and not available for outer observation. If we want to know more about the underlying cognitive processes, we need to rely on the observable linguistic behaviour labelled as language performance (Chomsky, 1965). Chomsky clearly distinguishes linguistic competence and performance, with the first he refers to underlying cognitive processes and representations that come into play with language acquisition, whilst he identifies the second with the observable manifestations of the linguistically relevant cognitive processes.

Later linguistic theories of acquisition (Anderson, 1983; Bates & MacWhinney, 1982) share innatism proposed by Chomsky and agree that language faculty is eventually a part of the whole cognitive system and identify language processing with an information processing system. Anderson's model the Adaptive Control of Thoughts (ACT) represents this view. The core concept in Anderson's theory is the production system. This system is made up of production rules and subrules responsible for language production. There are three types of memory that facilitate and enable production: working, procedural and declarative memory. Working memory is used for the actual performance of the production rule. Declarative memory sorts actual information in the form of cognitive units such as propositions

and images. Procedural memory contains processes that check parts of the production rules to serve declarative memory.

In his Competition model MacWhinney (1987b) slightly revised Anderson's ACT model. Mac Whinney's model has similarities with that of Anderson's but there are some differences. It is another approach that considers information processing a key element in language acquisition but views information processing from a more functional aspect. The basic idea is that language is a channel and tool for sending information and is a storage of signals to convey meanings. Humans can use four types of signals to convey meanings: (1) word order, (2) vocabulary, (3) morphology and (4) intonation. These four types of signals are represented in different ways in different languages. Some languages rely more heavily, for example, on word order, e.g., English, while others rely on morphology, e.g., Russian, Hungarian. There are languages that are dependent on intonation, e.g., Chinese. The child who learns a language acquires the appropriate weighting for each of these four factors and based on this knowledge, can decide which is crucial and preferential for processing. Identifying the subject of the sentence is central to the Competition model.

A lot of theorists raise the question of to what extent stages of children's language development are predictable and how those stages build on each other. Regarding the rules that govern development stages theorists mention different mechanisms. Some of them (Macnamara, 1982; Pinker, 1984) propose the continuity view. They assume, if Universal Grammar (UG) is present from the start, children only must set a fixed number of parameters and can learn any new lexical items and find the relevant syntactic solutions to them by using unchanged learning mechanisms, linguistic categories, and structures. This view proposes that language is acquired in a linear sequence where subsequent stages build on each other. Language development depends on the child's ability of parameter setting and rule generating rather than on their biological maturation. The representatives of this view suppose that maturation can be relatively independent of experience.

The maturational view (Krashen, 1982; Littlewood, 1984; Piaget, 1964) as opposed to the continuity view implies that children's linguistic progress is explained and determined by their biological timetable or maturation and not by parameter setting.

The representatives of this view argue that subsequent stages do not build on each other in a predictable manner.

> 'It can happen that a phoneme, for example an affricate, produced with ease at a previous stage of language development will be difficult or impossible to produce at a later stage. Another fact in favour of the maturation view is that sudden bursts of progress and temporary stagnations alternate in children's language development, which underpins discontinuity rather than continuity' (Clark, 2003, p.402).

According to the maturational approach there are three different stages of development: (1) pregrammatical, where children categorize words used in their environment as nouns or verbs. (2) the lexical stage, this period comes with an increase in vocabulary size. (3) The acquisition of functional categories such as determiners inflections, tense suffixes, and modal auxiliaries, which emerge later in the functional stage. (Clark, 2003, p. 402).

The only prerequisite of acquiring and producing language is the activation of the universal human built-in capacity. The shortcoming of the views discussed above is that little attention is paid to the dynamism of learning and individual differences are left out of consideration, furthermore they have little to say about how the innate categories are linked to actual linguistic forms.

Interactionalists (Brown,1973; Bruner, 1975; Clark, 2003; Dore, 1975; Halliday, 1973; Hamers, 2004; Littlewood, 1984; Vygotsky, 1978) argue that the way children learn a language is defined by both biological and social factors. Language develops under the influence of constant conscious interplay between the child and their social environment. The fact that during the first few years of language acquisition the child-caretaker communication is limited to the child's immediate environment, the so called 'here and now' context, invaluably adds to the favourable linguistic environment. The speech directed to the child termed as 'motherese' or 'caretaker speech' is tailored and adjusted to the child's actual cognitive capacity and linguistic level (Hamers, 2004) Simplified forms and sentence patterns, repetitions, higher pitch, more varied intonation, and paraphrasing are typical elements of the fine-tuning strategy.

2.2.2 The natural order of language acquisition

Chomsky's (1959) innatist theory, Anderson's Act model (Anderson, 1983; Mac Whinney's Competition model (1989) and the interactionist view (Bates & MacWhinney, 1982, Bruner, 1975; Vygotsky, 1967) have one thing in common, they all see child language in its own right and not from the adult language perspective. They all agree that child language is creatively constructed by the child during interactions with their social environment and draw attention to the fact that children seem to develop language in a similar way and on a similar schedule. In the late 1970s and early 1980s the question in SLA research: 'Is there a common sequence in morpheme acquisition in children acquiring English as a second language?' was prominent. Researchers (Krashen, 1973; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & White, 1987) grouped certain morphemes into subsequences reflecting the conception that certain morphemes tend to go together. Morphemes were studied in actual talk to get a better understanding of such partial orders of, for example past tense (Krashen, 1973), negation and question formation (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1993) among others. Linguists used data gathered from observations of children's speech to know more about the lexical function of morphemes in children's language use. Brown (1973 studying L1 acquisition supported the assumption that there is a predictable order of children's morphological acquisition observed that children in the early years of language acquisition show an outright preference for lexical rather than grammatical morphemes producing utterances such as 'Not Daddy' 'There bird'. Supported by his research findings Brown (1973) proposes an order of L1 acquisition for 14 grammatical morphemes in the circle of three English children acquiring English up to the age of four. The order proposed by him is the following:

Figure 1 – An order of L1 acquisition for 14 grammatical morphemes (Brown, 1973)

1. present progressive -ing (as in she is running.)
2. preposition *on*
3. preposition *in*
4. plural-s (as in two books)
5. irregular past forms (as in she went)
6. possessive 's (as in daddy's hat)

7. uncontractible copula (e.g., as in yes, she is)
8. articles *the* and *a* (which were classified together)
9. regular past -ed (as in she walked)
10. regular third person singular -s (as in she runs)
11. irregular third person singular forms (e.g., she has)
12. uncontractible auxiliary *be* (in she was coming)
13. contractible copula (as in she's tired)
14. contractible auxiliary *be* (as in he's coming)

Brown (1973) also calculated the relative frequency of these morphemes and found that the order of frequency does not correlate with the order of acquisition, that is, although one would expect that more frequently used forms are earlier acquired, empirical data suggest that it is not always the case. The development of inflections cannot be explained with habit formation and argues that children are active contributors of their own development, and the order of their acquisition shows individual differences.

Slobin (1973) studying L1 acquisition agrees with Brown's conceptualization and adds that there are two main contributors of children's order of acquisition for inflections and grammatical morphemes: (1) the semantic complexity and (2) the formal complexity of the expression for a particular meaning in whatever language the acquisition takes place. He gives concrete examples to underpin his claim: English children master the suffix -ing well before the past -ed because -ing is semantically easier for them to comprehend as parents apply the 'here and now' strategy in the socialization process. The context of 'here and now' creates a favourable condition for language acquisition for the simple reason that children can make use of the physical copresence of the signified and the signifier. In other words, they can build on the world of 'here and now' as it guarantees that they have a common focus of attention with their cospeakers. When acquiring the basic vocabulary children use the referents of those objects that are in sight and use verbs at the same time, as they perform the actions referred by those verbs. An example of the role of formal complexity in language acquisition is that children acquire the numbers quite early, generally between 1;6 and 2;3 regardless of the language they learn. However, the task of marking plural on nouns can be more challenging for the simple reason that formulating plural imposes more complex cognitive efforts than

learning numbers. Cross-linguistic differences further complicate the sequence of acquisition (Clark, 2003), as different languages express certain grammatical relations differently. In case of signalling plural, for example, some languages use only one inflection with only a few exceptions like English, whereas others have subtypes of plural depending on the gender and phonological form of the noun like in Russian.

The importance of the situation and the shared background knowledge is reflected and highly valued in the early speech of children, especially in the period of the holophrastic period (one-word, two-word sentences) between the ages of 12-18 months. This period lacks inflections, children usually join two words to form sentences, and due to their low level of language proficiency they are unable to meet the requirement of well-formedness. Because utterances are reduced, the situation plays a crucial role in understanding and interpreting them. Functional linguists (Dore, 1975; Halliday, 1973) emphasize that despite their imperfect language children can differentiate communicative functions and patterns can be discovered in those functions. Slobin (1973) investigated two-word utterances in the speech of children having acquired six different languages and identified seven types of communicative functions. (1) locating and naming (e.g., there book; (2) demanding or desiring (e.g., more milk); (3) negating (e.g., not hungry); (4) describing an event or situation (e.g., block fall); (5) indicating possession (e.g., my shoe); (6) describing a person or thing (e.g., pretty dress) (7) questioning (e.g., where ball).

Halliday (1973) concludes that children's pragmatic development is driven by the fact that they realize that they can do certain things with language. He also argues that different functions emerge in a predictable order. First the 'instrumental' function (I want) emerges. It is then followed by representational (I say as it is), regulatory (Do as I tell you), interactional (Me and you), personal (Here I come), heuristic (Tell me why), and imaginative (Let us pretend) functions. Linguists doing research into language acquisition (Clark, 2003; Dore, 1975; Jacobson, 1960; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991; Slobin, 1973) argue that children are effective and frequent users of the regulatory-instrumental function of language and their resort to regulatory-instrumental functions precede propositional-referential functions in the first three years. The earlier emergence of the regulatory-instrumental function is

explained by the fact that children primarily use their language to get what they want in situations where they try to persuade their cospeakers to act as they wish them to act. The later emergence of the propositional-referential function is attributed to the fact that children's use of language to negotiate content and true opinion come into play later. Language in the first three years is mainly used for communication and is successfully used for communication irrespective of grammatical well-formedness.

Dore (1975) applied Halliday's ideas and concepts as a guidance and did further research to identify functional patterns in a three-year-old child's bilingual speech. He differentiated twenty-one functional patterns that differed with language settings and language partners. These are (1) greeting; (2) affirmation or declaration; (3) calling; (4) asking or questioning; (5) answering or responding; (6) negating, refusing or denying; (7) requesting or demanding; (8) explaining; (9) insisting; (10) emphasizing surprise or astonishment; (10) praising; (11) expressing love or affection; (12) expressing fear or horror; (13) mischief-making; (14) agreeing; (15) approving disagreeing or disapproving; (16) complaining; (17) expressing anger; (18) dissatisfaction; (19) expressing possession; (20) cultural communication or orientation; and (21) using higher thinking or reasoning skills.

Such and similar empirical studies show that researchers attribute special attention to form-function relationship and are determined to explore how linguistic forms are related to functions. Children's language behaviour is suggestive of how form-function relations are constructed and reconstructed in social interactions (see Section 2.2.4 The social context of second language acquisition).

2.2.3 Children's strategies to cope with linguistic challenges

Clark (2003) identifies several strategies children use when coping with unfamiliar words and new linguistic categories. The context where they first encounter a word plays an important role, but they need a long period of practice to make sure that they established the conventional meaning of the new word. Clark adds that children are consistent in how they map or relate any meaning to a new word. She claims there are three principles that organize children's language acquisition: (1) frequency, (2) dealing with relations (3) overextension and narrowing down.

Frequency is a key element in language acquisition and children rely on it in a systematic way. In terms of inflections frequency is exploited in a way that children are more likely to use inflections that appear on many stems than those that appear only on a few, even when tokens of the latter are much more frequent in overall usage. For example, children only begin to add regular -ed past suffixes when regular verb types outnumber irregular ones. It means that children need a certain magnitude or a critical mass of examples to identify the past tense paradigm in -ed. Children are more attentive to type frequency than token frequency.

There is remarkable consistency in children's dealing with relations and preferences. Clark (2003, p. 155) describes some of the coping strategies children operate in dealing with relations. Regarding event orders children assume that the clause order reflects the actual order of events, i.e., the earlier mentioned event comes before the later mentioned. In agent or subject identification children assume that there are constant, canonical relations between the participants of an event, and they interpret the relationship between subject and object accordingly. They take it for granted that mothers feed babies and not vice versa.

Due to their limited lexicon children between the ages of 1;6-2;6 tend to overextend and underextend words. Most overextensions are based on similarity in shape, sound, size, texture or on combinations of these properties, for example, children of this age use the word 'dog' for all animals having four legs, and 'bácsi' (uncle) for all adult people. Clark emphasizes that overextension is evidence in favour of asymmetry between children's production and comprehension arguing that words overextended in production are rarely overextended in comprehension (Clark, 2003, p. 89). Overextension is a typical phenomenon in child language, which rarely appears in adult language.

Parallel with overextension children from about age 1;6 to 2;6 may underextend words. An example of underextension is when a child uses the word 'cookie' for only a certain type of pastry, or for the one that is baked by the grandmother. Similarly, the word 'telek' (a piece of land) used by a Hungarian child may refer only to their own family's holiday home.

MacWhinney (1982) also suggests that appropriating the functional and the formal level is a crucial element of language development. This two-level adjustment termed

as mapping by MacWhinney (1982) is attributed to the assumption that linguistic forms are developed to express meanings and communicative intentions. Furthermore, MacWhinney explains the dynamic character of form-function mapping with the fact that forms and functions do not have a one-to-one relation claiming that a single form can serve different functions, and, conversely, a single function may be served by several linguistic forms (Bates & MacWhinney,1982, p. 71).

2.2.4 The social context of second language acquisition

After a brief overview of language acquisition theories in this section I discuss the importance of the social environment in SLA, which is considered as a basic premise of successful second language acquisition (Hamers & Blanc, 2000, Hamers, 2004; Nikolov & Szabó, 2015). The context theories proposed by Schumann (1978), Anderson (1983) and Baker (1995, p. 115), imply that the differences between the language use patterns of the language learner and that of the target language community influence the degree to which an individual acquires that language. While Schumann (1978) in his Acculturation Model regards the perceived differences between the minority and the target language as static and changing relatively slowly over time, Giles (1984) in the Accommodation theory describes the distance as dynamic and fluid arguing that the quality of language input is a strong predictor of language outcome.

Research into SLA is divided into two groups according to the type of the social context of language acquisition. Classroom-centred research explores learners' language use in the institutional or formal environment (Chaudron, 2000; Duff, 2002; Nikolov, 1999; Nikolov & Szabó, 2015; Lugossy, 2003). Individual-centered studies investigate the speakers' language in naturalistic, informal settings (Bialystok, 1991; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamers, 2004; Hoyle & Adger, 1998; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991; Pavlenko, 2006; Steiner & Hayes, 2008, Velasco, 2020). Researchers regardless of the context of their investigation insist that the feedbeck bilingual children get from their social environment largely affects their learning and communication strategies. It is central to the child's language development how and for what functions the second language is valued in the child's social context.

Nikolov's (1995,1999) and Lugossy's (2003) observations underpin Hamer's research findings by arguing that children without any academic experience in terms of their second language have difficulties in using L2 for educational purposes. Their observation findings reveal that young children learning English in the school setting extensively rely on L1 in both on-lesson tasks and off-lesson authentic interactions. They appeal to L1 when they are asked for their true opinion and negotiate content in the English lesson. The authors attribute this phenomenon to the low level of L2 competence and the lack of experience in using L2 for learning and literacy-related activities (reading aloud, joint reading, discussing stories). Nikolov (1999) underscores the impact of the input on language choice and urges to investigate the issue in genuine situations. She claims, there is a strong relationship between language input and language choice. She emphasizes that the preference and dominance of a language does not exclusively depend on the quantity of the input. Meaningful use of L2 will lead to language development because exposure to L2 without comprehension will not facilitate learning and will not result in higher proficiency.

The learner's self-regulation (Dörnyei, 2005) in the learning process is dependant on the behaviour models they have in front of them. Like multilingual societies tend to value and use certain languages more than others, individuals can develop preference for language: one can be highly valued and more frequently used, whereas others are devalorized and less used (Hamers, 2004, pp. 82–84). Similarly, bilinguals differentiate their languages by function, for example, one language is reserved for the communicative, whereas the other one for the cognitive function (Cummins, 1991). The language share patterns are formulated by the quality and the quantity of the exposure to their languages. However, the picture may further diversify along a few dimensions, e.g., time, age, situation, emotional stance etc.

To the extent that the adults around and with the children value the use of each language for certain functions, children value the respective language for these functions and thus will develop these aspects, as described in Hamers' (2004) 'feedback mechanism' theory. In bilingual individuals both languages contribute to the development of different functions but in a different manner and degree. This constant matching process between the form of language and the function it is meant to fulfil is termed as form-function mapping (Hamers, 2004, p.72).

In the socialization process children constantly regulate and readjust their form-function mapping. They appropriate meanings to forms taking into consideration their current proficiency level, their experience about language and patterns of language behaviour in their immediate social environment. Hamers (2004) argues that in language development functions precede forms, in the sense that language users are less focused on the structural and grammatical properties of forms and are more likely engaged in conveying the intended meanings. This view of language is in line with Halliday's (1973) perspective claiming that language is a tool to make meaning, so when we use language for communication our primary goal is to find appropriate linguistic forms to get meanings across. When two languages are in contact, the same process occurs with the difference that there are two linguistic forms at the language user's disposal.

Hamers (2004) underscores that home literacy environment and differences between families in their language use patterns influence children's school achievement. She attributes this to the fact that those children who do not use L2 for literacy-related tasks lack the necessary vocabulary and are not familiar with certain concepts in that language. Also, they have less opportunities to develop relevant learning strategies, consulting the dictionary or books. Hamers (2004) concludes that children use their respective language according to their lived experiences and earlier language use practices. Her empirical studies in immersion programmes imply that those children who used their second language as a tool for thinking and learning in their home settings could use it for academic purposes as well. Those applying the second language only for the communicative function did not do well in educational settings. This assumption sheds different light on immersion courses and encourages revision of the scope and effectiveness of these institutions.

Empirical studies (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamers, 2004; Hoyle & Adger, 1998; Lugossy, 2003; Kamalanavin, 2011; Nikolov, 1999; Pavlenko, 2006; Steiner & Hayes, 2008) give evidence that bilingual speakers use their second language as a complementary set of forms. By mixing their languages they can shade the intended meaning. Bilinguals' language behaviour embedded in social interactions reveal that language expertise is an issue for negotiations and define local norms of conduct and language use (Cekaite and Björk-Willén, 2012).

Speakers use and abuse their languages to satisfy their communicative needs and to control the situation and, at the same time, they can identify the situation and their interlocutor's mood through the language they use. Children are unlikely to develop evenly in both of their languages as their knowledge, skills, and profiles of language use are rarely acquired in a perfect balanced manner across their two languages (Murphy, 2014). It may occur that the weaker language is preferred and becomes predominant in a certain setting, which refers to the bilingual child's inclination to use one language over the other. The balance between the bilingual's two languages changes dynamically over time depending on the bilingual's communicative needs (Murphy, 2014, p. 37).

Paradis (2004) compares bilinguals' ways of operating their language system to a city transportation. As people choose a method of transport that best fits their demand, bilinguals can choose one of their languages for the intended meaning.

Pavlenko's (2006) data show that language choice mostly reflects the locally determined language use patterns and signal a variety of personal meanings. Her bilingual participants' language choice shows that in certain cases they wanted to exclude others by changing the code and, conversely, their language choice represented their assimilation attempt to the community of friends. Pavlenko (2006) sees the context of acquisition, autobiographic memories and language dominance in the language user's community as determining factors in speakers' language preference.

What can be concluded from scientific research about language preference in bilingualism is that bilinguals tend to have asymmetry in their two languages for the simple reason that in the bilingual context they are unlikely to repeat every experience in both of their languages. On the other hand, the preference of one language can be attributed to bilinguals` strategic language behaviour: the use of one language is meant to carry greater emphasis. Also, language choice can be a sign of bilinguals' sensitivity to the linguistic preferences of their interlocutors (Murphy, 2014, p. 42).

2.2.5 The age factor – the time of acquisition

Age in second language learning as an important variable has an extensive literature. The core questions are whether there is a specific period of decline in language learning capacity, and whether any such decline is due to maturational factors. What remains controversial is whether all aspects of language are equally sensitive to age effects (DeKeyser, 2012).

Some authors supporting the critical or sensitive period theory (Lenneberg, 1967; Fabbro, 1999; Krashen, 1973; Paradis, 2004; Penfield & Roberts, 1959) assume that there is a strong relationship between age and language outcomes and imply a declining learning capacity within a specific age range. They assume that certain ages are more favourable and facilitate successful language learning more effectively. Some define certain age barriers, (the ages of three, six, and fourteen), after which, due to certain cognitive and psychological conditions language learners are less effective in acquiring a language. Although theorists' opinion is divided in terms of the desired time for language learning, they agree that success in language acquisition is closely connected with the lateralization of the brain. The fact that the placticity of the brain decreases with age has strong effect on the efficiency of the learning process (Fabbro, 1999, p. 109).

More recent research (DeKeyser, 2012; Hakuta et al., 2003, Nikolov, 2009), however, has shown that lateralization is complete by early infancy if not at birth, so the assumption that increasing lateralization is to blame is no longer viable. More fine-grained distinctions need to be made to determine what aspects of language are affected by age of acquisition. "Age effects" a more neutral term with fewer theoretical implications than the term "critical period" is preferred because it takes environmental factors into consideration (e.g., patterns of socialization, input differences, clear onset or offset points of the "critical or sensitive period") and distinguishes between various aspects of language learning such as speed of learning (Nikolov, 2008), type of learning (explicit, implicit) and ultimate attainment (DeKeyser, 2012).

There is no evidence that children are more successful language learners than adults. Empirical data underpin that children and adults differ in their learning strategy (Nikolov, 2009; Paradis, 2004). The difference between their linguistic progression

lies in the different ways of internalizing knowledge. While adults mostly apply the left hemisphere of their brain, children use both of their hemispheres with more interaction between them. Children's extensive reliance on right hemisphere learning explains their preference for holistic patterns, e.g., formulaic speech, chunks, and ready-made panels of language in contrast with adults who process language in a more analytic way and rely more extensively on grammar and explicit learning. Children tend to resort to procedural or implicit memory (knowing-how), while adults rely mostly on declarative or explicit memory (knowing-what). Nikolov (2008, p. 13) argues that children learn slowly, and need a lot to practice. At this age, less can be taught, in a longer period of time. Paradis (2004) points out that children display emotional associations in language acquisition because much of childhood communication is emotional.

In summary, recent research findings deny the critical period hypothesis and suggest that the success of language learning is irrespective of age. A combination of biological, non-biological, affective, cognitive, and social factors coupled with individual differences accounts for some of the variation success between child and adult L2 learning (Moon & Nikolov, 2000; Nikolov & Timpe-Laughlin, 2021; Scovel, 2001; Singleton & Ryan, 2004). Children do not learn faster, in fact, they learn more slowly, than adults or adolescents, which distinction is generally accepted by researchers on age effects (Nikolov, 2008; Nikolov & Djigunović; 2006). Children use language as a tool for interpersonal interactions, showing a functional and synthetic approach, whilst adults having more awareness of linguistic categories tend to pay more attention to grammar and apply a more analytical and structural approach to learning. We must not claim that one or the other way is better, both have their advantages and disadvantages. In answer to the question if there is a declining learning capacity within a specific age range and a maturational/biological reason for this decline, we can claim that the effects of age and other predictors can be quite different from one domain of language to the other.

2.3 Conclusion

Chapter 2 clarified the basic recurring terms of my thesis. I surveyed those inevitable to clarify at the beginning, with the aim of specifying their meanings and justifying their relevance in my dissertation. The same chapter outlined language acquisition

theories, revealing how the process of acquiring a language is theorized and viewed from different perspectives. The section 'The social context of bilingualism' highlighted that the process of second language acquisition is immensely driven by the environment in which the child develops. Language choice can be a sign of bilinguals' sensitivity to the linguistic preferences of their interlocutors (Murphy, 2014, p. 42).

The overview of research into the natural order of language acquisition aimed to underpin that certain elements and phenomena show resemblance across different cases of bilingualism. Despite the different trajectories in child bilingual development young bilinguals achieve nearly the same milestones. They exhibit similar patterns and stages of development within roughly the same time frame. Although research into the field has revealed that bilingual children lag behind their monolingual peers in respect of vocabulary size and morphosyntax, they accentuate that bilingual children's underperformance in certain areas is rather more explained and associated with the amount and quality of input the child receives in the respective language. Their falling behind on some measures does not mean that they are delayed or deviant. In the final part I explored theorists' opinion about the desired time for language learning/discussed the "age effects" in second language learning.

Chapter 3 – Conceptualization of bilingualism

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 discusses the construct bilingualism. In my research I restrict the possible variations of bilingualism to individual bilingualism as opposed to societal bilingualism. I know my discussion of terms and definitions regarding bilingualism will lack completeness and is beyond the scope of my dissertation. The problem is further complicated by the fact that different authors tend to adopt their own distinctions and operational terms. Yet I am determined to outline what dimensions are considered in bilingual research and use Valdés's and Figueroa's (1994) ideas as a comprehensive mind map to describe and classify bilingualism.

(1) Age (simultaneous/sequential/late)
(2) Ability (incipient-in its early stages/receptive/productive)
(3) Balance of languages (balanced/unbalanced)
(4) Development (additive or ascendant – second language is developing/, subtractive or recessive – one language is decreasing)
(5) Context where each language is acquired and used (e.g., home, school)
(6) Circumstantial – elective

Instead of giving an extensive introduction and discussion of bilingualism I only endeavour to overview the most relevant phenomena. I present the selected terms and their definitions in order to highlight certain dimensions and features that allow me to place my case in the palette of second language acquisition. The focused elements and categories are used as a basis of comparison and contrast and seen as referential points, which help locate similarities and differences in my case, provide guidance

in outlining patterns in the wide variety of bilingualism. My aim with the reviewed scholarly literature is to give a better understanding of the phenomenon and disclose why certain dimensions and features are looked into more elaborately than others.

3.2 Who is bilingual?

The discussion of bilingualism in the literature usually starts with attempts to define who can be considered bilingual. The multitude of the definitions accentuate the complexity of the phenomenon and the diverse connotation of the construct. Although it has been emphasized that there will never be a straightforward definition, there are persistent attempts to assert criteria that distinguish bilinguals from mono- or unilinguals. The purpose of my overviewing the related literature is to assert relevant operational terms and working definitions to describe and position my participant's bilingualism in the wide variety of bilingual trajectories. The related literature (Altaribba & Heredia, 2008; Baker, 2006; Fabbro, 1999; Larsen-Freeman, 2018; Paradis, 2004; Pavlenko, 2006) gives evidence that bilinguals do not form a homogeneous group for the simple reason that there are various routes to bilingualism.

The fact that bilingualism involves psychological, linguistic, social, and educational factors further complicates the picture. In the present research psychological, sociolinguistic, and pedagogic considerations of bilingualism are targeted to the extent that is useful and essential to identify and interpret my case. I am mostly concerned with the sociolinguistic and ecological aspects (Larsen-Freeman, 2018) of bilingualism and restrict my research to three main points. Firstly I investigate the interplay between my participant's language choice behaviour and the social context in which she acquires her languages. Secondly I try to determine code-switching patterns in her talk. Thirdly I outline pragmatic differentiation behind her code-switching practices and her identity development in bilingualism. I investigate the above-mentioned phenomena within a ten-year time frame.

3.3 Competence-based bilingualism

Early definitions (Bloomfield, 1933; Thiery, 1978) identify language competence as the criterion for distinction. According to a well-known definition put forward by the

American linguist Leonard Bloomfield (1933, p. 56) bilingualism means native-like control of two languages representing a fractional approach.

> In the extreme case of foreign language learning, the speaker becomes so proficient as to be indistinguishable from the native speaker round him. (…) In the case where this perfect foreign language learning is not accompanied by the loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, (the) native-like control of two languages (Bloomfield, 1933 quoted in Grojean, 1982, p. 213).

Thiery (1978), the supporter of the maximalist criterion also insists that a bilingual speaks each language in a native-like manner in all domains of discourse and in all sociolinguistic registers. Bloomfield's and Thiery's definitions seem to corroborate with laypeople's general opinion, which is underpinned by Grosjean's (1982) findings. The majority of the monolingual and bilingual students interviewed by the scholar regarded native-like language knowledge as a strong predictor of performance success and the basis of distinction. Bloomfield (1933) and (1978) representing a maximalist approach consider language proficiency as a measure and criterion of bilingualism leaving many people with non-native control of their languages unaccounted for. This ideal bilingualism, being very rarely the case, ignores the sociolinguistic fact that bilinguals usually use their languages in different domains with significant register constraints and unequally improved language skills. Also, the route to bilingualism, e.g., social background, individual differences significantly influence the language outcome.

3.4 Use-based approach to bilingualism

Another camp of scholars (Diebold, 1961; Haugen, 1953; Macnamara, 1967; Weinreich, 1953) measure bilingualism by the extent of language use and the social context of acquisition. In contrast with the supporters of the structural or competence-based view presented in the previous subsection, they are representatives of the functional or used-based view and emphasize the sociolinguistic aspects in the construct of bilingualism. They agree that as there is no ideal language competence, there are no ideal bilinguals either. Bilinguals do not form a homogeneous group; they make up a continuum incorporating a number of stages and varieties of bilingualism between the lower and upper ends of the line. At one end there is the rare equilingual (Bloomfield, 1933; Thiery, 1978), who is indistinguishable from the native speaker, at the other end (Diebold, 1961; Haugen, 1953; Grosjean, 1992;

Mackey, 1962; Macnamara, 1967; Weinreich, 1953) there is the person, who has just begun to acquire a second language.

Haugen (1953, p. 7) accepts the multicolour and versatile nature of bilingualism and validates a very inclusive and weak version of bilingualism. His approach infers that a foreign tourist who learns some useful expressions before travelling to a foreign country can just as well be considered bilingual.

> Bilingualism (…) may be all degrees of accomplishment, but it is understood here to begin at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language. From here it may proceed through all possible gradations up to the kind of skill that enables a person to pass as a native in more than one linguistic environment (Haugen 1953, p. 7).

Diebold (1961) introduces an even more inclusive definition representing the minimalist approach. He claims that a type of bilingualism can be attained when a person begins to understand L2 utterances without being able to utter anything in that language. Macnamara (1967) determines bilingualism in terms of the four language skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. He maintains that there are many possible combinations in abilities of mastering these skills arguing that a person who possesses only one of these four skills or understands a few words in a foreign language can be called bilingual. The above definitions consider competence as the criterion of making distinctions among different degrees of bilingualism and identify the construct from a pure sociolinguistic perspective, and thus further broaden the construct of bilingualism.

Weinreich (1953) and Mackey (1970) take into consideration the versatility of language use paying attention to the social context of language acquisition. Weinreich (1953, p. 1) considers bilingualism as ’the practice of alternately using two languages’, whereas Mackey (1970) claims that ’bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language, it is a characteristic of its use’. Grosjean’s (1982) definition gives further underpinning to the previously presented authors’ conceptualization: ’Bilingualism is the regular use of two (or more) languages, and bilinguals are those people who need and use (two or more) languages in their everyday lives’ (p. 51).

As we see, the definition above identifies language competence, regularity, and alternate use as three prerequisites of bilingualism. However, they emphasize, it is

not an external measure that defines the quality of bilingualism, it is more the use and the context of use that counts. Appropriate bilingual competence, their argumentation goes, is the knowledge that enables the speaker to use their language according to their personal needs. Fabbro (1999) has also reached the pragmatic conclusion that bilingual individuals have different needs for their two languages and ascribe different social and emotional functions (what a language is used for, when, where, with whom) to them. This view obviously reflects the sociolinguistic perspective, which considers language as a societal product rather than an abstract entity.

Haugen (1953), Meisel, (1989) and Swain (1972) introduce a third and a fourth element, the time and manner of language acquisition, as a basis to distinguish simultaneous and successive acquisition. Simultaneous refers to the exposure to a second language since birth, whereas successive marks the case when the learner encounters the second language only later. With reference to simultaneous acquisition there are terms such as ’bilingualism as a first language (Swain, 1972), ’first language acquisition’, ’native acquisition of two languages’ and ’simultaneous acquisition of two first languages’ (Meisel, 1989). All four terms refer to the case when both languages are acquired from the beginning in the first socialization.

Whichever bilingualism is the case, the authors emphasize that the simultaneous-successive distinction does not imply that children’s ability in a language acquired from birth in natural settings will be superior compared to those children who acquire that language later through studying it at school. They insist that children belonging to either group can acquire equal command of their both languages. Studies on bilingualism give evidence that the starting time and duration of exposure to a language cannot be considered the only predictor of success. There are a number of studies reporting on people who possess high proficiency in both of their languages, albeit they have not learned them during the first socialization. Interpreters, language teachers, certain minority language groups learn their second language at school and not in the family yet acquire high competence.

3.5 The holistic approach

In his criticism of the monolingual view Francois Grosjean (1985, p.471) recommends pragmatic, socio-cultural and personality psychological approaches to

specific cases of bilingualism to reveal its real character. To bridge the monolingualism-bilingualism dichotomy he presents a synthesis of earlier conceptualizations and creates a holistic view of bilingualism. A bilingual has a unique and specific configuration, which Grosjean describes with his famous hurdler analogy to demonstrate the similarity between a hurdler and a bilingual. Although the high hurdler blends two types of competencies: high jumping and sprinting, no expert would compare a high hurdler to a sprinter or a high jumper. Instead, the hurdler is collectively accepted as an athlete in their own right. Similarly, a bilingual is an integrated whole, a unique and specific speaker-hearer, and not the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals. To emphasize the specificity of bilingualism Saunders (1988) makes an interesting point: possessing two languages is not as simple as having two eyes. Bilinguals place the world in a totally different perspective.

Cook (2008) persists that second language learners' competence, whatever it is, should not be compared with monolingual competence. In his criticism of the monolingual view of bilingualism he stresses that the basic problem is treating L2 users as failed monolinguals. Although he accepts that initially, in the process of learning a second language a L2 learner's knowledge of L2 falls behind the knowledge of L1, he refuses such comparisons and rejects to distinguish L2 learners as inferior, inefficient, unsuccessful language users. The concept of interlanguage to refer to L2 learners' insufficient L2 knowledge is more appropriate and under no circumstances can be evaluated as abnormal (Cook, 1993, p. 244). Bilinguals should not be considered as deficient compared to their monolingual peers. Bi- or multilingualism is a normal state of mankind.

The term multi-competence (Cook, 1993, p. 111) has been introduced to counteract the unilingual bias. Instead of the convenient idealisation of monolingualism linguists should deal with multilingualism independently in its own right. Bi- and multilingualism should not be studied through a monolingual lens, second language acquisition should not be subjected to first language acquisition but could make a core area of linguistic studies.

What can be concluded from the discussion in the present section is that bilingualism is described as several interim phases of bi-or multilingual competence on a scale

that ranges from the most restrictive to the most inclusive endpoints. Despite many overlapping and interwoven conflicts the interpretations and definitions have one element in common. They all attempt to answer the question: 'What level of proficiency is needed to class someone as bilingual?' implying that the degree of language knowledge is central in the debate.

3.6 Communicative competence

To analyse the individual bilingual's development, which is central to this thesis, it is inevitable to refer to the normative views on native monolingual's competence. As it is seen in the previous section, one's first language competence is an orthodox framework for the conceptualization and theorization of second language competence and acquisition. The necessity of revisiting the phenomenon emerged in the literature (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980, 1983; Cook, 1993; Cummins, 1991; Van Ek,1986) making authors replace the concept of final idealized competence with the notion of multi-competence to clarify that bilinguals' competence is not equivalent with two monolinguals' state of mind. In Cook's (1993) interpretation multi-competence is a fluid phenomenon, not a final state of language proficiency, which constantly changes with the learner's newly emerging communication challenges and the individual's own perception of self. It is an internal psychological state that is constituted by the user's identity and is influenced by the way they perceive the world around them.

This latter conceptualization represents a functional approach to the theory of language and encourages linguists to regard language proficiency as a dynamic entity. Language proficiency must be determined alongside a continuum instead of viewing it as an end point of the learning process. Such an approach infers that people use their languages at different levels of proficiency and in different domains of their everyday life, at work, at school, at home, requesting different language knowledge and skills from them. Similarly, to first language users, second language speakers exhibit a wide variety of linguistic competence. This view led linguists to accept the validity of multi-competence introduced by Cook (1993) and makes them reconsider the earlier structure-oriented approach to language proficiency.

The structuralist view of language until the 70s (Chomsky, 1975; Krashen, 1982) put the focus on linguistic competence (the ideal speaker-hearer's tacit knowledge of the

grammatical structures and vocabulary of a language) where linguistic performance (the realization of that knowledge) is peripheral ignoring such important variables of language use like the social context of learning and individual differences. The 1970s witnessed the development of numerous psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and interactionist models of language proficiency. The functionalists (Hymes, 1972, Stern, 1983; Van Ek, 1986) point out that language proficiency is a much more complex construct and besides grammar and vocabulary there are further elements that should be taken into consideration. They emphasize the dynamic character of the phenomenon arguing that some components of language become more important at the expense of others according to the actual needs. To reflect dynamism language competence models of the 80s reconsider mastery of language exhibiting a higher level of adaptability to the variety of purposes speakers use their languages for. Those models offer more comprehensive descriptions, view language as the means of communication. Language proficiency involves the ability of successful communication and, thereby, acquiring social, pragmatic, and strategic competences appear to be inevitable components.

There is a consensus among the reviewed authors that employing strategies is a typical phenomenon in both learning and communication, learners are motivated and interested in using strategies as learning and communication is a goal-oriented process. They emphasize that employing appropriate learning and communication strategies is a prerequisite of making learning and communication a successful endeavour, which view justifies the involvement of 'strategic competence' in language competence models. Dörnyei (2005) argues that learning strategies are supplementary tools in L2 learners' repertoire, which can be used purposefully to increase self-efficacy. He not only accepts that strategies are important components of language competence but also emphasizes the importance of teaching learners how to appropriate the most relevant strategies to their learning styles. Realizing the importance of the social context and individuals' active and creative participation in the learning process encouraged linguists to reconsider the construct 'language competence'. However, the complexity and diversity of the concept still uphold.

Cummins in his Threshold Theory (TT) (1979) concerning second language acquisition distinguishes Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive or Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) as two types of language

proficiency. BICS is a type of language proficiency that enables bilingual children to communicate with peers, to use the language in informal settings or to follow contextualized and cognitively not very demanding school curriculum. If a child does not have CALP in the language of schooling, they will probably underperform and face difficulties in understanding and processing information. Cummins concludes that only the status of balanced bilingualism will place children in the position where they probably experience positive cognitive effects of bilingualism. Although critics note Cummins' lack of attention to sociocultural factors influencing second language learning. They emphasize that he has added much to the general understanding of what comprises the construct of language competence and made major contributions to the development of a theoretical basis for bilingual education (Medved Krajnović, 2005).

Canale and Swain (1980) suggest the most popular communicative competence theory, which cosiders social interaction as an equal component of language proficiency is considerable because earlier models in the 60s (Lado, 1964; Carroll, 1968) focused on language skills and components from a purely linguistic approach and ignored the sociocultural and sociolinguistic context. Canale and Swain (1980) divided communicative competence into four components: a linguistic component (e.g., syntax and vocabulary); a sociolinguistic component e.g., use of appropriate language in different situations); a discourse component (e.g., ability to participate in conversations); and a strategic component (e.g., improvisation with language when there is difficulty in communication).

Van Ek (1986) views language knowledge as a complex phenomenon made up of subcompetences, constructed and reconstructed by the demands of the varying contexts where L2 learners use the language. No subcompetences are to be viewed as end points, certain subcompetences are acquired and developed more at the expense of others. Van Ek outlines six elements of language competence to be acquired by second language learners. They are linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, strategic, socio-cultural, and social competence. This categorization infers that linguistic competence is only a part of the whole and there is something more language learners must acquire. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to use appropriate language in different situations with different people. Discourse competence is the ability to employ appropriate strategies to construct and interpret

discourse in communication. Strategic competence is the ability to compensate gaps in knowledge or use knowledge in creative or alternative ways to convey the intended meaning. Sociocultural competence is the knowledge of how a particular sociocultural context affects language, how it modifies the choice between meanings and forms. Social competence refers to the ability of using certain social rules and conventions in communication. For example, how to use social strategies like interrupting, initiating, and closing a conversation.

Bachman (1990) further refines the construct and divided it into two major components: organizational competence and pragmatic competence. He breaks down organizational competence into two parts: grammatical competence and textual competence, where grammatical competence consists of vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and phonology/graphology. Textual competence accounts for the knowledge of connecting utterances to make a text either in writing or speaking. Pragmatic competence has two subcategories: illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence. Bachman distinguishes four language functions referring to relationships between utterances and the intentions, or communicative purposes of language users: ideational (the way we convey meanings and experiences), manipulative (using language in an instrumental way to achieve a goal), heuristic (the use of language to discover new things about the world and solving problems), and imaginative functions (using language beyond the 'here and now' (e.g., for humour and fantasy).

Sociolinguistic competence, the second part of pragmatic competence describes communication as embedded in the culture of the communities where it is used inferring that language is an integral part of the individual's identity. It is also remarkable that Bachman does not list components in a hierarchical framework suggesting that those components constantly interact with one another, and language users exhibit variations of language competence. He adds strategic competence to his model with reference to the individual's ability to plan, modify and assess the language output highlighting in this way the language user's self-regulation in the process.

I base my analysis in the present dissertation on the model of communicative competences proposed by Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995), therefore I present a detailed description of the model.

The explanation of the five competences is as follows: (1) Discourse competence concerns the selection, sequencing, and arrangement of word, structure, sentences, and utterance to achieve a unified spoken or written text (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p.13.). (2) Linguistic Competence, the mastery of language code, encompasses knowledge of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. (3) Actional competence (the ability to comprehend and produce speech acts), defined as competence in conveying and understanding communicative intent. Matching actional intent with linguistic form carries the illocutionary force of speech act and speech act sets (Celce-Murcia, et.al., 1995, p. 17). The domain of actional competence consists of two main components, knowledge of language function and knowledge of speech act. Therefore, actional competence involves knowledge of how speech act and language function can be patterned and sequenced in real life situations (see Table 2 Celce-Murcia, et. al., 1995, pp. 20-21) As seen in this model, speech acts are discussed under actional competence to emphasize that this knowledge of linguistic resources is somewhat different from the knowledge of sociocultural rules. It is a dimension, which is associated with actional intent rather than with sociocultural factors. (4) Sociocultural competence refers to the speaker's knowledge of how to appropriate messages with the social and cultural context of communication, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variations in language use.

The authors (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p. 23) distinguished four main subcategories of the relevant sociocultural competence, namely, social contextual factors, stylistic appropriateness factors, cultural factors, and nonverbal communicative factor. 5. Strategic competence is described as knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them. It is the ability to solve communication problems despite an inadequate command of the linguistic and sociocultural code. Strategic competence consists of five subparts, avoidance and reduction strategies, achievement and compensatory strategies, stalling and time gaining strategies, self- monitoring strategies, and interactional strategies (Celce- Murcia et al 1995, p.28).

Table 2 – Suggested Components of Actional Competence (Celce-Murcia et al 1995, p. 22)

Knowledge of language functions
➢ **Interpersonal exchange**
o Greeting and leave-taking

- Making introductions, identifying oneself
- Extending, accepting, and declining invitations and offers
- Making and breaking engagements
- Expressing and acknowledging gratitude
- Complimenting and congratulating
- Reacting to the interlocutor's speech
    - showing attention, interest, surprise, sympathy, happiness, disbelief, disappointment

➢ I**nformation**

- Asking for and giving information
- Reporting (describing and narrating)
- Remembering
- Explaining and discussing

➢ **Opinions**

- Expressing and finding out about opinions and attitudes
- Agreeing and disagreeing
- Approving and disapproving
- Showing satisfaction and dissatisfaction

➢ **Feelings**

- Expressing and finding out about feelings
    - love, happiness, sadness, pleasure, anxiety, anger, embarrassment, pain, relief, fear,
    - annoyance, surprise, etc.

➢ **Suasion**

- Suggesting, requesting, and instructing
- Giving orders, advising and warning
- Persuading, encouraging and discouraging
- Asking for, granting, and withholding permission

➢ **Problems**

- Complaining and criticizing
- Blaming and accusing.
- Admitting and denying. Regretting
- Apologizing and forgiving

➢ **Future scenarios**

- Expressing and finding out about wishes, hopes, and desires
- Expressing and eliciting plans, goals, and intentions

- Promising
- Predicting and speculating
- Discussing possibilities and capabilities of doing something

Knowledge of speech act sets

Note: This table is for oral usage; a parallel he of specifications is needed for written language–perhaps labelled 'rhetorical competence.'

In general, these models shared four main aspects: strategic competence; linguistic competence; pragmatic competence (comprising both discourse and functional/actional competence) and sociocultural competence (including sociolinguistic competence). The conceptualization of competence in the CEFR (2020) was influenced by the different competence models developed in applied linguistics from the early 1980s and applied psychology and socio-political approaches also formulated the view of competence described in the CEFR. The CEFR presents communicative language competence under three headings: (1) linguistic competence, (2) pragmatic competence and (3) sociolinguistic competence putting communication at the centre, where the plurilingual speaker has a single, unique interrelated repertoire to combine their general competences and various strategies to accomplish tasks (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 129).Such synthesis of the earlier aspects demonstrates a more comprehensive model emphasizing the action-oriented approach where purposeful and collaborative tasks facilitate ’fluid languaging’ (Bonacina Pugh et al., 2021; Wei & Lin, 2019). The introduction of ’languaging’ as a dynamic, creative process across the boundaries of language varieties seems to be an innovative element in the conceptualization of communicative competence compared to the previous models. Presenting plurilingualism in the CEFR as an uneven and changing competence, in which the user/learner applies their resources in their different languages in a different way, is a timelier approach to competence (Council of Europe, 2020).

The models of communicative competence above have something in common: the linguistic, social, and affective aspects of language along with the inherent cognitive processes all contribute to successful second language acquisition and influence the language output. None of them can be ignored.

Chapter 4 is designed to giving an elaborate discussion of communication strategies, thereby strategic competence conceptualized as the knowledge and use of communication strategies will be described there.

3.7 Circumstantial vs. elective bilingualism

The distinction between circumstantial and elective bilingualism is a relevant point to deal with in my research. Circumstantial bilingualism (Harding & Riley, 1986) is fostered by political or economic power. For circumstantial bilinguals learning a second language is necessary to survive and integrate in another community to function effectively in the new community. Elective bilingualism (Harding & Riley,1986; Valdés & Figueroa, 1994) refer to the case where it is the individual's choice to learn a language either in institutional (classroom) or informal (home) framework. Bernd Kielhöfer and Sylvie Jonekeit (1983, p. 95) introduce the term 'artificial bilingualism' as a subcategory of elective bilingualism. Artificial bilingualism, their argumentation goes, as opposed to natural bilingualism, comprises an arrangement where a second language is mediated by a non-native speaker in an environment where that language has no or limited community support and native control. The supporters of natural bilingualism express their doubt whether a non-native speaker can pass on a second language to their children and discourage parents from establishing 'artificial' bilingualism as all such cases are doomed.

In his critical overview of this biased attitude Saunders (1988) justifies the suitability and competence of non-native parents he claims that there is not much difference between parents sustaining 'artificial' bilingualism and parents in an immigrant family (p.41). The language that immigrant parents use with their children has no native community support either and is somewhat different from the language children would hear from peers in their native country. Furthermore, if these children decide to pass the language on to their children the differences between the language they mediate, and the language used authentically will be even more noticeable. Regarding authenticity, the non-native speaker-mediator and the immigrant parent have much in common. Due to language isolation both cases contain unnatural and artificial elements. To eliminate the native speaker, native environment bias, Saunders (1988) emphasizes that bilingualism mediated by non-native parents is outright beneficial because this special linguistic configuration offers complementary

linguistic solutions for the speakers to shade communication, make functional distinctions, earn inner satisfaction, enhance privacy, and family integrity. Jenkins et al. (2011) in their discussion of the *global Englishes* paradigm argue that new' Englishes develop as a means of communication between non-native speakers of English (NNSE) and native speakers of English (NSE)in the widespread face-to-face and electronic global communication. These English varieties, native or non-native, are accepted in their own right and should not be evaluated against the native speaker norms. As they point out, the idealized monolingual speaker approach clearly does not hold any more. We have to move forward and open up the possibility of incorporating the unique multilingual perspective. (Jenkins et al, 2011; Moussu & Llurda, 2008) Promoting this multinorm method one in which linguistic diversity and 'translanguaging' or 'fluid languaging' (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021; Jenkins et al., 2011, Wei & Lin, 2019) are acknowledged is timely. The EFL (Jenkins et al., 2011) perspective which sees non-native Englishes as different rather than deficient is an additional option about which teachers and learners can make informed choices. ELF speakers generate various speech communities where speakers' jointly construct meanings and interactions and make use of a shared repertoire to facilitate communication.

Baker (2006), in line with Saunders' argumentation, adds that the palette of bilingualism in the new millennium is more colourful than ever before. The possibility for staying abroad for educational or business purposes coupled with free employment have changed people's attitudes and beliefs about learning languages and raised the prestige of language learning. More and more people living and working transnationally (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, p.60) decide to teach foreign languages to their children at an early age and those with high mastery of language tend to raise their children bilingually at home before institutional education. This new demand has broadened the spectrum of bilingualism. 'Elite bilingualism' introduced and characterized by Paulston (1980) as a privilege of upper-class educated people who can afford private bilingual education for their children is no longer exclusive of upper-class, educated intellectuals and professionals today. The term 'elective bilingualism' (Harding & Riley, 1986) or 'planned bilingualism' (Velasco, 2020) to replace the discriminative and biased 'elite bilingualism' better describes the situation where individuals choose and learn a second language to their

own personal advantage voluntarily or quasi-voluntarily without direct economic or political constraints. People's choosing study-, or work-abroad periods to acquire a language in authentic setting also belongs to this type.

3.8 Living with two languages – Unitary system vs. separate systems

A wealth of scholarly research into child bilingualism are devoted to finding an answer to the question of children's ability of separating their two languages. There has been a debate for a long time on whether bilingual children use one linguistic system or two separate systems at the beginning of language acquisition. Another point of their debate is defining the time for separating their two languages. Regarding the question of language separation there are two camps among researchers. Some support the early language separation view whereas others insist that children handle their languages as one unitary system regardless of the number of languages being acquired.

The supporters of the unitary system (Arnberg, 1987; Meisel, 1994; Saunders, 1988; Vihman, 1985; Volterra & Taeschner, 1978) argue that children up to age of two mix their languages because they are unable to distinguish between their two languages. These researchers propose the existence of a three-stage model according to which children go through three stages of language acquisition: at the beginning of bilingual language acquisition, they use a single lexicon with words from both of their languages and operate a hybrid morphosyntactic system. During the second stage they develop separate lexical codes but still possess a unitary syntactic system. In the third stage, at around the age of two, the two linguistic systems including lexicon and syntax start to function separately and the two codes are fully distinguished.

As opposed to the unitary view the conception behind the separate system hypothesis is that children are able to separate their languages from the very beginning of lanquage acquisition. The reason for language mixing is their low level of language proficiency. A great number of empirical studies in the defence of the separate view have found (De Houwer, 1990; Lanza, 1997; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1997;) that in bi-, and multilingual language acquisition children's languages develop independently and separately. Children as early as around two years old know which language to

speak ’to whom’ and in ’what situation’. According to the ’appropriate language matching’ theory (Genesee et. al., 1995) languages are used in contextually sensitive ways, they are mixed on purpose and the lack of separation is not always attributable to the child’s inability to distinguish their languages. Analysing cases where children insert elements of their weaker language is recommended because it would betray more about the function of selecting between languages.

Baker (2006) claims that instead of seeking persuading evidence to support either the unitary or the separate language theory we should look for empirical data about children’s authentic discourse to see how and why they select from their languages. Baker argues that it is rare that children keep their language separate and points out that they mix their languages in very complex and varied ways. At the same time, he does not consider this type of language switch as a deviant behaviour. De Houwer (1990) has found that it is not enough to answer if the child separates or not, it is more useful to examine what levels of language are affected and what contexts are concerned.

The supporters of both camps, those accepting the unitary language development (Volterra & Taeschner, 1978; Vihman, 1985), and those supporting the separate language development or just one overall integrated system (De Houwer, 1990; Lanza, 1997; Meisel, 1994) agree that further empirical data are needed to settle the debate. They emphasize that there are some other underlying psychological factors we must take into consideration in dual language acquisition. Due to space constraints, I do not deal with these factors in my thesis. I am mostly concerned with the role of the social environment in language separation.

Authors of both views emphasize the interplay of social environment on language use and claim that the social and cultural background is an important contributor that influences the formulation of bilingualism and modifies language preference and separation. De Houwer (2007) explains that the role of immediate language environment is the primary predictor for language use, especially the frequency with which a parent uses a particular language to the child strongly influences the language outcome. If the respective language has a high prestige in the speaker’s narrow and wider social environment, it is easier to sustain that language in everyday interactions. Hamers and Blanc (2000), Hamers (2004) support this opinion and

emphasize that the way the home, the neighbourhood and the wider social network evaluate a given language will determine the learner's attitude, evaluation, beliefs, and emotions around that language. Hamers (2004) describes her interpretation in her dynamic model of bilingualism presented in her socio-cognitive model of bilingualism (Hamers, 2004, p. 82).

3.9 Research into child bilingualism

In the literature there is a number of accounts on establishing and maintaining bilingualism in the family. The presented studies provide a detailed explanation of the applied interactional principles and the patterns of exposure to languages for the surveyed bilingual child. Three aspects are taken into consideration: the language of the parents, the language of the community and the parents' strategy regarding what language they use with their child. These cases of bilingual trajectories can be divided into two groups according to whether the second language is mediated by (1) native (Greenwood, 1998; De Houwer, 1990; Fantini, 1985; Navracsics, 1999) or (2) non-native parents (Facey, 1986; Saunders, 1988; Past & Past, 1978; Quisenberry et al., 1978; Velasco, 2020).

Research into child bilingualism shows a vast diversity regarding the foci of the investigation as well. The object of the inquiry, the levels of language being investigated are different. Some studies focus on phonology or morphology (De Houwer, 1990; Medved Krajnović, 2005), others engage in lexicon (Navracsics, 1999) morphosyntax or syntax (De Houwer, 1990; Navracsics, 1999). Some present tendencies in the child's overall language development to survey discrete parts of language, for example, children's metalinguistic awareness, pragmatic differentiation and/or code-switching practices without concentrating on one specific level of language (Cekaite & Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hornáčková, 2017; Kleemann, 2013; Lanza, 1997; Lugossy, 2003; Navracsics, 1999; Nikolov, 1995, 1999, 2008; Pawliszko, 2016; Velasco, 2020).

Whichever level is concerned, the researchers have concluded that cross-linguistic phenomena such as translanguaging are an existing element in dual language acquisition. They all argue that the presence of interference cannot be attributed to the children's incapability of separation and bilingualism does not cause mental exertion (Cekaite & Willén, 2012; Cromdal,2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hornáčková,

2017; Kleemann, 2013; Lanza, 1997; Lugossy, 2003; Navracsics, 1999; Nikolov, 1995, 1999, 2008; Pavlenko, 2006; Pawliszko, 2016; Saunders, 1988; Velasco, 2020). Translanguaging (Bonacina Pugh et al., 2021; Wei & Lin, 2019) that manifests itself in systematic moving between languages and frequent code-switching gives evidence of the child's pragmatic differentiation. Authors argue that code-switches have different functions at different levels of language and appeals to another language can be attributed to insufficient knowledge competence rather than separation problems (De Houwer, 1990; Lugossy, 2003; Navracsics, 1999; Nikolov, 1999, 2008; Saunders, 1988; Velasco, 2020; Velasco & Fialais, 2018). With reference to the separate–unitary system debate Navracsics (1999) argues that certain levels, e.g., lexicon are handled as a unitary system by the children, and other levels, e.g., morphosyntax are separated.

Opinions are divided in what method is the most successful in child second language acquisition. There are supporters who insist that the only relevant method of raising a child bilingually is the OPOL (one person one language) system. There are representatives of OTOL (one time, one language) a weaker version of OPOL (one person one language), who say it is enough if parents follow a consistent language boundary system and keep languages distinct by either person, location, time, or occasion.

There have been numerous attempts to try to socialize young children into two or three languages from an early age and the authors produce a variety of findings. Although the findings of single- case studies are not suitable for generalizations, they raise awareness to the dynamism and heterogeneity of child bilingualism and contribute to formulating a more complex picture of what can happen when a child is exposed to more than one language. What should always be born in mind is that making strict categorizations is always a risky endeavour due to versatility and individual differences.

3.10 Conclusion

In chapter 3 I presented the selected authors' opinions on the question: At what point do we consider someone bilingual? We have seen that the distinction among bilinguals is a matter of degree of language competence and language use. As competence is an accepted measure of bilingualism, I gave an overview of its

scientific conceptualization to raised awareness to what distinctions are made on the difference between child and adult learning. Approaches to and interpretations of child bilingualism were also addressed. I emphasized that recent research dominantly supports the idea of life-long positive effects of bilingualism (Bialystok, 2001) in contrast with the view prevailing for a long time that bilingual children are linguistically, cognitively, and emotionally disadvantaged.

I referred to recorded cases of child second language acquisition in home settings. My aim was to show (1) how families make a foundation for raising their children with more than one language and (2) what conclusions the authors have drawn from specific cases of bilingual trajectories.

I surveyed the two competing perspectives on whether bilingual children use one (Vihman, 1985; Volterra & Taeschner, 1978) or two separate linguistic systems (De Houwer, 1990; Genesee, 2003) in the process of language acquisition. Reference to both considerations is justified since my participant's code-switching practices implicitly raise the question of language separation.

A separate section was dedicated to discussing the difference between circumstantial and elective bilingualism to find supporting evidence to define Sarah's case as elective bilingualism in the complex and colourful picture of bilingualism.

Chapter 4 – Bilingualism and cognition

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to discussing 'strategy'. To give a better understanding of the concept I give an overview of how the respective literature identifies the construct. Earlier in section 3.6 on 'Communicative competence' I presented how and where linguists in the field place the construct in the broader context of communicative competence. Now I present definitions and taxonomies of both learning and communication strategies to scaffold the empirical part of my discussion. At the same time, I intend to provide an organising principle of what I am going to analyse and look for in my data.

First, I clarify what people originally mean by the word 'strategy'. The basic term strategy goes back to the ancient Greek term *strategia*, which those days used to be identified with the art of war. More specifically it meant an optimal management of military troops or any kind of armed forces in a warship period, a plan of future actions decided by generalship or military leaders, senior management with the intention of achieving a specific goal. The definition implies that strategy is a well-structured comprehensive plan that includes a series of actions to be taken toward a goal. Specific actions within strategy are considered as tools leading to the success of strategy and are referred to as tactics. Today many people use these two terms (i.e., strategy and tactics) interchangeably as both imply conscious planning, management, and progression toward a certain goal. Some people, however, insist that tactics has a negative connotation indicating its cunning and manipulative character. In our modern global world, due to the increased and sharpened competition people devote

more attention to strategy and strategic behaviour than before. They think that selecting the right strategy is a prerequisite of successful problem solving and high performance. In corporate settings for example, where a network of corporate staff must perform a number of actions within a set time period sometimes in a fairly aggressive manner to beat the competition, strategic planning is inevitable and the only chance to survive.

4.2 Learning and communication strategies – Distinctions between strategy and other mental processes

Reviewing the selected literature, I have found that researchers in the field explain the construct 'strategy' by discriminating it from other mental phenomena. The difference among the approaches is the criterion the researchers use to define 'strategy'. Blum and Levenston (1978) propose temporality as a defining feature. They differentiate two types of strategies: strategies that initiate processes and strategies that are situation-bound. The former refers to learning strategies, the latter is equivalent to communication strategies. While learning strategy refers to the learner's effortful activity to enhance learning over a prolonged period, to take a 'systematic series of steps by which the learner arrives at the same usage over time' (Blum & Levenston, 1978, p. 402), communication strategy is used on a single occasion to solve a momentary communication problem.

Seliger (1984) also proposes temporality as a defining feature in distinguishing communication and learning strategies. He uses the 'tactic-strategy' dichotomy as a criterion to distinguish situation-bound momentary and systematically used strategy. Faerch and Kasper (1983) introduces problem-orientedness and consciousness as criteria for identifying strategy. In their conceptualization strategy is part of the planning process, consisting of two phases: the planning and the executive phase. The planning phase is the learner's preparation for achieving a goal, whereas the execution of the plan is the product, the observable speech or writing itself. In their hierarchical model there are strategies that are incorporated into the planning process and strategies applied to solve a specific problem. In this view strategies are conscious steps that can be inserted in the production either as a sequence of intentional actions or a response to an emerging problem. Faerch and Kasper (1983) differentiate reduction/avoidance strategies and achievement strategies to indicate

speakers' two responses to communication problems: they can either avoid an obstacle by reducing the intended meaning or can manage the problem by achieving a solution. The choice between the two approaches depends on the learner's personality. Avoidance-oriented speakers most probably operate reduction strategies, whereas achievement-oriented ones resort to achievement strategies.

Goal-orientedness and intentionality as the basis for describing strategy has been accepted and supported by other theoreticians (Bialystok,1990, Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021; Wei & Lin, 2019). Accordingly, strategies are supplementary activities that the learner can operate to achieve a goal, which conceptualization is consistent with the one proposed by Krashen (1982). In his Monitor Model further developed and termed as the Input Hypothesis Krashen identifies the learner's conscious intervention in the learning process with the 'monitor' (See section 2.1.1), which is analogical to intentional or strategic use, a conscious check on what the learner wants to say. It is an effortful activity to modify the learner's performance.

4.3 The sociolinguistic – inductive approach

The taxonomies above offer systematic organizing structures to describe a range of events that might happen when speakers approach a task in reaching a particular communicative goal in SLA. In this section I present how theoreticians (Selinker, 1972; Tarone. 1988) relate the different types of strategies to the speakers' actual language use.

Selinker (1972) supporting an inductive approach suggests that strategy should not be considered exclusively as an element of a theoretical psychological model but should be treated as measurable and observable functions that are accessible to direct inspection. Strategies manifest themselves in the language learning process in the form of interlanguage. Investigating the learning process offers a fruitful arena for examining and analysing strategies.

Tarone's (1977) typology is a big step towards an organized description of communication strategies. Because it was based on her subjects' interlanguage production, the categories within communication strategies are illustrative and uncover much about the strategy types that learners adapt.

Figure 2 – Tarone's taxonomy of communication strategies (Adapted from Tarone, 1983, p. 62)

- **Avoidance**
  - Topic avoidance
  - Message abandonment
- **Paraphrase**
  - Approximation
  - Word coinage
  - Circumlocution
- **Conscious transfer**
  - Literal translation
  - Language switch
- **Appeal for assistance**
- **Mime**

4.4 The integrated view

Wong Fillmore's (1979) list of social and cognitive strategies sounds as direct advice for learners: 'Give the impression that you can speak the language'; 'Count on your friends for help.'; 'Join a group and act as if you understand what's going on, even if you don't.' Her inventory of strategies highlights the evolutionary nature of language competence to emphasize that communication progresses from an incomplete linguistic system moving towards higher levels of proficiency. The principle of the 'Make the most of what you've got' illustrates an appropriate strategy to counterbalance insufficient language proficiency and earning the feeling of success. Such justification gives a relief to learners, lowers anxiety, and thus facilitates progress in learning. Connecting social and cognitive strategies displays the acceptance of the interrelatedness of the two strategy types. A new element in Wong Fillmore's description is emphasizing versatility and individual differences in strategy use during the learning process. Her conceptualization implies that there is a wealth of combinations of social and cognitive strategies and a range of individual solutions in their application.

Stern (1983) revisiting second-language learner's effectiveness in operating strategies introduced the term 'good learner' to imply that language learners lie somewhere on the continuum between successful and less successful learners. Good learners are identified as active participants of the learning process who can control their learning and develop positive attitudes towards the self, the language, and the social environment. The four equally important strategies (Stern, 1992) are: management and planning strategies, cognitive strategies (academic or explicit learning), communicative-experimental strategies, interpersonal strategies and affective strategies Stern implies that the distinction between learning and communication strategies is untenable because formal, functional mastery, communicative capability and affective elements are equally needed to acquire the desired level of language proficiency (p. 400).

In Corder's (1981) taxonomy second-language learners have two options to regulate their language performance: either they adjust their message to their linguistic resources to make their communication meaningful or try to expand and manipulate their existing and available linguistic system to convey the intended meaning. The strategy applied in the first process is the 'message adjustment strategy', the second is the 'resource expansion strategy'. In Corder's interpretation 'resource strategies' impose some risk on the language speaker because it might entail errors and lead to failure of communication. Switching languages and paraphrasing are two manifestations of such risk-taking strategies. In her overview of communication and learning strategies Bialystok (1990) concludes that all conceptions above have one thing in common. All cited authors agree that speakers apply two types of strategies to enhance their language production: they modify either the meaning or the form. She accepts that taxonomies are of high importance in understanding of how learning and communication organized, regulated, and realized by learners, but argues that if we want to understand strategy, we must put it in a larger context. One possible way, she recommends, is to consider 'strategy' as a part of a general theory of communication. Discourse analysis as a possible method of sociolinguistic analyses of language use in various contexts would bring us closer to understanding the construct.

Another possible way of identifying the construct is considering language communication strategies as part of the cognitive mechanism of language learning as

they are jointly responsible for linguistic performance and language acquisition. Within cognitive processes two components are responsible for language processing: (1) analysis of linguistic knowledge and (2) control of linguistic processes. From this viewpoint communication and learning strategies have much to do with such mental processes as intentional and directed attention (Bialystok, 1991).

Later conceptualizations in the 90's have greatly contributed to understanding strategy by adding well-structured taxonomies of the construct although recirculation of earlier theories can be witnessed. Oxford's (1990) taxonomy of LLS, one of the most dominant in the literature, has become influential in second language acquisition research. In her conceptualization the basic components of strategic behaviour like planning, management and goal-orientedness constitute an intrinsic part of the learning process. Learning strategies are defined as a combination of specific actions taken by the learner with the aim of making learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new situations (1990, p. 8).

Figure 3 Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies (1990):

Direct strategies	**Indirect strategies**

Memory strategies:
• Creating mental linkages
  ○ Grouping
  ○ Associating/elaborating
  ○ Placing new words in context
• Applying images and sounds
  ○ Using imagery
  ○ Semantic mapping
  ○ Using keywords
  ○ Representing sounds in memory
• Reviewing well
  ○ Structured review
• Employing action
  ○ Using physical response
  ○ Using mechanical techniques
	Metacognitive strategies:
	• Centering learning
	  ○ Overviewing and linking already known material
	  ○ Paying attention
	  ○ Delaying production to focus on listening
	• Arranging and planning your learning
	  ○ Finding out about language learning
	  ○ Organizing
	  ○ Setting goals
	  ○ Identifying the purpose of a language task
	  ○ Planning for the language task

	○ Seeking practice opportunities • Evaluating your learning ○ Self-monitoring ○ Self-evaluation
Cognitive strategies: • Practising ○ Repeating ○ Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems ○ Recombining ○ Practicing naturalistically • Receiving and sending messages ○ Getting the idea quickly ○ Using resources for receiving and sending messages • Analyzing and reasoning	**Affective strategies:** • Lowering your anxiety ○ Using progressive relaxation ○ Using music ○ Using laughter • Encouraging yourself ○ Making positive statements ○ Taking risks wisely ○ Rewarding yourself • Taking your emotional temperature ○ Listening to your body ○ Using a checklist ○ Writing a language learning diary ○ Discussing your feelings with someone
Compensation strategies • Guess intelligently • Overcome limitations in speaking and writing	**Social strategies:** • Asking questions ○ Asking for clarification ○ Asking for correction • Cooperating with others ○ Cooperating with peers ○ Cooperating with proficient users of the new language • Emphatizing with others ○ Developing cultural understanding ○ Becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings

Cohen (1998, p. 5) claims that the element of intentionality and consciousness gives strategy its distinctive character. These are two elements that distinguish strategies from those processes that are not strategic. To apprehend the construct, he justifies the split between language learning and language use strategies and differentiates the specific stages of strategic processing by distinguishing language behaviour before, during and after the performance. Cohen insists that strategies are manifested in concrete actions taken by the learner to enhance their learning and use of their second or foreign language in storing, retaining, and recalling a language. He recommends investigating these steps of actions more elaborately to get a clearer picture of the learners' strategic behaviour.

Language use strategies include four subsets: (1) retrieval strategies, (2) rehearsal strategies, (3) cover strategies and (4) communication strategies. Retrieval strategies are used to recollect language material from storage. Rehearsal strategies are used to rehearse or practise target language structures. Cover strategies are those strategies that learners use to make an impression that they have control over material even if it is not the case. Cover strategies constitute a special type of compensatory or coping strategies. However, differently from Faerch and Kasper's (1983) conceptualization Cohen assumes that besides the learner's ability to manage themselves in an emerging linguistic problem these strategies also involve the ability to avoid looking unprepared, unknowledgeable, and foolish. (Cohen, 1998, p.6). Communication strategies constitute a fourth subset of language use strategies. This category of strategies focuses on the learner's approaches to conveying the intended meanings towards the listener or the reader. Communication strategies include intralingual strategies such as topic avoidance or abandonment, message reduction, code-switching, and paraphrasing (p. 7).

Cohen (1998) emphasizes that successful completion of a task may require a variety of strategies and strategies can serve multiple functions. Multilinguals exhibit a refined and fine-tuned use of strategies for the simple reason that they include the selection of language as a strategy. The element of choice, earlier referred to in Faerch and Kasper's (1983) conceptualization, provides a complementary strategic tool in multilinguals' linguistic repertoire.

Further differentiation of language learning and language use strategies is justified according to whether they are cognitive, metacognitive, affective, or social (Cohen, 1998; Dörnyei, 2005; Oxford, 1990) (see Figure 5 'Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies'). Cognitive strategies are employed both in learning and language use. In learning cognitive strategies are operated to identify, group, and store the material, whereas in language use these strategies facilitate comprehension and production of the second language. Metacognitive strategies allow learners to control their own learning by organizing, planning, and evaluating their learning process, before, during and after the process. Language users apply affective strategies to regulate emotions, motivation, and attitudes. Manifestations of the operation of the affective strategies are the cases when language users try to find opportunities to motivate and encourage themselves to practise and use L2. Cases of recollecting good memories and positive experiences about L2 use also fall under this category. Finding ways to lower anxiety and get reward, acknowledgement, or any other emotional advantages from the use of L2 can be considered as manifestations of affective strategies. Cooperating with others to fulfil a task, asking for help to cope with communication challenges, initiating and conducting interactions with peer learners or native speakers are suggestive of the effective operation of the fourth type of strategies, that of the social strategies.

4.5 Strategy vs. self-regulation

Although the 90's witnessed a paradigm shift in the interpretation of the construct of strategy, the described typologies and earlier definitions of strategy still leave a lot of other questions open. Two of such questions are: What distinguishes normal learning from strategic learning? What is the difference between ordinary language use and strategic language use?

Celce-Murcia et al. (1995, p. 27) conceptualize strategic competence as the knowledge of communication strategies and position problem-orientedness as a central feature of strategic behaviour. The scholars divide the component system of communication strategies into five subcategories as described in Table 3 below. *Avoidance or reduction strategies* involve appropriating one's message to one's resources. *Achievement or compensatory strategies* enhance language to reach a communicative goal and compensating for linguistic deficiencies. (See Bialystok,

1990; Cook, 1993; Corder, 1981; Faerch & Casper 1983). *Stalling or time-gaining strategies* include *fillers, hesitation devices and gambits* as well as *repetitions. Self-monitoring strategies* involve correcting or self-repair, *rephrasing* to ensure that the message gets through. The last category, *interactional strategies,* highlights the cooperative aspect of strategy use. *Appeals for help when* the learner relies on the interlocutor's knowledge rather than using his/her own language resources. *Meaning negotiation strategies* are divided into ways of *indicating non-understanding and* making *comprehension checks.* As I stated earlier (see Section 3.6), my analysis is based on the model introduced by Celce-Murcia et al (1995).

Table 3 – Suggested components of strategic competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p. 28)

- Avoidance or reduction strategies
  - Message replacement
  - Topic avoidance
  - Message abandonment
- Achievement or compensatory strategies
  - Circumlocution (e.g., *the thing you open bottles with* for *corkscrew)*
  - Approximation (e.g., *fish* for *carp)*
  - All-purpose words (e.g., *thingy, thingamajig)*
  - Non-linguistic means (mime, pointing, gestures, drawing pictures)
  - Restructuring (e.g., *The bus was very... there were a lot of people on it)*
  - Word-coinage (e.g., *vegetarianist)*
  - Literal translation from LI
  - Foreignizing (e.g., LI word with L2 pronunciation)
  - Code switching to LI or L3
  - Retrieval (e.g., *bro... bron... bronze)*
- Stalling or time-gaining strategies
  - Fillers, hesitation devices and gambits (e.g., *well, actually..., where was I...?)*
  - Self and other repetition
- Self-monitoring strategies
  - Self-initiated repair (e.g., *I mean...)*
  - Self-rephrasing (over-elaboration) (e.g., *This is for students... pupils... when you're at school...)*

- Interactional strategies
  - Appeals for help
    - direct (e.g., *What do you call...?)*
    - indirect (e.g., *I don't blow the word in English...* or puzzled expression)
  - Meaning negotiation strategies

    Indicators of non/misunderstanding
    - requests

      - repetition requests (e.g., *Pardon?* or *Could you say that again please?)*
      - clarification requests (e.g., *What do you mean by...?)*
      - confirmation requests (e.g., *Did you say...?)*
    - expressions of non-understanding

      - verbal *(e.g., Sorry, I'm not sure I understand...)*
      - non-verbal (raised eyebrows, blank look)
    - interpretive summary (e.g., *You mean...?1So what you're saying is...?)*
- Responses
  - repetition, rephrasing, expansion, reduction, confirmation, rejection, repair
- Comprehension checks
  - whether the interlocutor can follow you (e.g., Am *I making sense?)*
  - whether what you said was correct or grammatical (e.g., *Can Ilyou say that?)*
  - whether the interlocutor is listening (e.g., on the phone: *Are you still there?)*
  - whether the interlocutor can hear you

Dörnyei (2005) points out that the element of choice (Cohen, 1998; Corder, 1981; Faerch & Kasper, 1983) is an important aspect of learning strategies. He concludes that one significant shift which provides a broader perspective is the transition to the concept of *self-regulation.* The term *self-regulation* instead of *strategy* seems better since it shifts the focus from the product nature of the learner's goal-orientedness and displays the individual's active participation both in the learning process and language performance.

This approach suggests that learners have options, a range of tactics from which they can choose to enhance the effectiveness of learning and communication to make their language particularly appropriate for the circumstances. Learners are motivated to find effective ways to reach a goal and their behaviour becomes strategic when it is

particularly appropriate for the individual. To explore Sarah's operating communication strategies, I relied on her code-switches and metalinguistic comments as being observable manifestations of such strategic behaviour.

4.6 Metalinguistic awareness: skill, ability, knowledge

When analysing language users' language development from the strategic perspective it is inevitable to refer to such cognitive processes as the ability to control linguistic processes. Researchers (Bialystok, 1991; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991) having done extensive research into bilinguals' cognitive processes label the control of linguistic processes with the term of metalinguistic awareness. Bialystok (1991) and Hamers (2004) argue that external (social environment, context of acquisition) and internal (conceptual-linguistic and metalinguistic processes) components together formulate the language output. They also emphasize that metalinguistic processes have much to do with strategic behaviour, in other words, strategic behaviour is relative to metalinguistic awareness. They also claim that the term 'metalinguistic awareness' in the literature is debated and point out that the lack of a straightforward definition causes a lot of confusion. The first step towards describing metalinguistic awareness is finding distinguishing features that separate it from other cognitive functions (Bialystok, 2001, p. 121.) In the 1970s the prefix „meta" was applied to a variety of cognitive functions, such as metacognition and metamemory. Ever since it has been used to refer to any activity that requires some extra knowledge or effort on the learner's side. Bialystok (2001) claims that although in Cazden' conceptualization (1976) metalinguistic awareness is used as a unique construct and defined as:

> The ability to make language forms opaque and attend to them in and for themselves, is a special kind of language performance, one which makes special cognitive demands, and seems to be less easily and less universally acquired than the language performances of speaking and listening. (Cazden,1976, p. 29)

the definition still leaves an important question open, for example, it does not clarify what is 'special' about cognitive demands. To give a more insightful approach Bialystok (2001, p. 123) recommends using metalinguistic as a qualifier for knowledge, ability, and awareness. In Bialystok's conceptualization (1) the characteristics of the task, (2) the abilities of the learner and (3) the properties of awareness are strong predictors of one's metalinguistic awareness. She insists that

metalinguistic knowledge is broader than knowledge of a particular language. It is knowledge of language in its most general sense, it is abstract knowledge not particular knowledge. Metalinguistic ability describes the capacity to use knowledge about language as opposed to the capacity to use a language and argues that many of the arguments are caused by the fact that researchers do not talk about the same thing when discussing metalinguistic awareness. What is metalinguistic for one scholar, is part of ordinary language use for another.

Further confusion in the application comes from the fact that metalinguistic awareness is used as an umbrella term and associated with special tasks, skills, and levels of awareness. (1) When applied to tasks, it refers to certain uses of language, e.g., making repairs and judgements about well-formedness (p. 114). (2) When the term is identified with skills, it refers to the learner's ability to focus on language forms without asking them to do so. (3) When associated with awareness it refers to any performance that is carried out with the deliberate control and awareness of the language learner.

In Malakoff's and Hakuta's (1991) taxonomy metalinguistic awareness is identified with ability, skill and knowledge and described as both a mental state and a process. The indicated mental state refers to the learner's deliberate control of the forms and functions of the language. The process application is treated as a way of approaching and solving a problem. The cited authors' research into bilinguals' metalinguistic awareness greatly contributes to exploring the relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness. Their findings underpin that language alternation is a manifestation of metalinguistic awareness. Analysing child natural translations Malakoff and Hakuta (1991) have found that despite numerous grammatical mistakes the surveyed children always succeeded in getting the meaning across because natural translations and code-switches were consciously exploited to serve their own communicative intentions.

Bialystok (1990) argues that language use of bilinguals offers valuable data to research metalinguistic awareness because bilingualism promote the control of processing over linguistic knowledge (p. 128). It is so because bilinguals are quicker to recognize that the form-meaning relation, that is the basis of symbolic reference, is arbitrary. Bilinguals have experience in looking only at the forms of expressions

when they decide which language to use. Simply by changing the form they can modify, shade, and differentiate the meaning. Bialystok (1990) argues that understanding the control of language processing is inevitable for a more detailed description of language proficiency. At the same time, she emphasizes that empirical data are needed to provide us with an inductive approach to the construct. We must analyse communication strategies in concrete examples, as they are manifestations of language processing whether conscious or unconscious. Strategies are the ways in which the processing system extends and adapts itself to the demands of communication.

The fact that metalinguistic awareness is tightly connected to and often interchangeable with consciousness justifies investigating the role of attention in the process. Metalinguistic awareness, Bialystok argumentation goes, does not come into play without the additional mechanism of attention. According to Bialystok's conceptualization in metalinguistic awareness attention is actively focused on the domain of knowledge that is needed to explain and understand a property of language (p. 127).

Attention is responsible for the realization of both: (1) analysis of linguistic knowledge and (2) control of linguistic processing, which processes are two manifestations of metalinguistic awareness by which language proficiency improves. Also, these mechanisms are responsible for the language learner's ability to carry out various language functions. (Bialystok, 1991). 'Attention', originally proposed by Jackendoff (1987), has two subtypes: selecting and directing attention. The selecting function controls the level of detail that is activated for a given problem. The directing function controls the attention to the specific information that is necessary for the solution. In Bialystok's conceptualization selective attention is responsible for deducing information from abstract representation, whereas directed attention is expected to focus on the selected information for the purpose of performing in a specific context (p. 120).

In line with Bialystok, Hamers (2004, p. 81) in her socio-cognitive model of bilingualism agrees that attention is a key element of metalinguistic awareness and identifies metalinguistic awareness with the child's ability to pay attention to language forms and comments about the language. In Cromdal's (2013), Cekaite and

Björk-Willén's (2012) and Gafaranga's (2012) interpretation a clear sign of metalinguistic awareness is when children are engaged with the relevance of the appropriate language. The fact that they tend to overtly socialize and regulate themselves and their peers into appropriate language use is a clear sign of their metalinguistic awareness.

4.7 Bilingualism and emotionality

Authors (Baker, 2006; Cromdal, 2013; Cekaite &Björk-Willén,2012; Chen et al., 2020; Gafaranga, 2012; Hoyle and Adger, 1998; Hamers, 2004; Kamalanavin, 2011; Lugossy, 2003; Nikolov, 1999; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006; Pawliszko, 2016; Ricento, 2005; Steiner & Hayes, 2008) call attention to the dynamic nature of language learners and to the role of lived personal experiences in the language learning process. Earlier sociolinguistic research in second language acquisition and bi- and multilingualism have already dealt with the social-contextual determinedness of language preference but in these studies (Grosjean, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993) language choice in emotional expressions have been examined only peripherally. Although those studies included factors such as topic, context, interlocutor, the speaker's language proficiency, the versatility of functions of code-switches has been oversimplified, leaving a lot of questions open in connection with affective functions. Pavlenko (2006, p.198) claims that emotions can be best observed in private speech acts. Participant observation where the researcher has an informal and open rapport with their participants can reveal more about bilinguals' emotional talk, consequently, are more suitable. The small number of relevant empirical data can be explained with the fact that emotional talk is almost impossible to capture for research purposes.

Naturally occurring discourse, personal accounts on language choice and preference provide a fruitful arena for collecting and studying data on affective meanings of language shift and on identity formulation during the learning process. Pavlenko (2006, p. 198) raises attention to the role of emotions and life trajectories in SLA. Norton (2000) and Cekaite and Björn-Willein (2012) argue that research into the interplay of lived experience are invaluable sources of qualitative explanations in this respect. They both add that single-subject case studies give easy access to the individual learner's emotional outflows. Thus, ethnographic accounts of second

language learning in informal settings complement research conducted in educational institutions. Pavlenko and Dewaele (2004) in their attempt to explore the relationship between emotionality and language choice carried out extensive research using a web questionnaire between 2001 and 2003 (Pavlenko & Dewaele, 2004). The authors investigated which language was chosen to express positive affect such as love, intimacy, deepest feelings, praise for one's children, and which language fitted best to express negative affect such as anger, arguing, swearing, scolding, and disciplining children.

Bilinguals' and multilinguals' code-switching practices underscore that code-switching is not always attributed to the speaker's laziness, negligence, or insufficient language competence. They are not accidental slips of tongue, on the contrary, in most cases there is purpose or logic behind switching languages. Inter-group relations, the extent an individual and their environment value a specific language, momentary communication challenges, personal needs among others may as well have a major effect on the use of code-switches. Baker (2006) presents a list of twelve overlapping code-switches with different functions and meanings.

(1) Stressing, when the speaker applies code-switches to emphasize a particular point in a communication. (2) Substitution, if a person does not know a word in one language, that person can substitute it with borrowing one from another language. (3) No equivalent, a code-switch is inevitable as it expresses a concept that has no equivalent in the other language. (4) Reinforcement, a code-switch can be used to emphasize one's power or authority. (5) Clarifying, a code-switch can be used to clarify a point in the conversation. (6) Communicating friendship, a code-switch can express someone's intention to belong to a community, a desire to be accepted in a group, or simply represents family bonding. (7) Relating a conversation, code-switching can mean that the speaker reports another person's utterance in that person's language to sound authentic. (8) Interjecting, the purpose of code-switching in a conversation can be the intention to change the language of communication, or to signal that the speaker wants to be accepted and involved in the conversation and win attention. (9) Easing tension and injecting humour, the use of code-switches may signal a desire to change the interlocutor's mood or to change the style of the conversation. (10) A change of attitude or relationship code-switches can signal social distance or expressions of solidarity, shared values, and growing rapport. (11)

Excluding people, a person can switch to their languages because they want to oust others from the conversation. (12) Changing to certain topics, code-switches reflect that L1 and L2 refer to different domains. For example, L1 can be the language of home and L2 is the language of school or vice versa.

Nikolov (1999) also calls attention to the affective power of language choice. Her classroom observations underpin that in puberty pupils tend to refuse the use of L2 and prefer L1 in spite of their good level of L2. As Nikolov (1999) explains, L1 often mediates the pupils 'rebellious attitude. Their resort to L1 may signal their protest against the teacher's and the institutional requirements. Language choice can be a reflection of how they percieve and identify themselves in the community. Nikolov's classroom observations are in line with the research findings presented above: the reason why L1 carries stronger emotional involvement is that the surveyed children developed affective meanings and emotive communication in that language.

Norton (2000) also emphasizes that emotional attachment to a language plays a decisive role in language learning and the success of such an endeavour depends on individual conceptions of identity during the learning process. She claims that the learner's commitment towards language learning is affected by the way they interpret themselves and the world around them. She refuses to define learners in a binary system as motivated or unmotivated, introverted, or extroverted, inhibited, or uninhibited. She argues that learners' personality dynamically changes over time and space due to different affective factors. On the other hand, it is impossible to separate these personality traits because they coexist in contradictory ways even within a single individual. Norton (2000) underscores that while many SLA theorists (Ellis, 2008; Krashen et al., 1979; Schumann, 1978; Stern, 1983) recognize that language learners do not live in idealized, homogenous communities, this heterogeneity has not been given as much attention as it deserves.

Pavlenko's (2006) research into emotionality explores how emotions influence language choice and what affective functions code-switches carry. The author categorized speakers' code-switches and interactions according to the communicative intentions they serve. The data reveal that code-switches indicate different emotions e.g., distress, endearment, fear, sympathy, and admiration. Pavlenko (2006) also claims that speakers show unique emotional attachment to their

languages due to their different socialization patterns and personality traits. While investigating what emotions they relate to their languages she found that in general L1 signals intimacy and L2 is a sign of keeping distance. However, a number of counterexamples were discovered when the weaker L2 conveys more intensive emotions, and there are cases when bilingual speakers appeal to L2, because the simple use of the 'unexpected' language exerts a surprising effect.

In several cases the interviewees rely on L2 when discussing embarrassing topics because that language lowered the level of anxiety and enabled them to control their emotions. Some people chose L2 even if it was their weaker language when they wanted to redefine power relationships. The speakers who learned L2 later in life rarely use L2 in the affective function, whereas those who acquired their L2 in childhood used L2 forms to convey emotions more often.

All authors above agree that emotions and affect are worthwhile topics in SLA research. People speaking more than one language rarely keep their languages separate. This phenomenon can be explained by unconscious psychological reasons, such as cognitive constraints, and, as their findings suggest, can be attributed to conscious, strategic processes. An example of such strategic mixing is when bilinguals move between their languages because they recognize that it is an extra resource to express themselves in a more subtle and appropriate way. Also, these authors express their hope that empirical evidence will contribute to dispersing the misconception that code-switching is a sign of low-level language proficiency, and a manifestation of inability of language separation. Steiner and Hayes' (2008) findings give evidence that in bilingualism a shared language can generate a special bond between parents and children and language choice goes deeper than randomly using words to communicate. They often apply mixed language use and operate translanguaging as a general practice and strategy to mediate communication.

4.8 Bilingualism and identity

Authors (Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006; Ricento, 2005;) revisiting SLA research in the 90s recommend considerations of identity in SLA. In the 90s a great deal of attention was turned to the sociocultural dimension of bilingualism and second language learning. Since then, ethnographic studies (Mirzaie & Parhizkar, 2021; Velasco, 2020) have mushroomed to reveal how identity formulates and transforms

in the varied contexts of second language learning. Earlier studies had dichotomic oppositional categories like native-non-native, motivated-unmotivated language learner to suggest that the ultimate goal of learning is nativelike proficiency and the desire to become an indistinguishable member of the target speech community. Such studies approached bilingual identity as someone whose main goal is to be accepted in the target culture group and described the language learner with fixed, invariant attributes (Ricento, 2005). The individual learner was placed in a bipolar system distinguishing between the good/successful language learner vs. the bad/less successful language learner, the motivated vs. unmotivated learner, the instrumentally motivated vs. integratively motivated (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) language learner.

Such and similar approaches are far too product-oriented and do not tell anything about the changes learners undergo during the process. They also ignore other background elements that come into play during learning. This approach considers the learner as static and implies that learners can be described with permanent, unchanged attributes. They consider the individual as a social attribute and examine them exclusively according to their success or failure regarding their integration effort and success into the target community. Some state that only native-like language proficiency gives the perception of legitimate language speaker and use the term indistinguishable speaker with reference to the perfect level of language competence and the state of assimilation. These researchers underscore learners' desire and ability to integrate in the target language community. Emphasizing the importance of the learner's integration effort Schumann (1978) in his acculturation model claims the perceived distance between the learner's own culture community and the target language community will finally determine the learner's ability to integrate. The smaller the distance between the two cultures (own culture vs. target culture) the less confrontations learners experience and, consequently, learners acquire the target language with less difficulty.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) emphasize the importance of the learner's goal-oriented effort to satisfy their personal needs in learning. The authors identify learners' emotional involvement with two types of motivation: instrumental and integrative motivation. Instrumental motivation reflects the learner's intention to acquire their language for career development (e.g., to win a job) and academic achievements

(e.g., passing a language exam). Integrative motivation involves the learner's effortful activity to win group affiliation meaning that they succeed in obtaining membership in a group which they want to belong to.

Recent approaches (Cromdal, 2013; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamers, 2004; Kamalanavin, 2011; Mirzaie & Parhizkar, 2021; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006; Pearson, 2008; Ricento, 2005; Steiner & Hayes, 2008; Velasco, 2020) put more emphasis on the interaction of an individual's multiple membership and illuminate how these memberships are understood by the learner and the learner's environment; how different subject positions unfold in different contexts (Ricento, 2005, p. 898). The authors of first-person, single-subject accounts provide a wealth of examples taken from socially constructed naturally occurring authentic interactions to give a complex picture of what is going on in the individual during the learning process (Norton, 2011, p. 429).

It turns out that the degree of motivation and the attitudes displayed by the individual learner are not static. On the contrary, the entire process of learning as well as the perception of their selves are affected by the actual context. Microlevel social encounters of bilinguals underpin that they are offered a range of opportunities to speak and are placed in different situations. Accordingly, bilinguals take different subject positions from the disregarded to the fully accepted language user (Norton, 2000; Ricento, 2005).

As noted in the related literature (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Velasco, 2020) systematic language alternations shape and organize the way how young bilingual speakers' intentions are displayed in talk. In peer interactions social conflicts of targeting, criticizing, and evaluating one another's actions, conducts, speech, lexical choice appear to be a central element. Bilingual studies (Cekaite-Björk-Willén, 2012; Gafaranga, 2012) argue that language proficiency is a usual trouble source of peer crossings. During their language-related practices e.g., corrections, critical remarks, children tend to ridicule one another in an impetuous manner. Peers pick upon one another's linguistic mistakes and instruct each other into appropriate ways of behaving and speaking in a teacher-like manner.

The significance of microlevel accounts on individual behaviours and attitudes to learning is that they explore the relationship between identity and SLA from multiple

perspectives, thus greatly contribute to eliminating dogmas and biases in bilingualism.

4.9 Conclusion

In chapter 4 I overviewed the literature on the subject of communication and learning strategies language users and learners apply. I presented what distinguishing features are proposed to identify the multifaceted term *strategy*. As I am mostly concerned with child second language acquisition, I devoted a section to the relationship between language and cognition to the extent that is needed to understand the empirical part of my thesis. I discussed metalinguistic awareness as a special linguistic property according to Bialystok's (1991) conceptualization and investigated the construct from three different perspectives in terms of skill, ability, and knowledge. My intention was to illuminate the interrelation between bilingualism and emotionality in chapter 4. To give a global understanding of the subject I drew on Cekaite & Björk-Willén's (2012), Baker's (2006), Cromdal's (2013), Gafaranga's (2012), Knechtelsdorfer's (2011), Nikolov's (1999), Norton's (2000) and Ricento's (2005) research findings. I revealed on what basis these researchers describe the individual learner as a dynamic actor in developing bilingualism. I delved more deeply into the subject matter to guide thinking about how second language learning takes place and why it takes place in so many variations.

Part 2 – The case study

Table 4 – The dimensions of the empirical part – The focus of analysis

	Focus of analysis	The addressed research questions, the particular phenomena investigated to answer the research question.
Chapter 5	Research Design - The relevance of ethnographic single case studies	Ethical considerations • The applied research methodology • Data collection instrument • Ethical considerations • Limitations of the research - Possible constraints • The background to the study • The case history • Research questions • The participant • Sarah's personality • Data collection instruments and procedures • The dataset • Transcribing the data • The time span of research
Chapter 6	Sarah's utterances, interactions, and self-reflections to depict her L2 development at different levels of language analysis (lexicon, morphology, syntax)	**Research question 1 –** Sarah's L2 language development – lexicon, morphology, syntax • Lexicon: holophrases, false cognates • Morphology. past tense forms • Syntax: formation of questions and negation

Chapter 7	Sarah's communicative intentions conveyed through L2-L1, L1-L2 code-switches, and language alternations manifested in her naturally occurring talk	**Research question 2 –** L2 as a complementary strategic tool to convey the communicative intent in Sarah's talk **Research question 3 –** Patterns in communicative intentions in terms of L1-L2 code-switches • Accommodating to the established language separation rules • Expressing emotional attachment • Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use • Topic abandonment and tricking • Easing tension and injecting humour
Chapter 8	Manifestations of Sarah's identity transformations in her developing bilingualism displayed in her self-reflections	**Research question 4 –** How does Sarah's English contribute to Sarah's identity development? **Research question 5 –** The categories identified in Sarah's identity development • Group affiliation and allegiance • Handling negative feedback and asking for justification and reinforcement • Reference to other language learners' experiences • Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy • Getting authority via L2 • Finding ways to enhance learning strategies

Chapter 5 – Research design of Sarah's case study

5.1 Research design – The methodological background to the case study

Researchers (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Duff, 2007; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p. 12; Schiffrin, 1994) distinguish quantitative (nomothetic) and qualitative (hermeneutic) research arguing that they represent two distinct approaches to scientific enquiry. The quantitative-qualitative dichotomy has been long discussed and interpreted in scientific research and much attention has been paid to it ever since. Each paradigm represents a collection of approaches to research, and both are categorized on the basis of methods and techniques. In the 90's new qualitative approaches started to complement quantitative research and provide alternatives to traditional approaches. Since then, qualitative research has witnessed an expansion and become popular with the growing interest in ecological validity.

Ecological validity (Hammond, 1998; Larsen-Freeman, 2018) is the degree to which the observed and recorded data of a bounded phenomenon (e.g., language behaviour) reflect the nature of a particular phenomenon as it occurs and manifests itself naturally in informal settings without the researcher`s control and interference. Qualitative research as a complementary paradigm beside quantitative research meets the requirement of validity by representing authentic contexts and cases. Personal accounts of experiences, subjective interpretations of a particular

phenomenon, authentic contexts across a broader span of time have become a major focus in qualitative research.

5.1.1 Ethnographic research – The case study

The present research falls into the category of person-oriented qualitative research. It is a case study conducted longitudinally with a timespan of ten years aimed at understanding my Hungarian dominant daughter's English development and language use in family-context bilingualism guided by and implemented in non-native control and speech community. This type of bilingualism due to its rare and divergent character is also known as marginalized (Duff, 2002) because L2 acquisition takes place in a non-native language environment and is primarily supported by non-native speakers of that language.

To eliminate the researcher bias I hereby declare that generalizing and testing a priori hypotheses are not intended. The reason for conducting research was to explore the individual learner's SLA path investigating how, when, and why the second language is learned and used. A sufficient number of details and rich contextualization (Creswell. 2003, p. 196) enabled me to constitute research questions and identify language use patterns with the aim of contributing to the growth of knowledge in the field of individual second language acquisition.

My study is also a representation of a convenience case. Emotional bonding and cohabitation give a great opportunity to investigate my child's language behaviour in her natural environment and examine the phenomenon in a holistic fashion and in a context-sensitive way. In terms of data collection, I place my case in the category of ethnographic (Hymes, 1974) and ecological (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, p. 59) research. Ethnography of communication (EC) first developed by Hymes (1974) provides a set of methods for conducting qualitative, interpretive (Duff, 2002) research in a variety of settings. EC is a relevant framework to conduct micro-level analyses like discourse samples and to examine patterns and functions of communication. I consider my research an ethnographic single case study as I strive for the complex understanding (Larsen-Freeman, 2018) of one person's language behaviour. Long time, participant observation, open-ended interviews, triangulation of information and interpretation allowed for viewing the data in a holistic manner (Chaudron, 2000; Griffee, 2012).

The ethnographic single-case study seems to be a relevant method to give an exploratory, interpretive, and in-depth description (Duff, 2002) of my single participant's, Sarah's language development. The case study as an inductive form of research allows me to explore the details and meanings of individual experiences in the myriads of realities. I do not set out to provide statistical analyses of discrete linguistic elements. The emphasis is not on the numerical accounts (e.g., frequency calculations) of a particular linguistic phenomenon, I attempt to reveal why and how things happen in a particular way. Besides identifying and discussing the main foci of the research (my participant's communication strategies, communicative intentions, identity development) I am determined to find patterns in the data and make them evident for the reader. I know my single-subject case is not suitable for generalizations but strongly believe that it provides valuable data to extend the pool of our knowledge about what can happen in dual language acquisition. To make it as valid as possible I tried to avoid biased statements by triangulating the data adding my participant's own subjective interpretations of the events as well as my and all involved interlocutors' opinions and conclusions.

My research is socially constructed as I did not have assumptions before commencing my study, it is the case itself that created reality for my inquiry, generated questions and directed my attention to the issues under scrutiny. Our family-context bilingualism meant additional motivation, so I started systematic data collection. In fact, the recordings of our discourse meant an invaluable gift, the act of recordings as well as the replays created hilarious times for us, recalled nice memories and generated joyful recollection of the family's past events and linguistic issues, which my older daughters evaluated as super. As a sign of their approval and appreciation they claimed they would do the same with their children. When Sarah was around three, in 2003, they even gave me a dictaphone as a present to replace my old-fashioned cassette player to record Sarah' talk, though they knew I had already begun writing my diary about Sarah's language acquisition well before that time.

The recorded material of Sarah's talk aroused and occupied my attention to the extent that at around her age of one I decided to turn the entire process of my observations into a research project and write a doctoral dissertation on it. My enthusiasm and curiosity towards the topic led me to consulting the referential literature and applying to a doctoral school. As I became more and more familiar with the findings and

requirements of scientific research on the topic, I was increasingly determined to carry out systematic data collection. I attempted to describe the context of each speech event in detail, attached my interpretations and classified the data according to a certain principle.

I employed two overlapping qualitative methodologies in my inquiry. The first is discourse analysis (DA), a sociolinguistic approach to uncover the systematic properties of language use in a specific context as they manifest themselves in talk-in-interactions, (see Section 2.1.5, Pragmatics and discourse analysis). The second is an anthropological approach. Ethnography of communication first developed by Hymes (1974) representing a major qualitative approach to discourse analysis offered an anthropological approach to language 'as it views discourse as a reflection of cultural and social reality and seeks to find holistic explanations for cultural conceptions and constructions of meaning and behavior' (Lazaraton, 2002, p. 39).

I consider my research ethnographic as I strove for the complete understanding of my participant's language behaviour. EC provided a relevant framework for the micro-level analyses like discourse samples, patterns, and functions of communication (Duff, 2002, p. 291). As an ethnographic researcher I had better insights into my participant's linguistic behaviours and the sociolinguistic patterns which underlie the behaviours because I concentrated on samples that arose from natural events (Chaudron, 2000, p. 30). Long-time participant observation, open-ended interviews, triangulation of information and interpretation (e.g., the participant's subjective interpretations, my colleagues' on-research notes and reflections) allow for viewing data in a holistic way.

5.1.2 Ethical considerations

The fact that my participant is my own child raised ethical concerns. My first impression was that it was rude and unethical to penetrate the natural flow of somebody's life and privacy to access data for scientific research. My second concern was if it was ethically acceptable to disseminate the findings and pass them on to a third person. To disperse my doubts and justify my research I had to familiarize myself with basic ethical principles relevant to research involving human subjects. I needed guidance on how to act and analyse complex problems and issues of this nature (The Belmont Report, 2014; Duff, 2012).

I studied qualitative research methodology (Creswell, 2003; Duff, 2007; Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Griffee, 2012; Lazaraton, 2002) extensively to see what ethical and moral obligations are to be satisfied in qualitative studies. Referential literature provided invaluable guidance in general, but I was extremely uncertain about the concrete implementation as it was not fully applicable in my case. I realized that ethical responsibility in qualitative research is an ongoing process. I had to constantly reconstruct, revisit my methods and attitudes. I had to establish my own scenario and approach. I tried to obey respect, beneficence, autonomy, and justice considered as basic ethical principles in qualitative research (Kvale, 1996).

In terms of respect, I assured that I conduct my research without interfering in the dynamics and nature of the case. I tried to elaborate a systematic arrangement of conditions, by providing a clear protocol for dealing with potential difficulties. In doing so I made serious efforts to make the entire process predictable, transparent, and controllable without being invasive. Also, I developed a very alert mode to be able to identify the tiniest changes and make the necessary adjustments accordingly. As I was aware of the fact that the research may involve emotional risks, I defined clear protocols on how to deal with the distress my participant might experience. To minimize such risk, I attempted to oversee the potential consequences of placing my participant in a dual language environment and revealing her identity.

In my attempt to treat Sarah as an autonomous individual I ensured that she had received a full disclosure of the nature of the study, the risks, benefits, and alternatives, with an extended opportunity to ask questions. I tried to assure her that our endeavour is doing good for her even though she might experience discomfort and harm. I maintained reflective and informative observation by eliciting her accounts of feelings and interpretations throughout the process to make sure that the study does not have any invasive procedure.

The ethical principle of autonomy was only partly observed as at the outset her young age made impossible to assure informed consent and give the right to freely decide whether to participate in it. Later, her progression towards maturity facilitated compliance with the autonomy principle by letting her fully understand the study and by giving her the right to withdraw at any time. I told her how data are collected and how the results will be published. I gave her detailed information about the circumstances of study: Under the criterion of informed consent, I asked for her

approval to share the dataset of her written and oral productions with a third party including other participants, triangulators, reviewers and potential readers (Duff, 2007, Griffee, 2012; Mackey & Gass, 2016).

To eliminate violations of personal rights I kept records on incidents and ethical issues I encountered in my study to ensure discussion, analysis, and prevention of future mistakes both with my participant and the people involved in the research. Also, the accuracy or completeness of each excerpt transcript was verified by my participant before the analysis was complete. In the method of Sarah`s providing consent in my research context I kept her informed and asked for her approval on an ongoing manner to build confidentiality and, at the same time attempted to make a reasonable balance between over-informing and under-informing (Kvale, 1996).

In accordance with the principle of justice I made serious efforts to fairness and equal share by avoiding exploitation or abuse of my participant. In practice it meant that in cases of detecting her tiredness, embarrassment, or any reported (overt or covert) discomfort and overwhelm she experienced using English and interviewing I discontinued the process.

The present research imposed dual roles on the people involved in the research. As I am the person who conducted the observation, I was supposed to take on the role of the researcher. Simultaneously I fulfilled another role, the role of the mother and caretaker. Sarah also had two roles that is the role of the participant and that of the daughter or the person cared for. Defining and differentiating the dual roles, identifying the boundaries the research imposed on both of us was inevitable at the outset especially because as her mother I felt overinvolved. My role as a researcher was clearly and recursively explained to Sarah and the purpose of the study was recurrently discussed, thus she regarded me as such and not as someone who is doing something dubious. The clear definition of roles contributed to congruency in terms of our multiple roles.

Even so reconciliation of my multiple roles generated additional challenges and demanded high level of awareness. Yet, some adverse impact of all my roles was obvious. When acting as a researcher it was particularly challenging to keep distance, observe without interfering and sustain the image of the objective, unbiased researcher.

Being the participant's mother, I tended to be overenthusiastic, over rewarding, obsessed and biased with Sarah`s production and progress. Refraining from subjectivity was another challenge I had to cope with. To reduce subjectivity to minimal I put a special emphasis on triangulating my findings. Consulting authorities of the subject, discussions with colleagues, friends, family members greatly contributed to eliminating biases and gave an opportunity to familiarize myself with multiple interpretations. At the same time cohabitation and the intimacy of the mother-child relationship proved to be outright beneficial and added to the validity of the research for the simple reason that I enjoyed the trust of my participant. Our informal and open rapport revealed more about emotional talk and depicted nuances otherwise difficult to capture for research purposes. Also, the emotional bond between us created favourable conditions to have immediate access to mutual feedback and gave space to straightforward, unmitigated personal accounts, reflections, feelings, opinions. These circumstances have contributed to beneficence (Mackey & Gass, 2016), which is considered as an important quality indicator of ethnographic single-case studies.

The management and reconciliation of my participant's dual role caused less difficulty for Sarah than I had expected. Although sometimes I witnessed certain imbalance and apprehension during the research, that was attributed to the versatile and competing perception of her bilingual identity rather than to her aversion to being the locus of attention and the subject of a scientific study. Her discomfort, as I perceived it, mostly emerged in situations when she perceived herself as an incompetent L2 user and felt embarrassed about using English in public in the circle of the uninitiated 'out-group' members. She never showed signs of her objection to being the subject of the research.

I knew that her understanding of the research was limited due to her young age and immaturity. To establish researcher reflexivity and provide context and understanding for the participant I continuously readdressed and rediscussed the purpose of the research in an ongoing fashion throughout the research. With Sarah's progression towards maturity, she became more and more knowledgeable about what, how and why we are doing. Learning that she and her talks attracted so much attention, and her L2 development evoked other people's appreciation and interest, she began to use the situation to her own joy and advantage. She stated several times

that she was proud of playing such an important role in my work and she wanted to read what I write about her.

Despite all my doubts, concerns and imbalances, the circumstances positively affected her participation and cooperation in my research and assured me that my research fulfils the ethical requirements of scientific research. During the project, I realized that the systematic arrangement of conditions, the clear protocol for dealing with potential difficulties, greatly contributed to making my research ethically acceptable. I was able to conduct open, informative, and reflexive research with high level of awareness, transparency, adaptability, and sensitivity. Professional integrity has been established by means of ethical conduct and compliance with the ethical and moral rules and obligations (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Griffee, 2012; Mackey & Gass, 2016**).** As a final point I would like to reassert that the conditions of my whole research project based on the above-described favourable conditions and the systematic guarding of the ethical standards and principles of qualitative studies has created a solid foundation for Sarah`s bilingual development, which I define as the goal of the whole research.

5.2 The background to study

5.2.1 The case history

As I proceeded in documenting Sarah's discourses, I realized that my data gave insightful representations on how Sarah and the whole family benefitted from our family-context bilingualism. My research, although lacked scientific nature at the outset, enhanced family integrity making the audiotaped and written samples recurrent objects of our family discussions. My daughters, Dóri, Nani and Sarah were captivated by discussing episodes and shared memories of our life and were keen on hearing their own voice on the audio recordings. I also realized that Sarah's dual language acquisition aroused many people's interest in our environment and they were eager to get informed about the success of our endeavour. As time elapsed, they urged me to document Sarah's discourse to let them see how our "system" works and what progress she makes in acquiring two languages at a time.

The fact that both my family and my narrow social environment expressed enthusiasm and curiosity gave me further motivation and stimulated me to familiarize

myself with the methodological requirements of data collection and those of writing a case study. Parallel with studying the proper methodology I investigated qualitative studies, searched for publications about child second language acquisition and compared my case with them. In my attempt to give a better understanding of my child's language behaviour and linguistic solutions I studied the related literature extensively, gathered additional data and at around Sarah's age of four I decided to transform my prolonged observations into scientific research and began to write a doctoral dissertation based on the wealth of data collected over the years.

As a mother and a language teacher I have always attributed high significance to the supportive home environment in language learning. Socializing my children into language and displaying appropriate communicative and behavioural norms have always been among my highest priorities. The quality of a child's social environment, apart from biological or genetic heritage, is an important predictor of their language development, orientation to their languages and academic achievement. Parents, especially mothers are the role models whose responsibility is crucial in how their children apply and display the language or languages they have been socialized into. To exercise our parental responsibility and maximize the benefits of our professional and social background, I and my husband, decided to integrate English in our daily life despite the fact that we are non-native speakers, and our speech community lacks native control of English. These circumstances imposed an additional task on us. Apart form fulfilling our jobs as caregivers we were challenged to serve as language transmitters in terms of L2.

Our goal with the dual language family context was to create favourable conditions for our children to cope with communicational challenges in the multilingual environment we live presently. Having families of mixed nationalities among our relatives, and foreigners in the circle of our friends provided a great chance to formulate a bilingual, Hungarian-English, social environment around us. The extended circle of English-speaking friends offered a natural setting for second language acquisition and L2 interactions. This background also meant a good reason for using a second language with our children as early as possible. The most challenging part of our endeavour was to design how we could make English usage a family routine. We thought that the solution lay in effective time management and

consistency, as well as our capability of allocating time and opportunity to the use of English at home.

Our family lives in Székesfehérvár, the municipal seat of county Fejér situated in a region called Transdanubia in Hungary. We are five of us in the family, me, and my husband Csaba and our three daughters, Dorottya (hereafter Dorothy), 36. Annamária (hereafter Nani), 32 and Sarah, 24 in 2023. I am a teacher of English and Russian at the Székesfehérvár Faculty of the University of Óbuda. My husband is a teacher of physical education at a local secondary school. My husband and I are committed to exercising our parental responsibility in creating a home environment that gives all family members opportunities to make the most of what they have and know. We believe if we are determined and consistent, we can support our children so that they could use their home environment to its full potential. In fact, we were committed to giving them a battery of resources to satisfy their needs and improve their skills. As, by profession, we specialize in the areas of language and physical education, it is foreign languages and sports that we consider as imperative to pass on to our children. Our double background provided an intellectual asset, which offered a sufficient basis, a supportive milieu we could build on. Also, our profession meant strong dedication, we organized our family life around it and it has strongly influenced our views on child raising.

We soon came to realize that in terms of sports we had a more favourable situation for making our goal real. We could easily meet the challenge of involving sports activities in our children's daily routine as we had a well-established institutional framework of physical education at our disposal in Székesfehérvár, where we live. To make the children physically prepared for regular sports activities my husband started to teach them to swim at an early age and after our daughters had acquired the basics of all four swimming styles, we enrolled them to the local synchronized swimming sports club, and they all won several regional and national competitions in figure skating and synchronized skating. At her age of 6 Sarah was given the opportunity to do show jumping at a nearby equestrian centre, which she has been doing ever since.

What concerns our plans about teaching a foreign language to them at an early age, we soon discovered that we were overoptimistic and naive about it and when I set

out to teach my children, it turned out to be much more difficult than I had expected. Before their birth I decided to get them acquainted with English at an early age, during their kindergartner years. The fact that we had regular encounters with families of mixed nationalities and transnational employment, gave the idea of integrating English in our children's daily life from an early age. It was a favourable background that made us believe that it was a viable endeavour.

My plan was to read tales and teach rhymes to my children around bedtime. I also assumed that they would learn English naturally simply through involving English in loose conversations during routine everyday activities and in family and friend-oriented situations. When our two elder daughters were born, we tried to keep to our plans and set out to create opportunities for sufficient exposure to English. Unfortunately, we failed to be consistent, our joint readings were very rare or hectic, and by the evening we were so exhausted due to our daily duties at home and at work that we were unwilling to switch to English at home. We thought the children could just as well acquire the language in the institutional framework at school.

Twelve years later, by the time our third daughter, Sarah was born in 1999, we realized that a lot of things had changed around us, and we had to reconsider our views and conception of language acquisition because of the increased prestige of foreign language knowledge, especially that of English, primarily due to the change of the political system and the appearance of multinational organizations in the country. Experiencing those changes around us we came to realize that things were fluid and changed over time.

We had the same views about child raising and the importance of home literacy environment in the case of all three daughters. The main difference appeared in our attitude to bilingualism. We became increasingly sensible and attentive to the impulses coming from our narrow and wider social environment. That change in our thinking might have been propelled by the fact that, by the time Sarah was born, being in our mid-thirties, we became more experienced. There was another important affective element that changed our concept of parenthood. Sarah was our third child who came relatively late, seven years after our second daughter and twelve years after our first one was born, and we wanted to enjoy every minute of having a little baby again.

By the time Sarah was born in 1999, our bigger daughters were at school, Nani was in the second year of the junior section of the primary school, Dorothy at the age of 12 had just started the sixth grade at a local six-grade secondary school. These circumstances enabled us to get a global and clearer picture of what role home literacy environment and the parents' attitudes and contribution play in children's academic, emotional, and physical development. Sarah's arrival was a turning point and gave motivation to review and reflect on our parental-pedagogical methods and competence.

Having learned the lessons from our lived experiences with the elder ones we were even more committed to provide Sarah with distinguished attention and appropriate education to eliminate the failure of our early parenthood. Knowing that children's linguistic and academic development is in direct relation with the time and attention devoted to them we decided to prepare an operative plan to incorporate English into our daily family life. Due to this change in our mentality, despite our hectic days, we tried to allocate sufficient time to educate our children and learn with them.

Because we constantly struggled with time constraints, we forced ourselves to assign at least half an hour to family discussions of personal accounts of school and work-related issues, experiences of the day. In that period, it became a daily routine that I spent some time with Dorothy checking and preparing her homework in English. She was very particular about our joint learning. She attended a class specialized in that language and was eager to improve her knowledge to pass her language exam. I also devoted time on facilitating Nani's progress in English, who started learning it in extracurricular lessons. It was a coincidence that for Nani those English lessons began when Sarah was born.

The fact that both elder daughters showed enthusiasm and commitment towards learning English meant an emotional trigger and generated a powerful driving force for us to integrate home learning into our family activities through spontaneous interactions. I felt responsibility for the bigger ones' English development and wanted to build a supportive environment to help them. However, taking care of Sarah, a new-born baby that time, occupied too much time and energy at the expense of the big ones. My daughters, especially Nani, the second one, as a clear sign of jealousy towards Sarah, often gave voice to her dissatisfaction and blamed me for

neglecting her and Dorothy in favour of Sarah. Realizing that she missed me very much, I tried to allocate specific times for her. We assigned Sarah's bath time daily to listen to Nani's cassette of English rhymes and songs they used during English study circles. During bedtimes I seated her in my lap in Sarah's room and we spent hilarious time reading English tales and bedtime stories and singing the songs they learned. After a while Dorothy also joined us and those reading sessions became so appealing for the girls that they asked me to make them a regular practice at home.

The English home lessons were part of our everyday life. We all benefitted from the situation. On the one hand, our joint English-speaking sessions dispersed my bad feelings over not paying enough attention to my bigger daughters. On the other hand, the joint readings triggered more extensive involvement of English in the family. Recollection of our readings, recitation of song lyrics, and tales in English became frequent elements of our loose conversations. The girls spent significant amounts of time reading in English autonomously in their free time, looked up new words or expressions, asked for clarification, which propelled our language-related discussions. Checking their English homework together gave opportunities to deal with English-related problems daily.

Thus, without setting up a rigorous action plan for English use at home we could create a well-functioning agenda for a dual linguistic environment around us. After a while, I noticed that the girls, mostly Nani, often halted next to Sarah's cot, reciting English rhymes, and trying to speak to Sarah in English. Her face reflected that she felt proud that she was much more knowledgeable than her little sister. For Nani using English even at her low level of mastery seemed to be comforting as it counterbalanced her disappointment and fear she felt over her changed position in the family due to Sarah's arrival. Apparently, she used her English as a strategic tool to reconstruct her stricken self-esteem.

My children's positive attitude to English served as an inspirational force and was the primary reason for considering the possibility of sustaining and further developing our bilingual home. The secondary reason was that we have had an extensive circle of friends, among them foreign families whom we meet regularly. The fact that on such encounters we use English as a tool for communication has also been encouraging. We have strong ties with a Polish couple, who used to live next

door at the university hostel during my university years in Szeged. In the fourth year of my university studies when their first daughter, Ola, and our first daughter, Dorothy were born within a month, our common school and parental responsibilities made that emotional bonding even stronger.

The fact that the big girls, Dorothy, and Ola and their second daughter Kasia and Sarah are close friends has contributed to our frequent encounters with them. We speak Hungarian with them as they have high proficiency in it but often switch to English, especially during events with other foreign people's presence. Such events give us opportunities to build international relationships.

Another close friend of ours is a Slovak woman, Miroslava from Bratislava with her two sons, Jakub, and Dominik. Dominik is the same age as Sarah and speaks a little English. During the time spent together with Mira and our Polish friends we use English as our common language. When being together on skiing holidays or in summer camps our children communicate with each other in English, thus our foreign friends have considerably facilitated to make our bilingual plan work. Our frequent encounters and loose conversations validate the use of English in the eyes of our children. They learnt to enjoy speaking English and look forward to the chance to use it. They feel comfortable about such English-speaking sessions as they are associated with relaxed and carefree friendly gatherings where language mistakes do not count as long as they understand each other. Our daughters' positive attachment to English persuaded us that the idea of involving English in our home environment is viable and is worth a try.

By the time Sarah was born in 1999 I had ten years of teaching practice behind me. Besides teaching in higher education, I also had a chance to teach English in industrial and business organizations. That time, in mid-90s, several multinationals moved to Székesfehérvár, which phenomenon generated and boosted the needs for international communication. In such multicultural contexts it soon became obvious that foreign language knowledge and primarily the knowledge of English is crucial in job opportunities. Language schools and individual language teachers benefitted from this situation as there was a boom in the number of potential language learners, which meant a growing number of English lessons. This condition greatly affected my work opportunities and professional improvement, as in that period, between

1996–2004, I regularly taught at multinational companies. First-hand experience in authentic multicultural contexts changed my thinking and strengthened the idea that knowing foreign languages is an invaluable resource for an individual to cope with challenges of the competitive global world.

Although these circumstances were advantageous regarding work opportunities, they had adverse effects on my private and family life. Undertaking a second job at business and industrial companies meant working inconvenient hours, before and after my usual work time, early morning, and late afternoon, drastically reducing the time spent with my children. I experienced how work interfered with precious family time. I felt uncomfortable and suffered from bad consciousness over not having enough time with and for my children. However, I knew I was not in the position of giving up those English lessons. I could not afford to refuse them for financial reasons. With all its negative effects, having the chance to teach in the business context had more advantages than disadvantages. It was useful for my professional development and gave me opportunities to mingle with foreigners. I could dynamically enlarge the circle of our foreign acquaintances. Some of them have become our family's close friends. We regularly organized gatherings either in our home or at their places and had a good time together on such occasions.

International relationships opened a window to a new and until that time unknown world. I started to see learning, teaching, and using English from a different perspective. Our friends' attitude reflecting a pragmatic, use-based approach to foreign language use made me less focused on form or correctness and impressed me so deeply that I initiated using English in loose conversations at home on a daily basis. Involving more and more English in our spontaneous everyday interactions at home developed my children's creativity and resourcefulness in the way they dealt with the upcoming communication challenges. When I asked them how they felt about using English, they reported that at first, they felt awkward to use it instead of Hungarian, but then they gradually accommodated to the situation and overcame the difficult initial period. During the retrospective interviews Sarah revealed that earlier she felt anxious and different about using English publicly, especially in the presence of outsiders, but she also reflected a change in her attitude adding that she felt more and more comfortable over time. She also mentioned that she often found herself

addressing her in-group friends in English and conducting loose conversations in English with them just for fun, even if it was not required in that situation.

My experiences collected at multinational companies directed my attention to functional and needs-based language teaching This shift in focus and attitude seemed validated and justified usage-based language learning in education and in the world of business. In response to the change in my mentality I started to evaluate and redefine my role and tasks not only as a teacher but also as a parent. I concluded that I should be more mindful and strategic to satisfy such emerging demands in English knowledge and find alternative opportunities to prepare both my children and students for the new challenges.

Our family exhibits substantial linguistic variation in the sense that we use multiple foreign languages (English, French, Polish, Russian) for a range of purposes, including professional work, communication in the extended family and with friends from different first language groups and at different levels of proficiency. Our interactions involve both non-native and native speakers of English, French, Polish and Russian. Hungarian is our mother tongue, English is used as a second language, the third most frequently used foreign language is French, the rest (Polish and Russian) are spoken occasionally. As far as English is concerned our three daughters have a chance of widespread communication and frequent face-to-face contacts with native and non-native speakers of English and French partly in person or electronically in social media channels, let alone international travel and work and study-abroad periods.

Our daughters have reported that multilingualism has strongly influenced their attitude to language and language learning. Our bilingual home and the multilingual community we belong to was a determining factor in their career choice. Our biggest daughter Dóri was so obsessed with languages that she chose language teaching as a profession, she graduated from ELTE University in the specialization of Slavistics studies. She is a secondary school teacher of Russian by profession. Russian was her major and Polish her minor subject at university. At present she works as an advisor at the education authority of Fejér County and is entitled for a language allowance for her English and German B2 and her Russian C1 language certificates. Nani, our second daughter who is married to a Frenchman lives in France, Villers St. Paul. She is a qualified hotel management specialist and works in tourism in France. She uses

both of her foreign languages French (C1) and English (B2) daily. She speaks Hungarian to her four-year-old daughter, who is a French-Hungarian bilingual. Our youngest daughter's, Sarah's chosen profession is not connected directly to foreign languages, yet she regularly uses English in her studies and French when she communicates with her sister and friends living in France. She studies at Technical University of Budapest at the Faculty of Architecture. Her bilingual trajectory and multilingual experience are discussed in section 'The main findings of the study' in chapter 9 in detail.

5.2.2 Research questions

In my study the following central research questions are addressed:

RQ1 How does Sarah's L2 development manifest itself at four different levels of linguistic analysis: lexicon, morphology, syntax and pragmatics over ten years in her changing context?

RQ2 How does Sarah integrate English into her discourse to convey her meaning?

RQ3 What categories can be identified in Sarah's communicative intentions?

RQ4 How does Sarah's English development shape her identity?

RQ5 What patterns can be identified in Sarah's identity development?

5.2.3 The participant

The case study is restricted to one person, Sarah, who is the researcher's (myself) own child. However, as the focus of the investigation is on child's second language acquisition, a number of other participants, related individuals are also included. They are considered as interlocutors in the child's interpersonal communication. In most cases it is the mother (the researcher) and the child's siblings and peers whose discourse is observed and audiotaped by the researcher.

The study was conducted at the child's home and in other informal settings, in the circle of close friends and family members where the child felt comfortable and had an open rapport with interlocutors. These circumstances provide a naturalistic context, which is a fruitful arena for data collection. I involved informal interactions:

mother-child, adult-child, and peer-peer discourse. The fact that I am the mother of my participant justifies my case selection and sampling procedures.

Cohabitation and joint activities provided an easy and permanent access to child spoken discourse and narratives, which enabled me to do observations longitudinally without the risk of attrition. The case investigated can be considered as an extreme case, which is not suitable and intended for making generalizations or testing a priori hypotheses. Realizing limitations of single cases with my research I intend to reveal a specific case in depth, to analyse and discuss the data with the purpose of exploring the uniqueness of the individual language learner. The significance of the study lies in thick description, detailed analyses, and interpretation of one particular case.

5.2.4 Sarah's personality

As a child Sarah was a short girl with long blonde hair and blue eyes. In her childhood she was reserved and a bit shy. At the same time, at home and among friends and initiated people she felt comfortable, she was talkative and funny. She was a very active, creative, sensible girl with outstanding artistic skills in drawing and music. She was quick on the uptake, so she had no trouble learning new things. She was a bit introverted, liked withdrawing in her room drawing, reading, and playing music; she played the piano for eight years and has been keen on doing sports, especially horse riding since her childhood.

Her kindness, delicacy and charm attracted people's attention. Even though she never wanted to be at the centre, she impressed others with her wits and charming appearance. Until about her age of fourteen, she disliked social gatherings and avoided new social opportunities, in such cases she withdrew and was reluctant to talk. Her too much modesty sometimes undermined her self-esteem regarding her English learning. She often complained that she was too slow to learn a second language and would never reach the kind of bilingualism her role-model bilingual friends, Kasia and Brendy acquired.

As she matured, looking back on that experience, she realized how high other people valued her second language competence, which motivated her to continue using English. She herself reported on several 'rewarding' cases when her L2 use worked for her. Her ability of translanguaging (Bonacina-Pugh et al., 2021) or 'fluid languaging' (Wei & Lin, 2019) was considered as an attractive trait by many, which

made her appear more interesting for others. Now she is grown-up, whose appearance and character have not changed much, she is slim with long blond hair, modest and persistent, who puts a lot of energy in what she does and how she looks and appears. Her excellent academic achievements, her appealing personality and modest behaviour attract people's attention and evoke their appreciation, yet she is satisfied only if she meets her own personal standards.

5.2.5 Data collection instruments and procedures

Data for the research were drawn from multiple sources, they were collected with the help of (1) participant observation and field notes, (2) the participant's own reflections; (3) semi-structured retrospective interviews conducted with the child, and (4) other documents such as the child's writings e.g., personal letters and drawings. The interactions were tape-recorded at home and some other informal settings where Sarah felt comfortable with the presence of her friends and family members. I recorded the interactions on a weekly basis in a ten-year timespan.

The selected discourse extracts are presented as excerpts in my thesis, and they are numbered in an ongoing fashion. I added the child's age after each excerpt in brackets with the first number indicating the year, with the second number indicating the month. For example: (3;6). The analysed excerpts have been extracted and transcribed according to Tannen's and (1984, 1993) and Jefferson's (2004) convention. Providing the transcribed discourse samples and interviews in the appendix of my dissertation is expected to enhance the validity and credibility of the results. All those sources used for data collection contribute to the multiple insights to the analysis.

I started data collection well before I decided to do research into Sarah's second language acquisition without any framework regarding research design and analysis. The main guidance and organizing principle regarding data collection methods were (1) my intuitions, (2) Sarah's willingness for oral production and (3) my alertness to record the data. It happened in the way that when I found Sarah's talks interesting for some reason, I wrote them down in my diary or if it was out of reach, I simply grabbed a piece of paper to take notes. Throughout my data collection and the whole research, I accumulated enormous piles of such notes and scraps of papers with conversations and my comments on them. When Sarah was big enough, six years of age, she herself

started to collect and record her own writings to contribute to my research. She did it for fun, without request, I have never forced her to do anything that was against her will.

Over the years the detailed documentation of Sarah's L2 development and the elaborate account of the dynamic ways she displayed and recognized her language proficiency and linguistic identity have led to my academic excursion into the area of bilingualism. My dataset became not merely a chronicle record of the case, my eagerness to provide fuller understanding of my participant's language acquisition has become a major inspirational force to undertake a longitudinal research study. After investigating several inquiries in contemporary bilingualism and second language research into the organizational function of language alternation I decided to make it the topic of my doctoral dissertation. Researching the indicated topic appeared to be satisfying for me, it fitted best in my professional background and my home and family seemed to provide relevant field for data collection and investigation. More importantly, these circumstances have helped not merely to collect data but also to offer in-depth accounts of the contextualised nature of individual language use.

The fact that I could conduct my research at home and in other informal settings exploring naturally occurring, spontaneous interactions and language-focused activities contributed to ecological validity (Hammond, 1998, Larsen-Freeman, 2018). Doing research with my family's involvement was another inspirational force as I could work without departing from them. My overenthusiasm about the outcome of my research carried me away from finding the focus at the beginning but after getting familiarized with the methodological requirements of qualitative research I successfully adjusted all my research activities to systematic research design, which meant I revisited the existing recordings I had collected until that time to decide about their relevance for my research. From that time in an ongoing fashion, I recorded her talks on a weekly basis to provide enough data for analysis. In the evenings, or whenever there was a free hour at my disposal, I worked with my data more elaborately, read my notes repeatedly and tried to find patterns in them. The data I selected for my analysis later were transcribed for my dissertation. The time of the decision of utilizing my data in the framework of a well-structured analysis coincided with Sarah's age of four.

I must note that data collection was not continuous, there were interruptions in it. The amount of my professional duties, household and motherly responsibilities greatly influenced my commitment to research, the pace and quality of scientific data collection and analysis. There were times when my research was pushed to the background. It also happened that I was so uncertain about the relevance of my research that I almost gave it up for good. It took me a time to regain motivation and enthusiasm. There were unproductive periods when I could not pay enough attention to scientific research, either because of my heavy workload, or I was simply unsure whether it was worth doing it. I constantly read the literature in the light of which I reflected on my previous job and progress. I rethought, re-evaluated, and revised my findings and judgements from time to time. During revisions I realized what used to seem relevant became less relevant in the light of recent research findings. Even so, for the simple reason that the research was conducted over a long period of time, certain parts of my discussion became outdated. The new trends that I familiarized myself with affected my views, as a result of which I rewrote and restructured certain parts of my thesis. The time spent on keeping the thesis updated for the reasons mentioned above significantly delayed the completion of my study.

5.2.6 The dataset

As I intended to present an interpretive analysis of my participant's language use in naturalistic settings, my research lacks the application of quantitative methods and the usage of corpus. In both data management and analysis, I used purely qualitative approaches. and analysed my data with the help of qualitative methods. The term dataset (Creswell, 2003; Duff, 2012) instead of corpus is more appropriate to refer to the source material I used for linguistic analysis in my dissertation. Instead of compiling a machine-readable corpus I used illustrative quotations and excerpts to make major emergent themes, patters, and developmental stages obvious. The analysed material is made up of the written and audiotaped versions of isolated speech events recorded at different periods of time.

I am aware of the fact that as opposed to quantitative research my case fails to provide unbiased interpretations and findings for the simple reason that I did not use measurements and my findings were influenced by my intuitions following the 'empirical linguists' example. The fact that at the outset I did not apply any scientific

methodological guidelines impeded statistical-numerical calculations. For about four years of data collection, I recorded only those data that seemed interesting to me for some reasons and during that time (1) not all data were carefully transcribed word for word, (2) the full context in which data were collected sometimes remained undocumented, and (3) both data collection and analysis were inevitably influenced by my own personal position and interpretation.

After this initial period, when Sarah was about four years old, I decided to use my data for scientific research. To meet the credibility requirements, I validated my data by employing multiple data collection instruments and processes: free/participant observation, on-field, off-field notes, semi-structured retrospective interviews, Sarah's elicited comments. By being able to view the phenomenon under study I gained an emic perspective. This emic view enabled me to explore and explain the nuances of Sarah's dual language acquisition. It also gave me a better understanding of most of what I experienced, as well as motivated me and Sarah to participate. I looked for evidence and justification regarding the data sources by using other people's perspective and I asked for their opinion. Despite the limited research techniques of qualitative studies (Creswell, 2003, p. 195) I carefully observed validation, accuracy, and credibility of the findings (Chaudron, 2000; Creswell, 2003, Duff, 2007) throughout the whole process of research. To meet the requirements of scientific research I implemented several strategies available for the qualitative researcher. I checked the accuracy of the findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) using triangulation, member-checking, using thick or rich description of the case, providing self-reflection, presenting negative information, spending prolonged time in the field, using peer-debriefing, and using external auditors (Creswell, 2003 p. 196).

I achieved reliability by looking for consistent patterns of themes and by investigating researchers' works. To fulfil the methodological criterion of validity I checked whether my findings are accurate from the researcher's, the participant's, and the reader's perspective (Creswell, 2003, p. 181). I applied multiple data collection instruments and used different data sources as mentioned earlier in the present section. I carried out prolonged engagement and persistent observations, used field notes, audiotaped interactions, and relied on the retrospective interviews to provide interpretations of different perspectives. I frequently consulted with friends

raising their children in multilingual communities and investigated scientific approaches to case studies. During the process of collecting data and drafting my thesis as well as after its completion I consulted with my thesis advisor, my colleagues and fellow researchers with relevant professional background, asked them to act as external auditors and reviewers and inquired about their critical remarks and commentary. Due to their invaluable help and contribution, I had the opportunity to revisit my considerations and interpretations, they stimulated me to rethink and review my knowledge statements.

The feedback I received from them highlighted the importance of taking the reader's perspective throughout the whole research work and encouraged me to regard clarity and simplicity as two fundamental guiding principles in writing up my thesis. Relevant scientific ethnographic research was also inspiring as they justified my research by claiming that qualitative research invaluably contributes to the growth of our pool of knowledge and significantly complements quantitative research. It was motivating that several researchers conducting qualitative research (Chaudron, 2000; Creswell, 2003; Duff, 2012; Lazaraton, 2002; Schiffrin, 1994; Young, 2002) expressed their strong conviction that for holistic explanations of socially constructed meanings and behaviours the transcribed and coded interactional data are just one, and not necessarily the most important source of information in documentation.

Generalizability that can hardly be fulfilled in single-case studies was not aimed for. I simply observed my participant's real-life language use through an interpretive lens, attempted to illuminate why and how things happen, tried to discriminate patterns, types, categories, and developmental stages among triangulated sources and did not want to seek how often things happen. My interpretive research was aimed to (1) uncover recurring patterns in the way my participant uses her two languages naturally, and (2) categorize my data accordingly. Quantification of types within categories and computer-based analysis of linguistic phenomena are not the aim of the present study but it could be worthwhile and desirable in subsequent research.

5.2.7 Transcribing the data

All data selected for scientific analysis were transcribed for ethical and practical purposes: (1) to eliminate over subjectivity and the researcher paradox (2) to facilitate triangulation, (3) to obtain a machine-readable written format, which in

successive research would be favourable for a computer-assisted data analysis at a later stage.

The meticulous procedure of transcribing all the data was worth doing, on the one hand, it reveals the complex nature of ethnographic texts, on the other hand, it contributed to having initial insights into salient themes and recurring patterns. The interview transcripts also outlined the path for the first steps and facilitated thematic and lexically oriented data analysis. To give an insight into the multi-level coding of the data, in appendices B, D, F G I included my initial comments and interpretations and linked them to the relevant turns and passage parts as well (Gallucci, 2011, p. 98). While transcribing the data I adopted a combination of Tannen's (1993) and Jefferson's (2004) transcription conventions. Some additional or different transcription notations that I find useful have been added to the list and indicated as my own markings. The applied transcription conventions are shown in Appendix A.

5.2.8 The time frame of the research

Data for the research covered over ten years, from Sarah's ages of eight months to age eleven. During that time the child's discourse (child-mother, child-father, child-child or peer-peer interactions) was observed and tape-recorded in natural settings to provide a sufficient amount of data for analysing her communication and the function of language choice. Also, I accumulated a great amount of data from my on-site and off-site notes. I give a detailed description of data collection and management in the section 'Dataset'. Parallel with participant observation I conducted semi-structured and retrospective interviews to elicit Sarah's views, to initiate discourse with her, to scaffold and promote interactions in the hope of obtaining information and further data for my study. The interviews enabled me to direct the locus of Sarah's attention to a particular theme and to obtain her personal experience so as to explore more about her subjective interpretations of own self-concept and her perceived development in L2. The multiple data collection instruments revealed her attitude to L2 and contributed to better understanding of identity transformations the individual language learner undergoes during the learning process. Adding her interpretations to those of mine provided triangulation and has made the findings more valid. The whole study comprises observation, data collection, data analysis, and discussion, which covered a period of ten years from her age of one to eleven. The main foci of

my analysis are shown in Table 5 below indicating the child's age from which the data were taken.

5.3 Conclusion

Chapter 5 provided a general overview of the research I conducted with the aim of understanding my participant's second language acquisition as well as the emergence of the second language in her discourse and identity. I presented the purpose of the research and identified the research questions. I listed the data collection procedures and described the setting followed by the methods of analysis employed in addition to the ethical considerations. I reflected on the limitations of my research and gave an account of the multiple roles, concerns, and biases I had as a researcher to ensure the quality requirements of qualitative research. The last section was a description of the transcription convention I drew on in transcribing the analysed discourses in the empirical part.

Table 5 – The scope of investigation into Sarah's utterances, interpersonal interactions and comments presented in the empirical part of the thesis

Chapter	Focus of analysis	The phenomena addressed and investigated	Sarah's age when data were collected
Chapter 6	Sarah's utterances and interactions to depict her L2 development at different levels of language analysis (Lexicon, morphology, syntax)	• Lexicon: speech-like vocalizations, early words, holophrases, literal translations, false cognates	From eight to 18 months
		• Morphology. past tense, the morpheme-based approach	From two to eleven years
		• Syntax: formation of questions and negation	
Chapter 7	Sarah's communicative intentions conveyed	• Accommodating to the established language separation rules	Between ages of three and
		• Expressing emotional attachment	

	through L2-L1, L1-L2 code-switches and language alternation	• Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use • Topic abandonment and tricking • Easing tension and injecting humour	eleven years
Chapter 8	Manifestations of Sarah's identity transformations in her developing bilingualism	• Group affiliation and allegiance • Handling negative feedback and peer criticism and asking for justification and reinforcement • Reference to other language learners' experiences • Defining group boundaries and Preserving alliance and privacy • Getting authority via L2 • Finding ways to enhance learning strategies	Between the ages of three and eleven years

Chapter 6 – Sarah's L2 language development

6.1 Introduction

In this section I present the findings of my empirical research I conducted into my participant's English development with the aim of exploring the role of and reasons for L2 use and preference in conveying the communicative intent. I present the findings along the line of five research questions in the next three chapters divided into several sub-sections to give a detailed discussion of the main themes and categories that emerged and were identified during data analysis.

In the previous theoretical part of my thesis, I reviewed the literature, presented definitions and taxonomies to background what I am going to analyse in my dataset. The present part familiarizes the reader with the empirical results of my research. In the following three chapters, 6 to 8, I analyse excerpts to give an insight into Sarah's L2 development from her age of eight months to eleven years. I base my conclusions on the data I gathered with the help of on-field and off-field notes as an insider participant and from the semi-structured retrospective interviews I conducted with Sarah. I am aware of the limitations of retrospection, as it can be inaccurate because of the time interval between the actual speech performance and reporting on the speech event (Cook, 2008; Mackey & Gass, 2016). Yet, I attribute high significance to analysing data retrospectively enabling me to capture important details that might

have remained hidden or unnoticed at first sight, as well as it provided an opportunity to revisit earlier ideas and interpretations.

Details on data gathering and my perception of the methodological limitations of the present research have been discussed in chapter 5 in section 5.1 titled 'The methodological background to the case study'. Underlying cognitive processes like strategies and metacognitive awareness are discussed in detail in separate sections in the theoretical part of my thesis in chapter 4 titled 'Bilingualism and cognition'. I raise the reader's attention to the fact, that I do not go deep into the discussion of the cognitive mechanism of language processing, and I deal with these aspects of language acquisition only to the extent that is important for analysing and interpreting the excerpts in chapters 6-8.

My aim is to get a comprehensive picture of Sarah's reliance on English in her communication. First, in chapter 6 I analyse Sarah's interlanguage development through a number of examples to see how and why L2 appears in her talk and what levels of language are affected. Second, in chapter 7 I investigate Sarah's communicative intentions mediated by both L1-L2 and L2-L1 code-switching to explore the role of translanguaging. Third, in chapter 8, I present data to reveal Sarah's identity transformations in the dual language acquisition process and draw examples on how she perceives her self at different points of her developing bilingualism. These three foci are discussed in three separate chapters.

6.2 The aim

In the empirical part of my thesis, I am concerned with Sarah's bilingual development: I analyse how she uses her two languages focusing on the relationship between her two languages and her overall bilingual proficiency. I investigate how she relies on code-switching and language alternation as a coping communication strategy to raise the effectiveness of her communication (Greggio & Gil, 2007; Medved Krajnovič, 2005). In my inquiry I did not investigate my participant's L1 development because I did not apply systematic data collection about it. I kept a diary and jotted down her L1 utterances. I used these records as a reference point and a basis for comparison to explore her L2 development. The analysis of her L1 development goes beyond the scope of my thesis. My aim is to give insights in her

L2 progress, as indicated in the title of the thesis, for the simple reason that space limitations preclude an in-depth analysis of her development in both of her languages.

Yet, in studying my participant's second language development, the acquisition of L1 was always considered, as there was powerful crosslinguistic influence. I assume that investigating her motives of bidirectional code-switches give a better understanding of her proficiency level and developmental stages in regard with the L2. In my attempt to reveal patterns in her bidirectional (L1-L2, L2-L1) code-switches I included several L1 utterances and references to L1 in the selected excerpts of talk. The massive and continuous reliance on L1 is further justified by the fact that a significant part of the semi-structured retrospective interviews was conducted in L1. During the semi-structured retrospective interviews, I generally asked five questions to elicit Sarah's perceptions and explanations of the discourses, field notes and her letters I had collected. The interviews disclosed her thoughts and feelings about a particular topic or situation and facilitated coding and analyses of the data. Some of the questions were predetermined, some others were not planned, they emerged spontaneously during the interview. It happened that the number of questions changed, e.g., not all of them were used every time. The predetermined questions I used were as follows: What do you think about this talk/writing? Why did you discuss this? Why did you switch to English? Why did you speak Hungarian/English? Why didn't you speak Hungarian/English? The data drawn from the retrospective interviews were used in my interpretations of the excepts presented in the dissertation.

I expected that talking about feelings and reporting on subjective interpretations of learning and language use was easier in Hungarian, in her native language. As most of her personal accounts have been documented in Hungarian, I present them in Hungarian to fulfil the validity requirements of qualitative research. English translation has been added for those who might not know Hungarian. When analysing code-switches in a particular speech event in this chapter I do not give detailed descriptions of the wide range of learning and communication strategies. Taxonomies and conceptualizations of different types of learning and communication strategies are discussed in section 4.1, 'Learning and communication strategies'.

I reveal the moments and motives of my participant's language choice to give a systematic account of where and how language alternation occurs. Free private conversations seem to be a reliable source to collect my primary data and discourse analysis is a viable method to interpret my dataset. This methodological approach facilitates easier capturing for direct inspection than for explaining underlying cognitive processes. Nevertheless, detailed discussions of psychological and psycholinguistic aspects of language use are beyond my reach. On the one hand, space limitations do not allow for research of the field, on the other hand, it would require deeper professional background and competence than I currently possess, and it is not the aim of the present study.

6.3 The principle underlying raising a bilingual child

Up to present we, the parents have used Hungarian and English alternately with Sarah. The original idea was that right after her birth in 1999 we would try to obey a predefined family rule for language separation where Hungarian and English are used alternately maintaining the 'one person one language' (OPOL) (Ronjat, 1913) principle. According to this system our original plan was that I would speak English to Sarah most of the time, while the other members of the family would use Hungarian. However, within a couple of weeks after Sarah's birth I realized that it was not viable.

It was implausible for me to speak English all the time and, I was unable to convey subtleties of meanings in a language which is not my mother language. Also, we realized that as we are Hungarians and in most of the time we live in a monolingual Hungarian language community, our social environment would not fulfil the credibility conditions of balanced bilingualism. Our doubts have been verified: the use of Hungarian exceeds English up to the present, talks in Hungarian significantly outnumber our English-speaking sessions. Ultimately, I had to reconsider our language use pattern and our rule for language separation and finally embarked on a more permissive language use system: we facilitated Sarah's exposure to English by allocating a certain period of time (two hours minimum) daily, following the One-Time- Of - Day One Language (OTOL) principle. It means we decided to establish our own locally patterned cultural, social, and linguistic milieu for Sarah. These child-directed English-speaking periods included free-time activities: mealtimes,

play times, bedtimes in informal settings when we were undisturbed and had time for relaxing joint activities and loose conversations in English. In the circle of our foreign friends, both native and non-native speakers of English, of course, we used English as a common language but even so there has been significant asymmetry between the exposure to English and Hungarian ever since.

Until Sarah's age of three it was quite easy to observe our locally established family rules in terms of language use and separation. I managed to follow our daily schedule and provided a realistic dual language environment because I was at home with Sarah on maternity leave. Due to extensive child-directed speech exposure in English during her first three years Sarah showed a development cascade regarding L2. Later, as my employment commenced, the time we spent together was reduced significantly to four-five hours daily, and during this short time Hungarian was more often used at the expense of English. Also, the amount of English varied depending on my emotional stance and responsibilities: when I was in a low mood and felt under pressure because of housework I tended to use Hungarian as it was faster, easier, and more effective than English. Thus, Sarah had less opportunity to develop in this language, and consequently her L2 development slowed down at her age of four. I define her an unbalanced bilingual as there is significant asymmetry between her two languages.

By her age of three she was fluent in Hungarian and although she had developed a high level of listening comprehension in English, she exhibited limited proficiency in production in English. By her age of seven she felt at ease in using L2 for the communicative function in context-embedded interactions but underperformed in academic functioning where she was expected to follow and understand context-free curricular contents.

6.4 Sarah's L2 development in three domains of L2 – Lexicon, morphology and syntax

6.4.1 Introduction

In chapter 6 I present how Sarah integrates L2 in her linguistic repertoire and how it manifests itself at four different domains of language: lexicon, morphology and syntax. I note that the phonetic-phonological analysis of my participant's L2

development is missing form the present thesis as I do not possess enough data to present her production at this level. Pragmatic analysis goes beyond the present chapter, chapters 7 and 8 are designed to reveal my participant's pragmatic development focusing on the sociocultural-interactional aspect of pragmatics. It must be noted here that all the indicated levels of language are analysed from the social-functional perspective. This approach enables me to make valid interpretations of free talk conducted in two languages.

My aim is to show (1) how Sarah deploys her developing bilingual skills to enhance the effectiveness of her communication and (2) how language switch (Tarone, 1977) adds to the stylistic effectiveness of talk (Greggio & Gil, 2007; Medved Krajnovič, 2005). A sample set of erroneous and errorfree utterances, discourse samples and language-related episodes give evidence that her second language enriches her linguistic resources. I attempt to present that language alternation is utilized as a coping or achievement strategy (Celce-Murcia et all, 1995; Canale & Swain, 1980) in communication challenges and identify moments when Sarah draws on translanguaging in organizing her talk (Gafaranga, 2012, p. 503). I also look for underpinning evidence that code-switching is a complex but normal developmental feature of strategic bilingual behaviour in communicative contexts (Bonacina Pugh et al., 2021; Genesee, 1989; Gumperz, 1982).

6.4.2 Lexicon – Sarah's early L2 development

In this section I investigate Sarah's corresponding meanings to forms in the process of acquiring new words in both Hungarian and English between the ages of eight months and five years. In my functional analysis my primary goal is to know more about the role of her lexical choice (1) in mediating her own and (2) in interpreting the interlocutor's intention in a particular context in bilingual conversations.

I first present my participant's lexical development in the holophrastic stage of language acquistion (Clark, 2003, p. 16, see section 2.2.2, The natural order of language acquisition). This is the age of 8-18 months, the one and two-word sentence period. In this period of language acquisition until approximately the age of 18 months Sarah acquired a fairly limited vocabulary of some 50 English words. (A summary of Sarah's first 50 words according to the order of acquisition in L2 is presented in Table 6). In terms of lexical development, I have found that until the age

of four Sarah's L2 vocabulary was restricted by her developing communicative competence in both of her languages. The function of mixing is compensation, she frequently operates the 'fill the gap' strategy (Tarone, 1977, see section 4.3, The sociolinguistic – inductive approach), which means she alternately uses her languages to compensate the lack of a single word or a grammatical structure in either of her languages. The fact that she can compensate her low-level proficiency by using both L1 and L2 as complementary sets of linguistic tools gives evidence that she could turn bilingualism to her own favour and using her languages alternately helped her express herself more appropriately.

The two main organizing principles in her language choice are simplicity of form (Clark, 2003, p.284, see section 2.2.3, Children's strategies to cope with linguistic challenges) and the degree of exposure to a particular language (Clark, 2003, p. 196). Thus, she used the language that was more easily accessible for her. It must be noted here that in my interpretations at this early stage of interlanguage I rely on contextual aid and my participant's nonverbal communication, prosodic cues, such as body positioning, gestural performance and suprasegmental elements, the participants' emotional charge, without them it would be difficult to specify meanings.

In the indicated period Sarah's language use betrays that her code-switches and resorts to either of her languages are manifestations of both compensatory and achievement strategies (Canale & Swain, 1980, see section 3.6 Communicative competence) and used to counterbalance low level of language proficiency to get the intended meaning across. Attention must be drawn to the fact that from the holophrastic period up to approximately her age of four, due to the child's poor lexicon and articulation difficulties, it is almost impossible to say whether appeals to L1 or L2 function as substitutions of missing elements or are used intentionally as a strategic tool to convey meaning and enhance communication (see Excerpts 1–5).

6.4.3 Early words – The holophrastic period

The dataset I collected from Sarah's early language development underpins that English appears at a very early age, in the period of bubbling. Some English sounds and sequences were recognizable in her early vocalizations at eight months of age; however, this period is not discussed in my dissertation. I give only a brief overview of how her prelexical vocalizations resemble L2 and are developmental precursors

of her first L2 words at the end of the first year of her life. The focus is on her more speech-like production, on the holophrastic period, between eight and 18 months of age. Her utterances taken from the holophrastic period reveal that the main reason for choosing an L2 element is that it is less challenging than the L1 counterpart. I draw the reader's attention to the fact that at the level of phonetics-phonology I have not documented sufficient number of examples in her talk, for this reason I do not devote a separate chapter to analyse her L2 development at that level.

Sarah began to babble between her ages of six and eight months. The earliest babbling was duplicated and repeated consonant-vowel (CV) combinations, where the syllable consisted of a consonant-like sound (here 'k', 'm', 'dj' and 'b') combined with a vowel-like sound, some kind of 'ʌ', 'ɒ', 'e' and 'æ' (Clark, 2003, p.103). For example, [k^hʌk^hʌ] (coffee), {meme} (mummy), [djɒdjɒ](Dodó), [bæbæ](big) and [beibei] (flower). At her age of eight months these consonant-vowel (CV) combinations were reduplicated and replaced with their single syllable versions, for example, [k^hʌ] (coffee), [me] (mummy), [djɒ](Dodó), [bæ](big) and [bei] (flower). Sarah displayed a preference for the above-mentioned consonants over the others and favoured mainly the [k^h] sound. My data underpin researchers' (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003; Slobin, 1873) findings suggesting that babbles are combinations of short and long sequences of consonant-vowel (CV) combinations that are duplicated or repeated between six and eight months. My data are also in line with Vihman's (1982) assumptions who suggests that by ten to twelve months of age most babble sequences sound compatible with the surrounding languages and are similar in rhythm and intonation to the language children hear in their immediate environment. The fact that Sarah's production shows strong similarities between the phonetic sequences in babbles and early words supports for the continuity theory (Macnamara, 1982; Pinker, 1984, see section 2.2.1, Language acquisition theories) over discontinuity as indicated in chapter 2,' Language acquisition theories'. However, it is hard to draw a clear line between her babbling and her first productions of word.

Although my data do not provide persuasive evidence for the continuity view (Clark, 2003, p. 104), some of Sarah's early productions infer that her early vocalizations have direct connection with her early words and her language behaviour reflects language use patterns around her. My observations underpin that she had a keen ear

for regularity (see section 2.2.2, Children's strategies to cope with linguistic challenges), for example, her early vocalizations with an initial [kʰ] may have had their origin in my routine of drinking coffee near her cot. The fact that it was a recurring activity, accompanied every time with the sentence 'Mummy is drinking coffee' infers that the word 'coffee' where aspiration occurs on the voiceless stop 'k' was the model of her frequently used [kʰ] and that of the sequences like [kʰʌ], [kʰe]. Due to her restricted articulation between her ages of two and three some of Sarah's early word uses departed from adult use in striking manners both in Hungarian and English. At that age I observed occasions when she overextended and underextended (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) her words and used her own versions for things that did not coincide with the adult language use (Clark, 2003, p. 89). [kʰʌ] the representative of the word 'coffee' at the age of 1;7 is an example of overextension, an umbrella term to signal the act of (1) drinking, (2) request of drinking and later at the age of 1;9 further extended to express (3) fascination and satisfaction. Sarah used the same word in referential and regulatory-instrumental functions alike (Slobin, 1973; Dore, 1975; Clark, 2003; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991) (see section 2.2.2, The natural order of language acquisition). The word [kʰʌ] was not only the referent of objects and notions but also functioned as a speech act (see for example Excerpt 2 and section 2.1.6, The speech act theory).

The documented data show that Sarah's L2 production was dominated by some 50 words as shown below between her ages of seven and 18 months.

Table 6 – Sarah's first 50 words in the order of acquisition

1.[kʰʌ]- tea, diaper, request, satisfaction	2.[dɛk] [pei]-plain, birds, all flying objects	3.[pe], [pɒ], [poi]-boy,
4.[pʌ]-apa, kapa (hoe), lamp, pyjama,	5.[kaʊ]-clown	6.[ʌp]-up and down
7.[pɪ]- pig	8.[gɪg]- big	9.[t(h)e]-please and thank you
10.[ɒdj]-doll	11.['khɒkhɒ]-knock-knock, cough,	12.[kəs]- horse
13.[bʌ]-bread	14.[tjeɪ]-shoes, chair	15.[pæ]- cap

16.[bæ] all animals, later only Bonci, her cat,	17.['keke]-cat, stroke, hand.	18.[jəjd]- word, [jɒ]-won
19.[bju:]-umbrella	20.[tji]-kitchen	22.['hoko], ['tʌtɒ]-hot
23.[djʊ'ti:]-you see, as both warning and reward, later only as warning	24.[tΛ]-touch	25.[ə:j]-hair,
26.[kʌ]-clock, coffee, 'I want to drink', 'I want it' (request, satisfaction)	27.[bɒ]-bottle,	28.[ne], {nanj}-Nani (her sister), no, mustn't
29.[ke]-cat	30.['kɒkɒ]-chocolate	31.[kə]-cottage cheese
32.[kəm]-give me	33.[bʊ]-book	34. [p^{h}em] - lamp
35.['meme]-mummy	23.[bə:] -bird	37.[bei]-expressing admiration over something nice and beautiful, beautiful,
38.[mu:] -moon	39.[mo:]-more, further	40.[bə], [bei]- ball, flower
41.[ne]-cold, gaining attention, warning	42.['djΛdjΛ]-Dodó (her sister)	43.[ti:]-key
44.[pu:]-shampoo	45.[tjΛ] – children	46.['tetje]-trousers
47.[pe]- pencil case	48.[ka:]- car, cry	49.[kɒ]-socks
50.[jeɪt] - wait		

Data taken between age 0;9 and 1;4 show that she differentiates meanings by uttering the same word with different intonation: affirmative, interrogative, and imperative. Her choice between the suprasegmental elements depends on which one satisfies her communicative intention better. Below I present examples of this phenomenon.

Excerpt 1

1 Sarah: ['beibei'ʌp]. ((Points up to a bunch of flowers, which was hanging from the barrier of the gallery over the sitting room where I was playing with her.))

2 Mother: Yes, Dodó put her beautiful flowers there.
3 Sarah: [ʌp]? ((Stretches her both arms out and turns her head upwards signalling her intention to be picked up and taken upstairs.))
4 Mother: Do you want to go upstairs?
5 Sarah: [ʌp]? (Springs gently on her legs to push me to pick her up and go upstairs)
6 Mother: Good, we'll go. ((I start to go up the stairs with Sarah in my arms.)) Now we are here. ((reaching the top)) Where are we now?
7 Sarah: [ʌp.]
8 Are you happy that mummy brought you up to see the beautiful flowers?
9 [k^hʌ]. (0:11)

The discourse in excerpt 1 was recorded at her age of 0;11. Toddling about in the living room looking for her bunny that I hid behind the cushion on the sofa, Sarah suddenly stopped, stretching her arm upwards and persistently pointed to the ceiling while uttering ['beibei'ʌp] repetitively in line 1 with falling intonation. The affirmative [ʌp] in lines 1 and 7 is considered as a referent to satisfy the referential function and is meant to convey the meaning:'Dodó's bunch of flowers is upstairs' (line 1) and 'We are upstairs.' (line 7). At the same time, the interrogative [ʌp] with rising intonation in lines 3 and 5 complete with her body positioning, one arm pointing upwards, with the other reaching for my hand adds an instrumental-regulatory function to her utterance conveying a request to imply: 'Mummy, take me upstairs.' Whereas the use of [k^hʌ] in line 9 in affirmative serving an instrumental-regulatory function is meant to express her satisfaction over my fulfilling her request.

Excerpt 2 below is an example of Sarah's using the same sequence of sounds to refer to two different things.

Excerpt 2

1 Mother: What's Sarah going to do now? ((I was holding her drinking bottle with tea in it in my hand))
2 Sarah: [k^hʌ] ((meaning 'tea' and 'the act of drinking))
3 Mother: What is in Sarah's hand? ((I gently dragged her favourite diaper she was squeezing in her hand.))
4 Sarah: [k^hʌ] ((meaning 'pelenka' [diaper]))

5 Mother: Yes, I know, it is your diaper. I don't want to take it from you, it's yours. (0;9)

Sarah's utterance in lines 2 and 4 give evidence that she utters the sequence [$k^h\Lambda$] as a referent to signify two different things (1) tea and (2) her diaper, her safety blanket used to comfort and pacify herself when she was sleepy or tired and left alone in her room at bedtime. It is even more interesting that [$k^h\Lambda$] as the signifier of `tea`(tea) shows resemblance with none of the Hungarian and English referents 'tea' ('tea') 'innivaló' ('drink'),'iszik' ('drinks') 'szomjas' ('thirsty'), 'cumisüveg'('bottle'). It can be assumed that [$k^h\Lambda$] is the representative of the Hungarian word 'pelenka'. Yet, the assumption that [$k^h\Lambda$] is the representative of the last syllable of the word 'pelenka'can be excluded as we never used 'pelenka' ('diaper'), we with no exception used 'diaper' to refer to her favourite safety blanket. It must be noted that [$k^h\Lambda$] produced with a little puff of air as [k] is released is how English native speakers produce the sound, which makes me assume that [$k^h\Lambda$] is derived from the word 'coffee', as explained earlier. Sarah heard the word 'coffee' so many times that it was easy to remember for her.

Later at the age of 1;3 she identified 'coffee' with any liquid and with the act of drinking. The fact that she uttered only the first syllable is a normal phenomenon at this stage of her language development (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003). The reason why she used [$k^h\Lambda$] also for 'diaper', her favourite piece of cloth she used to scratch as part of her sleeping ritual, might be explained with the phenomenon of overextension but can also be considered as an invention of her own, a neologism (Crystal, 1997), which is also typical of the indicated stage of child language development. My observations of her systematic use of the same utterance underpin that the meaning of [$k^h\Lambda$] was further extended to signal affect. Sarah associated this word with pleasant experiences and used it to signify everything she associated with positive emotional stance. Thus, the same utterance is operated in the referential and the instrumental-regulatory functions. Later in chapter 7 I add further examples to give a clearer picture of the affective function of code-switching in her language use.

Analysing the above-described utterances in the holophrastic period two things are apparent: (1) the one and two-word utterances lack well-formedness or grammatical correctness and (2) they function as sentences giving evidence of Sarah's ability to

perform speech acts (see sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7) i.e., achieve interpersonal activities and social actions linguistically.

After the holophrastic period, referred to as the age between 10 and 18 months in the literature (Crystal, 1997) she made great progress in the number of sounds and words produced. As it is seen in Table 6, after favouring mainly [k^h], [k], [m], [n], [p], [b], sounds she started to use sounds like [dj], [tj], [h] and [s]. Sound [ʃ] was pronounced imperfectly and replaced by [t] and [s] until her age of 3;6. First, until 2;3 she pronounced it as [t] as in [tʌ], ['tʌjə] (Sarah), then until 2;9 the sound [t] was replaced with [s] as in [saiə] for 'Sarah'. The sounds 'l', 'r', 'v' and 'w' were uniquely pronounced [j] until her age of 3;2, for example, [jeit] to mean (late) and (wait), whereas ['jeji], ['jo:j] were used to mean 'very' and 'your'. A Hungarian example of the same phenomenon is ['mʌmɪjɑj] to mean 'mamival' (`with mummy`). Apart from these exceptions after her age of 3;2 Sarah could pronounce all sounds in perfect compliance with the conventional adult word use.

I observed recurring gesture-vocalization combinations or umbrella reactions in Sarah's lexicon, for example, until the age of 2;3 she used [tʌ] and ['tʌjə] (Sarah). [tʌ] and ['tʌjə] accompanied with repetitively pointing to her own chest with her index finger manifested an expressive way of winning attention for herself from the interlocutors (Slobin, 1973). It was replaced by [saiə] at her age of 2;9. The initial [tʌ] also exemplifies overextension as until her age of 2;3 she referred to all children with the same sequence of sounds. Later, at the age of 2;3 by adding the early word [tjɒ] for 'child' or 'children' she used a more appropriate referent and narrowed down the domain of [tʌ] to only herself. Other examples of narrowing down domains by finding more appropriate words are as follows: the initial referents of her early word [bæ], originated form the word 'Bonci', her cat was used to refer to all four-legged animals, which was later restricted to signify only her cat at her age of 2;9. She found more appropriate words for other animals, for example [bə] for bird, [dɒ] for dog and [kəs] for horse.

Until the age of 2;8 she used [ne] meaning 'no' while continuously shaking her head to signal dislike, and dissatisfaction (Slobin, 1973). At her age of 2;9 she replaced both [tʌ] intended to mean 'Sarah' and [ne] intended to mean 'no' with conventional and recognizable words in her communication as: [saiə] (Sarah) and [nəʊ] (no). The

utterance [djʊˈti:] (2;1) was also used as an umbrella reaction to represent ’You see’ to mark something illicit, dangerous, or mischievous and a sign of reward too. Later, at the age of 2;6 she used [djʊˈti:] only for warning and precaution. As a sign of reward at the same age she started to use [dʌ], showing more resemblance with the word ’done’ or ’well done’. I insert stretches of interactions from this stage to show how these items were produced in response to my utterance.

Excerpt 3

1 Mother: So, you hit your knee again. ((I picked her up as she was crying after falling off the stairs.)) You know, you mustn’t do this, it’s dangerous.
2 Mother: You are too young to do it, ask mummy and she’ll help you.
3 Sarah: **[djʊˈtɪ:]**↓ ((Intensively shakes her head admitting her disobedience.))
4 Mother: Sarah is a clever girl!
5 Sarah: **[kʌʔ!]**↑ ((In a celebratory manner)) (2;1)

The conversation above describes a case of Sarah’s apology for her disobedient behaviour. Lines 1-2 infer that (i) climbing the stairs is somewhat illicit for Sarah and (ii) also she was not allowed to do it alone. Line 3 betrays that in this situation the utterance [djʊˈti:] (you see) was intended to show regret and functioned as apology to conciliate the mother. It can also be referred to as an act of revoicing, her gestures, body posture, facial expressions gave evidence of her imitating me.

The conversation in excerpt 4 took place when one afternoon Sarah took my hand and led me to her room to see a construction she built from Lego blocks, the conversation in excerpt 5 happened while she was washing her dirty hands in the bathroom.

Excerpt 4

1. Mother: What a nice castle!
2. Mother: Was that you, Sarah?
3. Sarah: **[djʊtɪ:]? [**You see?]
4. Mother: Yes, you are really clever. (2;1)

Excerpt 5

1 Mother: Here is the soap, wash your hands. ((Starts to wash her hands rubbing the soap between her palms and looks up victoriously signalling that she expects acknowledgement.))
2 Sarah: [djʊti:]. [Well-done] ((Stretches her hands towards me to show how clean they are.)) (2;6)

In both situations her utterances in lines 3 (excerpt 4) and 2 (excerpt 5) were to mean that she prided herself over her performance. As opposed to excerpt 3, where [djʊ'ti:] was used to express apology, in excerpts 4 and 5 it was the manifestation of pride, self-fulfilment, a request for acknowledgement. It must be noted that in my interpretations I extensively drew on Sarah's referential and representational gestures alongside her vocalizations and early word uses because they provided valuable additional information to discern her intended meaning. The communicative events were interactionally successful because we had a shared sense of discourse behaviour.

The excerpts above underpin that although Sarah made serious efforts to imitate the words she heard, she failed to produce them due to her limited articulation ability, at least until her age of 3;6 as indicated in the previous section. It also turned out that overextension and referential gestures proved to be effective ways of stretching her limited linguistic resources. As she progressed in producing sounds in both of her languages her words showed more resemblance to the conventionally used ones and as early as her age of 2;5 all her sounds were recognizable and compatible with conventional uses both in Hungarian and English. Nevertheless, due to her bilingual socialization she displayed small deviations from her monolingual peers' lexical development. The following section is to illuminate patterns of language alternation as a strategic linguistic tool to extend her insufficient lexicon and communicative competence between her ages of three and five.

6.4.4 Sarah's lexical development between ages of three and five

The examples below show how Sarah's two languages interacted between the ages of three and five. The presented stretches of discourse below illuminate how Sarah utilizes literal translation as a type of communication strategy to compensate a missing lexical element in L1 (Tarone, 1988, see Section 4.3, Tarone's Taxonomy of Communication Strategies).

Excerpt 6

1 Sarah: De szép napvirág van a kertedbe! (What beautiful sunflowers you have in your garden.)
2 Mother: It is **N A P R A F O R G Ó** (sunflower) in Hungarian.
3 Sarah: <u>But sunflower **napvirág**</u>! …**Yes, mummy?!** (hh) ((Stresses each item of the English compound word to signal that 'napvirág' is the correct translation of sunflower.))
4 Mother: Yes, it is, but the Hungarian napraforgó is **not** from **sunflower**.
5 Sarah: Jó, akkor napraforgó. [Ok then sunflower]. (3;7)

One summer afternoon while working together in the garden Sarah expressed her fascination with the sunflower blossoming in our back garden as in line 1. The word repair performed by me in line 2 seems to turn the conversation to a linguistic trouble source for Sarah. Her reaction in line 3 implies that the inappropriateness of the word for word translation (line 4) surprises her, but it does not seem to cause big trouble, which she reinforces with giving her approval of my explanation in line 5.

The utterances below exemplify further instances of literal translation.

Excerpt 7

1 > Húzd le a ledőnyt, mer **beleesik** a nap a szemembe?!<… [Let the blinds down because the sun falls into my eyes.] […]
2 […] Így nem tudom fölcsinálni a gombomat! [This way I can't do up my buttons.] (2;9)

One sunny morning being engaged in buttoning up her blouse Sarah expressed her dissatisfaction in an unmitigated manner as in line 2. She modulated her voice to augment the degree of her anger over not being able to perform the act of doing up a button alone. The case is to demonstrate two linguistic phenomena at a time: an inter-, and an intralanguage error. Her interlanguage mistake, a literal translation 'do up' →'fölcsinál' (line 2) exemplifies a typical case when the bilingual speaker translates an L2 element word for word into L1 to fill a lexical gap. The intralanguage error emerges in the Hungarian 'ledőny' instead of 'redőny' (line 1), where 'r', the initial letter of the correct word 'redőny' is erroneously pronounced as 'l'('ledőny'), due to the speaker's immature articulation.

Excerpts 8-9-10 below exemplify the appearance of false cognates in Sarah's language use. False cognates, falsely perceived lexical items, are manifestations of both interlanguage and intralanguage mistakes (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, pp. 58-59). The specificity of the data taken from Sarah's talk is that these types of interlanguage errors concern both Hungarian and English. The excerpts below give evidence that her two languages interact in both conveying and interpreting meanings. The discourse samples below underpin that Sarah resorts to formal analogy and approximation (see Section 4.3, Tarone's Taxonomy of Communication Strategies) to expand or compensate her limited vocabulary in both communicating and interpreting meanings.

Excerpt 8

1 Sarah: >Mummy, the **big ca:r** is coming!< Quickly! Where is [kæbitʃ]?
2 Mother: Cabbage is **k á p o sz t a**. You wanted to say **garbage**, no?
3 Sarah: **GARBAGE?!** (3, 2)

Sarah's excitement of emptying the garbage can is marked in line 1. To signal her eagerness to take the bin outside the gate to make it available for the dustmen she repetitively shouted the word ['kæbitʃ,] as in line 1. The reason for substituting 'garbage' with 'cabbage' is supposingly its phonological resemblance with ['kæbitʃ], which was a frequently used and a better-known element of her lexicon.

An example of the appearance of false cognates in Sarah's language use is exhibited in excerpt 9 below.

Excerpt 9

1 Grandma: De szép mamuszod van! [What nice slippers you have.]
2 Sarah: Az nem **egér**, mama, hanem **kutyus**. [That is not a mouse, grandma, it is a dog.]
3 Grandma: Én nem is mondtam, hogy egér. [I didn't even say mouse.]
4 Sarah: Jaj, mama, akkor mér mondtad, hogy **mouse**? A mouse az **egér**↓ [Oh, grandma, then why did you say 'mouse'? Mouse is egér (mouse).] (3.4)

In excerpt 9 Sarah's grandmother's fascination over Sarah's weird slippers generated a language-related episode in line 1. The slippers attracted the grandmother's

attention because the front featured a dog head with long ears on both sides. Sarah's astonishment marked with her comment in line 2 adds a humorous element to the discourse due to a misunderstanding. Sarah identifies the word 'mamusz' (felt slippers) with a better-known, similarly sounding L2 word 'mouse'. At the same time, Sarah's critique in line 4 infers her ignorance of her grandma's lack of English proficiency, which fact precludes her from understanding Sarah's comments in lines 2 and 4. This language-related episode exemplifies a case when the bilingual speaker has easier access to an L2 element, for its phonological similarity with an L1 item, but the other speaker, due to her monolingual mind, is unable to interpret that particular cross-linguistic phenomenon. Their different linguistic backgrounds and approaches result in communication failure in lines 2 and 4. Sarah conceives the situation through her bilingual lens, whereas the grandmother due to her monolingual approach has only one language system to satisfy her communication needs.

Examples after Sarah's age of three are suggestive of her improving metalinguistic awareness (see Section 4.6 'Metalinguistic awareness: skill, ability knowledge'). She directs attention towards language form and targets differences between her two languages. The excerpts below exemplify cases of word searches and instances when L2 becomes the object of linguistic investigation.

Excerpt 10

1 Mother: Sarah, I'm giving you a bath. Get ready. (No reaction.) Are you sitting on your ears? I can't hear your answer:!...

2 Sarah (appearing in the bathroom): Mér úgy mondod azt, hogy adok egy fürdést? Mondd azt angolul, hogy 'megfürdetlek'? Na, hogy van az? ↑[Why do you say in the way that 'I give you a bath?' Say 'megfürdetlek' (I'll give you a bath) in English. So, how is it?]

3 Mother: In English we can say give you or run a bath for you or simply I bathe you. If you like, I will say I'll bathe you. Is it ok now?

4 Sarah: Yes. **I bathe you**, **I bathe you**. Jó, hogy megtanitottad.?! (hh) [Good that you have taught me.] ((She stroked my hand gently.))

5 Mother: Again, we've learnt something new. (3;1)

In the evening around bedtime while preparing a bath for Sarah, I instructed her to get ready as shown in line 1. I repeated my request in a high-pitched voice elongating

the word ’answer’ to indicate my dissatisfaction about her unwillingness to do her bedtime responsibilities. Perceiving the change in my intonation and wording (line 1), to avert my resentment Sarah reiterates the discourse in a more pleasant atmosphere. In her comment in line 2 she redirects the locus of attention to a lexical problem to make it the topic of our forthcoming discourse. The same utterance gives evidence that the word search serves as a pedagogical prompt to escape from an embarrassing situation she feels over her dispreferred disobedient status. My simple replacement of the trouble source ’give a bath’ with ’bathe’ is transformed into a strategic exchange by Sarah in lines 4-5. To index her regret and gratitude for my cooperation in the initiated discourse she parrots the alternative version of the trouble source English expression in line 4 in an emphatic manner accompanied by a stroke. This excerpt is an additional illustration of how particular word searches are utilized as resources for constituting relevant social behaviours (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p.177). Her goal to restore peace between us using the normative function of her discourse is reached: I interpret her utterance as an apology for her naughtiness. Her feeling guilty over neglecting my request and delaying bath time is successfully remedied. Her emergent interest in discussing a lexical problem is obviously the manifestation of the successful operation of topic avoidance, a subtype of communication strategies (see Figure 4, Tarone's ‘Taxonomy of Communication Strategies’ and Section 4.3 ‘The sociolinguistic - inductive approach’).

The excerpt below implies that in Sarah’s developing bilingualism tales and narrating English story books offer a good opportunity to learn particularly because such activities constitute routinized parts of the daily family agenda.

Excerpt 11

1 Mother: ((Reading a story from an English book)) *’Early in the morning everyone made their way to the field. The old horse pulled the reaper. The children skipped along, pushing each other and laughing, while the women chatted, their rakes in their hands. The men walked more quietly, some smoking pipes with …*((I stopped reading and started to think for a moment))*… long coils of twine over their shoulder.*’(*The old days*,366 stories for bedtime, p.147) I wonder what **twine** is in Hungarian. Would it be ’kéve’ or ’guriga’ in Hungarian? What is the name of those big things in the horse

riding school that look like…(hh) >Sarah, wait I don't know this word.< Let me think.

2 Sarah: **Mummy**?! And? Read!

3 Mother: Yes, but I don't know this word.

4 Sarah: No matter, mummy, look in your book. = But later.= Now keep on reading.

5 Mother: What book do you mean?

6 Sarah: The **big word book**. Only read on now. (hh) (4;6)

Excerpt 11 implies that using two languages facilitates literacy-related activities and offers opportunities to learn how to learn. Joint readings also provide a rich database to examine how Sarah targets, addresses language-related episodes of her everyday life. When one evening we started to read a new English storybook titled *'365 stories for bedtime'* Sarah's choice fell on the story entitled *'The old days'* in it. While reading I recognised two unknown words: 'reaper' and 'twine'. I halted to find an appropriate word in a try-making manner as in line 1, which usually happened when I got in a lexical trouble, though it was even more typical that I tried to overcome such obstacles by finding simpler or synonymic substitutes or camouflaging the lexical shortage. Line 2 shows that Sarah does not tolerate my lapsing and requests to ignore the problematic elements as in line 2. As a sign of remedy, she recommends the idea of consulting the dictionary displaying an effective operation of cognitive, metacognitive and compensation learning strategies (Cohen, 1998; Oxford, 1990) (see Chapter 4.4, The integrated view). Her comment and actual behaviour clearly reflect the locally established language use and language learning practices, indexing the local habit of using the dictionary in cases of word searches.

The fact that joint-readings, as well as English-related activities (the internet, translations, correspondence, compositions, language tests, siblings' homework) occupy a significant and usual part of our daily life determines and strongly influences her views and conception about language use and learning. She frequently witnesses us reading English and other foreign language books written in Russian, French, Polish and has learnt that those readings go beyond fun and enjoyment and are frequently used as a source and authority of knowledge, a tool to learn and think. To learn more about how language-related activities govern her attitude to language

see Sections 1.5 An introduction of Sarah's case and Section 6.3 The family established rules for language separation.

My and her siblings' frequent consulting the dictionary introduces and offers alternative ways of learning. We, the members of the family, are her role models as language learners and speakers who set an example and teach her how to learn. In the social environment she has been raised, books and dictionaries are regarded as respectful authorities for both enhancing knowledge and compensating our lack of knowledge. Her home-literacy environment and the regular use of the dictionary as well as English books have not only expanded her learning strategy repertoire but also raised her awareness to the fact that learning requires the learner's active participation. It also happened that I explained a word in English to her and she acquired certain words and concepts earlier in English than in Hungarian, which fact underpins that English has also affected her cognitive processing, for example the process of meaning making.

Hamers (2004) underscores that home literacy activities (reading aloud, joint reading, discussing stories) influence the levels of academic functioning in children in their school years. To the extent that adults around the child value the use of language for certain functions, they will value the respective language for these functions and thus develop these aspects (see Section 2.2.4, The social context of second language acquisition). The idea that literacy activities are fundamental tools in developing identity, constructing the world around us and in attitudinal development towards languages encouraged me to exploit the potential of picture books and fairy tales. Telling and reading stories give meaningful context to which children can relate their own personal experience.

Sarah's utterance in line 4 at the same time constitutes two social acts: a literal and an illocutionary act, which imply two different meanings. The literal act is an imperative: 'Mummy, look up the word in the dictionary. The illocutionary act underlying the literal act conveys the meaning: 'Mummy, don't worry about not knowing the word just read on!' implying that she perceives my halt and hesitation too time consuming and my word search unnecessary. She wants to read on the tale as she is curious and excited to know how the story ended. Her utterance gives evidence of how her resourceful solution satisfies her personal needs.

6.5 Sarah's L2 development at the morphological level

6.5.1 Introduction

The previous section explicated patterns in my participant's L2 lexical development identifying the most characteristic phenomena in her developing bilingualism such as overextension, literal translation, false cognates, consulting authorities of knowledge to enhance communication and compensating for insufficient vocabulary. This section aims to describe Sarah's language development at the level of morphology referred to as the system of word-forming, interpreting word structures and parts of speech in language. The reviewed literature on bilingual development discusses several aspects of morphology such as frequency and number of certain morphemes, morphological gender, morpheme acquisition. (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008; Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Tomas, Smith-Lock, Demuth, 2012). The present section addresses only two phenomena: present and past tense formation of verbs focusing on the acquisition order of the simple past tense.

In terms of English morphology Sarah produced a lot of erroneous use of language up to her age of eight in English. In mastering several suffixes of English, she displayed a lot of similarities to English native children's acquisition stages both in the order of acquisition (Brown, 1973) and in the strategies applied during the learning process (see Section 2.2.1, Language acquisition theories). When discussing Sarah's acquisition in terms of grammatical morphemes I will not attempt to account for her full morpheme acquisition order, I only outline partial ordering. I concentrate primarily on Sarah's use of two of the more revealing morphemes like the present progressive and simple past tense. Although the data drawn from Sarah's speech and personal letters show certain inconsistencies in the process of the indicated morpheme acquistion, it shows resemblance to research findings revealed in other studies (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003; Krashen,1973; Slobin, 1973). Omission and commission (Clark, 2003.p.191; Tomas, Smith-Lock & Demuth, 2012) two typical errors of the language acquisition process, will be described and exemplified in the forthcoming paragraphs.

6.5.2 Formulating simple past verbs

Sarah's acquisition of present progressive reflects and underpins the importance of the familiarity principle (Clark, 203, p. 192) in morpheme acquisition (see Section 2.2.1, Language acquisition theories and Section 2.2.3 Children's strategies to cope with linguistic challenges). In accordance with native children's acquisition, in Sarah's talk the suffix –ing appeared first at her age of 0;10 before any other morphemes, which is explained by the fact that she had a clear understanding of where and why the morpheme -ing is used. Such a degree of familiarity and regularity (Clark, 2003) in terms of the present progressive –ing is explained in the literature by the universal feature of language socialization, namely with the application of the 'here and now' strategy in child language acquisition. Researchers of the topic (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003; Slobin, 1973) emphasize that the reason for the early appearance of the –ing suffix is that children's interpersonal communication is based on the present. The utterances caretakers use during communicating with young children refer to the objects, activities and people that are perceivable in their immediate environment (see Section 2.2.1, Language acquisition theories and Section 2.2.3 Children's strategies to cope with linguistic challenges).

Between her ages of one and three we extensively relied on her immediate social or physical environment and talked about things, actions and people that were present at the moment of our communication. These conditions must have led to Sarah's earlier acquisition of the present continuous tense than that of the past in L2. Sarah's acquisition of the present progressive also shows close resemblance with native children's with using –ing forms omitting the conjugated forms of the verb 'to be' before present participle until her age of four e.g., 'What are you doing, Sarah? Sleeping.' (3;2) (see section 2.2.2, The natural order of language acquisition).

Examples of both omission and commission errors (Clark, 2000; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Tomas, Smith-Lock & Demuth, 2012) appeared in her speech regarding past tense formation. Omission is described as morpheme reduction when, for example a suffix vowel is missing, (e.g., Daddy *drinkd tea. I * drinking.). Commission, the insertion of a redundant or additional letter or inflection manifests itself in the sentence 'Dodó *tooked my diaper'). Both error types in Sarah's language use give evidence that she attempts to produce the

morpheme but incorrectly applies the rules to a particular case. She applied regular inflections to words where those inflections are not used normally, for example, *shoeses, *toothes, *['teisiz] (chairs), *sawed, *cutted, *drinkd, *sleepd *wenting (2;9). I recorded unique and hybrid solutions like *drinktek, *dancingnek' in her speech which suggest powerful interaction between her two languages. In these particular cases, a Hungarian suffix'-tek', -nek' to mark 3rd person plural past and present tense are added to the English verbs 'drink' and 'dance'. Her production reflects that she overgeneralized certain rules and duplicated a particular affix as in 'seeses' and 'tooked' which goes in line with scientific findings (Tomas, Smith-Lock & Demuth, 2012).

I note here that analysing language interference from the formal-grammatical perspective goes beyond the aim and scope of this thesis; therefore, I do not deal with it in the discussion. There is experimental evidence (Berko, 1958) that children between the ages of five and seven creatively construct their language and extend the use of affixes to such an extent that they add inflectional affixes even to nonsense stems although they had never heard such solutions before. However, cases of both omitting and adding inflections to familiar words outnumbered adding inflections to nonsense words (Clark¸ 2003; Brown, 1973; Tomas, Smith-Lock & Demuth, 2012), which fact supports that familiarity (Clark, 2002) is an important guiding principle in Sarah's language acquisition.

It is seen from the excerpts that Sarah showed difficulties with verbal morphemes, however, in the production of –ed suffix Sarah went through almost the same order as Brown (1973) Lightbown and Spada (1993) and Krashen (1973) concluded based on their empirical data. (see Section 2.2.2 'The natural order of language acquisition'). A significant difference in Sarah's case was that she did not start to use past forms between the ages of two and four, like with typically developing native English children, she started to use them later, only after her age of 4;6. From that age she mostly used verb stems, regular and irregular past and also past participle forms alternately and randomly as independent lexical units, for example, *go, *went, *sawed, wanted, spoken, gone etc. Later, at the second stage, after her age of five she started to apply the –ed suffix on both regular and irregular verbs exhibiting omission and commission mistakes, for example, *wented, *sawed, *tooked, *spended, *eated, *drinked, wanted, waited, *rushd, lied, *knockd. I also recorded

the occurance of the past participle form of irregular verbs and even future forms to indicate the past, which phenomenon shows a kind of divergence from research findings in this respect (Brown, 1973) and Krashen (1973).

Reporting on past events in English appeared only at around her age of four. I attribute the appearance of the past forms in her speech to the fact that we started to include reading tales and stories in English in our everyday activities around that time. Sarah acquired those forms earlier that appeared on a larger number of stems. She mastered more productive forms earlier, for the simple reason that they appeared regularly and, on many stems (Clark, 2003, p.196), which corroborates the scientific evidence that regularity plays an important role in the order of language acquisition (Clark, 2003). For example, irregular verbs appeared in her speech between her ages of two and five, well before regular past forms, for the simple reason that irregular verbs are more frequent in early SLA, they cover a substantial portion of English verbs and are learned by rote. The data above exhibit a lot of erroneous productions. In some cases, morpheme errors represented omission and verbs were used as a bare stem (e.g., Mummy go yesterday). In other cases, Sarah made errors of commission by attempting to produce the morpheme but incorrectly applying the rules (e.g., Sarah dranked tea).

From her age of five she regularly used simple past tense, switching between correct and incorrect past forms of regular (e.g., wanted), and irregular verbs, (e.g., tooked or comed/camed). I conclude that in terms of past tense marking Sarah exhibited an order of acquisition as follows:

1. don’t + past
2. sporadic use of past participle and future forms
3. past irregular
4. past regular
5. was + base form

An interesting moment in her language use is that she also used present and past participle verb forms to mark past tense between her ages of eight and eleven as shown in excerpts 12 and 13 drawn from the letters she wrote me.

Excerpt 12

Today in the school we spoken about what will we do for the family for Christmas. I think this will be a werry good present. And Márti néni doesn't know what will I do. She sad everything, but this she doesn't because she doesn't know me. When she tell this I think about this composition… Today when I make my homework I maked a little table with this representation: KNOCK! If you will come in! Then I sad to you that I do my homework. Then you cam in, but you don't knockd the door and rushd in my room, however there was that 'KNOCK!'… I lide on the exercise book, and I don't noticed that next to me was this paper. But I was happy because only a werry little was write on it. Oh! I don't knowd that how I will put it under the tree, but it's succesful. I love you mami! Merry Christmas! When I write the composition for you it was a werry bad feeling because I don't want to tell about that. But a little it was difficult because Nani noticed it. I lide on it, so that she doesn't see it. Yes! Sorry! So I don't noticed that next to me there is Nani. Mami, don't look such angry because I said it for her. I think it's werry 'ciki'. Sorry, mami, that I say in Hungarian, but I don't know it in English and it isn't in the Hungarian-English dictionary. Ok, it isn't will happen again! I said for Nani I LOVE YOU**!!!** So now everybody knows my composition, Dad, Nani, Dodo and I. And you can tell everybody and you can show everybody because it is yours. (8;4)

Excerpt 13

Mami, why did Nani cry when we went to horse riding? Don't you remember? You know that when papa camed with us…. Mami, you remember when we were in that restaurant next to 'Aranybulla'? It was werry werry bad, there was werry cold. The food wasn't good…but it was Bandi's birthday and I or we like Bandi. He is werry cute. Besides, in addition many things happened with me and there were you and the family too. (9;2)

6.5.3 Morphological overgeneralization

Clahsen and Jessen (2021) point out that in bilinguals children's language productions are based on similarity-based associations of unknown words with existing known words. It means that certain parts of a particular word (e.g., a suffix) are more dominant in both recognition and formation and that partial information determines the meaning of the whole word. Below I present how Sarah

overgeneralizes a particular L2 suffix and applies it onto L1. A particular conflict between me and one of my daughters served as a social site to deploy how L1 and L2 interact in Sarah's language use at the morphological level.

Excerpt 14

1 Sarah: Nani, mummy is angry with you.
2 Sarah (trying to abandon the topic) Yesterday was good, I played with Dá. Yes, mummy?
3 Mother: **DÁ**? Not **DÁVID**? He is **DÁVID** not **DÁ**. (Trying to avoid laughter)
4 Sarah: Dá-á-á[:] with Bence! …> I don't want to speak. <↓
5 Nani: I **adore** you?! …Look, mummy is laughing, she is not angry with me **anymore**. ((Laugh)) Thank **you**, Sarah you're my **adorable sister**.?! (3;2)

The excerpt exemplifies a spontaneous exchange between Sarah and me after an argument with my second daughter Nani. Sarah being the overhearing audience of my critique of Nani's misconduct makes her comment in line 2. It is important to note here that **S**arah often monitors and comments on her sisters' actions and regulates them in a teacher-like manner with the aim of helping me out. In the present interaction she does not engage in in-depth negotiation of Nani's violating the local norms of conduct, instead she immediately redirects my attention to her memories of amazing playtime with 'Dá' in line 3. The mislabel 'Dá' in line 2 was the first syllable of the name Dávid. The second syllable 'vid' was omitted because she falsely identified it with the English 'with' preposition. I note here that the use of 'Dá' to mark Dávid cannot be attributed to lexical or articulation shortages since by that time Sarah had mastered how to utter multi-syllable words. The false cognate 'Dá' must have been derived from the frequently heard sentence 'Dávid, Bence are coming', with the two names mentioned concurrently in one stretch. Sarah's elongation of 'Dá' and her comment 'I don't want to speak' in line 4 is a clear sign of her dislike over being corrected and ridiculed as in line 3.

This example gives evidence that Sarah's Hungarian language use is affected by the English morphological structure. Sarah overextends a particular grammatical phenomenon onto the Hungarian language. 'Dá' adds a normative function and a funny atmosphere to the discourse. Her incorrect labelling serves as a fun matter for the interlocutors and builds frustration of looking incompetent in Sarah. On the other

hand, her refusal to repair in line 4 plays off an effective counter effect. In the end, she benefits from the situation: she advances her position in the discourse by deploying a pedagogical prompt. The humorous moment of her lexical error averts further negotiation of Nani's untoward behaviour to Nani's satisfaction shown in line 5.

This and further excerpts analysed in the present thesis underpin that many of Sarah's appeals to L2 generate powerful effects on the interlocutors' part due to their unexpected nature. They also represent divergence from conventional monolingual use. Sarah's switching between her two languages evokes a variety of emotional reactions: laughter, conciliation, relief, astonishment, embarrassment, disappointment, etc. The behavioural responses generated by her language use are relative to the situation and the interlocutors' mood in a particular speech event. After her age of three it is typical that she requests explanations on the interlocutors' discourse behaviour. She exhibits varied ways of handling language repair; she gets hurt, acknowledges, refuses or ignores criticism.

6.6 Sarah's L2 syntactic development

6.6.1 Introduction

Syntax is the domain of language that relates to the grammatical agreement of words within a sentence. In another conceptualization it describes the word order within a phrase or sentence (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008, p. 79). The previous two sections gave an insight into certain phenomena of Sarah's developing bilingualism at the lexical and morphological levels, this section describes Sarah's syntactic development focusing on the process of her mastering transformations required in questions and negatives in L2.

6.6.2 Formulating questions and negatives

Until her age of four Sarah showed difficulties with the English syntax both in the way she signalled grammatical relationship among the parts within sentences and in terms of word order. She tended to produce errors of omission, which means she omitted inflections in marking the relationships between agents, actions, and instruments. For example, 'Sarah kitchen.' (2;1) (Sarah wants to go to the kitchen), 'Nani shoe.' (2;2) (This is Nani's shoe.), 'Mummy give.' (2,0) (Mummy give it to

me.), ’Daddy [tʌ].’ (3;1) (Daddy loves Sarah). This phenomenon suggests that she took the same route as native English children do in that early period of language development (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

In this section I focus on Sarah’s formulating questions and negatives in L2. My data infer that in terms of questions and negatives she showed resemblance to native children’s syntactic development. Until the age of two, similarly to English native children, she used declarative sentences with rising intonation for questions (Pienemann, Johnston & Brindley, 1988, Lightbown & Spada, 1993, p.61.) and used ’no’ for negations. The developmental stages proposed by research findings were delayed due to her insufficient L2 exposure. Apart from the elongated time of acquisition, Sarah similarly to native English children went through several development stages in her progression towards mastering L2 questions.

Declarative sentences with rising intonation

Until the age of two or so like English native children she differentiated statements and question by means of suprasegmental elements. She uttered declarative sentences with rising intonation for questions (Pienemann, Johnston & Brindley, 1988, Lightbown & Spada, 1993, p.61.).

1 Mother: Look, mummy’s putting your skates in the bag, we’re getting dressed and go.
2 Sarah: Go [ho:k]? (Shall we go to the ice hall?)
3 Mother: Don’t kick your blanket off. It’s cool in here.
4 Sarah: Sarah need ['bænko:]? (Does Sarah need a blanket?) (2;5)

Uninverted wh-type questions - Alternate use of verb-subject and the subject-verb order

At the next developmental stage Sarah still did not change the internal structure of the sentence, she simply used uninverted wh-type questions where the question word was placed at the beginning of the sentence, for example ’Where daddy go?’ (3,5), ’Why Sarah cry?’ (3;5). ’Where Sarah diaper?’ (3;2), ’What Dodó eating?’ (3;7). Between her ages of three and five I observed that Sarah’s questions sporadically followed the pattern of declarative sentences using the verb-subject and subject-verb order alternately as in ’Where go Kata?’ (3;2), ’Why Nani cry?’ (3;4), Regarding

yes/no questions rising intonation added to the declarative order was utilized to mark questions until her age of five. ’Go Sarah?’ (3;2),’Dodó play with Sarah?’ (4;9).

Fronting without inversion - Verbs at the front lacking ’do’

Between the ages of four and five fronting (Lightbown & Spada, 1993) appeared in Sarah’s questions. She tended to use auxiliaries *may, can* and *do* at the beginning of her questions, which phenomenon underpinned her understanding of the difference in the structure of questions. Although she perceived that certain elements of the sentence must appear in a frontal position, she regularly performed errors of both omission and commission (Littlewood, 1984, p.10; Clark, 2003, p.194.). In the process of omission, she put a verb at the front lacking the auxiliary as ’Give piggy-bank money?’ (5;1) Commission errors are exemplified in her adding the auxiliary ’do’ in those sentences where otherwise no auxiliary would have been required: ’Do I can have ice-cream?’ (4;10).

Inversion with correct and incorrect forms

After age five Sarah’s questions imply that she mastered the rule that inversion was a prerequisite of making questions and added ’do’ in her questions but marking person and time correctly on ’do’ appeared only at the age of six, until that age she used both correct and incorrect forms, e.g., ’Do mummy love you?’ (6;7), ’Do Nani like chocolate?’ (7,4). Sometimes she failed to use inversion in wh- questions and used either inversion or a wh-word, but not both as in ’Can Sarah read?’ (6;5) or ’Where mummy can buy?’ (6,7). A clear sign of her noticing the difference between the structure of questions and declarative sentences is that at the age of 5;7 she started to produce yes/no questions where she used auxiliaries and inverted word order although grammatically incorrectly such as in ’Is this is bad fairy?’ (5;4), ’Do you can call the cats? (5;7),’Mummy, play you with me?’ (6;1). However, until her age of six she used declarative word order in wh-questions: ’Why you say this? (5;11), ’Why Cinderella speak English?’ (5;2). After four, as seen in excerpt 15 below she started to use ’do’ in questions and negatives but as far as the age of six, in the majority of cases she did not mark the person and time on the auxiliary ’do’. The excerpt below is to exhibit the diverse picture of her question formulation.

Excerpt 15

1 Sarah: Do you Dodó see my cat on the wall?' (Sarah points to her drawings featuring her cat on the wall.)
2 Dodó: Why isn't Csubi there?' (Dodó notices that the picture of her other cat, Csubi is missing, so she enquires about it)
3 Sarah: Csubi don't like me, because don't sit in my lap. I not draw Csubi. Dodó, do you can find Csubi? (5;7)

Later, at the age of six in wh-type questions she started to invert the word order but only if the verb was 'is' or 'are'. 'Why is Bonci cry?' (5;2) 'Where are we going?' (5;4). In other cases, she still applied affirmative order.

'Whatsit' 'whers' were used as formulaic chunks

After her age of four 'don't' appeared but she used it with all subjects without marking person and time on it until six. Similarly, to findings in other studies on child language acquisition (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003; Lightbown & Spada, 1993) she produced correct questions with 'where' and 'what' but 'whatsit' 'whers' were used as formulaic chunks, since she was not aware of the fact that there are two elements included, e.g., 'Whers cats?' 'Whats those?' (3;6); `Whers my shoeses? ` (4;7).

Auxiliaries may, can and do at the beginning of her questions with subject omission

As I mentioned earlier, between the ages of four and five Sarah developed preference for using auxiliaries *may, can* and *do* at the beginning of her questions perceiving that certain elements of the sentence must appear at frontal position: 'Why Cinderella speak English?' (5;2); 'May sleep upstairs? (5;7);'Why you say this? (5;11);'Can go to skate?', 'Can skate Nani? (6;2). 'Do Dodó go to skate?' (5;4), 'Do you Dodó see my cat on the wall?' (6;3)'Mummy, will play you with me?' (6;6) also exemplify cases of subject omission. Such utterances give evidence that although she understood that questions require inverted word order, at this developmental stage she was not able to formulate them grammatically correctly. Nevertheless, such omission errors did not cause communication breakdown as the interlocutor in a concrete interaction could easily identify the subject of the sentence relying on shared knowledge and contextual information in a specific case. I attribute the omission of the subject to the Hungarian syntactical structural characteristics, where the subject of a verb is marked in the suffix of the verb and is not necessary to identify. Mastering

the use of the correct inversion took place only after her age of seven, when she started to learn English at school. School instruction raised her awareness of grammatical rules, and the institutional framework familiarized her with the written form of the English language, which improved her spelling and gave her an opportunity and motivation to deal with English grammar.

After her age of eight, due to school English, she became so 'grammar-focused' that she frequently initiated discussing and practising grammar with me like forming questions and the use of verb tenses in English. We devoted specific time to explicit grammar sessions explaining and practising grammatical structures. Due to the increased number of hours spent on grammatical issues she became more and more familiar with English grammar.

Combining negation and wh-words - Inability to negate and invert at the same time

By her age of 8, with her progression in grammar, she was familiar with inversion in both wh-questions and 'yes/no' questions. After nine she started to use even more complex questions like negative questions being able to combine negation and a wh-word as in 'Why Sarah can't eat chocolate?' (9;6) but sometimes it was beyond her ability to negate the question and invert at the same time, e.g. 'Mama not work today?'(10;2).

Questions in subordinate clauses or in embedded questions – Overinversion

Producing questions in subordinate clauses or in embedded questions meant further challenge for Sarah. She frequently overgeneralized inversion and used the inverted forms both in the main and in the subordinate clause as in' I don't know where can the cat sleep' (11;1). She also applied overinversion such as 'Do you know where is my teddy-bear?' (8;3).

In the study of formulating negation, I grouped Sarah's production according to Milon's (1974) categorization who observed the development of Ken, a seven-year-old Japanese boy learning English in Hawaii for six months and differentiated five developmental stages in the data.

Anaphoric negation

In negatives first until her age of 2;11 Sarah used anaphoric negation, showing native children's practice (Milon,1974). The negative in this case is understood as an instance of sentential negation in which the negative element negates a prior utterance with the insertion of 'no' or 'not' before or after the verb as in 'No. Read ['iela]' (1;8) ('No. Read Cinderella.' to answer the utterance 'Did we read Cinderella?' 'I love Kidi. No.' (2,1) to answer, 'Do you love Kidi?'. The examples below illustrate that providing the context in which the negative utterances occur contributes to interpreting the intended meanings. 'No, I know in English'. (3;3) to succeed 'Do you know the English word?', 'No singing song' (3;7)' after 'Shall we sing a song?', No speak English' (3;9), 'No Daddy love Kidi' (3;10) in response to the relevant previous sentences: 'We are speaking English', Daddy loves Kiddi' (Deprez & Pierce, 1993, p.26). In this developmental phase the respective utterance is often associated with non-verbal communication, for example a headshake and wrist-twist e.g., `Sarah eating.' (2:9), `Daddy home. (2:2) both performed with the accompanying head and hand movements to signal 'no`.

Non-anaphoric external negation

As opposed to anaphoric negation, non-anaphoric external negation exhibiting the structure 'no +adjective/verb/noun as in 'No brown.' (3;4), 'No drink' (3,7),'No cat' (2;8), 'No more' (2;2) 'Sarah no' (2;8) appeared at around her age of two. At this stage 'no' and 'not' do not serve as substitutes of the whole sentence, although the negative element is still external it does appear to be an integrative part of the sentence at least in meaning. At this developmental stage she was unable to move the negative element from the peripheral position to the sentence-internal position. (Deprez & Pierce, 1993, p.26).

Internal 'be' negation

Internal 'be' negation is displayed in sentences like 'Lunch is no ready' (4;5) 'Shoes is no clean' (3;11) where negations use intermittent forms of the copula 'be' both grammatically correctly and incorrectly.

Internal full verb negation, and 'don't' imperative

Cases of internal full verb negation, where 'do' is replaced with 'no' and 'not' placing the negative element ('no' 'not') before or after full verbs, are exemplified by the

utterances as follows: ’Mummy go not’ (4;8), ’I am not went’ (5;2) ’I not draw Csubi’ (5,7). The use of the auxiliary ’don’t’ was mostly restricted to imperatives and rarely utilized in other contexts until her age of five. ’Don’t touch it.’ (4;8) ’Don’t pull the cat.’ (4;9)

A variety of forms for ’do’; ’do’ for negation without tense agreement

Regarding the suppletive non-imperative Sarah produced a variety of forms for ’do’. I documented utterances such as ’Csubi don’t like me’ (5;1), ’Mummy don’t said’ (6;4), ’I don’t went to shop’ (7;5). The sentences ’Mummy don’t said’ (8;5), ’I don’t went to shop’ (9;5) give evidence that she used ’do’ for negation without tense agreement, whereas ’You didn’t can run from dogs’ (7;9) exemplifies a case when negation is attached to other auxiliaries in the sentence.

6.7 Conclusion

In chapter 6 I examined Sarah’s language development in the lexical, morphological, and syntactic domains. I included authentic interpersonal interactions and two of Sarah’s writings (see Excerpts 12 and 13) to exhibit the most outstanding phenomena of her L2 acquisition at the levels of language analysis mentioned above. When discussing her lexical and morphological development, I concentrated on how she acquired, used and interpreted new words, inflections and structures in L2. The role of language alternation in compensating lexical troubles between her ages of one and nine was investigated to illuminate the process of her assigning meanings onto forms in the context of bilingualism. In terms of morphology, I described the most typical moments of her morpheme acquisition putting a special focus on the production of the present progressive and the past simple forms of L2 between her ages of two and ten. Regarding her syntactic development, I attempted to investigate how she progressed in formulating questions and negatives in L2 until her age of nine.

My empirical data show that in the process of language acquisition Sarah produces some typical and idiosyncratic linguistic solutions. Sarah’s L2 development between her ages of one and four suggests that her L2 does not coincide with the adult language and might have little overlap with conventional language use. As opposed to monolinguals, my participant’s language development shows an even more complicated and diversified picture because she has two linguistic code systems to

satisfy her communicative needs and in the majority of the investigated time span, she had insufficient proficiency in both of her languages. This fact further complicates linguistic interpretations and makes the task extremely challenging for the researcher. I raised the reader's attention to the fact that space limitations of the present thesis do not allow for more extensive in-depth analysis of my participant's L2 acquisition and development.

Chapter 7 –The role of L2 in conveying communicative intentions in Sarah' talk

	The focus of analysis	The particular phenomena addressed and investigated
Chapter 7	Sarah's communicative intentions conveyed through L2-L1, L1-L2 code-switches and language alternations	• Accommodating to the established language separation rules • Expressing emotional attachment • Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use • Topic abandonment and tricking • Easing tension and injecting humour

7.1 Introduction

In chapter 7 I present how my participant conveys her intended meanings with the help of L2-L1, L2-L1 code-switches. I explore the dynamic and diverse character of Sarah's code-switching behaviour and thematize her appeals to L2 in various situations at different points of her L2 development. I refer to code-switches as a specific skill relating to the bilingual's pragmatic competence, the ability to select the language according to the interlocutor, the context, and the topic of conversation (Meisel, 1994, p. 414, see Section 2.1.3, Transfer, interference, code-switching).

I present the documented data on how Sarah uses code-switches as linguistic tools to generate pragmatic effect (Medved Krajnovic, 2008; Murphy, 2014) and address the questions: 'What can Sarah do in her English?' and 'What can Sarah do in her two languages better than with only one?' While investigating Sarah`s resort to L2 I apply the pragmatic and discourse analytic approach to reveal Sarah's intended meaning behind language alternation and shed light on departures from the monolingual use. I investigate Sarah's language alternation practices to answer research questions 3 and 4.

The code-switching approach to bilingual language use analysis is further justified by the fact that code-switching is a very striking characteristic of the bilingual speech mode (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Greggio and Gil, 2007; Grosjean, 2001; Hamers, 2004; Nikolov, 1999; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006) and a 'significant aspect of talk organization'(Gafaranga, 2012, p. 504), which is easy to notice but hard to explain.

7.2 Patters in communicative intentions in terms of L1-L2 code-switches

In chapter 7 I categorize the samples according to my participant's communicative intentions. In my category system I extensively rely on Cekaite and Björk-Willén's (2012), Gafaranga's (2012), Cromdal's (2013) Greggio and Gil's (2007), Nikolov's (1999) and Pavlenko's (2006) research findings, who have concluded that the multilingual speakers they observed and interviewed, used to code-switching to convey various functions and affective stances. I present a number of samples that reveal more about the nature and role of code-switching in Sarah's language use and outline patterns in them. The analysed excerpts in this chapter are aimed to explore (1) what sorts of code-switches are applied to mediate and interpret communicative intentions; (2) what motivates L2-L1 and L1-L2 code-switches in Sarah's language use and (3) which language considered appropriate by her in each discourse.

It is important to note that the number of examples listed under one analytical category is not the same. The unequal number of the categorized examples is attributed to the fact that for certain categories I have found relevant examples in a larger amount whereas for others I could identify only a few. When categorizing the

investigated discourses, I could differentiate six overarching categories. Below I give the list of those five communicative intentions.

1 Accommodating to the established language separation rules
2 Expressing emotional attachment
3 Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use
4 Topic abandonment and tricking
5 Easing tension and injecting humour

Below I present a table of the six categories of communicative intentions I distinguished in my dataset.

Table 7 – Categories of communicative intentions conveyed in Sarah`s L1-L2 and L2-L1 code-switches and the descriptions of the categories

Category	Description
Accommodating to the established language separation rules (Excerpts 16,17,18)	The excerpts of this category give evidence of Sarah`s constant self-regulation and self-identification in bilingualism to show that she has definite expectations and knowledge on who, where, when speaks Hungarian or English. Deviations from the locally established language share patterns give her opportunity to discuss the relevance of the preferred language and redefine her conception of bilingual identity.
Expressing emotional attachment (Excerpts 19,20,21)	Sarah's appeals to English often signal emotionality. The excerpts of this category underpin that using L2 offers her versatile and sophisticated ways to have and generate effective emotional power in her listener's mind. The excerpts suggest that some English-related episodes represent a unique atmosphere of privacy and family

	integrity where L2 marks and constitutes intimacy.
Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use (Excerpts 22,23,24,25)	The excerpts under this category are suggestive of how the interlocutor's language behaviour (choice and preference) modifies and reconstructs Sarah`s language appropriating process. Switching languages has a conciliating effect and enhances rapport with the interlocutor by powerfully relying on and benefitting from the shared personal styles and preferences. These examples demonstrate how Sarah criticizes others' biased and disrespectful attitude toward her. The discourse samples of this section are characterized by emotionally charged, expressive demands, humorous comments, serious or playful accusations uttered with a vast range of intonational structure, distinct rhythm, and increased intensity.
Topic abandonment and tricking (Excerpts 26,27,28)	Topic abandonment serves as a conversational repair (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012). These are examples of Sarah's subjective commentary and diversion from the topic of conversation, which is meant to mitigate the interlocutors 'resentment and dissatisfaction over her untoward behaviour. The excerpts of the category are used as additional resources in the organization of conversational repair (Gafaranga, 2012) to compensate for limited expertise in the language of schooling and giving true opinion. Sarah's rerouting correction practice serves as a

	strategic tool to counterbalance and mitigate the interlocutor`s outright unmodulated manner.
Easing tension and injecting humour (Excerpts 29,30)	Humour in Sarah's discourse is a tool to ease tension, to win attention, to control power relationships beyond self-serving entertainment. It is an effective tool to control communication and a manifestation of self defence. Humour contributes to generating the expected discourse behaviour, laughter, amazement, and embarrassment in the interlocutor.

The section below is to present the detailed analysis of the selected samples, organized and numbered according to the categories indicated in table 7.

7.2.1 Accommodating to the established language separation rules

The forthcoming excerpts are to reveal that Sarah has definite expectations and knowledge on who, where, when speaks Hungarian or English.

Excerpt 16

1 Sarah: Mummy, the good fairy also speak **HUNGARIAN**?
2 Mother: When I read in **Hungarian**, the fairy also speaks in **Hungarian**. But when in **English**, I say in **English** what the fairy says.
3 Sarah: How is 'magic spell' in Hungarian then?
4 Mother: Varázslat. [Magic] (3;5)

One evening Sarah expressed her surprise when I started to read Cinderella in Hungarian, which was one of those tales that until that time I had always told her in English. Switching to Hungarian was a purposeful act on my part; it was less time consuming and deliberated me from clarifying meanings and collecting feedback on Sarah's comprehension, which was normally the case when reading in English. During the tale Sarah seemed delighted and did not inquire about the cause of my language choice. It was the fairy's speaking English that surprised her as in line 1.

The fairy had spoken only in English until that time, so her speaking Hungarian intrigued her. She was eager to know (1) if the fairy could speak Hungarian too, and (2) how magic spell, her favourite expression would sound in Hungarian (line 3). Her curiosity in line 1 implies that she associated English with certain people according to the previously experienced local norms and standards. Deviations from the rule aroused her attention, which she wanted to discuss.

Another example of the same type is the utterance in excerpt 17. It illustrates how deviations from the locally established language use patterns makes her redefine her conception of language use and how she accommodates to the new situation.

Excerpt 17

1 Sarah: Mummy, Brendon speaks English in the **kindergarten, too**.
2 Mother: With whom? With **you**?
3 Sarah: No, with his mother.
4 Mother: Yes, his father is **American**, so they speak **English more often** than we do… At home in the street, in the shop, everywhere. Perhaps it was easier for him to speak English.
5 Sarah: Yes, but I never speak English **with you** in the **kindergarten**.
6 Mother: They do it in their way, we do it in our way.
7 Sarah: I only **AT HOME** with you. (3;4)

Coming back home from the nursery Sarah made a statement as in line 1 about Brendy's using English in the kindergarten. Sarah's astonishment at Brendy's using English in the kindergarten considered an unexpected domain for using that language is an instance of her conception of the labour division between her two languages. Brendon, Sarah's groupmate in the kindergarten, is an American-Hungarian bilingual, whose first language is English. For Sarah it was strange that someone uses English outside home without the mother's presence, since it was quite different from the household language use pattern, she was socialized in. She was satisfied with my explanation that the language use system we established in our family is only one in the multitude of language share patterns that bilingual families use but the issue of language choice and preference remained a recurrent topic of our discourse.

Excerpt 18 below exemplifies an instance when L1 was used to criticize the way how L2 speakers treated other participants in a situation where the participants in question

did not share a dual linguistic code. The conversation occurred in our home when Brendon, a balanced American-Hungarian bilingual, offered to play a boardgame in a Hungarian monolingual boy's, Boti's presence.

Excerpt 18

1 Brendon: I've brought a board game with me. Let's play with it, you'll enjoy it.
2 Brendon: Do you want to play in the living room or on the balcony?
3 Botond: Mit mond? [What's he saying?]
4 Sarah: **Azt, hogy bent játsszunk vagy a teraszon**. [That should we play inside or outside?]
5 Brendon: No wind, so let's go outside.
6 Sarah: Brendy, **a Boti is itt van ám**!'?! [Brendy, Boti is also here!]
7 Brendon: Jaj, **bocsánat**! [Oh, sorry.]
8 Botond: Na jó, de most már **magyarul**! [Good, but now in Hungarian!]
9 Sarah: ((Turning to Botond)): { }Ha megint elkezdi angolul, majd segítek.(hh) [If he starts again in English, I'll help.]
10 Sarah: De most már játsszunk! [But now let's play.] (5,9)

Excerpt 18 is a spontaneous comment on co-participants' language choice and a manifestation of Sarah's normative preference for correct and relevant language use (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p. 179). Sarah's comment in line 2 is a critique of what is perceived as her friend's, Brendon's biased attitude by using English in Boti's presence who had difficulties in understanding it. The support offered in line 9 is a clear sign of Sarah's sensitivity towards Boti's communication needs and of positioning herself as a sufficiently competent speaker of English. Although line 9 is an implicit reference to Boti's inferior level of L2 expertise, Sarah does not constitute clear distinctions among the participants as competent versus incompetent speakers of English. However, by criticizing Brendon's untoward attitude, she signals that she does not want to pay particular attention to the asymmetry in the participants' linguistic competence. She is more committed to maintaining the peers' cooperation and on-task behaviour during free play. Excerpt 18 shows how solutions to language problems are managed by socializing and instructing the participants into the relevant language use and peer group identities.

7.2.2 Expressing emotional attachment

Excerpt 19 below is an example of assimilating an L2 word in L1 context as a manifestation of affective communication strategy (see Section 4.5, Strategy vs. self-regulation?) by which Sarah wins attention and adds to emotional intensity.

Excerpt 19

1 Sarah: Mummy, when I am as big as Dodó ((her older sisiter)), I also say ’**ANYA**’ (’mother’) to you?
2 Mother: I don’t know. What do **you** think?
3 Sarah: No, you are my **MUMMY** [:]. ((intersects hurriedly.))
4 Mother: So you like calling me **[mΛmi]**?
5 Sarah: Yes. And **I always say it**. (5,2)

Sarah raised the question in line 1 while having dinner together in a narrow family circle. Her inquiry surprised me because it was a long-established speech habit that my older daughters addressed me ’anya’ as opposed to Sarah’s addressing me as ’mummy’. Sarah had perceived the wording difference earlier, yet until that time she did not give voice to her curiosity. The fact that she transformed the situation into an object of analysis and scrutinized the relevance of using the foreign sounding ’mummy’ in the L1 context gives evidence of her metalinguistic awareness and pragmatic competence (see Section 3.6 Communicative competence and Section 4.6 ‘Metalinguistic awareness: skill, ability knowledge’).

The case shows that even if [mʌmi] sounds odd, it is fully assimilated in her first language. Lines 3 and 5 infer that the foreignized ‘mummy’ in L1 context was a better fit, a linguistic tool to amplify Sarah’s emotional bonding to me. Her choice grew increasingly L2-like and her L2 appropriacy preference has persisted ever since. Her body positioning as she hugged me tight, illustrated that using this word gave her internal satisfaction. [mʌmi] instead of ’anya’ ['anɪa] represented alliance, we-ness and intimacy (Baker, 2006; Pavlenko, 2006). I detected some other instances of L2 transfer which exhibited similar emotional efficiency (see Section 4.6, ’Bilingualism and emotionality’). Integrating an L2 element in L1 context gives evidence of employing code-switching as a communication strategy (Oxford, 1991; Cohen, 1998; Dörnyei, 2005) (see Chapter 4, Learning and communication strategies, for example

Figure 4 on Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies, p. 85 and Table 3 Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p.89). It is used to serve a goal, to get the intended meaning across, express overcharged emotions to the mother. Excerpt 19 is suggestive of Sarah's perceiving the dynamism of language use and shows how she accommodates herself to the transitional and fluid character of speech habits. She accepts that language use can change over time, as people and language choice can carry emotional power.

Excerpt 20

1 Mother: Sára, **nem**. Értsd meg, **most dolgom van**! [Sarah, **no**. Understand, **now I am busy**.]
2 Sarah: Én jobban szertem a **'Sarah'-t**, mint a 'Sárát.' [I prefer **'Sarah'** to 'Sára'.]
3 Sarah: Főleg, ahogy **TE** mondod?! (hh) [Especially the way **YOU** say?!]
4 Sarah: Mikor úgy mondod, hogy 'Sarah', akkor tudom, hogy **nem vagy ideges**, meg **ráérsz**. [When you say 'Sarah' I know that **you are not nervous** and **have time**.]
5 Mother: Tényleg **így gondolod**? [Really, you think so?]
6 Sarah: Igen, **mikor van időd, angolul mondod**. [Yes, **when you have time, you say it in English**.] (4,2)

On a Monday afternoon after getting home from work I dropped all my bags on the floor and was about to change for gardening. When Sarah realized my determinedness to do housework instead of playing with her, she reacted as in line 2 signalling that she disliked the way I treated her.

This example shows that Sarah's L2 oriented statements enhanced the pragmatic effect of what was said and influenced her L2 requestive choices. This case infers that foreignizing (see Table 3 Celce-Murcia et al.,1995, p.89), using her name with L2 pronunciation was not only appealing to her but also gave her information about the interlocutor's mood. The family established pattern for language separation made Sarah perceive that I am less busy when I speak English to her, and she gives voice to it in the excerpt above. The foreignized name 'Sarah' instead of 'Sára' gives her the impression the context of our forthcoming conversation would be English, which meant my willingness to dedicate time to our joint activities, The remark 'Főleg, ahogy te mondod.' (Especially the way you say it.) was meant as another amplifier,

a strategic tool to please me, make me more cooperative and behave as she wished. As to pragmatics, both excerpt 19 and excerpt 20 underpin Sarah's pragmatic competence, her knowledge of appropriate language use to achieve her intended communicative act. Sarah' L2-inclined behaviour, her preference of L2 is a pragmatic choice of appropriacy in the concrete communicative acts. Foreignizing in both speech events is an effective strategic tool for her to establish special norms for interpreting her interlocutor's meaning.

Excerpt 21

1. Mother: Please, don't ask me, go and ask Kata to play with you…(hh) Now I'm not in the mood of playing that game.
2. Sarah: Mummy, I **HATE[:]** you! (Expressed 'hate' with overwhelming kindness and with a special accent on it.)
3. Sarah: **You know**, it means **I love you**. De angolul úgy hangozik, **mintha az 'utál' is szép lenne**! [But in English it sounds as if 'utál' (hate) were nice!]
4. Mother: Yes, **I know**[:], you have already explained it several times to me.(hh) (4;5)

Having perceived my sorrow, Sarah was trying to cheer me up with an utterance in line 2 accompanied by gentle hugs and kisses. The way she uttered 'hate': swinging her head while pursing her lips towards me betrays that 'hate', the opposite meaning of the originally meant 'love' is expected to make a powerful influence on me and adds to my efficacy to exhibit the appropriate response behaviour.

It must be noted that Sarah's appeals to L2 in signalling emotionality was a typical phenomenon, which can be attributed to her impression that in certain situations English served as a part of acting to please some people, especially me, her mother. The verb *hate* accompanied with the above-described body language and accent was recurrently used to dissipate tension and signal her sympathy and overwhelming love towards the mother. Excerpt 21 is also an illustration of how Sarah displayed and interpreted the relevance of appropriate language use determined and regulated by the local norms. The euphemistic strategy realized in a L1-L2 code-switch (*utál→hate*), making a word sound more pleasant than it really was, empowered Sarah to generate effective emotional power in the listener's mind and intensified emotional bonding towards the interlocutor eliminating the offense and insult, which *utál* (hate) normally connotated. The word *hate* as opposed to its L1 counterpart was

used to please the mother and replace a locally taboo Hungarian verb *utál* (hate) considered inappropriate for use in polite mother-daughter conversation. The perlocutionary force of the English speech-act *I hate you* generated the expected discourse behaviour, i.e., relief in the interlocutor. The purposeful code-switch satisfied Sarah's personal needs: it successfully dispersed negative emotions and coerced a positive change in the interlocutor's mood. Using L2 in this specific context is suggestive of the close rapport between us and a clear sign of her reliance on my acknowledging a shared sense of what is meant by what in our wording.

7.2.3 Conciliating the interlocutor and identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use

Excerpt 22

1 Mother: Na, most már **mars aludni**! **Ne mondjam többször**! (**Now** already **go to to bed**. **Don't let me say it again.)**
2 Sarah: Give me my **diaper**.
3 Sarah: It is not here. { }(hh)
4 Mother: Go and fetch it quickly.
5 Sarah: But we **didn't read**! I want **'Make-believe'**! (4;2)

It is around bedtime when in response to my outburst Sarah unexpectedly turns to me in line 2 in English remorsefully. The diaper is a safety blanket for her, she has been using it from babyhood up to the present day as a comforting object when sleeping or feeling tired. The utterance in line 2 is purposeful and meant to soften me. Her using English together with her gestural and body performance, smile on her face, outstretched arms, glimmering eyes is a linguistically performed social act to make me less strict about the bedtime agenda and read another tale for her. The well-placed communicative act embedded in a code-switch in line 2 facilitated the conveyance of her intended meaning (see Section 2.1.7, Direct and indirect speech acts). Her L2 request serves as an affective strategy to control the interlocutor and get inner satisfaction (see Figure 4 'Oxford's taxonomy of LLS', p. 85 Oxford, 1990, p.8, Section 4.4 'The integrated view').

The examples below reveal how the interlocutor's language behaviour modifies and reconstructs the child's language appropriating process. Sarah's interpretation of an

L2 code-switch in communication justifies the reciprocal character of strategic language use, which means that producing and interpreting strategic language use are constantly affected and restructured by the feedback the child gets from her environment. The fact that Sarah can identify the mother's mood by her language choice is evidence of this reciprocity.

Excerpt 23

1 Mother: Nem hiszem el, hogy még mindig nem söpörted össze a szemetet!' [I don't believe that you still haven't swept up the floor!]
2 Sarah: **Your voice is nicer in ENG**LISH.
3 Mother: It is all the same whether I speak English or Hungarian. Now I am **angry,** and I do not want to speak any more.
4 Sarah: >Tudom, **amikor mérges vagy, meg sietsz** valahova, akkor **n e m beszélsz angolul**. Nem is beszélsz sehogyan.< [I know **when you are angry and hurry** somewhere then **you d o n o t speak in English.** You don't speak in any way.]
5 Mother: Yes, it's true. Now, will you do what I want from you?
6 Sarah: Yes, and I sweep up and I wash up too. (9;2)

The excerpt exemplifies that language choice can serve as an indicator for the child of her interlocutor's mood or emotional state and shows how this information is interpreted and converted into her own advantage.

Once I was really enraged because she hadn't swept up in the kitchen after asking her to do so several times. I shouted in Hungarian, because typically when I lose temper, I am unable to control my language use and speak in Hungarian. Sarah has figured out how my emotional states are related to my language uses. Her ability to discover casual relationship between language choice and my emotional states as a linguistic phenomenon is underpinned by her remarks in lines 2 and 4. As a reaction to my reproach Sarah appealed to an unexpected code-switch to evoke a chilling effect on me in line 2 because relying on her earlier practices, she knew that her speaking in English softened me, and helped to reach consolidation. The excerpt gives evidence that Sarah came to realize how my emotional states and my language use were interrelated. Her understanding of the interplay between my language choice and emotional state was reflected in her remarks in line 3. Her comment shows

that she had identified patterns in the way I moved between English and Hungarian. Emotions and spontaneous utterances of high intensity were communicated in L1 rather than in L2 due to the fact I was less capable of controlling my language use, whereas L2 was used in relaxed activities, in favourable conditions when sufficient time and attention were devoted to her. Her statement in line 2 gives a summary of her observations: I sounded different when I spoke English. With the reference to the change in the tone of my voice she also implied that she preferred my L2 use and liked the mood and atmosphere L2 lent to my speech (Pawliszko, 2016). The interplay of lived experience and language preference in Sarah's language performance reflects Pavlenko's findings (2005, 2006) according to which multilingual speakers show different emotional attachment to their languages due to their different socialization patterns and personality traits (p.113).

Excerpt 24

1 Mother: I've asked you thousands of times to clear away everything in your room. There are piles of clothes everywhere.
2 Sarah: **I've asked you thousands of times to come to horse-riding with me![:]** You promised. (6;7)

Sarah's appeal to L2 in excerpt 24 betrays her resourceful operation of the affective communication strategies giving evidence of her ability to get emotional gain via using L2. In a late afternoon when I got home after work, I entered Sarah's room to ask how things went at school that day. I could hardly find room to sit down on her bed as it was fully covered by clothes scattered all around. I became angry and made a remark about her untidiness shown in line 1. To my surprise she did not try to defend herself as she usually did, she went on putting the puzzle pieces on the board in front of her and answered in a neutral voice in English as in line 2. Her answer in English was unexpected for me in this situation. I was frozen because it rarely happened that she replied in English in a situation which was degrading and uncomfortable for her, for example when I reprimanded her. In these cases, she generally used Hungarian perhaps because in these situations she had to defend herself, which was easier for her in her mother tongue. The most surprising element of her reaction in this case was that instead of feeling guilty and accepting her negligence she flew into attack, put the blame on me and, on the top of all, she did

so in English. She used my words (I've asked you thousands of times…) to remind me that despite my countless promises I had not escorted her to her horse-riding lessons. Her self-confidence shocked and chilled me and put me in an embarrassing situation. Her L2 reply generated such a chilling effect that instead of launching an attack I withdrew and softened to the extent that I had to laugh. With her well-placed L2 utterance in line 2 she could satisfy her personal needs and goal: from her point of view, she was exercising power, making herself look good. It was not merely self-serving to claim that my behaviour in regard to her horse riding was disrespectful it was an upright intention to impress or overwhelm me. The result of such a strategy enhanced rapport between us and was clear evidence of the fact that Sarah powerfully relies upon the interlocutor's personal styles and preferences.

Her cutback exerted a conciliating effect on me. When asking her for the second time I sounded more patient, and the incident was soon forgotten. Sarah's indirect speech act in line 2 (see Section 2.1.7 Direct and indirect speech acts) was performed to serve a twofold aim. Firstly, it was meant to evoke ill-consciousness in me because of not keeping my promise. Secondly, her reliance on L2 was intended to soften me and make me more understanding: She knew her utterance could apply the intended influence on me and I would give the expected behavioural response: I would change my attitude and forgive her. Both the form of the language she used, and the content, what she said, proved to be effective to control the situation.

Excerpt 25 below exemplifies that L1 is used to discipline the interlocutor. The interactional exchange presented in the excerpt reveals a case when Sarah's lexical mix-up generated a laughable matter among her siblings Nani and Dodó, who picked on her mistake. The siblings' repair is addressed to Sarah and challenged her L2 competence.

Excerpt 25

1 Sarah: 'I like pizza from *don't Pepe!' (Her older sisters started to giggle over Sarah's false perception of the name 'Don Pepe'.)

2 Dodó. From where?

3 Sarah: Dont Pepe.

4 Dodó (laughing aloud): It's not dont Pepe, it is don Pepe! Úgy, hogy don Pepe. A 'don't' az angolul van, mikor azt akarod mondani, hogy ne csinálj valamit. Például: 'Don't touch it'. Tudod? [Don't is in English when you want to say that you shouldn't do something. For example: 'Don't touch it'. You know?]

5 Sarah: Akkor én most angolul mondtam! [Then now I said in English.]

6 Sarah: 'Nani, fejezd már be! Mindig **nyihogsz**, ha nem tudom mondani.' [Nani, finish it! You are always whinnying when I don't know it.]

7 Nani and Dodó:'**Say 'nyihogsz'in English**!'

8 Sarah: Laugh. ((Turning down her voice.))

9 Dodó: A laugh **az nevet**, de **nem nyihog**! [Laugh is laugh not whinny!]

10 Sarah: **>Más szót nem szoktam erre mondani**.< [I don't use another word for this.] >De tudom, hogy te most nem nevetsz, hanem nyihogsz!< [But I know that you are not laughing but whinnying.]

11 Sarah: Mér kell nyihogni? [Why do you need to neigh?] Te persze mindent tudsz, mert te nagy vagy, mi? [You, of course know everything because you are big, aren't you?]

12 Dodó: **Dehogy, bocs**! Összekeverted, mert tudsz angolul! **Büszke lehetsz magadra**! [No, sorry! You've mixed them up because you know English.You can be proud of yourself!] (5;1)

The scene is the process of choosing a take-away restaurant to order a meal for family dinner. The interactional exchange reveals a case when a word falsely perceived by Sarah generated laughs among her elder sisters Nani and Dodó, the event of ridiculing is marked by a loud voice to highlight Sarah's failure to find and use the correct word. Line 4 implies that the siblings went on commenting and provoking Sarah for her mistake. The funniness of Sarah's remark is attributed to an interlanguage error. Using 'don't' instead of 'don', an overextension of the English imperative structure is a manifestation of an analogy-based compensatory strategy to counterbalance her immature L2 lexical competence. After realizing her loosing of the conversational control, Sarah gives a clear reference that she is offended by stating that she interprets Dodo's reaction rather impolite and insulting. To recapture the floor (Greenwood, 1998) she addresses her comment to Dodó (line 7) and continues to discipline her in a teacher-like manner. Her resourcefulness in line 7

serves manyfold purposes: (1) to eliminate the trouble source, (2) to discipline her sister, to regain authority and (3) to redefine her position. Sarah's outburst in Hungarian in line 3 seemed a good occasion to link the suitable register to her cutback commentary. Lacking the appropriate words for vernacular discourse and stylistic shade in L2 Sarah perceived that her sisters would be easier regulated in L1. Also, L1 appeared to be an effective tool to develop a counter-discourse with the aim to escape from her inequitable subject position and it was an opportunity to fight back for her sister's disregarding behaviour. The use of Hungarian in line 3 seems a good occasion for her to link a suitable stylistic shade and to give voice to her dissatisfaction and offendedness. L1 was motivated by the need to compensate for the low level of her register competence.

Excerpt 25 depicts an inciteful example of Sarah's identity perception in her developing bilingualism. Line 7 points towards the fact that she is aware of her lexical shortages regarding L2. The emphatic 'persze' ('sure') in line 8 is indexical of her aversion to her siblings' authoritative teacher-like position and the recognition of their entitlement to repair erroneous use. Turning her voice down while uttering *laugh,* her English translation of *nyihog* (whinny) in line 6 indexes her restricted register competence. In response to her sister's provocation in line 8 she admitted that she was aware of the inappropriateness of *laugh* in that context. Her utterances in lines 10-11 index her subordinate position in the local social order and her adopting the identity of a less knowledgeable person who is taught by more competent members of her family. Excerpt 25 depicts an example of Sarah's identity perception in her developing bilingualism: both realizing her initial mistake 'don't Pepe' and the word search for the L2 equivalent of 'nyihog' (whinny) are explicit identifications of trouble shooting on her part. Sarah's appeal to L1 serves as (1) a tool to index the asymmetry in her knowledge of L1 and L2; and (2) L1 is an additional safe resource to organize and manage the conversation.

Her counterattack as a reaction to Dori's comment in line 7 was deployed to mitigate her subordinate position of someone less knowledgeable person and served as a critique of her elder sister's disrespectfulness. Line 9 suggests that the tactic worked, because Dori regretted laughing at her. She admits that the mockery is outright unfair because Sarah's instance of language mixing originates from something to be acknowledged instead of being criticized. She declares herself to be someone with a

valued identity who can build distinctions with her L2 competence. In the very course of correction, the sister's spontaneous meta-comment in line 8 identifies Sarah as a knowledgeable and competent speaker of L2. To give further emphasis to her regret she apologized and made Sarah understand that her English knowledge was a real value, which she should be proud of.

7.2.4 Topic abandonment and tricking

Excerpt 26 is a typical case of resource expansion and the realization of metacognitive and affective strategies as described in Oxford's (1990) and Cohen's (1998) taxonomy and is suggestive of her employing topic abandonment and humour as types of achievement strategy. (Baker, 2006; Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Tarone, 1977) (see Section 4.5 and 4.7).

Excerpt 26

1 Mother: You haven't opened the book today. **You are lying, aren't you**? (Pressing Sarah's nose gently)
2 Sarah: **I am not lying, I am sitting**.
3 Mother: (can hardly hide a smile) Really? Then tell me the poem now. ((Sarah starts reciting the poem but stops many times not remembering the text fluently.))
4 OK, learn it, I will come later and ask you. But next time you should think before you cheat me. Promise,
5 Sarah: **Yes** [:]. P**ro**mise. (8;3)

This conversation occurred in the evening, she was lying in bed, and I asked her if she knew the Hungarian poem, Hajnal Anna: 'A náthás medve' 'The bear with a cold', she had promised to learn for school. She said yes, but it turned out to be a fib, as to my request she could recite the poem only with a lot of mistakes. I reproached her for not telling the truth shown in line 1. Feeling bad, she immediately bounced up in her bed and answered as in line 2. This event shows that she understood the illocutionary act of my utterance in line 1, she knew I was furious with her, therefore she tried to conciliate and soften me by a word play i.e., using a homophone 'lie'as a linguistic resource. The utterance was an attempt to get me to be more permissive

and forget about her improper behaviour. She could reach her goal: she impressed me by her resourcefulness.

Excerpt 27

1 Sarah: This is hedgehog **OR WHAT**?! ↑ ((Wants to say 'urchin', trying to divert me from what I am doing, to pay attention to her))
2 Mother: What? I don't understand. Who told you that word?
3 Sarah: You. It was in the bedtime book. In the tale. Here it is. ((Runs into her room and comes back with her favourite story book in her hand leafing it through to find the word she was looking for.))
4 Mother: Ah, **that one**! You meant **URCHIN**!
5 Sarah: **URCHIN**! Please, read it! (7;9)

One day I was very busy correcting a pile of exam papers in the bedroom and Sarah felt neglected because I did not play with her. To engage herself she started to examine the content of her big glass bowl full of pebbles, stones, shells, and other seashore treasures we collected on the shore during our summer holiday in Croatia. While sorting them out she suddenly came across the pricky shell of a sea urchin. Immediately she ran up to me with the urchin in her hand to ask me how it was pronounced in English. Because she did not get the answer first, she insisted on finding the story we read about an urchin in her story book. Her behavioural response represented a rebel. She was hurt because I refused to play with her so as a revenge, she wanted to involve me in some way. Normally she is not so eager to clarify a word she does not know perfectly in English. Her utterance in line 1 is a request conveyed with the help of an indirect speech act. The literal meaning is a request: 'Help me out and pronounce the word I am not certain about'. The implied meaning is a request for attention: 'Do not work, pay attention to me!'. It is seen that Sarah's reference to English served a twofold aim. (1) To make me realize that she is bored. (2) To make me stop what I was doing. Her asking about an English word seemed to be a witty idea to win my attention even if she knew I realized her tactful resort to L2. Reference to L2 proved to be an effective strategic tool to reach her goal: I abandoned the exam papers and, as a sign of cooperation, I joined her searching for the urchin tale in her picture book to satisfy her curiosity. The phatic function of her speech act, 'It was in the bedtime book', was achieved, she was able to initiate a conversation with me.

In excerpt 27 Sarah using her story book as the source of knowledge gives evidence that story reading provides access to learning experiences and is considered as authority she can rely on in cases of uncertainty or even can function as the act of boasting about and priding for linguistic competence. The reference to earlier readings, besides being the manifestation of an effective learning strategy serves also as an effective communication strategy. Bringing up different elements of our readings and making them the topic of discourse seem to be suitable strategic tools to win my attention and elevate her status.

Such language-related references including discussing and citing familiar stories give Sarah inner satisfaction. On the one hand, her English knowledge displayed and provoked in the related interactions provide opportunities for her to earn authority and respect in the family, and, on the other hand, reading, retelling these stories and narratives serve as appropriate scaffolding to turn her comments into opportunities for learning and practising L2.

Excerpt 28

1 Sarah: Mummy, **let the cats in**.
2 Mother. You know I don't like it. They live outside.
3 Sarah: But **Nati wants to stroke them**.
4 Mother: I say no[:].
5 Sarah: Nati, do you feel sorry for the cats?
6 Mother: But take them out as soon I ask you.
7 Sarah: **Sure, sure**. (6;6)

The scene is a case of Sarah's strategic appeal to L2. It demonstrates how she uses L2 as a complementary strategic tool to make the interlocutors change their mind and act in her favour. In the excerpted situation my apprehension against letting the cats in the house causes trouble for Sarah and evokes her intervention. The presence of Nati, a Polish girl of 13, speaking no Hungarian only English, offers an opportunity for Sarah to mitigate my rigour about the cats' whereabout. The gentle verbal pressure in line 5 was aimed to evoke my sympathy for the cats. The use of L2 in the presence of Nati, an out-group member, being a first-time visitor is meant to intensify compassion in me. This instance of Sarah's language shift was unexpected because until that episode she had resisted to use L2 with uninitiated members. Indeed, her

switch to L2 in an unusually high voice appeared to be an effective verbal action, a speech act with the illocutionary act to (1) win my support and (2) to evoke guilty conscience over my 'cruelty' (3) earn my appreciation over her use of L2 as a sign of her cooperation with and alignment to non-group peers. My behavioural response: a clear sign of my cooperation and generosity manifested by letting the cats inside meant the realization of the perlocution of the same speech act. In Sarah's utterance in line 7 two speech acts are achieved: (1) a promise to obey the locally established cat-keeping regulations; and (2) an expression of her indebtedness towards me.

7.2.5 Easing tension and injecting humour

Around the age of four playing with words became an interesting activity for Sarah. From that age she tends to investigate linguistic phenomena. As her lexicon widened, she realized that certain words in English have different meanings although they sound identical and also noticed that some Hungarian and English words sound the same. Recognising the differences of this nature she started to treat her languages as the objects of analysis and used them as frequent sources of puns. Her puns betray her directed attention to similarities and differences between her two languages. She discovers homophones, that is words that sound the same but have different meanings. Having discovered the presence of homophones in the English language she has fun with the language and frequently appeals to humour.

The excerpts below show how she converts her language-related observations into joyful social activities, how her well-placed puns satisfy her personal needs. Homophones are the most frequent linguistic elements that inspires her to play with language and inject humour in her discourse. The excerpts below give evidence that puns and 'injecting humour' termed by Baker (2006) are used not simply for self-serving entertainment, they are usually operated as effective communication strategies (see Section 4.7). Puns are tools to control power relationships in a discourse event and generate the expected discourse behaviour, laughter, amazement or embarrassment in the interlocutor.

Excerpt 29

1 Dodó: **SARAH, COME**. (hh) We're baking 'Kacsa Nagyi' chocolate cookies, which you like so much. Prepare the flour, sugar, eggs, and cocoa here on the table.
2 Sarah: Soon. ((The girls are waiting, but Sarah does not move from the sofa.))
3 Dodó: Are you sitting on your ears?... Is it so difficult to lift your buttocks and get the flour from the larder?
4 Sarah: No. Coming! ((Runs up to the table in the dining room and fidgets with the tulips, which are placed in the vase in the middle of the table. In the following moment she turns up in the kitchen with a tulip in her hand)) { } Dodó, your **flower** is here!
5 Dori (laughing): **VERY CLEVER**! (8;7)

The excerpt is an instance of the siblings' attempt to involve Sarah in the process of cake baking and is a case of the bigger ones' instructing her in L2. Having learned that Sarah was more cooperative when asked in English and seeing L2 the language of alliance and the appreciation of Sarah's L2 competence, the siblings requested Sarah in English. This time Sarah is asked to deliver the necessary ingredients, but Sarah was unwilling to fulfil the task. As a reaction to Sarah's ignorance of the request the sisters change the register and make a sarcastic remark in line 3 to discipline her. As a sign of apology for her displaying inappropriate behaviour Sarah invents a joke to conciliate the siblings. Making sure that the big girls watch her, she imitates putting some flower in the bowl prepared for flour and cracks a joke victoriously in line 4. Certainly, the pun serves a successful tool to counterbalance her sisters' teasing. Realizing the effect of her impoliteness, she is determined to soften her sisters and regain her appreciated position. Her gestural performance, caressing the sisters' shoulder, the smile on her face, accompanying the utterance in line 2 indicated that the pun was applied not only for funniness. Her aim was undoubtedly to win her sisters' conciliation, which she finally could achieve as shown in line 5. Inserting humour and bringing about a humorous effect proved to be an effective strategic tool to defend herself and to win attention. The siblings' reaction and the smile on their faces signalled for Sarah that her pun hit the target. From the way the siblings reacted she realized that she could redefine her position in

the circle of siblings. Hearing her well-placed pun, her sisters admitted that she was clever enough to speak for herself and control the situation.

Excerpt 30

1 Sarah: Mummy, I know a good joke. (hh)
2 Mother: What is it?
3 Sarah: **Kidi is kidding**.
4 Mother: It is really **very funny**. I like it!
5 Sarah: Yes, and **I CAN JOKE** in **Eng**lish! (7;6)

In a summer afternoon when noticing the neighbour's dog chasing a ball in a funny way Sarah uttered the utterance in excerpt 30. Kidi is the name of our neighbour's dog. Both examples, excerpts 29 and 30, demonstrate the in-group nature of the interaction. Sarah has learnt that she can use these types of puns only with initiated people who have shared background and frequent interactions with her. The child assumes that her mother aligns with her, first she speaks English, so understands what 'kidding' means, second, she knows who Kidi is, that is, she knows that he is a dog, and his name is Kidi. Knowing that all these circumstantial elements are present Sarah can expect that her interlocutor understands, rewards and evaluates the humour in the utterance. She can rely on the fact that they both accept the local norms not only for interpreting a specific discourse event, in this case the pun, but also the norms for displaying appropriate discourse behaviour, in this case, laughter.

7.3 Discussion of the results

My inquiry had a twofold aim: (1) to investigate the function of Sarah's bidirectional (L1-L2, L2-L1) code-switches and (2) identify patterns in them. The analysed discourses reveal that her two languages interacted constantly, and she resorted to language alternation for a variety of reasons. Code-switching representing subtypes of communication strategies, e.g., metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (Oxford, 1990, see Section 4.4, The integrated view) was triggered by her need to mediate the communicative intent, negotiate meanings and enhance communication. Both L1-L2 and L2-L1 code-switches added to fluency and ease of expression, facilitated understanding, and enhanced the stylistic effectiveness and intensity of the girl's messages.

The excerpts presented in chapters 6 and 7 are suggestive of the dynamic character of the strategic use of code-switching. At an early stage of language development, up to the age of four, (see chapter 6.4, Sarah's L2 development at four different domains of language in L2 – Lexicon, morphology, syntax, pragmatics) the reason for her reliance on L2 was compensation due to her limited vocabulary in both of her languages. Later, between four and eleven, as seen in the excerpts of the present chapter, with her progression toward a higher level of communicative competence, she could operate code-switching as an achievement strategy.

The data are suggestive of Sarah's appeal to L2 with the purpose of mediating a variety of communicative intentions. With her progression towards a higher level of pragmatic competence she appeals to L2 as a complementary set of linguistic forms and resources to control situations. She developed a positive attachment to L2, prided herself for knowing English, experienced emotional gain and motivation from using L2, which encouraged her to further use and improve her L2. The examples taken from Sarah's talks are suggestive of her ability to understand and discuss her own and her interlocutors' emotions, attitude, and motivation.

The analysed data give evidence that cross-linguistic phenomena signalled affect and facilitated getting the intended meanings across. Code-switches as a subset of communication strategies expressed things like group-solidarity, endearment, attachment, conciliation, identifying the interlocutor's mood, having fun with language, tricking and preserving alliance and privacy. The excerpts in this chapter underpin how she adjusted language choice and preference to the locally established family norms and agenda and how she interpreted and related to the communicative event having two languages at her disposal. The indicator of her pragmatic competence, the knowledge of using relevant linguistic solutions in authentic situations is that she has definite expectations and knowledge on who, where, when speaks one or another language.

Sarah's L2-L1 code-switching patterns show resemblance to what is suggested by studies of bilingual education (Baker, 2006; Cekaite & Björk-Willén. 2012; Gafaranga, 2012; Lugossy, 2003; Nikolov, 1999; Pavlenko, 2006); therefore, I used these authors' categories when grouping Sarah's code-switches. My findings reveal similarities between my participant's emotions and the multilingual interviewees' affective stances of the reviewed scholarly literature.

The cited authors confirm that code-switches play an important role in defining group boundaries, establishing identity and power relations, signalling levels of intimacy and emotional charge and are strategic tools to convey a range of communicative intentions (Pavlenko, 2006). Code-switching is a marked choice understood as the speaker's strategic use of a new code to emphasize a message of a communicative act.

My explanation of how the two terms, *code-switching* and *translanguaging* are different, is the following: Translanguaging is an umbrella term, which includes code-switching. Code-switching focuses on language and is less concerned with the idiosyncrasy of the individual language user. Translanguaging views language use as a complex phenomenon, taking into consideration the language functions mediated by moving between languages, the individual's thoughts, intentions behind language alternation and the strategies underlying their language choice and preference.

Multilingual children operate code-switching for greater emphasis in their effort to reach a goal they do not achieve using only one language (Kleemann, 2013; Murphy, 2014). A code-switch can be used to emphasize one's power or authority, a desire to be accepted in a group, or simply represents family bonding. Code-switches used to ease tension and inject humour may signal a change of attitude or relationship, a desire to change the interlocutor's mood or to change the style of the conversation. Code-switches can signal social distance or expressions of solidarity, shared values, and growing rapport and, on the contrary, exclude others from the conversation. Code-switches may reflect that L1 and L2 refer to different domains. For example, L1 can be the language of home and L2 is the language of school or vice versa (Baker, 2006). Code-switches can reflect language expertise, which is an issue for negotiations and can define local norms for conduct and language use (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012).

It is important to note that the examples listed under my analytical categories differ in number. The unequal number of the categorized examples is attributed to the fact that for certain categories I have found several relevant examples whereas for others only a few ones.

7.4 Conclusion

In chapter 7 I discussed Sarah's L1-L2 and L2-L1 code-switching behaviour and identified the motives of her language choice and preference. The analysed data showed that Sarah's language use shows a kind of divergence from her earlier code-switching patterns, for example, from the code-switches depicting interlanguage errors in the previous chapter. The code-switches presented in chapter 7 were identified as important contributors to successful interpersonal communication and played an important role in differentiating meanings and in formulating the interlocutors' discourse behaviour (Schiffrin, 1994). The excerpts revealed a variety of communicative intentions mediated and interpreted through code-switching in Sarah's developing bilingualism in concrete communicative acts. Also, I demonstrated that bilingualism created a unique context and interesting moments to express a variety of communicative intentions and emotional stances both on the part of the speaker and the interlocutor.

Chapter 8 – Sarah's identity development in her developing bilingualism

	The focus of analysis	The phenomena addressed and investigated
Chapter 8	Manifestations of Sarah's identity transformations in her developing bilingualism	• Group affiliation and allegiance • Handling negative feedback and peer criticism and asking for justification and reinforcement • Reference to other language learners' experiences • Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy • Getting authority via L2 • Finding ways to enhance learning strategies

8.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I described the ways Sarah applied code-switching as a strategic tool to convey communicative intentions. In this chapter, from a new perspective, I concentrate on manifestations of her identity transformations in her developing bilingualism. I focus on the multiple identities Sarah developed in bilingualism at different points of time in a variety of situations. The excerpts presented in this chapter show how she negotiates her identity and allows insights into her perception of self. I intend to show how the feedback she gets from her social environment (e.g., peer criticism) constitutes her identity as the product of interpersonal interactions in bilingual informal settings. I draw on my data to find

evidence that during the process she constantly reformulates her self-image. Depending on the numerous effects Sarah develops versatile and sometimes contradictory identities and depicts various motivations and group affiliations.

8.2 Patterns in Sarah's identity development

In the present chapter I intend to illuminate how Sarah's experiencing emotional gains from appeals to L2 triggers further motivation to use and improve her L2. The excerpts below are to explore that Sarah utilizes L2 as a resource for constituting social relations and identities in both mono- and bilingual peer groups' interactions (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p 177). Her language choice is a 'significant aspect of talk organization' (Gafaranga, 2012, p. 510). Analysing the data, I have identified patterns in Sarah's identity development. The excerpts in this chapter are organized according to the following categories:

1 Group affiliation and allegiance
2 Handling negative feedback and peer criticism and asking for justification and reinforcement
3 Reference to other language learners' experiences
4 Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy
5 Getting authority L2
6 Finding ways to enhance learning strategies.

The table below presents the categories I identified in Sarah's talk displaying her orientation.

to her bilingual identity completed with the relevant excerpts

Table 8 - Categories of Sarah`s identity transformations and the descriptions of the categories

Category	Description
Group affiliation and allegiance (Excerpts 31,32,33)	The excerpts under this category are language-related exchanges considered as manifestations of Sarah`s sense of belonging to show

	how alliances and allegiances are created on the spot (Greenwood, 1998). The ways of regulating, identifying, and redefining herself in the cultural group, in the peer group, depend on her personal needs and interests. Sarah`s individual struggle to reach the respectful position of a sufficiently competent speaker of English is a recurrent phenomenon in the discourse pieces presented here.
Handling negative feedback and asking for justification and reinforcement (Excerpts 34,35,36,37)	Reactions to peer-initiated criticism, discussions of peer pressure cases give a better understanding of Sarah's socializing into appropriate ways of her regaining entitlement to use a language, which normally does not belong to her monolingual peer group members. The excerpts under this category show Sarah's report on peer criticism, her perception of the relative nature of language use, her conceptualization of language expertise and her sense of self in the language learning process. References to shared language use habits with native L2 speakers reflect Sarah's integration effort in the community of the target language. A sense of we-ness and group belonging she developed with members of the target community raised her self-esteem, gave her power and authority.

Highlighting deficiencies and asymmetries in second language knowledge (Excerpts 38,39,40,41,42)	The excerpts in this category demonstrate Sarah`s discussions of her feelings, doubts, and individual struggles in the L2 learning process. The impact of peer comments motivates her language learning progress and formulates her self-image. The selected language-related episodes underpin that peers' labelling her an incompetent L2 speaker encourages Sarah to reflect on her L2 competence using her bilingual role-model friends' viewpoint as a reference. The excerpts of this category are suggestive of the fact that Sarah's two languages fill different roles and functions. L1 is used to compensate for low language proficiency and to enhance authentic communication. L1 is more suitable to give voice to her true opinion, whereas L2 is used for pragmatic differentiation i.e., to generate a chilling or surprising effect in the interlocutor.
Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy (Excerpts 43,44,45)	The excerpts of this category present peer group negotiations as social sites for building local social order, values and norms that regulate one another's conduct and group-belonging. The excerpts give an insight into how verbal exchanges constitute social relations in the local social order, sometimes reinforcing intimacy and

	solidarity, sometimes ousting someone from the group.
Getting authority via L2 (Excerpts 46,47,48,49)	The excerpts exhibit the process of Sarah's taking advantage of her own L2 expertise. The episodes exemplify her contesting for the position of the competent L2 user through her efforts to win a respectful position in the circle of peers. These are social sites where Sarah, due to her L2 expertise, tends to gain entitlement to control the situation and speak up for herself. We can witness Sarah`s conceptualization and interpretations of making distinctions in terms of language competence. Learning that her L2 knowledge is highly respected and well-appraised she repositions herself as a self-confident user of L2 who became powerful enough to win the in-the-know position in terms of L2.
Finding ways to enhance learning strategies (Excerpts 50,51,52)	The excerpts in this section are manifestations of Sarah`s understanding of the importance of L2 knowledge. The excerpts are suggestive of her understanding that her English knowledge is an additional asset, which is acknowledged by legitimate, authorized, and competent users of L2, such as native peers and schoolteachers. Verbal declarations of her self-evaluation and self-reflections are vivid descriptions of the dynamic and sometimes contradictory character

	of her bilingual self. The excerpts outline the image of a responsible, proactive, reflexive L2 learner, who constantly monitors her learning and reveals multiple interpretations of her bilingual childhood mostly depending on the feedback she gets from her social environment.

8.2.1 Group affiliation and allegiance

For Sarah shifting to English within a discourse event between her ages two and eleven is a regular practice either voluntarily or as a response to others' request. She fulfils translation tasks with pleasure and enjoys the additional challenge they impose on her if it follows the household language use habits. The example below illustrates her sensitivity to the peers' communication needs and reveals her perception of her L2 competence.

Excerpt 31

1 Sarah: Brendy, we have coke, do you want?
2 Brendy: It is not good for me. Mom says I mustn't drink anything from the fridge. I'm ill with hörghurut [bronchitis] and taking medicine.
3 Sarah: Then tea? It's hot.
4 Brendy: A little.
5 Kata: **Mit mondott**? [What did he say?]
6 Sarah: Azt, hogy nem ihat hideg vizet, mert hörghurutja van. [That he mustn't drink cold water because he has bronchitis.]
7 Kata: **Hogy van az, hogy hörghurut angolul**? [How is 'hörghurut' [bronchitis] in English?]
8 Sarah. Nem tudom, **mi csak azt mondjuk, hogy 'ill'**. [I don't know, we say only 'ill'.]
9 **Meg a Brendy is úgy mondja**. [And Brendy also says so.]
10 Kata: **Jó, elhiszem**. [Good, I believe you.] (5;5)

From the short dialogue between Brendy and Sarah in lines 1-4 it turns out that Brendi was advised to avoid drinking anything cold while trying to get over his bronchitis. Brendy, Sarah's groupmate in the kindergarten that time, is a balanced bilingual with an American father and a Hungarian mother. Due to her lack of English knowledge Kata requests translating Brendy's words as in line 5. Sarah fulfils the task without hesitation in line 6 but Kata is not fully satisfied, she is more inquisitive and requests the accurate English equivalent of the word 'hörghurut'(bronchitis). Sarah, not knowing the English word herself, answers as in lines 8 and 9 and states how her family uses L2. Her remark in line 9 implies that this gap in her lexicon does not cause real trouble for her so she does not attribute much interest to Kata's hair-splitting. To support and verify her response (line 9) she argues that Brendy uses the same Hungarian word for that meaning.

Sarah's behaviour exhibits a dynamic sense of group-solidarity: she translates Brendy's English talk into Hungarian not wanting to exclude Kata, thus representing her assimilation attempt into the community of L1 friends. The reference to 'we', (line 6) indicating a group distinct from that of Kata's and identical with that of Brendy's is suggestive of her belonging to the L2 community. The excerpt illustrates how Sarah regulates, identifies, and redefines herself in the cultural group depending on her personal needs and interests. Directing attention to the similarities between Brendy's and her own family's language use in line 9 seems to be a good idea to speak from a powerful in-the-know position and makes her a respected and trustworthy L2 user in the peer group. References to shared language use habits with native L2 speakers reflect Sarah's integration effort in the community of the target language. A sense of we-ness and group belonging she has developed with members of the target community apparently raises her self-esteem and gives her power and authority. (Cekaite & Björk-Will; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Kleemann, 2013; Pavlenko, 2006; Norton, 2000; Ricento, 2005).

Excerpt 32

1 Sarah:'Olyan ciki, volt. Tudod, a diaper-rel alszom. A Maja meg észrevette, mikor mentünk aludni, és megkérdezte, mi az. [It was so embarrassing. You know, I sleep with the diaper. And Maja noticed it when we were going to bed and asked me what it is.]

2 Mother: És, megmondtad? (And did you tell her?)

3 Sarah: Meg, de **azt, mondtam hogy 'diaper'**. **A Maja meg nem tud angolul**. [**Yes, but I said 'diaper'. And Maja does not know in English.]**

4 Mother: Hát miért nem mondtad magyarul? [Why didn't you say in Hungarian?]

5 Sarah: **Így nem volt olyan ciki**. [**In this way it was not so embarrassing**.]

6 Mother: És, nem kérdezte az mit jelent? [And she didn't ask what it means.]

7 Sarah: Nem, nem kérdezett többet. Úgy tett, mintha értené, hogy mit mondtam. Pedig **én tudom**, **hogy nem értette**. **Csak nem merte bevallani**. Tudod, milyen nagyra van magától. [No, she didn't ask any more. **She pretended as if she understood what I had said.** But I know she didn't understand. **Only didn't dare to admit it**. You know how much she thinks about herself.] (7;4)

Having returned from a synchronized skating competition Sarah recounts an instance of her recapturing authority with the help of L2 in a troublesome interaction. The diaper she uses as a safety blanket at bedtime appears to be the source of trouble in the exchange. Sarah's weird bedtime ritual obviously evokes Maja's curiosity, which Sarah perceives as face threatening, so she responds in L2 by latching onto her peer's sentence before she could turn into deeper discussions of the matter in line 3. To clarify the situation Sarah reports on feeling extremely embarrassed by Maja's question (line 1) accompanied by a depreciatory smile on her face, so she decides to use the English equivalent of the word expecting that it sounds less ridiculous than the Hungarian 'pelenka'[diaper]. Indeed, the language shift appears to be an effective strategy for getting authoritative speaking, a linguistic tool to regain conversational control. L2 satisfies her personal needs, provides a secure ground to counterbalance peer teasing, preserves intimacy, and, at the same time, eliminates her inequitable subject position. Line 5 gives evidence of Sarah interpreting the habit of sleeping with her safety diaper rather childish and degrading for her age, which fact makes her reroute the talk by inserting L2 in the conversation. The switch to L2 is a successful resolution, as it exerts a chilling effect on Maja's part who abandons further inquisition. As Sarah's argumentation goes (line 7), Maja's silencing is a conscious, goal-oriented act: Maja is too proud to admit not understanding English

and fears looking disregarded. Her termination of the conversation is an obvious attempt to maintain a positive face and disguise her insufficient L2 knowledge.

Excerpt 33

1 Mother: What's wrong with speaking in English? Let your classmates know that you can speak English. At least they can practise it.
2 Sarah: ((whispering)) **De az olyan ciki, mikor angolul beszélsz, azt hiszik, hogy nagyképűsködök**. [**But it is so embarrassing, when you speak English, they think I am showing off**.]
3 Dodó: **You shouldn't be so shy! Be you very proud of your knowledge**! (6;5)

While walking through the corridor at school, accompanied by some of Sarah's classmates I inquired if she was selected to give an oral account in literature in line 1. Sarah found my English speaking out of place and warned me to switch to Hungarian arguing that her peers would assess L2 talk as eccentric behaviour, a manifestation of her self-contentedness. The utterance in line 2 exemplifies her perception of her bilingual self and underpins her group affiliation attempt. Apparently, Sarah's interpretation of the relevance of the correct language is displayed in the exchange. Line 2 discloses how she appropriates her two languages with two different social communities: in the circle of peers belonging to the well-informed and initiated members of the community she uses L2 with ease, whereas with out-group members she refuses to do so. The utterance gives evidence that she does not want to be ousted from the circle of her monolingual peers and her remark in line 2 expresses her desire to align to the established language separation norms. Her elder sister Dodó's comment in line 3 reflects high valorization of foreign language knowledge and is a clear sign of acknowledgement. The utterance is also meant to recognise the progress Sarah made in L2 acquisition to give her further motivation and increase her self-confidence.

8.2.2 Handling negative feedback and asking for justification and reinforcement

The data I used for analysing Sarah's identity development underpin that her and her peers' orientations to language use, corrective actions, assessments, criticism they

display in free play and conversation give strong motivation for her to negotiate language-related issues. Such free discussion activities serve as social sites of negotiating norms and values regulating her conduct and language use or choice. Also, they give opportunities to get encouragement from me and to find ways of self-evaluation and monitoring (see Section 4.4 The integrated view, for example Oxford's taxonomy of LLS).

Excerpt 34

Sarah:

1 A Barbi meg olyan nevetséges! **Annyit dicsekszik, hogy, ha már a külön angolon ügyes lesz, az anyukájával otthon is fognak angolul beszélgetni.** [Barbi is so ridiculous. **She boasts so much that when she becomes skillful enough in the extra English lesson** they will speak in English at home with her mother.]
2 Meg, hogy már most is a reggelinél tudta, hogy 'Drink tea'. Meg elmondta, hogy mit eszik, angolul. (And that she knew already at breakfast also: 'Drink tea.' And she said what she ate in English.)
3 **Nem is hiszem, hogy angolul beszélnek, csak azért mondja, hogy nagyképűsködjön**. [**I don't think they speak English; she says so that she could show off**.]
4 **Én is nagyképűsködhetnék, mert sokkal jobb vagyok angolból, mint ő. Mégse mondtam, hogy mi meg állandóan angolul beszélünk otthon, mer nem akarom, hogy kérdezgessenek, hogy mér beszélsz velem angolul. [I could show off too, because I am much better at English than her, still I didn't tell her that we always speak English at home, as I don't want her to keep asking why you talk to me in English.]** (8;9)

When asked about Barbi's birthday party Sarah answered in an unmodulated manner in excerpt 34 to show her astonishment evoked by her classmate's Barbi's report on how she progresses in English using it in loose conversations in home settings. Barbi's boasting in lines 1-2 is evaluated by Sarah as insulting and interpreted it as a sign of disregard. Sarah's indignation is further augmented by Barbi's unjustified optimism and self-confidence in line 2. Sarah's utterances in line 4 give a clear explanation of why it was hard for her to keep quiet and not to react to Barbi's

provoking statement shown in line 1. In Sarah's perception the avoidance of any reference to her L2 use routine appeared to be a good strategy to prevent her from the peer's invasive questions. Although she secludes herself from letting Barbi know more about the method of her family established bilingualism, she overtly prides herself on her L2 competence, which, as she declares in line 4, would give her the right to boast. However, her discretion restrains her from revealing her opinion.

Excerpt 35

Sarah:

1 A múltkor is kérdezett valamit a Szandra, hogy mi az angolul, és mondta, **ha olyan jól tudsz angolul, miért nem tudsz egy csomó magyar szót angolra lefordítani?** [The other day Szandra also asked what something in English is and said, **if you know English so well why can't you translate a lot of Hungarian words into English?]**

2 Azt is mondta, hogy azt **ember az anyukájától nem tud megtanulni angolul, csak, ha Angliában élnek. [**She also said that **one cannot learn English from their mother, only if they live in England.]**

3 **A nyelvtant meg főleg csak tanártól lehet megtanulni**, az anyukájától nem tudja az ember. [**Especially grammar can be learnt only from a teacher**, people can't do that from their mother.]

4 Én meg modtam, hogy de **igenis lehet, én is tőled tudok**, meg a Kasia is az anyukájával tanul magyarul. [But I said it is possible, **I also know it from you** and Kasia learnt Hungarian from her mother too.] (8;9)

In line 1 Szandra questioned the credibility of a language learning environment where one's own mother taught a foreign language and learning took place in home settings without an institutional framework. She argues that good knowledge of language requires native-like control with rich lexicon and high grammatical competence in lines 2 and 3. Her mentioning grammar as the main priority implies that it is a focused element of language competence to be controlled by an authorized person, preferably by a teacher. Szandra's argumentation in excerpt 35 reveals the essence of her view: a bilingual is an indistinguishable competent speaker of the target language whose L2 proficiency and performance must be discussed and evaluated in relation to monolingual norms. Upon Szandra's provoking comment Sarah felt her retreat would

have been a sign of adopting the position of a less knowledgeable person who accepted criticism without presenting counterevidence, so she decided to speak up for herself and displayed unmitigated disagreement in line 4. She argued that learning a second language at home was equally justified and was as real as teacher-controlled institutional learning. Her commentary discloses how she gained and regained the conversational control: after the initial withdrawal, she speaks up for herself. To signal her objection to Szandra's narrow-mindedness and teacher-like manner she drew on Kasia's example. The reference to her balanced bilingual friend Kasia meant presenting counterevidence against Szandra's biased view and a manifestation of Sarah's conceptualization of language proficiency at the same time. The excerpt demonstrates how language-related episodes in which peers displayed their views on language and language competence were initiated and discussed by Sarah.

The following excerpts of spontaneous peer interactions include comments on interlocutors' talk, entailing negotiations and corrections of vocabulary. I demonstrate how the competent use of the appropriate language, namely, English is addressed and constructed as a local norm of conduct.

Excerpt 36

Sarah:

1 Képzeld, **nem tudtam, mi az a <u>'melléknév' angolul</u>.** [Imagine, **I didn't know what <u>'adjective' is in English</u>.]**
2 A **Rámi** meg **kinevetett**, és azt mondta: **Nem is tudsz angolul**! [And **Rámi laughed** at me and said, **you don't really know English**.]
3 Olyan rossz, ha kérik, hogy fordítsak le egy szót, és nem tudom. **Megkérdeztem a Brendy-t,** és, képzeld, ő sem tudta. Mondta, hogy **az ő anyukája is megnézi a szótárban, ha nem tud valamit**. [It is so bad when I am asked to translate a word and I don't know. **I asked Brendy** and imagined; he didn't know it either. He said **his mother also looks it up in the dictionary when she doesn't know something.]**
4 Én is mondtam is neki, hogy **csak azt tudom, amiről mindig beszélgetünk otthon**, meg. hogy te sose kéred, hogy ilyeneket fordítsak le. Ilyen **nyelvtanos dolgokat sose mondunk angolul, csak úgy beszélgetünk,** hogy mi van velünk, de attól még tudok. Persze, hogy nem tudok mindent, de te is

mondtad, hogy senki se tud. [I also told him that **I know only what we talk about at home**, and that you never ask to translate such things. **Such grammar issues we never talk about in English, just talk**, even so I know in English. Of course, I don't know everything, but you also said noone does.] (9;5)

Excerpt 36 represents a case of Sarah's account of a discussion carried out between her and Rámi, one of her her classmates, who questioned her knowledge of English. Rámi's degrading remark labelling Sarah an incompetent speaker of English encouraged her to reflect on her own L2 competence using Brendy's, her role model bilingual friend's viewpoint as a reference. Coming to realize that Brendy, a native speaker of English was also unfamiliar with the English equivalent of *melléknév* (adjective), seemed to restore her self-esteem. Brendy's mentioning her mother's habit of consulting the dictionary to compensate for lexical gaps made it obvious that word for word translation could be challenging for even native speakers. Brendy's attitude to learning presented counterevidence against Rámi's view, which resulted in a positive change of Sarah's mind and dispersed her *I am incompetent* pessimistic belief. Although it was not stated but only implied Sarah did not appear to accept translation as an adequate standard and a valid measure of one's language competence. Brendy's unfamiliarity with the word in question supported her view. Sarah's comment in line 4 betrays that her use of English was restricted to mostly communicative and not to academic function. She pointed out that she had developed proficient level regarding the vocabulary of everyday topics but lacked grammar terms in English because her two languages filled not the same role and status. The example also reflects Sarah's conception of language knowledge as well as her awareness of the interrelationship between language competence and language use. Her remark in line 4 is an implicit reference to her understanding of the relative and dynamic nature of language knowledge, meaning that language learners usually do not develop all skills and aspects of language equally. Certain skills and competences are better developed whereas others are less improved. Sarah's introspection illustrates that she was capable of repositioning herself as a self-confident user of L2 who became powerful enough to speak for herself.

Excerpt 37

Sarah:

1 A Matyi azt mondta, **ha nem tudok folyamatosan beszélni, akkor nem is tudok angolul**. [Matyi said, **if I can't speak fluently, I don't really know in English**.]
2 De azt a Matyi nem tudja, milyen az angolt használni az igazi beszédben. [But Matyi doesn't know what it is like to use English in real talk.]
3 Mondtam neki, **ő lehet, hogy sok szót tud, de nem tudja összerakni. Én meg beszélgetek**. [I told him, **he might know many words but can't put them together to form a sentence**.]
4 Meg azt is, hogy mi otthon is angolul beszélünk kicsi koromtól. [And that we speak English at home too from my very early age.]
5 Utálatoskodnak, pedig **én nem szoktam dicsekedni az angollal.** [They are odious even though **I never boast about my English**.]
6 Tudod, milyen vagyok. [You know what I am like.]
7 Erre ő csak annyit mondott, hogy persze, te mindent tudsz. [To this he said only that sure you know everything.] (9;8)

Sarah is very sensitive to critical remarks and the negative opinion about her English knowledge contributes to her perception that she is an incompetent speaker of English. Bourdieu's (1991) notion of illegitimate discourse and Norton's (2000) term 'sensing the right to speak' make an important point that inequitable power relations and culturally mediated bad experiences can deter individuals from communication. As a reaction to Matyi's remark Sarah positions herself as an ignorant, disregarded speaker of L2 whose right to speak is shaken; therefore, she becomes hesitant and uncertain about her knowledge.

Sarah's imbalance and contradiction is reflected in line 3. She restores self-esteem by emphasizing her ability to use English in complete sentences not only in isolated words as Matyi does. Upon Matyi's degrading and provoking comment she feels her retreat would be a sign of adopting the identity of a less knowledgeable person, who is rightly being taught and provoked by more competent members of the peer group, so she decides to speak for herself and expresses her unmitigated disagreement in line 3.

Excerpt 37 shows that Sarah is sensitive to the opinion of her peers and her multiple perception of these opinions shape her self-image. The discussions of her perceptions depict the permanent struggle of the individual learner (Norton, 2000) in the process of self-identification. The fact that she recurringly initiates conversations to discuss her feelings and doubts about L2 gives evidence of these individual struggles. The peers' comments give her strong motivation to enhance her learning and she constantly monitors her own language progress. Discussions of similar cases of peer pressure at home help her restore her damaged self-esteem. Positive statements about her English knowledge make significant changes in the way she feels about her skills in English: after being reinforced about her knowledgeability and skilfulness in L2 she considers it as a source of pride and obtains the status of a self-confident and competent member in the community of peers. Excerpt 37 is suggestive of her employing metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (see Figure 4 'Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies', p.85 and Chapter 4 'Learning and communication strategies').

Sarah's perception of the relative nature of language knowledge, her conceptualization of language expertise and her self in the language learning process are also reflected in her reporting on peer criticism. Her hesitation clearly mediated in lines 1 and 2 give evidence that building valued competences and identities in the peer group in terms of L2 knowledge is not smooth especially because in her local community valued L2 speaker identities build on the degree of expertise, often identified with the category of nativeness. Matyi's thinking in line 1 reflects the general view of language competence inferring that competent language use means native-like knowledge displaying the ability of speaking fluently about all topics and in all domains. Sarah's remarks in line 2 represents more L2-like sociopragmatic norms and implies that her knowledge and skills constitute distinctions in her own local status. Both commentaries echo her orientations to what constitutes local norms of language competence: Matyi's statement referred to in line 7 suggests that Sarah's desired L2 identity is highly regarded, and she achieved the position of a valued member in the group's society.

8.2.3 Highlighting deficiencies and asymmetries in second language knowledge

Excerpt 38 is an instance of discussing grammar issues in L2, during which Sarah's lexical deficiency created a source of trouble.

Excerpt 38

1 Mother: What did you learn about in grammar lesson?
2 Sarah: A vonatkozó névmásokat, **de azt nem tudom angolul, csak magyarul**. [Relative pronouns, **but I don't know it in English only in Hungarian**.]
3 Mother: Relative pronouns.
4 Sarah: Milyen nouns? Életembe nem hallottam. [What kind of 'nouns'? I've never heard it in my life.) Honnan tudnám? Nem is érdekel. (How should I know it? I don't even care.]
5 Mother: I don't like the way you speak to mummy; you are very naughty. I have finished talking to you.
6 Sarah: **Don't be angry. But I don't want to speak about the grammar lesson. De ezt most elmondom.** Képzeld, tegnap a jégpályán próbáltunk, és akkor a Maja úgy meghúzta a pulcsimat, hogy elesett az egész sor. ([**But now I'll tell you this**. Imagine, yesterday we were rehearsing on the ice rink and then Maja pulled my jumper so the whole line fell down.]
7 Mother: It is funny, but I am still angry with you. (10;2)

Sarah's reluctance in line 2 is attributed to the fact that her L2 proficiency is not sufficient for academic functioning for the simple reason that she used that language in the communicative function for interpersonal communication and not in the institutional frame. Line 4 displays her inferior state of knowledge in that domain. Her untoward remark in the same line is an effective putdown and demonstrates her attempt to upgrade her unfavourable position in terms of L2 competence. Switching to L1in line 6 serves as a conversational repair (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012) to link to vernacular style. Sarah gives an account of a funny case that happened to her on the ice rink while they were rehearsing the program with the synchronized skating team. Recalling this funny episode coupled with her subjective commentary is meant to mitigate my resentment over her untoward behaviour in line 2. The excerpt is also

an example of the fact that the child is more enthusiastic about talking about her lived experience than dealing with curricular issues. Furthermore, L1 seems more appropriate to take her temperature in the communicative event and it is more appropriate for giving her opinion. At the same time the change in the topic of conversation initiated in L2 in line 6 seems like an apology and adds humour to the exchange. In excerpt 38 Sarah uses language alternation (Gafaranga, 2012) as an additional resource to enhance the conversation: L1 is utilized to compensate for her limited expertise in school English, while L2 is a correction practice to counterbalance her disrespectful manner.

In excerpt 39 Sarah is preoccupied with doing English homework during which she encounters a lexical trouble. In the process of word search her intent gaze at the interlocutor (the mother) can be interpreted as an invitation to participate in the word search. Asking for the pronunciation of the first syllable of the required word is an explicit request for help and joint vocabulary exploration on her part.

Excerpt 39

1 Mother: What's it in the picture?
2 Sarah: **I don't remember. How begins? Mondd az első szótagot, mummy.** [**Say the first syllable, mummy.]**
3 Mother: he…
4 Sarah: Megvan: hedgehog! [I've got it: hedgehog!] ((Victoriously))
5 Mother: **Underline the past forms** of the verbs in the text.
6 Sarah: Mi? Most össze kell párosítani, vagy **mit kell csinálni?** [What? Now should I match or **what should I do?]** ((Asks for translation into L1 to help in carrying on with the activity.))
7 Mother: Find the verbs in the text, then retell the story in your own words.
8 Sarah: **Mi is az a 'verb'?** [What is a 'verb'?]
9 Mother: Ige. (Verb) Read to yourself. ((Sarah starts reading in English.))
10 Sarah: Meglátogatták őket az elefántok… [The elephants visited them…] **Érdekes! [Interesting!]** ((Thinking aloud in a low voice.))
11 Sarah: De jó fejek! [What good duys!] ((Referring back to a text in English she was expected to retell later as a part of her English homework.))

12 Mother: Would you please start doing the task and find the verbs? ((Mother intersects impatiently angrily over Sarah's fussiness.)) Read it again!

13 Sarah: **Jó, csak mondjuk el magyarul is előtte!** Különben tudok egy jót az elefántokról. Elmondjam? **[Good, only let's tell it in Hungarian.** Anyway, I know a good story about elephants. Shall I tell you?) (8;5)

As shown in the discourse sample above Sarah is found to translate interlocutor-talk to herself to clarify vocabulary and communicate tasks and instructions in L2. The demand for L1 appears to be used as a mnemonic strategy (see for example Figure 5 'Oxford's taxonomy of LLS'). In lines 8-9-10 translation from L2 to L1 to herself marked by low voice and accompanied by think-aloud strategy seems to function as a strategy to promote understanding and indicate her making sense of a particular stretch of discourse. Translation also underpins that L1 plays an important role in the process of meaning making because L2 is not yet used at the level of thinking. L1 is exploited as a potentially effective tool to enhance communication and added a funnier atmosphere in the process of doing a compulsory school task.

The excerpt below is a child-mother interaction exhibiting a case when L1 is used as a compensation strategy although the interlocutor is not supposed to agree on using that language.

Excerpt 40

1 Mother: **Read the sentences,** then put them in the right order according to the pictures above. Then tell the story.

2 2. Sarah: **Na, most mondjuk el magyarul!'** [**Now let's say it in Hungarian.]**

3 3.Mother.: Why? I'll read it again, shall I?

4 4.Sarah: **Ne, angolul nem biztos, hogy értem.** Akkor most olvassam, vagy meséljem el a képeket, vagy mi? [**Not in English, I may not understand it in English.** Now shall I read it or describe the pictures, or what?] (7;4)

Line 2 betrays that Sarah heavily relies on the L1 when interpreting the instructions and school curriculum in her English textbook. When faced with the dilemma of whether to read the sentences or tell a story about the pictures she asks for the mother's explanation in Hungarian. Line 2 betrays that the child wants reinforcement in Hungarian to promote understanding by clarifying vocabulary and doing the task.

Appeal to L1 is a clear sign of taking a shortcut to adjust the instruction in order to make sure it is understood.

In the discourse below English was adopted by the mother as the medium but rejected by Sarah, who straightforwardly indicated the inappropriateness of that language and proceeded to continue the discussion using Hungarian.

Excerpt 41

1 Mother: What did you do while I wasn't at home? I see you collected the walnuts from under the tree and swept up dead leaves from the balcony. Nani says you visited grandma, so what was there, how are they? **What was for lunch?**

2 Sarah: **Sokminden.** [Many things.] ((Answers reluctantly burying in some paper in front of her.)

3 Mother: **I asked you in English, please, answer in English**, you know.

4 Sarah: **Jaj, most nincs kedvem. Mondom inkább magyarul, még annyi leckém van! A mama meg olyan kajákat főzött, amit nem is tudok angolul.** [**Oh, now I don't feel like it. I'd rather say it in Hungarian, I still have so much homework. And mama made such meals that I don't know in English.]** (9;3)

In excerpt 41 Sarah's L2-L1 code-switching appears to be motivated by taking a shortcut and saving time and effort. Line 4 implies that L1 is used as a strategic tool to compensate for L2 lexical and register shortages as well as to maintain and follow the flow of the conversation. The mother tongue adds to stylistic effectiveness, and it is more suitable to give voice to her opinion because English is more challenging cognitively.

Excerpt 42

1 Én **gyorsan akarom mondani. De ha angolul mondom, az lassú**, mert oda kell figyelnem. [I **want to say it quickly. But when I say it in English, it is slow**, because I have to pay attention.]

2 **Bezzeg a Kasia nem gondolkozik**, **amikor magyarul beszél! Azért is van olyan sok barátja.** [**But Kasia doesn't think when she speaks Hungarian! That's why she has so many friends.]**

3 Mondta, hogy az **nem elég, ha veled beszélek, csak, ha Angliában laknánk**. Mert ott a gyerekek is angolok. [She said **it is not enough if I talk to you, only if we lived in England**. Because there the children are also English.] (11;6)

4 **A Kasianak jó,** róla azt mondják, **olyan mintha magyar lenne.** Jó neki!' [**Good for Kasia,** she is said to be **like a Hun**garian. Good for her!]

5 A Kasiát sem tanítja az anyukája, mégis tudja a nyelvtant is, mert olyan sokat hallja, hogy megtanulja. [Kasia is not taught by her mother either still she knows grammar, because she hears it so much that she learns it.]

6 **Neki nem is kell tanulnia, csak úgy tudja.** [**She doesn't have to learn; she just knows it.]**

7 Te meg hányszor magyarázod a nyelvtant, de azt csak magyarul értem. [And you explain grammar how many times, but I understand it only in Hungarian.]

8 Mother: Jó, de te nem iskolában kezdted tanulni az angolt. Az angol nyelvtant nem is tanultuk itthon soha, csak mióta iskolában is tanulod az angolt! [Ok but you started to learn English not at school. We have never learnt English grammar at home, only since you learn English at school.] (11;9)

Excerpt 42 reflects Sarah's impression that a good and a competent language learner is indistinguishable from a native one in terms of fluency. Her reflection in line 2 implies her assimilation effort to be a member of the target language community. Mentioning that she envies Kasia, her best friend who lives in Hungary and is a balanced Polish-Hungarian bilingual gives evidence of her view. An apparent indicator of Kasia's excellence is that her fluency in Hungarian has led to winning authority and popularity in the circle of peers. Line 2 is a manifestation of Sarah's view: the only possible way of becoming a member of the target speech community is native-like fluency. Kasia's amazing progress in mastering Hungarian is due to her favourable situation: living in Hungary she has powerful community support, which is a favourable condition to acquire a language perfectly (line 6). Kasia's Hungarian proficiency contributes to forging social relations and provides appropriate ways of acting as a member of her peer group. Line 4 gives evidence that L1 is a reference point to assess proficiency in L2 and is an effective tool to help construct knowledge in that language. Sarah concludes that mastering a language needs enormous efforts unless the language learner is immersed in the target language environment and

surrounded by peers who speak that language (lines 2-7). The whole monologue is suggestive of the fact that in Sarah's language acquisition process her two languages fill not the same role and status.

8.2.4 Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy

Excerpts 43-44 present how peer group negotiations serve as a significant social site for building local social order, values and norms that regulate one another's conduct and language use.

This example also shows Sarah's adjustment to the established language boundary pattern.

Excerpt 43

1 Mother: Sarah, why don't you go and play in the garden? You can take blankets out and play with dolls or play hopscotch, skipping rope, whatever. Only be in the fresh air, don't sit in the room in such beautiful weather.
2 Sarah: **Ne beszélj már egyfolytában angolul! Most nem a Katáékkal vagyok! [Don't speak English all the time. Now I'm not with Kata.]**
3 Mother: Why not? There is nothing wrong with it, it is good practice for both of you!
4 Eszter: Mit mondott? [What did she say?]
5 Sarah: Gyere Eszter, menjünk ki játszani! [Come Eszter, let's go to play.]
6 Eszter: **De jó, hogy anyukád beszél veled angolul! Az én anyukám némettanár, de ő nem beszél velem németül, mert mi nem találtuk ki!** Beszéljetek még angolul! [G**reat that your mother speaks to you in English! My mother is a teacher of German, but she doesn't speak to me in German because we didn't establish this.** Speak on in English!]
7 Sarah: Majd később [Later.] (7,2)

One sunny afternoon Sarah and her classmate Eszter were sitting in the living room and had been watching television for a while when I decided to ask them in English to go outside and play there as shown in line 1. Sarah's objection to my speaking English in line 2 gives evidence that she disliked my addressing them in English. The reference to Kata, her best friend living next door in line 2 suggests that Kata and

Eszter belong to two linguistically diverse communities regarding their familiarity with our home bilingual context. Eszter inhabits a monolingual identity whereas Kata is a member of Sarah's bilingual peer group. line 2 also implies that in the presence of Kata belonging to the circle of her initiated friends Sarah justifies the relevance of English as the language of communication, whereas in the circle of outsiders represented by Eszter she doesn't. Also, with close friends, if they request it, she translates English into Hungarian and vice versa with pleasure, either because she does not want to exclude anyone from communication or simply, she wants to demonstrate her group belonging. Sarah is unwilling to change her language separation routine despite Eszter's explicit request in line 7. Surrounded by outsiders she refuses to speak English despite the fact that Eszter finds the idea of the English-speaking routine awesome and marks her admiration by expressing her desire to experience being raised in a dual language home similar to Sarah's (line 6). To endorse her appreciative stance, she explicitly regrets her mother's failure to pursue German-Hungarian home bilingualism with her. Despite Eszter's desire for integration and identification with the group of home bilinguals, Sarah is unwilling to modify Eszter's conversational position and rejects to continue the discourse in L2 seen it as unusual and a violation of the shared criteria of language choice.

Excerpts 44-45 below are further examples of how and when patterns of linguistic identity development emerge in talk-in-interactions. Line 2 (excerpt 44) implies Sarah's request for my cooperation, preserving alliance and privacy and, for the same reason, she questions my adherence to the norms. Such alliances and allegiances are often created via her spoken declarations to oust the others to non-group status (Greenwood, 1998, p.68). The peers signal their friendship and appreciation by accentuating their positive attitude to the particularized norms in their exchange. The documented verbal exchanges constitute the peers' social relations, where the language itself creates the immediate sense of belonging. It is also seen how the children's own standards and values are defined within the conversation.

Excerpt 44

1 Mother: Offer some cookies to Zsófi.
2 Sarah: M**ost nem a Brendy van ám itt, hanem a Zsófi! [now it is not Brendy here but Zsófi!]**

3 Mother: Oh, sorry, then translate what I say to her.

4 Zsófi: **Angolul beszélt anyukád? [Did your mother speak English?]**

5 Sarah: Aha.

6 Zsófi: **Na, beszéljetek még!** [**Please, keep on speaking!]**

7 Sarah: Hagyjál már! [Leave me alone!]

8 Zsófi. Mér? [Why?]

9 Sarah: Mer **ILYENKOR NEM SZOKTUNK.** [Because **we don't do it in such cases.]** (8;4)

Sarah's sensitivity to her peers' communicative needs depends on who those peers are. Excerpts 43-44 reveal how her own standards and values in terms of group identity are embedded in conversational behaviour. When surrounded by close monolingual friends, who do not speak English, but belong to the circle of the initiated friends, she aligns and marks peer relation with voluntary translations to protect positive face needs and the in-group nature of the community (Greenwood, 1998, p.71). Obviously, both Brendy and Kata are participating members of the group. They are speakers of a shared background performing routine and frequent interactions; thus, Sarah accommodates to them conversionally and declares social integration with them. However, using English in the 'show off' situations is sensed as 'awkward, insulting and hostile' thus she makes overt reference to her apprehension. In the presence of out-group members, she refuses reference to our home established English speaking routine and separates herself from her peer's further scrutiny into the matter. Accordingly, my English instructions in Zsófi's, an out-group member's presence, are interpreted as deviation from our language use practices. According to Sarah's interpretation, my L2 response displays inappropriate discourse behaviour and is regarded as an offence against the collective identity of her Hungarian peer culture (Greenwood, 1998, p.71). Sarah's utterance in lines 6 and 8 explicitly underpins that she does not attribute much significance to Zsófi's interest in line 3, and gives a quick, simple and negative answer to her question in line 4. Sarah's answer in line 8 implies that reference to the locally established language separation rules is a satisfying explanation, which does not require further clarification. The word 'ilyenkor' (this time) implies Sarah's adherence to her own peer-group norms, as well as her and her peers' place in their complex social world.

Similarly to the previous excerpt, excerpt 45 demonstrates that the place where a discourse happens plays an important role in shaping of Sarah's alternative language choices.

Excerpt 45

1 Sarah: **Már MEGINT ANGOLUL BESZÉLSZ! [You are speaking English again!]**
2 Mother: Mások előtt miért nem akarod, hogy angolul beszéljünk? Katáék előtt meg miért nem szólsz rám, hogy angolul beszélek? [In front of strangers why don't you want to speak English? And with Kata's family why do you note me that I speak English?]
3 Sarah: **A KATÁÉK MEG A KASIA-ÉK AZ MÁS, ők mindig itt vannak, olyan, mintha velünk laknának.** Ha meg nem értik, megkérdezik, miről beszélünk, és én elmondom nekik. Egyébként én tanulok abból. [**KATA'S AND KASIA'S FAMILIES ARE DIFFERENT, they are always here, as if we lived together**. And if they don't understand something they ask what we are talking about, and I tell them. Anyway, I learn from it too.] (7,2)

The conversation happened when Sarah reproached me for talking to her in English in the aisle of a busy shopping mall. Sarah's denial to pursue talk in L2 underpins that language choice, social status and context are deeply intertwined. Sarah's dissatisfaction over my using L2 at an inappropriate place (line 3) is sensed as a deviation from our discourse habits, a betrayal of our alliance. The geographical separation of her two languages is exhibited in the scene: L2 is restricted to function as the language of home, L1 is perceived as the language for public use. Sarah's comment (line 3) in a low voice is suggestive of her apprehension against my dispreferred activity, and a mitigated reminder of the necessity of displaying the expected discourse behaviour on my part.

8.2.5 Getting authority via L2

Excerpt 46

1 Siblings: Mi az ott Sára? [What's that there, Sarah?]
2 Sarah: **TIGRISZ [tıgrıs]** (tiger) ((Dodó and Nani start laughing.))
3 Nani: ['tıgrıs]? ((The girls are giggling.))

4 Sarah: **[tıgrıs]?**! ((Sarah utters the word angrily, putting the accent on the sound [ʃ] at the end of the word.))

5 Dodó: **Mondd MÉG EGYSZER! [Say it again!]**

6 Sarah: ['taıgə(r)] ?! ((victoriously)) (3;4)

In the example above the L2 code-switch falls into the category of both reduction and achievement strategies. The context of this event was that Sarah's elder sisters addressed the question in line 1 to Sarah in Hungarian. They kept pulling her leg because she had difficulty in pronouncing the sound [ʃ] in Hungarian, which often raised a laugh among the bigger ones. On her siblings' eliciting her to pronounce'['tıgrıʃ]' to avoid being the target of the siblings' game, she used ['taıg(ə)] since it did not contain the sound [ʃ] she had not mastered yet. The L1→L2 ([tıgrıs]→['taıg(ə)] code-switch representing message abandonment, as an effective communication strategy seems to be a powerful weapon to control the situation and disarm the siblings' teasing. It also offers a good opportunity to recapture attention and status. The resourceful cutback (line 6) facilitates Sarah's overcoming a troublesome situation and solving a momentary problem. She does not accommodate to the sisters' controlling the situation, on the contrary, she protests against their impoliteness. With the help of her response to the mockery (line 3) she immediately wins her sisters' appreciation and modifies her conversational position as well. The well-placed code-switch also serves as an expression of a desire for social approval in the group.

Excerpt 47

1 Sarah: Attila asked to use my chaps.

2 Mother: **What is 'chaps'? I don't know.**

3 Sarah: **Hát a LÁBSZÁRVÉDŐ**. [**Well, it is 'CHAPS'.]**

4 Mother: This word is new to me.

5 Sarah: **Doesn't matter, mummy. You are not a horse-riding teacher.**

6 Sarah: Na, majd akkor azt is **beleírod a könyvedbe, hogy te NEM TUDTAD, MI AZ A 'CHAPS', és ÉN MODTAM MEG neked?' [**Then will **you write in your book that YOU DIDN'T KNOW WHAT 'CHAPS' IS AND THAT I TOLD YOU?]**

7 Mother: Hát persze, hogy beleírom! Látod, én sem tudok mindent! [Of course, I will write it in it! You see, I don't know everything either.] (11;3)

This example apart from reflecting her concept of language knowledge gives an insight into how she justifies her role as a competent L2 user and the subject of a research study. The excerpt has a twofold implication: (1) By the age of eleven she adapts herself to different learning styles and expertise. (2) She comes to realize that native-like fluency is a less compelling indicator of L2 proficiency. Line 5 is a clear sign of Sarah's understanding of the direct relationship between language proficiency and the context of learning: her mother is not a horse-riding trainer, so 'chaps' and other English names of the horse-equipment accessories are missing from her L2 lexicon. Similarly, the excerpt demonstrates how the locally established language use habits formulate the child's concept and valorization of learning and knowledge. Line 6 is a clear reference to the present research project, which Sarah regards as a documented recognition of her language knowledge. Line 6 reflects her enthusiasm about being recognized. The present situation exemplifies how she finds an opportunity to use L2 to reach inner satisfaction. My fascination over her L2 competence lends her authority, pride, and reward. The very process of displaying her L2 'expertise' in line 3 is a clear sign of her control of the conversational topic.

Excerpt 48

1 Mother: Most akkor nem értem. [Then I don't understand this.]
2 Mother**: Mért akartad**, hogy a múltkor **az iskolában** az öltöző előtt **angolul beszéljek veled?** [**Why did you want me to speak with you in English last time at school** in front of the locker room?]
3 Mother: Fura volt, mert általában nem szereted, ha ott csevegünk angolul. [It was weird because you usually don't like when we chat in English there.]
4 Sarah: [mʌmi], hát **azér, hogy az Eszti lássa, hogy tudok**. [Mummy, because **I wanted to let Eszter know that I can.]**
5 Sarah: **Mióta tudja, hogy te angolul beszélsz velem, NEM IS OLYAN NAGYKÉPŰ! [Since she knows that you talk to me in English, SHE IS NOT SO SELF-CONTENTED.]** (10;7)

The excerpt sheds light on how Sarah counterbalances her peer's self-contentedness using English as a strategic tool. The majority of the examples in this section

associated with Sarah's interactions with her peers in educational settings deploys a range of actions targeting different aspects of language, for example discussions of local norms for language use. Sarah is often engaged in discussions questioning her willingness or apprehension to use English in the peer group. Lines 4-5 in excerpt 48 exemplify a case when L2 is used purposefully to constitute a focus of attention for the peers and influence social power relations. Line 5 demonstrates that her L2 knowledge is respected and contributes to winning the 'in-the-know' position in the local peer group. Sarah's request for switching to English is indexical of her desire for an authoritative position and entitlement to use English as a person who is sufficiently skilled in that language. Line 5 suggests that speaking English is a great opportunity to construct and negotiate hierarchical relationships in the peer group. In the same line Sarah declares that her L2 knowledge raises her prestige in the community and lends her a superior position. This language-related episode serves as a complex social action for shaping peer group relations and allows for playing out hierarchical social order based on the differences in her English language knowledge.

Excerpt 49

1 Mother: **És te jó vagy angolból?** Ügyesen dolgozol? [**And are you good at English?** Are you good at your job?]
2 Sarah: **Hát Andi néni mindig engem küld el a naplóért**. A Szandi azt mondta, hogy nem lesz a barátnőm, mert mindig én megyek a naplóért. Szerintem irigykedik**. [Well, teacher Andi always sends me for the class registration book.** Szandi said she wouldn't be my friend because I go for the class register. I think she is jealous.] (8;9)

Excerpt 49 gives clear evidence that L2 lends Sarah authority and constitutes emotional gain for her. As a response to my inquiry about her progress in the English lesson Sarah recounts that her English teacher sent her to fetch the register book during the class. The instance was obviously meant as a declaration of her acknowledged academic functioning in the English classroom and that of her perception of the teacher's reward. The excerpt reveals implicitly that she is doubly satisfied with her teacher's act: on the one hand, it gives her the opportunity to make Szandra jealous. Szandra is recurrently criticised in Sarah's talk for her dismissive

speech style and over-confident character. She tends to overrate her own English proficiency and disregard Sarah's, which is irritating in Sarah's eye. Being selected for the task of delivering the class report book is perceived as evidence of having the teacher's attention. The teacher's concept and expectations of the value of individual performance in the classroom is implied in the excerpt: one can gain remarkable recognition and credit by discerning what normative behaviour is to be applied in the classroom. Based on her lived experience Sarah concludes that being asked to help the teacher is a sign of reward and she deserves this reward because she is good at English. Line 2 also implies how Sarah views the relationship between language expertise and recognition: social and linguistic identity is described in terms of the degree of language expertise, which is a key element in organizing and determining status in the class and in the teacher's eyes.

8.2.6 Finding ways to enhance learning strategies

Excerpt 50

Sarah:

1 **Éva néni mondta, hogy <u>kérjük meg az anyukákat meg az apukákat is, hogy segítsenek az angol tanulásban,</u>** mert tudja, hogy sok apuka meg anyuka beszél angolul manapság. [Aunt Éva said we should ask our mums and dads too to help in learning English because she knows many dads and mums speak English today.]
2 Sőt **<u>örülne, ha otthon is beszélgetnénk angolul a testvéreinkkel, vagy szüleinkkel.</u> [What's more she would be happy if we talked in English with our siblings and parents at home too.]**
3 Én mondtam, hogy mi szoktunk, meg amikor a Kasiáék meg a Brendy-ék nálunk vannak. [I said we usually do and also when Kasia's and Brendy's family are at our place.]
4 Így legalább tudom gyakorolni a beszélgetést, az órán úgysincs mindig idő rá. [This way at least I can practise speaking, in the lesson we do not always have time for it.]
5 Te is mondtad, meg Éva néni is mondja, hogy <u>csak az órán nem lehet megtanulni</u>. [You have said and aunt Éva has also said so that <u>it is not possible to learn it only in the lesson</u>.]

6 Úgyhogy **jó, hogy sokat beszélünk**! Meg mondtam, hogy mi minden este olvasunk angol mesét. (So, it is good that we talk much! [And I said that we read English tales every evening too.]

7 Mother: **Legyél is nagyon büszke magadra**! [You should be very proud of you!] (9;1)

As a response to my daily inquiry about school events Sarah seemed to be reluctant to talk but when asked about English, she became enthusiastic. The excerpt is an instance of Sarah's echoing her teacher's words encouraging her pupils to practise English at home with the aim of improving their knowledge. Sarah's utterances in lines 1-2 imply the teacher's advice exerted persuasive power on her and reflect her desire to meet her teacher's expectations. Line 1 suggests that she extensively relied on what her mother and teacher, the authorities of knowledge said. The view that school and home are contexts for and constituents of each other in language learning was welcomed and fully approved by Sarah. The teacher's idea to synthetise academic and communication-based methods in language learning gave Sarah motivation to maintain our home English. The acknowledgement of her language knowledge in line 3 gives evidence that her positive attitude to L2 was highly respected and valorised.

Excerpt 51

1 Mother: Azért beszélek veled angolul, hogy megtanuld a nyelvet, és így az órán is meg a nyelvvizsgán is könnyű dolgod lesz, gyerekjáték lesz az egész! [I speak with you in English so that you could learn the language and this way you will have an easy job in the lesson and in the language exam, it will be like child's play.]

2 Sarah: Jó, de a **DOLGOZATBAN nem azt kell tudni**, **hogy mit csináltam ma!** (hh) [Ok, but IN THE TEST **what I have to know is not what I did today**.]

3 Sarah: **Ott azt kell tudni, ami az Ó:rai anyag**! [**There you have to know the lesson C::urriculum.**]

4 Sarah: Amikor én megyek nyelvvizsgázni, akkor **velem is leülsz tanulni**, **mint a Nanival**? (When I take the language exam **will you sit down with me to learn like with Nani**?)

5 Sarah: **Meg kéne tanítanod a NYELVTANT!** [**You should teach me GRAMMAR**.]

6 Sarah: > Mert azt úgy **nem** lehet, hogy **csak úgy beszélünk** ebéd közben, meg ilyenek? < [Because **it is not possible** in the way **that we just talk** during lunch.])

7 Sarah: Sőt, amikor nyolcadikas leszek **oroszul** is elkezdünk tanulni, utána meg **franciául és lengyelül is akarok.!** [Plus when I am in the eighth class, I will start learning **Russian** then **I want French and Polish too.**]

8 Mother: Na, jó. [Ok, good.] (10;7)

The scene is an account of Sarah's disappointing experience she lived through when her English quiz at school was marked with a four due to some grammar mistakes. Lines 2-3-5-6 state explicitly that she attributes her failure to the insufficient amount of studying grammar and school-related areas in English at home. Line 5 is a declaration of Sarah's opinion that filling this gap is our shared responsibility. Lines 2-3 give a clear sign of her perception that language is used for two distinct functions: communicative and cognitive functions (Cummins, 2000). Success at school is largely dependent upon the learner's awareness of grammar and that of more formal lexicon, she comes to realize that difference between home and school English is rather extreme. Academic functioning goes beyond naturally occurring topics. Sarah urges me to learn specialized terminology, which requires instructed teacher-led learning (line 5). Reference to these two quasi-contrasting approaches is a recurring element in her self-evaluation process.

Sarah`s valorization of foreign language knowledge as a reflection of her immediate social environment's lived experience is reflected in her commitment to language learning. As foreign languages are highly valued and language learning has high prestige in her specific social circle, she has developed a positive attitude to language learning. Her siblings' learning habits constitute an immediate motive for Sarah to consider and reconsider the functional difference in language use (line 4).

Excerpt 52, one of the gift-letters I received from Sarah, is a summary and self-report of Sarah's identity development in her bilingual childhood. The straightforward and shortcut self-evaluation gives a better understanding of the process of becoming a

bilingual individual as perceived at her age of ten. I also see it as a brief summary of what I have explored in my data in the present chapter.

Excerpt 52

'Hello Mami! How are you? Because I am very well! But if you are not well then now you will got a good time. The tail is biginning. When I was bourn you spoken with me in English. My first world was: moon, car, koffie. I know these. But, that how was it, I don't know. Who knows it, it's you mami. When I have given my diaper, I don't said 'pelus', I sad 'diaper', because you spoken whit me alway and only in English ENGLISH! Yes, I know that I say that 'I wont speak in English with you mami! But now I see that how mutch words I know and it's werry werry good. Oh! Sorry, not only words, but I know to make expressions. And all this things I know due you! Now I see! Grandma said, that when I was there, I always said those English words, and grandma said, that she doesn't understand nothing. This was when I don't went in the nursery, but I was with my grandma and granddad. Mami, I want a question from you. You will write this composition in that, I don't know, in **your** composition? Not my'n, but **your** composition. In your. Sure! He, he! That's why I lifing. I know that you remember werry much, because it was only November when I put a question: How is 'sure'? Write down. And now I know it. Ok! I want ONLY **THIS THINGS**, so you are not fritened, YES? It will go on! Only not this way.' (10;7)

The excerpt demonstrates how Sarah's orientations to L2 use and identity were constructed and transformed over time. In the beginning there was a period when she developed deliberate rejection of using L2. Recalling an L2-related episode with the grandmother implies that the emerging communication breakdown between her and the grandmother did not seem to cause a problem. The scene was described as a memorable episode to emphasize that English words constituted an integrate part of her lexicon from early childhood, and she used them in her speech directed to the grandmother even though her grandmother did not understand English. After presenting her ambivalent feelings she ended up with the conclusion that her bilingual childhood made sense and turned out to be fully accepted leaving the impression that her linguistic background formed a unique identity. In retrospect she admitted that it was a mistake to resist to L2 use. It was a transitional phenomenon

and by about the age of eleven she was proud of her bilingual identity. She gave a clear expression of her gratitude and respect towards the mother who, as it turned out, acted not only as a caregiver but also as a language transmitter in the family. The composition, a reference to my dissertation appeared to give an opportunity to publicly display her L2 progress and an effective medium to express her pride and overwhelming satisfaction she felt over being the locus of attention and that of the subject of scientific research. This moment gave further underpinning of what my thesis was meant to illustrate. Despite all imbalances discussed in Sarah's accounts she reached the level of a bilingual identity without feeling confused. She adapted herself to the bilingual background and by the age of eleven she could get on with her daily bilingual life without much trouble. She developed a positive attitude and emotional attachment towards her second language and was able to overcome her transitory aversion and negative feelings. The last three sentences of the excerpt reflect her commitment and enthusiasm and sound like a promise: she was determined to make further changes and adjustments in her behaviour to enhance her L2 learning. The utterance *I want only this things* in block capitals is a clear expression of Sarah's approval of the family established bilingualism and a manifestation of her cooperation effort.

8.3 Discussion of the results

Sarah's identity development shows a diverse and contradictory picture with lots of fluctuations, interspersed with imbalances caused by her varied perceptions of herself. Sometimes she depicts low self-esteem and feels disappointed because she senses herself as an incompetent and unauthorized L2 speaker who does not have the right to speak that language lacking the 'in-the-know position'. Some other times she appears as a self-confident, competent L2 speaker who prides herself for being a valued person of her peer group because of her L2 knowledge. The excerpts between her ages of four and eight give evidence that she has strong group affiliation with her Hungarian peers. She has the impression that her home established dual language arrangement is weird. She often feels different and considers bilingualism as eccentricity, which explains her refusal to speak L2 in the circle of outsiders until her age of eight. L2 is regarded as the language of intimacy and alliance, which she shares only with the initiated 'in-group' members in the family circle and her immediate community.

Later from her age of eight learning English in institutional frameworks at school changes Sarah's thinking in this respect. During the school years her peers' challenging her English is irritating and provoking for Sarah. As a response to peer pressure and criticism she learns to speak for herself and is able to justify her entitlement to use L2 as her appropriate language. With her growing self-confidence and strategic language use she can make distinctions via her English knowledge, regain control, and redefine her status in the group. After the age of eight she is right-down proud of her knowledge of English and rises to the challenge of resolving language-related problems and episodes. She learns that her L2 knowledge lends her authority in the circle of peers. She realizes that her English knowledge is handled with respect, her language expertise makes her a locally valued personality.

Excerpts collected between her ages of seven and eleven give evidence that she is attentive to her social environment's, primarily to her peers' opinion about language learning. Taking feedback into consideration she constantly targets, monitors, and evaluates her progress. Her relevant utterances are suggestive of her self-assessment. When identifying weaknesses and asymmetries in terms of English knowledge she expresses her needs to strengthen less developed language areas. Her utterances underpin that she is determined and motivated to enhance her learning. English appears to be an appropriate medium to satisfy her own personal ambitions, for example, to win acknowledgement and appreciation as well as peers' and teachers' attention. She comes to realize that her knowledge and skills constitute distinctions in her local social status (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p. 176).

As for RQ 4 and 5, the findings confirmed that Sarah's identity development shows a diverse and contradictory picture with lots of fluctuations, interspersed with imbalances caused by her varied perceptions of herself. The analysed discourses allowed me to explore Sarah's identity development and to illuminate that the way she felt about herself and her progress in L2 was a true reflection of her fluid and heterogeneous identity (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Duff, 2012; Norton, 2000, Pavlenko, 2006). The various feedback she received from her social environment influenced her self-concept in general, but peers exerted the strongest impact on her, which phenomenon is consistent with scholarly findings (Cromdal 2013; Gafaranga, 2012).

Sarah`s accounts on her self-perception reveal that she benefitted from the dual linguistic environment. Her English satisfied her own personal ambitions, attracted the interlocutor's attention, and offered additional opportunities to earn respect and appreciation. The dual language context generated language-related instances targeting, assessing, and criticizing her own language use and those of the others'. Free bilingual discussions served as social sites for regulating one another's conduct and entitlement to use English. In response to peer pressure and criticism she monitored and evaluated her own learning process and consulted more competent language users or other authorities of knowledge to legitimize her position as an L2 speaker and find justification.

She described her bilingualism as extra knowledge, as something `cool`, and perceived herself as a successful bilingual learner (Nikolov, 2000, p. 37) despite her transitional unwillingness to use English. Sarah tended to make her use of L2 conform to the monolingual-monocultural standards of her wider community (peers, out-group members, i.e., people not initiated in the family established language environment). Her accounts give the impression that developing her bilingual self was not easy. Her changing attitude towards her second language demonstrated in the excerpts give evidence of her struggling personality. The dual linguistic context presented issues that called for addressing, discussing, reorganizing, and transforming her views of language and her self-concept as a language learner.

Conclusion

In chapter 8 I focused on Sarah's identity formation in the dual language acquisition process. I provided a functional analysis of her oral and some of her written language production (personal letters, see excerpts 12, 13 and 52) drawn from her naturally occurring discourse and metalinguistic comments to reveal manifestations of her multiple personality. While analysing the dataset, patterns were identified to demonstrate how her sense of self is modified and diversified in the dual linguistic environment. My aim was to show that Sarah has developed a unique identity, which linguistically differs from that of a monolingual person since it has its basis in two cultures and two languages. This view goes in line with Grosjean's (1982) conceptualization of bilingualism, arguing that a bilingual is not a person who has two monolingual identities in one, but a unique mixture of the two

Chapter 9 – Final conclusions

9.1 The main findings of the study

The cross-disciplinary nature of my research justified the multidimensional approach. My research into Sarah's individual language use in bilingualism brought together perspectives on SLA from the fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and social psychology. The fact that I focus on the social aspects of individual language use justified the sociolinguistic approach to analysis. Pragmatics and discourse analysis comprised the theoretical framework to study and explore the interplay between aspects of language use and L2 learner identity construction in naturally occurring social interactions.

The social psychological and individual difference research dimension also emerged as essential to understand Sarah's perceptions, motivation, attitudes, and identity evolving in natural discourse. My findings confirmed that Sarah used code-switching as a strategic tool to convey communicative intentions. When studying and discussing code-switches I used the the conceptual framework of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia et al.,1995) and different taxonomies on language learning strategies (Oxford,1990). Although the strategies in the cited linguists' conceptualization and typologies relate to adult learners, their categories were applicable for Sarah's L2 use. I found a lot of similarities between the strategy types listed in the taxonomies and the ones used by Sarah.

Also, my data analysis was interdisciplinary in nature. It falls within the scope and tradition of linguistic ethnography in the sense that it combines linguistic analysis with ethnographic insights obtained from consecutive, retrospective interviews, participant letters and participant observation. Linguistic ethnography was best suited to my purposes as it represents a broad view on language form and use considering the information about my participants lived experiences. This cross-disciplinary

approach provided a better understanding of the affective dimension (e.g., emotions), as being crucial in SLA and in personal development.

I have been reflecting on my approach as a researcher and as an "ethnographer" who participated in my daughter's daily life, watched why and how things happened in the specific context where she lived and learned her two languages. The fact that I am the mother reduced the power imbalance between me and my participant and fostered a climate of mutual trust. It encouraged my participant to talk openly about her experience and at the same time facilitated gaining insights into her perceptions of the events.

I drew on data collected between my participant's ages of eight months and eleven years to explore her early lexical progress, formation of past tense, questions, and negatives. In terms of pragmatics a compelling amount of data has been explored to investigate the integration of L2 in differentiating, conveying pragmatic functions and communicative intentions in naturally occurring discourse. The transcribed discourse samples facilitated the identification of salient patterns to explicate the sociolinguistic and identity-formulating dimension of bilingualism.

The sociocultural approach allowed me to see how my participant's perceptions of her own English learning and use experiences in a variety of settings influenced and shaped her linguistic progress and learning outcome in SLA (Baker, 2006; Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012; Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012; Hamers, 2004; Larsen-Freeman, 2018; Mirzaie & Parhizkar, 2021; Murphy, 2014; Ricento, 2005; Pavlenko, 2006; Pawliszko, 2016; Velasco, 2020). My observations at the individual level provided useful data about individual differences in SLA, which constitute valuable contribution to individual differences research. The analysed language-related episodes explore a particular case of second language acquisition in a non-native environment, which has been an under researched area, and a rarely focused aspect of the field.

The presented excerpts exemplify that Sarah's uses of communication strategies were modified by bilingualism not only because she had two systems to satisfy her communicative needs but also because the locally established language use habits and language-related activities offered unique circumstances to operate various learning and communication strategies to convey and interpret meanings.

My research aimed at raising awareness to the role, responsibility, and potential of English-speaking parents who as language mediators and teachers offered a unique temporal, spatial and intellectual environment to pass a second language on to their children. Sarah's second language development as a complex development system and trajectory demonstrates the ecological approach to SLA and aims to challenge the monolingual bias (Larsen-Freeman, 2018, pp.59-60). My findings comprise sufficient underpinning evidence to state that Sarah's SLA despite the non-native control is realistic and it powerfully complements (having no more obstacles than) classroom-based instructed learning. The early exposure to English has added to her strategic repertoire in second language acquisition. Her fluid languaging (Bonacina & Pugh, 2021) offered a unique linguistic repertoire for her to communicate successfully beyond one language.

She applied a variety of reduction, achievement strategies (e.g., literal translation, foreignizing, code-switching, self-monitoring, appeals for help, meaning negotiations). The underpinning of her high level actional and strategic competence is her successful conveyance of pragmatic functions through well-placed code-switches often realized in speech acts (Oxford, 1990, Celce-Murcia at al.,1995).

To answer RQ 1 the data presented in chapter 6 illustrate that Sarah went through a similar order of acquisition as native English children but displayed approximately a two-year delay in acquiring the investigated properties of L2 (Brown, 1973; Clark, 2003, p.194; Krashen, 1973; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). The emergence of the frequency principle in Sarah's SLA is in line with scholarly research (Clark, 2003, p.192) but does not seem to be fully proven. The occurrence of the past participle irregular to mark past tense at the age of four might seem a kind of divergence from native-like English acquisition, yet, it does support the familiarity principle. The fact that I often used past participle forms in our discourse, explains her preference for past participle irregular forms to mark past tense despite the complexity of the element.

She used words and inflections from both of her languages before acquiring their conventional meaning (Clark, 2003, p. 153) and applied L2 elements in her L1 as a clear sign of overgeneralization. Sarah's lexical and syntactic development in English also shows similarity with scholarly research findings. Chapter 6 is an

overview of her L2 development and language contact phenomena at the lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic level. Chapters 7-8 concentrate on Sarah's strategic use of L2 in conveying her communicative intentions. I call my reader's attention to the fact that in my attempt to answer RQ 1 I relied on the findings of not only chapter 6, but also to those of chapters 7 and 8.

As for RQ 2 and 3, the data drawn from Sarah's English usage confirm that L2 became a language of strategic importance and code-switching were used as a strategic tool to convey and interpret communicative intentions. Code-switches often realized in and associated with speech acts were employed to both compensate for competence deficiencies and to enhance communication. Sarah adopted English to express communicative intentions (e.g., reconcile the interlocutor, change the interlocutor's mood, redirect the conversation, etc.). Integrating L2 enhanced the pragmatic effect of her utterances and added to making her message more effective (See Chapters 7 and 8).

In my attempt to categorize Sarah's communicative intentions invoked in her language alternation that is her translanguaging practice I identified patterns to illuminate that she

(1) accommodated to the locally established language separation rules,
(2) expressed emotional attachment with distinctions using English as the medium (Gafaranga, 2012, p.501),
(3) identified the situation and the interlocutor's mood by their language use, influenced the interlocutor's conduct and language use, socialized herself and the interlocutor into the appropriate norms and language use,
(4) abandoned and redirected the topic of conversation by switching to L2 in a particular social group,
(5) L2 injected humour to organize and control the situation,
(6) won a different kind of attention on the interlocutor's part by using L2.

I came to realize that bilingualism had a long-lasting effect on narrow family relationships and strengthened mother-child bonding. Integrating English into our daily communication has formulated a kind of alliance between the family members perceiving English as a contributor to intimacy and family integrity. Sarah`s accounts on her self-perception reveal that she has benefitted from the dual linguistic

environment, her English satisfied her own personal ambitions, attracted the interlocutor's attention, and offered additional opportunities to earn respect and appreciation. She realized that she got a different kind of attention when she used English, which gave her a strong motivation to continue using and learning it. She described her bilingualism as extra knowledge, as something `cool`, and perceived herself as being a successful language learner (Nikolov, 2000, p. 37) despite her transitional unwillingness to use English.

To answer RQs 4 and 5, I intended to explore Sarah's identity development. The analysed discourses illuminate that the way she felt about herself and her progress in L2 was a true reflection of her fluid and heterogeneous identity (Cekaite & Björk-Willén's, 2012; Norton, 2000, Pavlenko, 2006, Pawliszko, 2016). The various feedback she received from her social environment influenced her self-concept in general, but peers exerted the strongest impact on her self-concept, which phenomenon is consistent with scholarly findings (Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012, see Section 4.8. Bilingualism and identity).

Analysing how Sarah experienced her linguistic and personal identities through the process of her SLA some recurring patterns have been identified. The categories of her identity development in chapter 8 show that she:

(1) consulted and involved more competent language users and other authorities of knowledge to determine her linguistic identity and to find ways to tolerate imbalances in the L2 learning process,
(2) interpreted, evaluated and integrated peer pressure and criticism in language-related discourses (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012),
(3) monitored and evaluated her learning process in terms of L2 in response to her social environment's feedback, and found opportunities to identify deficiencies and asymmetries in her L2 knowledge,
(4) used L2 to align with the community to form alliance and privacy or, on the contrary, to distance herself from the group,
(5) built distinctions and reformulated local social order via demonstrating her L2 expertise (Cromdal, 2013; Gafaranga, 2012),

(6) sought and found opportunities to practise and enhance L2 learning, handled discomfort by finding ways to avert inferior status in terms of L2 (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012),
(7) appealed for help and reinforcement to cope with emerging L2 communication problems.

Sarah seemed to tend to adjust the use of L2 to the monolingual-monocultural standards of her wider community (peers, out-group members, i.e., people not initiated in the family established language environment). Sarah's accounts give the impression that the development of her bilingual self was not easy. Her changing attitude towards her second language give evidence of her struggling personality. The dual linguistic context in fact generated sites of conflicts between her desired and learner identity, which called for addressing, discussing, reorganizing, and transforming her views of language and made her revisit her self-concept as a language learner.

Regarding Sarah's psychological-ethical conflicts in the bilingual context, it can be stated that her assimilation to the family established bilingualism was relatively smooth, at the age of ten she became outright proud of the situation (see excerpt 52). Exposure to English outside the classroom enhanced her language proficiency but it was primarily beneficial for attitudinal and motivational reasons (Nikolov, 2000, p, 22), which underpins what Nikolov (2000) concluded from her empirical research:

> …it is possible that an early start contributes to young learners' attitudes and motivation, which later ensure good proficiency… SLA is a life-long enterprise, both proficiency and willingness to maintain it and develop it further are crucial. (Nikolov, 2000. p. 34) In the long run it is not the actual gain that matters, but learners' attitudes towards language learning and their own perception as successful learners. (Nikolov, 2000, p. 37)

With reference to Sarah's English proficiency level, let me report on some of her achievements and accomplishments as a language learner. Although I have no scientific evidence on whether she scored higher in English than her peers learning in an early-start foreign language programme, I can state that her family-context bilingualism had a clear positive effect on her English language skills and academic achievements. In the primary school, where teaching English began in the third grade, she exhibited higher communicative competence and reading comprehension due to our regular intensive English speaking and reading sessions at home. She also

outperformed her peers in metalinguistic skills. During the primary school years between 2006 and 2014 she was superior in grammar although teaching grammar started only in the fifth grade and was not focused on at home. At the age of 14, her classroom activities, school assignments and test results reflected her overall higher competence of English (B1 in all four skills) compared to her peers.

Not only did she perform better in the English lesson, but she outscored her peers in discrete-point school tests as well. As a proof of her superiority in English proficiency she won the English competitions at school level in four successive years between 2011 and 2014. These tests consisted of grammar exercises (gap filling, multiple choice items), reading, and listening comprehension (true/false and short answer questions). Apart from those tests no other objective standardized tests were used to assess her English competence. I avoided making her English knowledge an issue for testing and competition outside school.

At the age of 14, she was immersed in an authentic situation where she used English as a real means of communication and learning. In the academic year of 2014-15 she joined me to live in Oman during my two-year-long teaching-abroad period. As a home schooler in order to get prepared for the ninth-grade secondary school marking exams she attended preparatory classes (French, chemistry and maths) conducted in English by tutors of different nationalities, Canadian, Kenyan and Pakistani. The Omani context meant invaluable practice and motivation for Sarah to use her English knowledge of B2 proficiency level. She came to realize that her English greatly added to functioning successfully in both informal and school settings. Furthermore, she experienced using English as a common language in a non-native environment with both native and non-native speakers.

At secondary school she obtained a B2 language certificate at LCCI English for business, but the primary benefit of her bilingual background was the positive effect it exerted on her self-concept and attitude to language learning. In 2018, at age 19, she was admitted to the faculty of architecture at Budapest University of Technology and Economics. Now as a university student she sees foreign language knowledge as a prerequisite for academic and career success, and considers it an asset to communicate globally, participate in student mobility programmes and build her future career as an architect.

Up to the present she has felt at ease when using English in interpersonal communication in multilingual contexts. Her lived experiences with English have strongly improved her instrumental motivation to learn further languages, for example French. Her French proficiency level (B2), after four years of learning at secondary school, enabled her to undertake a student job at an Ibis restaurant in Sanlis, France during the summer of 2018. Now she evaluates her study- and work-abroad 'adventure' (Omani and French) as a recognition of her language competence and a 'real-life' challenge.

Exposure to two languages did not cause a language delay and did not exert any negative impact on Sarah's development in her L1. In our bilingual home, equal exposure to each language was difficult to achieve. Although she was exposed to L2 well before L1 was established, Sarah met all major communication milestones in her first language even before her peers. (e.g., babbling appeared at the age of 5 months, first words at 9 months, and she could combine words into sentences, produce two-word phrases by 16 months of her age. She could use grammatically correct utterances both in English and Hungarian when she was 19 months old. She started to construct sentences spontaneously mispronouncing only those words that contained sounds she had not acquired by that time (e.g., ['tʌjə] (Sára). Her most frequent grammatical errors were omission, commission errors pertaining to verb conjugation e.g., *végezett (végzett) (finished), *tarti (tartja) (holding), *tessze (teszi) (putting). No language delay or disorder was identified in her first language. Her receptive and expressive language skills in Hungarian developed dynamically with similar types and severity of errors found in monolingual peers.

No language retention for later academic skills was witnessed, on the contrary, she performed excellently in language and literacy-rich school-related activities. She became an efficient communicator in Hungarian, developed a rich vocabulary, high level listening and reading comprehension skills, which gave a solid foundation for her excellent academic functioning and achievement at school, the evidence of which is that she passed all her school leaving exams with excellence. Also, she is a high performer in terms of her higher education studies. In 2021 she won the first place at the scientific student research conference in the section *Innovative public spaces* at the Faculty of Architecture, Budapest Technical University and was awarded the *Pro Progression* extra award for her research work in the same year. The board

highlighted the high-level literary value of the textual part in her submission, which is another proof of her Hungarian proficiency, stylistic sense, and lexical repertoire.

9.2 Limitations of the case study

When I started to write the final conclusions, some ideas closely related to the length of my project emerged. I can see a lot of benefits of my longitudinal research in my ability to identify patterns in my data and the unique insight I obtained by surveying my subject, data and results over the course of many years. However, a few drawbacks need to be mentioned. Due to the large amount of data, I collected during the longitudinal research, enormous time had to be used to group them and look for emerging patterns in them.

Numerous obstacles and concerns (see Section 5.1.2, Ethical considerations) during my ten-year-long project enforced me to reconsider the methodology and my interpretations in the process. My views changed, the focus shifted as I became more familiar with the subject and the literature pertaining to my topic. Although the longitudinal study allowed for some flexibility, it was disappointing to realize that after a certain point it was too late to modify the direction. Tracing things back to obtain relevant data from years back was impossible. Yet, it happened that I reconsidered the foci, rewrote some parts because I realized that I had insufficient data to formulate a conclusion in connection with the previously researched aspects. The relevance and reliability of the collected data affected the outcomes, sometimes accelerated, sometimes slowed down the research. Another weakness of the project was that it took a long time to come up with conclusive results. Observing the requirement of internal and external validity was another challenge.

9.3 Ethical concerns arising from qualitative research methods

The nature and aims of my research inevitably gave rise to some ethical matters, which have been taken into account in all phases of my research and carefully considered throughout the entire study. Ethical issues, such as my participant's formal consent, autonomy, respect, justice, beneficence, right to withdrawal and transparency were addressed in section 5.1.2, where I describe the obstacles I faced throughout my research. I discuss the reliability and validity of our multiple

epistemological positions: the mother, the researcher - observer on my part, and the second language learner and the research participant on Sarah's part. I deal particularly with those principles that are essential and are often causes of concern in qualitative research.

A primary concern while designing my research was balancing my motherly role and my research ambitions, guaranteeing that my case study aims and methods under no circumstances exploit or abuse my child and the other participants who had been selected to be participants in my research. To comply with the moral and ethical requirements of qualitative studies I opted for a flexible design in which reflexivity and adaptability have been playing a vital role.

The ethical implications addressed in section 5.1.2 are intrinsically linked to the issue of transparency. The standard of transparency relates to the researcher's serious attempts to (1) avoid deception and concealment; (2) describe the research design and conditions taking the reader's perspective so that the study could be easily followed (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004, p. 495); (3) ensure that the data and the interpretations correspond to the requirements of internal and external validity (Duff, 2007, pp. 175-176); (4) guard against modifying the data so that they support personal views and biases; (5) avoid overgeneralizations and over-interpreting beyond what the results can support to observe confidentiality.

Our intimate mother-daughter relationship offered favourable conditions to maintain an open rapport with my participant, and, at the same time, accentuated the possible dangers of violating privacy and personality rights. In my attempt to provide systematic and principled answers to my research questions in the respective section of the present thesis I reveal my dilemmas in connection with the researcher paradox and data triangulation as well. To reassert the need for and importance of ethical standards in ethnographically informed case studies, I declare that I designed and applied a systematic frame to explore Sarah's as individual learner's autonomous second language acquisition.

9.4 Limitations of the research

The weaknesses of the present dissertation are many: As my study examined one person's language acquisition only, it is important to state that the findings are not

suitable for generalizations, however, the outcomes of my research are significant. This single case is supposed to call attention to individual differences and to show how the outcome of the language learning process reflects the learner's personal interpretation of her learning environment and her conception of identity. My aim with my dissertation is to reveal a possible context for second language acquisition**.**

The main reason why I was not able to present and analyse a larger amount of data is that at the outset I did not follow any scientific methodological guidelines in terms of data collection and analysis. For about four years I collected and analysed data based on my subjective interpretations and immediate decisions (see Section 5.2.6, The dataset). During that time not all data were transcribed, and some of them remained undocumented. Even later there were interruptions and less productive periods when I was overwhelmed and less motivated. In such periods it happened that data collection and the whole research halted for a while.

The fact that I am the mother of my participant means strong emotional attachment to her, impacted the objectivity of the research. To eliminate the researcher bias I checked the relevance of the study and the accuracy of the findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) using triangulation and rich contextualization. At the same time, due to cohabitation and our open rapport I could expect to gain insight into my participant's language use and development and could attain better understanding of her perceptions. The emotional bond between us created favourable conditions to have immediate access to nuances otherwise difficult to capture for research purposes. I am aware that my dataset does not represent a large sample. Even so, I am certain that my single-case study provides sufficient details to be credible and trustworthy, two criteria of qualitative research, and my study gives a comprehensive picture about my participant's L2 development and dual language behaviour.

9.5 Recommendations and implications for further research

In the present thesis I provided an extensive, in-depth analysis of Sarah's language and identity development between her ages of eight months and eleven years in a special type of bilingualism offering native control of Hungarian and non-native control of English. Although my research provides a compelling analysis of the case and the data collection instruments contribute to multiple insights to the analysis to enhance validity and credibility of the results, further research is needed to find out

to what extent the findings could be relevant for other young learners in a similar context. A follow-up study of Sarah's case and/or further data drawn from Sarah's and similarly socialized bilinguals' retrospective and present-day accounts would be instructive.

The discussion of young learners' L2 use as well as the investigation of emergent aspects of SLA, e.g., the learner's willingness to speak in the L2 in a quasi-monolingual environment, the impact of the public view on establishing and sustaining family-oriented bilingualism with non-native control warrant further explorations. Multi-case studies scrutinizing the role of L2 in mediating communicative intentions and negotiating bilingual identity in child second language acquisition would greatly add to the credibility of my results regarding relationships among variables. Such research would contribute to deciding whether the interpretations of my case correspond to another context which it is similar to (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004, p.495).

Qualitative and mixed-method analyses of lexical items indexing emotions (Galucci, 2011, Pawliszko, 2016) in the individual learner's discourse, investigations of the positive-negative connotation of bilingualism drawn from the previously mentioned datasets could also be included in a successive study.

References

Altarriba, J.& Heredia, R., R. (2008). Introduction: Theoretical and methodological background. In Altarriba J.& Heredia R., R. (Eds.), *An introduction to bilingualism: Principles and processes* (pp. 3-10). Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

Anderson, J. (1983). *The architecture of cognition.* Harvard University Press.

Argaman, O. (2010) Linguistic markers and emotional intensity. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research, 39*(2), 89–99. DOI 10.1007/s10936-009-9127-1

Arnberg, L. (1987). *Raising children bilingually: The pre-school years.* Multilingual Matters

Arndt, H. & Janney, R. (1991). Verbal, prosodic, and kinesic emotive contrast in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*. *15*, 521-549.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Harvard University Press.

Bachman L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford University Press.

Baker, C. (1995). *A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism.* Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2006) *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* 4th ed. Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.

Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B. (1982). Functionalist approaches to grammar. In E. Wanner & L. Gleitman (Eds.), *Language acquisition: The state of the art.* (pp. 173-218). Cambridge University Press.

Berko, J. (1958). The child's learning of English morphology. *Word 14*(2-3), 150-177.

Bialystok, E. (1990), *Communication strategies.* Oxford.

Bialystok, E. (1991). Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual proficiency. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 113-141). Cambridge University Press

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development. Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press

Bloomfield L. (1933). *Language*. Holt. Rinehart & Winston.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. (1978). Universals of lexical simplification. *Language Learning, 28*(2), 399-415.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.

Bonacina-Pugh, F., Da Costa Cabral, I, Huang, J. (2021). Translanguaging in education. *Language Teaching, 1–33,* doi:10.1017/S0261444821000173

Brown R. (1973). *A first language: the early stages*. Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. *Journal of Child Language*, *2*, 1–19.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1),1-47.

Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In Jr J.W. Oller, Jr. (Ed.), *Issues in language testing research* (pp. 333-342). Newbury House.

Carroll, J.B. (1968). On learning from being told. *Educational Psychologist.5,* 4-10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00461526809528955

Cazden, C. B. (1976). Play with language and metalinguistic awareness: one dimension of language experience. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly &K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its role in development and evolution* (pp. 603-608). Basic Books.

Cekaite, A., & Björk-Willén, P. (2012) Peer group interactions in multilingual educational settings: Co-constructing social order and norms for language use. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(2), 174-188.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z. & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 5-35.

Chaudron, C. (2000). Contrasting approaches to classroom research. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of language use and learning. *Second Language Studies, 19*(1), 1-56.

Chen, S., Zhao, J., de Ruiter, L., Zhou, J. & Huang, J. (2020): A burden or a boost: The impact of early childhood English learning experience on lower elementary English and Chinese achievement. *Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* Volume 25(3), 1-18., DOI:10.1080/13670050.2020.1749230

Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of B. F. Skinner Verbal Behavior, *Language, 35,*26-58.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* M.I.T. Press.

Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language.* Pantheon Books.

Clahsen, H., & Jessen, A. (2021). Morphological generalization in bilingual language production: Age of acquisition determines variability. *Language acquisition, 28*(4), 370-386.

Clark, E. (2003). *First language acquisition.* Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Commission of the European Communities (2003). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-2006.* www.eu.int/comm/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf (Retrieved on 11 December 2005).

Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition.* The Macmillan Press LTD.

Cook, V.J. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching.* 4th ed., Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. (1971). Idiosyncratic errors and error analysis. *IRAL, 9(*2), 147-159. Reprinted in Richards (1974).

Corder, S. P. (1981), *Error analysis and interlanguage.* Oxford University Press.

Council of Europe (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume*. Language Policy Programme Education Policy Division Education Department. Council of Europe.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Creswell, J. W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches.* (5th ed). Sage Publications.

Cromdal, J. (2013). Bilingual and second language interactions: Views from Scandinavia. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(2), 121-131.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first-and second language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp.70-89). Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire.* Multilingual Matters Ltd.

De Houwer, A. (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study.* Cambridge University Press.

De Houwer, A. (2007). Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 28*(3), 411–424.

DeKeyser, R. (2012). Age effects in second language learning In S. M. Gass and A. Mackey (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 442-461). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. *The Belmont Report. Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research.* J Am Coll Dent. 2014 Summer;*81*(3):4-13. PMID: 25951677.

Deprez, V & Pierce, A. (1993). Negation and functional projections in early grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry, 24*(1), 25-67.

Diebold, A. R. (1961). Incipient bilingualism. *Language 37*, 97-112.

Dore, J. (1975). Holophrases, speech acts and language universals. *Journal of Child Language*, *2*(1), 21-40.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duff, P. A. (2002). Research approaches in applied linguistics. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed.), (pp. 45-59). Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. A. (2007). *Case study research in applied linguistics.* Routledge Taylor & Francis Group (1st ed.)

Duff, P. (2012). Identity, agency and second language acquisition. In S. M. Gass and A. Mackey (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410-427). Routledge.

Edwards, D. & Stokoe, E.H. (2004). Discursive psychology, focus group interviews and participants' categories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 22*(4) 499-507.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition.* (2nd ed). Oxford University Press.

Fabbro, F. (1999). *The neurolinguistics of bilingualism: An introduction.* Psychology Press.

Facey, A. (1986). Bilingualism with a difference. *Bilingual Family Newsletter*, *3*(3), 5–6.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In Faerch C. and Kasper, G. (eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Longman.

Fantini, A. E. (1985). *Language acquisition of a bilingual child: a sociolinguistic perspective (to age ten).* Multilingual Matters.

Fasold, R. (1990). *Sociolinguistics of language.* Blackwell.

Gafaranga, J., (2012). Language alternation and conversational repair in bilingual in bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 16*(4), 501-527, Sage.

Gallucci (2011). *Language learning, identities, and emotions during the year abroad: case studies of British Erasmus students in Italy.* https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/1735/1/Gallucci_11_PhD.pdf

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language Learning.* Newbury House Publishers.

Garfinkel, H. (1974). On the origins of the term „ethnomethodology". In R. Turner (Ed.) *Ethnomethodology* Penguin.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging. language, bilingualism and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Geertz, C. (1973). *Interpretation of cultures.* Basic Books.

Genesee. F. (1989). Early bilingual development: One language or two? *Journal of Child Language, 6,* 161-179.

Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., Paradis, J. (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. In: *Journal of Child Language, 22,* 611-631.

Genesee, F. (2003). Rethinking bilingual acquisition. In J. M. Dewaele, A. Housen, Wie Li (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Challenges and directions for future research* (pp.158–182). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596315

Giles, H. (Ed.). (1984). The dynamics of speech accommodation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 46,* 1-155.

Greenwood, A. (1998). Accommodating friends: Niceness, meanness and discourse norms. In Susan M. Hoyle, C. Temple Adger (Eds.): *Kids talk. Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 66-82). Oxford University Press.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: a qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino, 10*(2), 371-393, jul. /dez.

Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *Philosophical Review, 67,* 377-88.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics.* vol. 3, Academic Press. Reprinted in Grice (1989). And R. Harnish (Ed.). (1994)

Griffee, D, T. (2012). An Introduction to Second Language Research Methods: Design and Data. *TESL-EJ Publications*. eBook edition, 2012.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism.* Harward University Press.

Grosjean, F (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(6), 467-477. |Published online: 14 Sep 2010, *Journal of* https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1985.9994221

Grosjean, F. (1992). Another view of bilingualism. In Harris, R. (Ed.). *Cognitive processing in bilinguals*. North-Holland.

Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In Nicol, J. (Ed.). *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (pp. 1-22). Blackwell. Also, in Li Wei (Ed.). *The bilingual reader*. (2nd edition). Routledge, 2007.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Hakuta, K., Bialystok, E., & Wiley, E. (2003). Critical evidence: A test of the critical-period hypothesis for second-language acquisition. *Psychological Science, 14*(1), 31–38.

Halliday M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language.* Edward Arnold.

Hamers, J. F. (2004). A sociocognitive model of bilingual development. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 23* (1), 70-98. Sage Publications.

Hamers J. F. & Blanc M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism.* Cambridge University Press.

Hammond, K., R (1998). *Ecological validity: Then and now.* www.brunswik.org/notes/essay2.html

Harding, E., & Riley, P. (1986), *The bilingual family: A handbook for parents.* Cambridge University Press.

Herbert, R., K. (2001). Talking in Johannesburg: The negotiation of identity in conversation. In: *Codeswitching worldwide II*. (pp. 223-250). Mouton de Gruyter.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Basil Blackwell.

Hornáčková, K., E. (2017). Social aspects of code-switching, In bilingual children. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 14* (2), 35-46.

Houmanfar, R., Hayes, L. J., & Herbst, S. A. (2005). An analog study of first language dominance and interference over second language. *Analysis of Verbal Behavior, 21*, 75-98.

Hoyle, S. M. & Adger, C.A. (Eds.). (1998). *Kids talk. Strategic language use in later childhood.* Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1974). Linguistics and sociolinguistics. In: *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach* (pp.193-209). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics, in T. Sebeok, (Ed.), *Style in Language*, (pp. 350-377), M.I.T. Press.

Jackendoff, (1987). *Consciousness and the computational mind.* M.I.T. Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *44*(03), 281–315. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115

Kamalanavin, V. (2011). *Raising bilingual children.* Bangkok Post, Section: Life, 29/11/2011.

Kecskés, I. (2016). Can intercultural pragmatics bring some new insight into pragmatics theories? In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society* (pp. 43–69). Springer.

Kielhöfer, B. & Jonekeit, S. (1983). *Zweisprachige Kindererziehung*. [Raising children bilingually]. Stauffenburg-Verlag.

Kleemann, C. (2013). Play in two languages. Language alternation and code-switching in role-play in North Sámi and Norwegian. *Nordlyd: Tromso University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics. 39*(2), 47-69. DOI 10.7557/12.2474

Knechtelsdorfer, Eva (2011). *Attitudes, motivation, identity. A comparative study.* Linguistic seminar paper 2011/12, 0275066A 190 344 350.

Krashen, S. (1973). Lateralization, language learning and the critical period: Some new evidence. *Language Learning, 23*, 63-74.

Krashen, S. M., Long, M., & Scarcella, R. (1979). Age, Rate, and Eventual Attainment in Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 13*, 573-582.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*, Pergamon. Downloadable from http://www.sdkrashen.com/SL_Acquisition_and_Learning/index.html

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Pergamon.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Sage Publications.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach,* McGraw-Hill.

Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism*. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Looking ahead: Future directions in, and future research into, second language acquisition. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*(1), 55-72.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M.H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Longman.

Lazaraton A. (2002). Quantitative and qualitative approaches to discourse analysis. In M. McGroarty (Ed.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 32-52), vol. 22, Cambridge University Press.

Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language.* Wiley.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & White L. (1987). The influence of linguistic theories on language acquisition research: Description and explanation. *Language Learning, 37*(4), 483-510.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned.* Oxford University Press.

Lindholm, K. & Padilla A. M. (1978). Child bilingualism: report on language mixing, switching, and translation. *Linguistics, 211,* 23-44.

Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning: Language acquisition research and its implications for the classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Lugossy, R. (2003). Code-switching in the young learners classroom. In J. Andor, J. Horváth & M. Nikolov (Eds.), *Studies in English theoretical and applied linguistics* (pp. 300-310). Lingva Franca Csoport.

Macnamara, J. (1967). The linguistic independence of bilinguals. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior, 6*(5), 729–736. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(67)80078-1

Macnamara, J. (1982). *Names for things: A study of human learning*. MIT Press.

MacWhinney, B. (1982). Basic syntactic processes. Syntax and semantics. In S. Kuczaj (Ed.), *Language acquisition 1*, (pp. 73–136). Lawrence Erlbaum.

MacWhinney, B. (1987a). *The mechanism of language acquisition.* (pp.xii+476). Lawrence Erlbaum.

MacWhinney, B. (1987b). Applying the competition model to bilingualism. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 8,* 315-327.

MacWhinney, B. (2008). A Unified model. In N. C. Ellis, & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 341-372). Erlbaum.

Malakoff, M & Hakuta, K. (1991). Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 141-167). Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning*, Edward Arnold.

Mackey, W., F. (1962). The description of bilingualism. *Linguistics*, *7*, pp.51-85.

Mackey, W., F. (1970). A typology of bilingual education. *Foreign Language Annals, 3*(4), 596-606.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* 2nd ed. Routledge.

Medgyes, P., & Nikolov, M. (2014). Research in foreign language education in Hungary (2006-2012). *Language Teaching, 47*, 504-537.

Medved Krajnović, M. (2003). The nature and role of code-Switching in developing bilingualism. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrebiensia*, XLVII-XLVIII, 311-334.

Medved Krajnović, M. (2005). Dynamism of successive childhood bilingualism. In: *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia I*, 25-38.

Meisel, J. (1994). Code-switching in young bilingual children. The acquisition of grammatical constraints. *Studies on Second Language Acquisition, 16,* 413-441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100013449

Meisel, J. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children, In: K. Hyltenstam & L. Obler (Eds.). *Bilingualism across the lifespan. aspects of acquisition, maturity and loss.* Cambridge University Press.

Milon, J. (1974). The development of negation in English by a second language learner. *Linguistics, 8*(2), 137-143.

Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (Eds). (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* Cambridge University Press.

Mirzaie, A., & Parhizkar, R. (2021). The interplay of L2 pragmatics and learner identity as a social, complex process: A poststructuralist perspective. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal, (TESL-EJ), 25*(1).https://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej97/a3.pdf

Moon, J. & M, Nikolov. (2000). *Research into teaching English to young learners.* University Press Pécs.

Morgant-Short, K., Faretta-Stutenberg, M.,Brill-Schuetz, K., Carpenter H. & Wong P., C., M. (2014). Declarative and procedural memory as individual differences in second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition,17*(1), 56 - 72. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000715

Moussu L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching, 41(*3), 315 - 348. DOI: https

Murphy, V. A. (2014). *Second language learning in the early school years: Trends and contexts.* Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: evidence from Africa.* Clarendon.

Navracsics, J. (1999). *A kétnyelvű gyermek.* Corvina.

Nemati, M. & Taghizadeh, M. (2013). Exploring similarities and differences between L1 and L2. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(9), 2477-2483.

Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9,* 115-123. Reprinted in Richards (1974).

Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1997). Language development in preschool bilingual children. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, 21*(4), 258–270.

Nikolov, M. (1995). Általános iskolás gyerekek motivációja az angol mint idegen nyelv tanulására [Primary school students' motivation to learn English as a foreign language]. *Modern Nyelvoktatás*, *1*(1), 7-20.

Nikolov, M. (1999). "Natural born speakers of English": Code switching in pair-and group-work in Hungarian primary classrooms. In S. Rixon (Ed), *Young learners of English: Some research perspectives* (pp, 72-88). Longman.

Nikolov, M. (2000). Issues in research into early foreign language programmes. In J. Moon & M. Nikolov (Eds.), *Research into teaching English to young learners.* University Press Pécs.

Nikolov, M (2008). "Az általános iskola. az módszertan!" Alsó tagozatos angolórák empirikus vizsgálata. ['Primary school, that is methodology.' Empirical study of English classes in the junior section.], *Modern Nyelvoktatás XIV*, 1-2, 3-19.

Nikolov, M. (2009). The age factor in context. In M. Nikolov (Ed.), *The age factor and early language learning.* (pp.1-38). De Gruyter Mouton.

Nikolov, M. & Szabó, G. (2015). A study on Hungarian 6th and 8th graders' proficiency in English and German at dual-language schools. In D. Holló & K. Károly (Eds.), *Inspirations in foreign language teaching: Studies in applied linguistics, language pedagogy and language teaching* (pp. 184-206). Pearson Education.

Nikolov, M &Timpe-Laughlin, V. (2021). Assessing young learners' foreign language abilities. *Language Teaching, 54*(1), 1-37.

Nikolov, M.& Djigunović J. M. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition, and early foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *26*, 234-260.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL, Quarterly*, *29(*1), 9-31. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587803

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change.* Pearson Education.

Norton, B. & Toohey K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, *44*, 412-446 doi:10.1017/S0261444811000309

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Newbury House Publishers.

Paradis, M. (1994). Neurolinguistic aspects of implicit and explicit memory: Implications for bilingualism. In: Ellis, N., (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of second languages,* (pp. 393-419). Academic Press.

Paradis, M. (2004). A *neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism.* John Benjamins B.V.

Past, A & Past, K. (1978). "Early childhood: The best time to become bilingual and biliterate", *Childhood Education, 54*(3), 155–161.

Paulston, C. B. (1980). *Bilingual education: Theories and issues*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Pavlenko, **A.** & Dewaele J. M. (eds.) (2004). Languages and emotions: A crosslinguistic perspective. Special issue. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(2/3).

Pavlenko, A. (2005). Bilingualism and thought. In J. Kroll & A. De Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 433-453). Oxford University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Emotions and bilingualism.* Cambridge University Press.

Pawliszko, J. (2016). Loving in two languages: language choice and emotionality in family communication of Kazakh bilinguals. In P. Cymbalista, M. Martynuska, E. Rokosz-Piejko, E. Więcławska (eds.), *International English studies journal. Studia Anglica Resoviensia, 13,* 55-68. University of Rzeszów.

Pearson, B., Z. (2008). *Raising a bilingual child: A step-by-step guide for parents*. Random House.

Penfield, W. & Roberts, L. (1959). *Speech and brain mechanisms*. Princeton University Press.

Piaget, J. (1964). Development and learning. in R. Ripple & U. Rockcastle (Eds), *Piaget rediscovered* (pp.7–20). Cornell University Press.

Pinker, S. (1984). *Language learnability and language development.* Harvard University Press.

Pienemann, M., Johnston, M., Brindley, G. (1988). Constructing an acquisition-based procedure for second language assessment. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 10*(2), 217-243

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino˜ en espan˜ol. Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics 18*, 581-616.

Quisenberry, N., L., Andersson, T., Past, A., W., & Past, Kay, E., C.(1978).Early childhood: The best time to become bilingual and biliterate. *Childhood Education, 54*(3), 155-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.1978.10728387

Ricento, T. (2005). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.895-911). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rokita-Jaśkov, J. (2015). Parental visions of their children's future as a motivator for an early startin a foreign languge. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*,*5*(3), 455-472.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism.* Blackwell.

Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le dévelopment du language observé chez un enfant bilingue*. H. Champion.

Saunders, G. (1988). *Bilingual children: From birth to teens.* Multilingual Matters.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse.* Blackwell Publishers Inc. and Ltd.

Schlegoff, E. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries. In D. Zimmerman and C. West (Eds.), *Language and Social Interaction. Special Issue of Sociological Inquiry, 50* (3/4), 104-152.

Schlegoff, E. (1988). Presequences and indirection: applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 55-62.

Scovel, T. (2001). *Learning new languages: a guide to a second language acquisition.* Newbury House.

Searle, J. (1962). What is speech act? In M. Black (ed.), *Philosophy in America* (pp.221-39). Cornell University Press.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech act.* Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Seliger, H. (1984). Processing universals in second language acquisition. In F. Eckman, L. Bell, and D. Nelson, (Eds.), *Universals of second language acquisition.* Newbury House.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-230.

Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching.* Center for Applied Linguistics.

Singleton, D. & L. Ryan. (2004). *Language Acquisition: the age factor.* Multilingual Matters.

Slobin, D., I. (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In C. A. Ferguson & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Studies of child language development.* Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* Appleton Century Crofts. https://doi.org/10.1037/11256-000

Steiner, N.& Hayes, S. L. (2008). *Seven steps to raising a bilingual child.* American Management Association.

Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Coversational style. Analyzing talk among friends.* Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in discourse.* Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy'. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 61-74). Longman.

Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in Interlanguage,* Edward Arnold London.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. A progress report. In H.D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R.C. Crymes (Eds.) *On TESOL '77.* Washington, DC TESOL, pp. 194-203.

Thiery, C. (1978). True bilingualism and second language learning. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language interpretation and communication* (145-153). Plenum.

Tomas, E., Smith-Lock, & K. Demuth, K. (2012). *Errors of omission and commission in verbal and nominal inflectional morphemes by children with SLI phonological effects and acoustic analysis.* 14th Australian Conference on Speech Science and Technology. 3-6 December 2012.

Valdés, G. & Figueroa, R. A. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias.* Ablex.

Van Ek, J. (1986). *Objectives for Foreign Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Velasco, E. (2020). Oral nativeness acquisition in English as a second language environments: A case study of planned bilingualism. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ), 24*(2).

Velasco, P., & Fialais, V. (2018). Moments of metalinguistic awareness in a Kindergarten class: Translanguaging for simultaneous biliterate development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(6), 760–774.
doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1214104

Vihman, M.M. (1982). The acquisition of morphology by a bilingual child: A whole-word approach. In: *Applied Linguistics, 3,* 141-160.

Vihman, M.M. (1985). Language differentiation by the bilingual infant. In: *Journal of Child Language*. *12*, 297-324.

Volterra, V. & Taeschner, T. (1978). The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language, 5*(2), 311-326.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1967). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. *Soviet Psychology*, *5*, 6-18.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA, *Modern Language Journal, 88,* 331-350.

Watson-Gegeo, K., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In M. Long & C. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 155–177). Blackwell.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact.* Mouton.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C, J. Fillmore, W. S. Y. Wang & D. K. Kempler (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behaviour.* Academic Press.

Wei, L. (2011). Moments analysis and translanguaging space. *Journal of Pragmatics 43*,1222–1235.

Wei, L., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, *10*(3–4), 209–215. doi:10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032

Young R.F. (2002) Discourse approaches to oral assessment. In M. McGroarty (Ed.) *Annual Review of Applied linguistics* (pp. 243-263. vol. 22). Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A – Transcription conventions

. or //	Sentence-final falling intonation
?	Sentence-final rising intonation
↑	Rise in intonation
↓	Drop in intonation
> <	The pace of speech has quickened
< >	The pace of speech has slowed down
?!	Exclamatory intonation
,	Continuing intonation (’more to come’)
.. or …	Pause (shorter or longer)
((comments))	Transcriber’s comments/ my insertion, contextual information, paralinguistic feature or correction of misspelled/mispronounced word
WORD (bold Capitals)	Extra loudness - Emphasis
word	Normal volume - stressed syllable/word/sentence
w o r d	Slowing down
[	Overlap (at the beginning of the speech)
{ }	Inaudible sound, too unclear to transcribe
=	Latched or continuing speech (no pause either between speakers or within one speaker’s turn
:	Elongated sound
::	Longer elongation
[:]	Prolonging the pronunciation of the final vowel/syllable
word (Underlining)	Highlighted key words and phrases
~~word~~	Misspelling/mispronunciation

(hh)	Laughter or breathiness
[ ]	The Hungarian lexical items translated by me into English
excerpt […] excerpt	Stretches of talk between turns that have been omitted

Appendix B – Sarah's L2 development – holophrastic period, false cognates, past tense forms, formation of questions and negation in chapter 6

Linguistic phenomenon	Example	Meaning/Interpretation/Explanation
Neologism (Crystal, 1997) **Referential function** **Regulatory-instrumental functions** (Slobin, 1973; Dore, 1975; Clark, 2003; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991)	1 [kʌ] 2 [bɔ:] 3 [beɪ] 4 [kʌ] 5 [djutɪ:] (You see) 6 [ne] (mustn't) 7 [beɪ] 8 [mɔ:]	1 diaper, smoother, coffee, tea, the act of drinking 2 all animals after 'Bonci' her cat's name 3 beautiful, cold 4 request, admiration 5 resentment, self-disciplining, pride, satisfaction, apology 6 prohibition, disciplining, gaining attention, warning, precaution 7 admiration over something nice and beautiful 8 more, further
Overextension	1 [ʌp] 2 [ne] 3 [djutɪ:] (You see)	1 down, upward direction 2 something illicit, dangerous, mischievous

		3 something praiseworthy, well deleven
Underextension	[keti], [mʊ:]	her cat, Bonci, moon, ball, all circle-shaped objects
Literal translation L2-L1	sunflower The sun falls into my eyes. I can't do up my buttons. 'doggy-bank' I'll give you a bath.	napvirág A nap beleesik a szemembe. Nem tudom fölcsinálni a gombokat. kutya-persely Adok neked egy fürdést.
Formal analogy and approximation **False cognates** (Tarone, 1977) **Morphological overgeneralization**	[moʊs] [kæbitʃ] [Da:] with Bence [dont] Pepe [pʌdələzək]	mamusz cabbage, garbage Dávid with Bence Don Pepe I am pedalling.
Foreignizing	[seərə], [mʌmɪ]	Sarah, mummy (also in Hungarian context)
Word coinage – Circumlocution- Metaphors	your word book my book your composition /your book	the dictionary her bedtime story book present dissertation
Past tense forms - omission	*Daddy *drinkd *sleepd, *lide	Daddy drank, slept, lay
Past tense forms - commission	*Sarah dranked tea, sawed, tooked, spended, camed,	Sarah drank tea. saw, took, spent, came,

	drinkingnek, dancingnek	They are drinking. They are dancing.
Past tense - don't + past	*I don't said [pelʊʃ] *I don't went to nursery *I don't noticed *You don't knocked the door	I didn't say [pelʊʃ] I didn't go to nursery. I didn't notice. You didn't knock the door.
sporadic use of past participle **past irregular,** **past regular** **was + base form**	*When I have given my diaper *you spoken whit me; went, took, did wanted, learned, tried was write	When I gave my diaper you spoke with me.
omitted inflections in marking the relationships between agents, actions and instruments	Sarah kitchen (2;1) Nani shoe (2;2) Dodó book (2;8)	Sarah wants to go to the kitchen. This is Nani's shoe. Dorothy's book

Appendix C – Sarah's L2 development – Categories at the level of lexicon, morphology, syntax with the corresponding excerpts presented in chapter 6

Holophrastic period, false cognates, approximation, literal translation, past tense forms, formation of questions and negation

Lexical development
The holophrastic period/neologism/ Referential function **/** Regulatory-instrumental functions
Excerpt 1 1 Sarah: [beɪbeɪʌp]. (Points up to a bunch of flowers, which was hanging from the barrier of the gallery over the sitting room where I was playing with her.) 2 Mother: Yes, Dodó put her beautiful flowers there. 3 Sarah: [ʌp]? [Let's go upstairs.] (Stretches her both arms out and turns her head upwards signalling her intention to be picked up and taken upstairs.) 4 Mother: Do you want to go upstairs? 5 Sarah:'[ʌp]?'[Let's go upstairs](springing gently on her legs to push me to pick her up and go upstairs) 6 Mother: Good, we'll go. (I start to go up the stairs with Sarah in my arms.) 7 Mother: Now we are here. (Reaching the top) Where are we now? 8 Sarah: [ʌp]. [upstairs] 9 Are you happy that mummy brought you up to see the beautiful flowers? 10 [kʌ]!. [At last, we are upstairs.] (Showing satisfaction) (0;11)
1 Excerpt 2 2 1.Mother: What is Sarah going to do? (I am holding her drinking bottle with tea in it.) 3 2. Sarah: [kʌ]! [I want to drink.] 4 3.Mother: What is in Sarah's hand? (I gently dragged her favourite diaper she was squeezing in her hand.)

5 4.Sarah: [kʌ] [pelenka] [diaper]

6 5.Mother: Yes, I know, it is your diaper. I don't want to take it away, it's yours. (0;9)

Excerpt 3

1 Mother: So, you hit your knee again. (I picked her up as she was crying after falling off the stairs.)

2 Mother: You know, you mustn't do this, it's dangerous.

3 Mother: You are too young to do it, ask mummy and she'll help you

1 Sarah: [djʊtɪ:] (Sarah intensively shook her head admitting her disobedience.)

2 Mother: Sarah is a clever girl!

3 [kʌ]?! (In a celebratory manner) (2;1)

Excerpt 4

1 Mother: What a nice castle!

2 Mother: Was that you, Sarah?

3 Sarah: [djʊtɪ:]? [You see?] (Sarah prides herself for being able to build a castle.)

4 Mother: Yes, you are really clever. (2;1)

Excerpt 5

1 Mother: Here is the soap, wash your hands. (Sarah starts to wash her hands rubbing the soap between her palms and looks up victoriously signalling that she expects acknowledgement.

2 2. Sarah: [djʊtɪ:]? [Well-done] (Sarah stretches her hands towards me to show how clean they are.) (2;6)

Literal translation

Excerpt 6

1 Sarah: 'De szép napvirág van a kertedbe`! [What beautiful sunflowers you have in your garden.]

2 Mother: It is napraforgó (sunflower) in Hungarian.

3 Sarah: But sunflower napvirág! Yes, mummy? (Sarah stresses each item of the English compound word to signal that 'napvirág' is a correct translation of it.)
4 Yes, it is, but the Hungarian napraforgó is not from sunflower.
5 Sarah: Jó, akkor napraforgó. [Ok then napraforgó (sunflower)] (3;7)

Excerpt 7

1 Sarah: Húzd le a ledőnyt, mer beleesik a nap a szemembe! (Let the blinds down because the sun falls into my eyes.)
2 Sarah: Így nem tudom fölcsinálni a gombomat! (This way I can't do up my buttons.) (2,9)

Approximation (formal analogy)

Excerpt 8

1 Sarah: Mummy, the big car is coming!
2 Sarah: Quickly! Where is [kæbitʃ]?
3 Mother: Cabbage is káposzta. You wanted to say garbage, no?
4 Sarah: Garbage. (3, 2)

False cognate

Excerpt 9

1 Grandma: De szép mamuszod van! [What nice slippers you have.]
2 Sarah: Az nem egér, mama, hanem kutyus. [That is not a mouse, grandma, it is a dog.]
3 Grandma: Én nem is mondtam, hogy egér! [I didn't even say that 'mouse'.]
4 Sarah: Jaj, mama, akkor mér mondtad, hogy mouse? A mouse az egér! [Oh, grandma, then why did you say 'mouse'? Mouse is egér (mouse).] (3.4)

Excerpt 10

1 Mother: Sarah, I'm giving you a bath. Get ready. (No reaction.) Are you sitting on your ears? I can't hear your answer!

2 Sarah (turning up in the bathroom): Mér úgy mondod azt, hogy adok egy fürdést? Mondd azt angolul, hogy 'megfürdetlek'? Na, hogy van az? [Why do you say 'I give you a bath?' Say 'megfürdetlek' (I give you a bath in English. And how is it?]

3 Mother: In English we can say give you a bath or simply I bathe you. If you like, I will say I'll bathe you. Is it ok now?

4 Sarah: Yes. I bathe you; I bathe you. Jó, hogy megtanítottad. [Good, that you have taught me.] (She stroked my hand gently.)

5 Mother: Again, we learnt something new. (3;1)

Excerpt 11

1 Mother (reading a story from an English book): *'Early in the morning everyone made their way to the field. The old horse pulled the reaper. The children skipped along, pushing each other and laughing, while the women chatted, their rakes in their hands. The men walked more quietly, some smoking pipes with …'* (I stopped reading and started to think for a moment*)… long coils of twine over their shoulder.*' (*The old days*,366 stories for bedtime, p.147) I wonder what twine is in Hungarian. Would it be 'kéve' or 'guriga' in Hungarian? What is the name of those big things in the horse-riding school that look like…. Sarah, wait I don't know this word. Let me think.

2 Sarah: Mummy?! And? Read!

3 Mother: Yes, but I don't know this word.

4 Sarah: No matter, mummy, look in your book. But later. Now keep on reading.

5 Mother: What book do you mean?

6 Sarah: The big word book. Only read on now. (4;6)

Past formation

don't + past

sporadic use of past participle, future forms

past irregular

past regular

was + base form

Excerpt 12

Today in the school we spoken about what will we do for the family for Christmas. I think this will be a werry good present. And Márti néni doesn't know what will I do. She sad everything, but this she doesn't because she doesn't know me. When she tell this I think about this composition… Today when I make my homework I maked a little table with this representation: KNOCK! If you will come in! Then I sad to you that I do my homework. Then you cam in, but you don't knockd the door and rushd in my room, however there was that 'KNOCK!'… I lide on the exercise book, and I don't noticed that next to me was this paper. But I was happy because only a werry little was write on it. Oh! I don't knowd that how I will put it under the tree, but it's succesful. I love you mami! Merry Christmas!

When I write the composition for you it was a werry bad feeling because I don't want to tell about that. But a little it was difficult because Nani noticed it. I lide on it, so that she doesn't see it. Yes! Sorry! So I **don't noticed** that next to me there is Nani. Mami, don't look such angry because I said it for her. I think it's werry 'ciki'. Sorry, mami, that I say in Hungarian, but I don't know it in English and it isn't in the Hungarian-English dictionary. Ok, it isn't will happen again! I said for Nani I LOVE YOU**!!!** So now everybody knows my composition, Dad, Nani, Dodo and I. And you can tell everybody and you can show everybody because it is yours. (8;4)

Excerpt 13

Mami, why did Nani cry when we went to horse riding? Don't you remember? You know that when papa camed with us…. Mami, you remember when we were in that restaurant next to 'Aranybulla'? It was werry werry bad, there was werry cold. The food wasn't good…but it was Bandi's birthday and I or we like Bandi. He is werry cute. Besides, in addition many things happened with me and there were you and the family too. (9;2)

Excerpt 52

Sarah: Hello Mami! How are you? Because I am very well! But if you are not well then now you will got a good time. The tail (tale) is biginning. When I was bourn you spoken with me in English. My first world was: moon, car, koffie. I know these. But, that how was it, I don't know. Who knows it, it's you mami. When I have given my diaper, **I don't said** 'pelus', I sad 'diaper', because you spoken whit me alway and only in English ENGLISH! Yes, I know that I say that 'I wont speak in English with you mami! But now I see that how mutch words I know and it's werry werry good. Oh! Sorry, not only words, but I know to make expressions. And all this things I know due you! Now I see! Grandma said, that when I was there, I always said those English words, and grandma said, that she doesn't understand nothing. This was when I **don't went** in the nursery, but I was with my grandma and granddad. Mami, I want a question from you. You will write this composition in that, I don't know, in your composition? Not my'n, but your composition. In your. Sure! He, he! That's why I lifing. I know that you remember werry much, because it was only November when I put a question: How is 'sure'? Write down. And now I know it. Ok! I want ONLY THIS THINGS, so you are not fritened, YES? It will go on! Only not this way. (10;7)

Sarah's language use at the morphological level

A morpheme-based process in Sarah's language use meant that certain parts of a particular word (e.g., a suffix or a preposition) were more dominant in both the recognition and formation of a word than using the whole information to recognize the word.

Excerpt 14

1 Sarah: Nani, mummy is angry with you.
2 Sarah (trying to abandon the topic) Yesterday was good, I played with Dá. Yes, mummy?
3 Mother: Dá? Not Dávid? He is Dávid not Dá. (Trying to avoid laugh)
4 Sarah: Dá-á-á with Bence! I don't want to speak.
5 Nani: I adore you! Look, mummy is laughing, she is not angry with me any more. Thank you, Sarah you're my adorable sister. (3;2)

Excerpt 25

1 Sarah: I love pizza from dont Pepe.

2 Dodó. From where?

3 Sarah: Dont Pepe.

4 Dodó (laughing aloud): It is not dont Pepe, it is don Pepe!

5 Sarah: How?

6 Dodó: Úgy, hogy don Pepe. A ’don’t’ az angolul van, mikor azt akarod mondani, hogy ne csinálj valamit. Például ’Don’t touch it’. Tudod? [Don Pepe. ’don’ is in English when you want to say that someone should not do something.]

7 Sarah: Akkor én most angolul mondtam! Mér kell nyihogni? Te persze mindent tudsz, mert te nagy vagy, mi? [Then I said it in English now. Why do you have to giggle? You of course know everything because you are big, don’t you?]

8 Dodó: Dehogy, bocs! Összekeverted, mert tudsz angolul! Büszke lehetsz magadra! [Oh no, sorry. You mixed them up because you know English! You can be proud of yourself!] (5;1)

Ommitting inflections in marking the relationship between agents, actions and instruments	Sarah kitchen (2;1) (Sarah wants to go to the kitchen.), Nani shoe (2;2) (This is Nani’s shoe.), Mummy give (2,0), (Mummy, give it to me.), Daddy [tʌ:] (3;1) (Daddy loves Sarah).
Sarah’s L2 development at the syntactic level **Formulating questions**	
Declarative sentences with rising intonation for questions	Mother: Look, mummy’s putting your skates in the bag, we’re getting dressed and go. Sarah: Go {hʊ:k}? [Shall we go to the ice rink?] (2;2) Sarah need ['bænko:]? (Does Sarah need a blanket?) (2;5)
Uninverted wh-type questions	’Where Sarah diaper?’ (3;2), ’What Dodó (Dorothy) eating?’

Alternate use of the verb-subject and the subject-verb order in questions - Questions sporadically follow the pattern of declarative sentences	(3;7) 'Where go Kata?' (3;2), 'Why cry Nani?' (3;4), 'Where daddy go' (3,5), 'Why Sarah cry?' (3;5). 'Where go Kata?' (3;2), 'Why cry Nani?' (3;4),'Dodó (Dorothy)want ice-cream?' (3;7). 'Dodó play with Sarah?' (4;9)
Fronting in questions without inversion **Verbs at the front lacking the auxiliary.** **'do' in sentences where no auxiliary required**	'Go Sarah?' (3;2) 'Do I can have ice-cream?' (4;10)
Inversion with correct and incorrect forms	'Do mummy love you?' (6;7), 'Do Nani like chocolate?' (7,4).'Can Sarah read?'(6;5), 'Where mummy can buy?' (6,7).
'whatsit' 'whers' used as formulaic chunks	'Wheres cats?' 'Whats those?' (3;6)
The use of auxiliaries and inverted word order grammatically incorrectly	'Is this is bad fairy?' (5;4), 'Do you can call the cats? (5;7),'Mummy, play you with me?' (6;1). 'Why you say this? (5;11), 'Why Cinderella speak English?' (5;2) 'Do you Dodó see my cat on the wall?' (6;3) (Sarah points to her drawings featuring her cat on the wall.) Dodó: 'Why isn't Csubi there?' (Dodó notices that the

	picture of her other cat, Csubi is misssing, so she enquires about it)
Wh-type questions she started to invert the word order but only if the verb was 'is' or 'are'	Why is Bonci cry? (5;2) Where are we going? (5;4).
Auxiliaries *may, can* and *do* at the beginning of her questions with subject omission	May sleep upstairs? ('May I sleep upstairs?') (5;7); Can go to skate?' ('Can we go to skate?) (6;2)
Combining negation and wh-words **Inability to negate and invert at the sane time**	'Why Sarah can't eat chocolate?' (9;6) 'Mama not work today?' (10;2)
Questions in subordinate clauses or in embedded questions **Overinversion**	' I don't know where can the cat sleep' (11;1) 'Do you know where is my teddy-bear?' (6;3).
Formulating negatives	
Anaphoric negation	'I love Kidi.' 'No.' (2,1) 'No I know in English'. (3,3) 'No singing songs' (3;7)'No speak English' (3;9) 'No 'Daddy love Kidi' (3;10) to succeed a previous sentence: 'Daddy loves Kidi'
Non-anaphoric negation	'No cat' (2;8), 'No more' (2;2) and 'Sarah no' (1;8),'No drink' (3,7) 'No mommy doing. Sarah wash' (4,3), 'No cat run, the dog' (4;5),

	`Tree no big`(5;1), ’No drink’(4,9), ’I no reach ball’(5;6)
Internal ’be’ negation	’Lunch is no ready’ (4;5) ’Shoes is no clean’(3;11)
Internal full verb negation, and ’don’t’ imperative	’Mummy go not’ (4;8), ’I am not went’(5;2) ’I not draw Csubi’ (5,7), ’Don’t touch it.’ (4;8) ’Don’t pull the cat.’ (4;9)
A variety of forms for ’do’	’Csubi don’t like me’ (5;1); ’Mummy don’t said’ (6;4), ’I don’t went to shop’ (7;5)
’do’ for negation without tense agreement	’You didn’t can run from dogs’ (7;9)

Appendix D – Categories of the communicative intent, the relevant descriptions and the corresponding excerpts presented in chapter 7

Category	Description	Example/discourse sample
Accommodating to the established language separation rules	Constant regulation and identification of her self as well as the interlocutors in bilingualism to show/demonstrate that she has definite expectations and understanding/knowledge on who, where, when speaks Hungarian or English	Mummy, Brendon speaks English at nursery too…but I never speak English with you in the kindergarten.' (3;4)'
		A Hamupipőke tud angolul?' (5,2)
Expressing and intensifying emotional attachment using L2 as a medium	Appeals to English to signal emotionality to underpin that using L2 offers versatile, intimate, and sophisticated ways to have and generate an effective emotional power in the listener's mind L2 sounds less offensive	'...when I am as big as Dodó (her elder sister), I also say 'anya' ('mother') to you?... No, you are my {mʌmi}.' (5;2)
		'…Én jobban szertem a 'Sarah'-t, mint a 'Sárát.' Főleg, ahogy te mondod. Mikor úgy mondod, hogy 'Sarah', akkor tudom, hogy nem vagy ideges, meg ráérsz.' (4;2)
		'Mummy, I hate you!... De angolul úgy hangozik

		mintha az ’utál’ is szép lenne!’ (4;5) ‘Nem szép a hangod, ha magyarul beszélsz, szebb angolul.’ (4;5)
Conciliating the interlocutor - Identifying the situation and the interlocutor’s mood by language use	Language-related episodes of how the cospeaker’s language behaviour modifies and reconstructs Sarah`s language appropriating process. Switching languages has a conciliating effect and enhances rapport with the interlocutor by powerfully relying on and and benefitting from shared personal styles and preferences.	‘Na mostmár mars aludni! Ne mondjam többször! ‘Give me my diaper. It is not here.’ (4;2) ‘Tudom, amikor mérges vagy, meg sietsz valahova, akkor nem beszélsz angolul. Nem is beszélsz sehogyan.’ (9;2)
Disciplining and criticizing biased attitude	Criticizing others’ biased attitude in terms of language use and preference. Sarah`s conceptualization and interpretations of making distinctions in terms of language competence. Code-switches are used to enhance the stylistic effectiveness and intensity of Sarah`s messages	’I love pizza from don’t Pepe.’… It’s not dont Pepe, it is don Pepe! A ’don’t’ az angolul van, mikor azt akarod mondani, hogy ne csinálj valamit. Például ’Don’t touch it’. Tudod? Sarah: Akkor én most angolul mondtam!’ (5;1) Dodó: Say ’nyihogsz’in English!’Sarah:’Laugh. …Laugh Dodó: Az

		’nevet, de nem nyihog! Sarah: Más szót nem szoktam erre mondani. De tudom, hogy te most nem nevetsz, hanem nyihogsz! (5;1)
Topic abandonment and tricking - Abandoning and redirecting the topic of conversation	Topic abandonment serves as a conversational repair (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012) to link a vernacular style. Subjective commentary and diversion from the topic of conversation are meant to mitigate interlocutors` resentment over her untoward behaviour. Excerpts of the category are used (Gafaranga, 2012) as an additional resource in the organization of conversational repair to compensate for limited expertise in language of schooling and giving true opinion, correction practice to counterbalance and mitigate the interlocutor`s outright unmodulated manner.	Mother: You haven’t opened the book today. You are lying, aren’t you? (Pressing Sarah’s nose gently) Sarah: I am not lying, I am sitting. . Jó, akkor örökké csak ülni fogok. (8;3)
		’A Hamupipőke szebb ám angolul mondva.’ ’Cinderella is nicer in English.’ (5,2)
		Sarah: Mummy, let the cats in. Mother. You know I don’t like it. They live outside. Sarah: But Nati wants to stroke them. (6;6)
		’Would you please start doing the task and find the verbs? (Mother intersects impatiently being angry over her

		fussiness.) Read it again!’ Sarah: Jó, csak mondjuk el magyarul is előtte! Különben tudok egy jót az elefántokról. Elmondjam? (8;5)
Easing tension and injecting humour	An effective tool to control communication a manifestation of self defence. Humour is a tool to ease tension, to win attention, to control power relationships in a discourse event beyond self-serving entertainment. Humour contributes to generating the expected discourse behaviour, laughter, amazement, embarrassment in the interlocutor.	Dori, Nani: Sarah, come. We’re baking ’Kacsa Nagyi’ chocolate cookies, which you like so much. Prepare the flour, sugar, eggs and cocoa here on the table. Dori: Are you sitting on your ears? Is it so difficult to lift your buttocks and get the flour from the there? Sarah: Dodó, your flower is here. Dori (laughing): Very clever! (8;7)

Appendix E – Sample coding of data in Sarah's communicative intentions mediated by language alternation, in her metalinguistic comments and narratives in chapter 7

Key

Highlighted parts of Sarah's comments – initial coding, focus of analysis

Comments on the right margin – descriptive codes

Comments on the right margin in bold – pattern codes

Accommodating to the established language separation rules

Mummy, Brendon speaks English at nursery too.
Mother: With whom? With you?
Sarah: No, with his mother.
Mother: Yes, but his father is American, so they speak English more often than we do. At home in the street, in the shop, everywhere. Perhaps it was easier for him to speak English.
Sarah: Yes, but I never speak English with you in the kindergarten.
Mother: They do it in their way, we do it in our way. (3;4)

Brendon's language behaviour represented a deviation from Sarah's household language use pattern **Sarah's definite expectations and knowledge on who, where, when speaks Hungarian or English.**

Sarah: Mummy, the good fairy also speak Hungarian?
Mother: When I read in Hungarian, the fairy also speaks in Hungarian. But when in English, I say in English what the fairy says.
Sarah: How is 'magic spell' in Hungarian then?
Mother: Varázslat. (3;5)

L2 is associated with certain people according to the previously experienced local norms and standards. Deviations from the rule arouses her attention. **The relevance of language use. Accommodating to the local language separation rules.**

Brendon: I've brought a board game with me. Let's play with it, you'll enjoy it.

Sarah: Brendy, a Boti is itt van ám!

Brendon: Jaj, bocsánat! (5;9)

Accommodating friends, social sensitivity. Normative preference for correct and relevant language use

Mother: Is it an indoor game?

Petra: Mit mond?

Sarah: Azt kérdezte, hogy bent szokták játszani? (7;4)

Expressing and intensifying emotional attachment using L2 as a medium

Sarah: Mummy, when I am as big as Dodó (her older sister), I also say 'anya' ('mother') to you? I don't know. What do you think? (Thinking) No, you are my mummy. (She intersects hurriedly.)
Mother: So, you like calling me {mʌmi}? Sarah: Yes. And I always say it. (5,2)

difference between her sisters' and her wording. You like calling me [mʌmi]? Yes, and I always say it- **foreignizing**

Mother: Sára, nem. Értsd meg, most dolgom van!
Sarah: Én jobban szeretem a 'Sarah'-t, mint a 'Sárát.' Főleg, ahogy te mondod. Mikor úgy mondod, hogy 'Sarah', akkor tudom, hogy nem vagy ideges, meg ráérsz.
Mother: Tényleg így gondolod?
Sarah: Igen, mikor van időd, angolul mondod. (4,2)

'jobban szeretem a Sarah-t, főleg ahogy te mondod'…'. L2 intensifies the content of utterances and amplifies her **emotional bonding** to the mother. 'nem vagy ideges, meg ráérsz'. L2 in controlled, relaxed contexts, L1 when mother can't control her language use.

Mother: Please, don't ask me, go and ask Kata to play with you. Now I'm not in the mood of playing that board game.

Sarah: Mummy, I hate you! (She expressed 'hate' with overwhelming kindness and with a special accent on it.)

Sarah: You know, it means I love you. De angolul úgy hangozik mintha az 'utál' is szép lenne!

Mother: Yes, I know, you have already explained it several times to me. (4;5)

'Mummy. I hate you'- **euphemism – a linguistic bridge to replace a word which is disagreeable and offensive**

L2 -alliance, we-ness and intimacy, 'utál➔hate**' code switch a chilling effect**

Conciliating the interlocutor - Identifying the situation and the interlocutor's mood by language use – disciplining - criticizing biased attitude

Mother: Na mostmár mars aludni! Ne mondjam többször!

Sarah: Give me my diaper. It is not here.

Mother: Go and fetch it quickly.

L2 to **soften the interlocutor,** make her less strict about the bedtime agenda**.** An affective strategy to control the interlocutor and get inner satisfaction.

Sarah: But we didn't read! I want 'Make-believe'! (4;2)

Mother: Nem hiszem el, hogy még mindig nem söpörted össze a szemetet!'

Sarah: Your voice is nicer in English. Mother: It is all the same whether I speak English or Hungarian. Now I am angry, and I do not want to speak any more.

'Your voice is nicer in English'- Sarah **identifes the interlocutor's mood by her language choice.**

Sarah: Tudom, amikor mérges vagy, meg sietsz valahova, akkor nem beszélsz angolul. Nem is beszélsz sehogyan.

Mother: Yes, it's true. Now, will you do what I want from you?

Sarah: Yes, and I sweep up and I wash up too. (9;2)

Mother: I've asked you thosands of times to clear away everything in your room. There are piles of clothes everywhere.

Sarah: I've asked you thousands of times to come to horse-riding with me! You promised. (6;7)

cutback for **a conciliating effect**

Sarah: I love pizza from don't Pepe.
Dodó. From where? (Her older sisters started to giggle over Sarah's false perception of the name 'Don Pepe'.)

I love pizza from don't Pepe - don't instead of don – erroneous interpretation of a grammar issue, **morphological generalization**.

Sarah: Dont Pepe.
Dodó (laughing aloud): It's not dont Pepe, it is don Pepe! Úgy, hogy don Pepe. A 'don't' az angolul van, mikor azt akarod mondani, hogy ne csinálj valamit. Például 'Don't touch it'. Tudod?
Sarah: Akkor én most angolul mondtam!
Sarah: Nani, fejezd már be! Mindig nyihogsz, ha nem tudom mondani.

L2→L1'--laugh→nyihog (whinny)switch - to **counterbalance the inequitable subject position of an incompetent L2 speaker**

Nani,Dodó: Say 'nyihogsz'in English!

Sarah: Laugh. (Turning down her voice.)

Dodó: Laugh az 'nevet, de nem nyihog!
Sarah: Más szót nem szoktam erre mondani. De tudom, hogy te most nem nevetsz, hanem nyihogsz!
Mér kell nyihogni? Te persze mindent tudsz, mert te nagy vagy, mi?

'De tudom.'- counter-discourse, L1-**disciplining**, stylistic shading

Dodó: Dehogy, bocs! Összekeverted, mert tudsz angolul! Büszke lehetsz magadra! (5;1)

'Dehogy, bocs! Összekeverted, mert tudsz angolul! Büszke lehetsz magadra!**'L2 to wield power to win sisters' respect**.

Topic abandonment and tricking
Abandoning and redirecting the topic of conversation

Mother: You haven't opened the book today. You are lying, aren't you? (Pressing Sarah's nose gently)
Sarah: I am not lying, I am sitting.
Mother: (can hardly hide laughter away) Really? Then tell me the poem now.
Sarah starts reciting the poem but lapses many times not knowing the text fluently.
Mother: OK, learn it, I will come later and ask you. But next time you should think before you cheat me. Promise?
Sarah: Yes. promise. (8;3)

lie-lie – a homophone to avoid an uncomfortable situation. **Topic abandonment and tricking, redirecting the topic**

to conciliate and soften the mother by **playing on humour.**

Sarah: This is hedgehog or what? (She wants to say 'urchin') (Trying to divert me from what I am doing, to win my attention)
Mother: What? I don't understand. Who told you that word?
Sarah: You. It was in the bedtime book. In the tale. Here it is. (She runs into her room and comes back with her favourite story book in her hand riffling it through in order to find the word she was looking for.)
Mother: Ah, that one! You meant urchin!
Sarah: Urchin! Please, read it! (7;9)

word search, reference to **L2 to win attention** to turn her comments into opportunities for learning and practising L2.

Sarah: Mummy, let the cats in.
Mother. You know I don't like it. They live outside.
Sarah: But Nati wants to stroke them.
Mother: I say no.
Sarah: Nati, you feel sorry for the cats, yes?
Nati:Yes.
Mother: But take them out as soon I ask you.
Sarah: Sure, sure.(6;6)

Easing tension – Injecting humour

Dori, Nani: Sarah, come. We're baking 'Kacsa Nagyi' chocolate cookies, which you like so much. Prepare the flour, sugar, eggs and cocoa here on the table.

sisters' teasing, motherlike behaviour, to floor the ground and control the situation by giving orders to Sarah

Sarah: Soon, soon, soon. (The girls are waiting, but Sarah does not move from the sofa)

Dori: Are you sitting on your ears? Is it so difficult to lift your buttocks and get the flour from the larder?

Sarah: No. Coming!

(Sarah runs up to the table in the dining room and fidgets with the tulips, which are placed in the vase in the middle of the table. In the following moment she turns up in the kitchen with a tulip in her hand.)

'Dodó, your flower is here'- a pun, humorous effect, **redefinition of the local social order**, winning appreciation

Sarah: Dodó, your [flauə] is here.

Dori (laughing): Very clever! (8;7)

'Kidi is kidding'- a pun

Sarah: Mummy, I know a good joke.

Mother: What is it?

Sarah: Kidi is kidding.

Mother: It is really very funny. I like it!

Sarah: Yes, and I can joke in English! (7;6)

the interlocutor's acceptance of the local norms not only for **interpreting a specific discourse event, displaying appropriate discourse behaviour**

Appendix F – Categories in Sarah`s building her social and linguistic identity, category descriptions and the corresponding excerpts presented in chapter 8

Category	Description	Discourse sample
Group affiliation and allegiance	Language-related exchanges considered as manifestations of Sarah`s sense of belonging. They show ways of regulating, identifying, and redefining herself in the cultural group depending on her personal needs and interests. Sarah`s individual struggle to reach the respectful position of a sufficiently competent speaker of English	Kata: Hogy van az, hogy hörghurut angolul? (How is 'hörghurut' in English?) Sarah. Nem tudom, mi csak azt mondjuk, hogy 'ill'. (I don't know, we say only 'ill'.) Meg a Brendy is úgy mondja. (5;5)
		Sarah:'Olyan ciki, volt. Tudod, a diaper-rel alszom. Sarah: Meg, de azt, mondtam hogy 'diaper.' A Maja meg nem tud angolul. Mother: Hát miért nem mondtad magyarul? Sarah: Így nem volt olyan ciki. Mother.És, nem kérdezte az mit jelent? Sarah: Nem, nem kérdezett többet. Úgy tett, mintha értené, hogy mit mondtam. Pedig én tudom, hogy nem értette. Csak nem merte bevallani. Tudod, milyen nagyra van magától. (7;4)

		Sarah: (whispering): De az olyan ciki, mikor angolul beszélsz, azt hiszik, hogy nagyképűsködök. Mother: You shouldn't be so shy! Be proud of it! (6;5)
Handling negative feedback and asking for justification and reinforcement	Reactions to peer-initiated criticism, discussions of peer pressure cases give a better understanding of Sarah's socializing into appropriate ways of her regaining entitlement to use a language, which normally does not belong to her monolingual peer group members. Sarah's reporting on peer criticism, her perception of the relative nature of language knowledge, her conceptualization of language expertise and her sense of self in the language learning process.	Képzeld, nem tudtam, mi az a 'melléknév' angolul. A Rámi meg kinevetett, és azt mondta: Nem is tudsz angolul! Olyan rossz, ha kérik, hogy fordítsak le egy szót, és nem tudom. Megkérdeztem a Brendy.t, és, képzeld, ő sem tudta. Mondta, hogy az ő anyukája is megnézi a szótárban, ha nem tud valamit.2 Persze, hogy nem tudok mindent, de te is mondtad, hogy senki se tud. (9;5)
		De azt a Matyi nem tudja, milyen az angolt használni az igazi beszédben. Mondtam neki, ő lehet, hogy sok szót tud, de nem tudja összerakni. Én meg beszélgetek. (9;8)
		A Barbi meg olyan nevetséges! Annyit

		dicsekszik, hogy, ha már a külön angolon ügyes lesz, az anyukájával otthon is fognak angolul beszélgetni. … Nem is hiszem, hogy angolul beszélnek, csak azért mondja, hogy nagyképűsködjön. (8;9) …a Szandra …Azt is mondta, hogy azt ember az anyukájától nem tud megtanulni angolul, csak, ha Angliában élnek. A nyelvtant meg főleg csak tanártól lehet megtanulni, az anyukájától nem tudja az ember. (8;9)
Highlighting deficiencies and asymmetries in second language knowledge	Conversations to discuss Sarah`s feelings, doubts and individual struggles in the L2 learning process. The impact of peers' comments motivates her language learning and progress. Language-related episodes to underpin that L1 is often used as a reference point to assess proficiency in L2 and is an effective tool to help construct knowledge in that language. L1 is used to compensate for low language proficiency and enhance authentic	Mother:'What did you learn about in grammar lesson?' Sarah: 'A vonatkozó névmásokat, de azt nem tudom angolul, csak magyarul.' (10;2) Mother:'What's it in the picture?' Sarah: 'I don't remember. How begins?''Mondd az első szótagot, mummy.' (8;5)

	communication. L1 is more suitable to give voice to her opinion and adds to stylistic effectiveness more than in the foreign language. The excerpts of this category are suggestive of the fact that in Sarah's language acquisition process her two languages do not fill the same role and status.	Sarah: Na, most mondjuk el magyarul!' …angolul nem biztos, hogy értem. Akkor most olvassam, vagy meséljem el a képeket, vagy mi? (7;4) Sarah: Jaj, most nincs kedven annyit gondolkozni. Mondom inkább magyarul, még annyi leckém van! A mama meg olyan kajákat főzött, amit nem is tudok angolul. (9;3) 'Én gyorsan akarom mondani. De ha angolul mondom, az lassú, mert oda kell figyelnem. Bezzeg a Kasia nem gondolkozik, amikor magyarul beszél! A Kasianak jó, róla azt mondják, olyan mintha magyar lenne…. mert olyan sokat hallja, hogy megtanulja. Neki nem is kell tanulnia, csak úgy tudja.' (11;9)
Defining group boundaries and preserving alliance and privacy	Peer group negotiations as social sites for building local social order, values and norms that	Sarah: Ne beszélj már egyfolytában angolul! Most nem a Katáékkal vagyok! (7,2)

	regulate one another's conduct and group-belonging.	Zsófi: Na, beszéljetek még! (angolul) Sarah: Hagyjál már! Zsófi. Mér? Sarah: Mer ilyenkor nem szoktunk. (8;4) Sarah: A Katáék meg a Kasia-ék az más, ők mindig itt vannak, olyan, mintha velünk laknának. Ha meg nem értik, megkérdezik, miről beszélünk, és én elmondom nekik. Egyébként én tanulok abból. (7,2)
Getting authority via L2	The process of displaying her own L2 expertise and her contesting for the position of the competent L2 user. Making a distinction in the local social order.	Dodó and Nani (Sarah's elder sisters): Mi az ott Sára? Sarah: {tigris}! (Angrily, putting the accent on the sound {s} at the end of the word. Dodó: Mondd még egyszer! Sarah: Tiger. (in a celebratory manner) (3;4) Sarah: Na, majd akkor azt is beleírod a könyvedbe, hogy te nem tudtad, mi az a 'chaps', és én modtam meg neked?' (11;3) Mother: Mért akartad, hogy a múltkor az

		iskolában az öltöző előtt angolul beszéljek veled? Sarah: {mΛmi}, hát azér, hogy az Eszti lássa, hogy tudok. Sarah: Mióta tudja, hogy te angolul beszélsz velem, nem is olyan nagyképű! (10;7)
Finding ways to enhance learning strategies	Manifestations of Sarah`s justification of the importance of L2 knowledge. Her understanding that her English knowledge is an additional asset, which is acknowledged by legitimate, authorized, and competent users of L2, such as native peers and by schoolteachers.	‘Te is mondtad, meg Éva néni is mondja, hogy csak az órán nem lehet megtanulni. Úgyhogy jó, hogy sokat beszélünk! Meg mondtam, hogy mi minden este olvasunk angol mesét.’ Mother: Legyél is nagyon büszke magadra! Sarah (9;1)
		’Jó, de a dolgozatban nem azt kell tudni, hogy mit csináltam ma! Ott azt kell tudni, ami az órai anyag! Meg kéne tanítanod a nyelvtant!’Mert azt úgy nem lehet, hogy csak úgy beszélünk ebéd közben, meg ilyenek?’ (10;7)
		‘When I was bourn you spoken with me in English. But now I see that how

		mutch words I know and it’s werry werry good. Oh! Sorry, not only words, but I know to make expressions. And all this things I know due you! Now I see!’ (10;7)

Appendix G – Sample coding of data in Sarah's negotiating her identity development in chapter 8

Key

Highlighted parts of Sarah's comments – initial coding, focus of analysis

Comments on the right margin – descriptive codes

Comments on the right margin in bold – pattern codes

Group affiliation and allegiance

Building/Constituting locally valued competences and identites – socializing into local norms of conduct (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p.176)

Kata: Mit mondott? (What did she say?)

Sarah: Azt, hogy nem ihat hideg vizet, mert hörghurutja van. (That he mustn't drink cold water because he has bronchitis.). Kata: Hogy van az, hogy hörghurut angolul? (How is 'hörghurut' in English?)

Sarah. Nem tudom, mi csak azt mondjuk, hogy 'ill'. (I don't know, we say only 'ill'.)

Meg a Brendy is úgy mondja. (And Brendy says so.)

Kata: Jó, elhiszem. (Good, I believe it.) (5;5)

'Nem tudom…meg a Brendy is úgy mondja' reference to native-speakers to **obtain a powerful in-the-know position**, the impression of a **competent L2 speaker**.

Valid statements position her as a **sufficiently competent speaker of L2** in the circle of her peers.

Sarah: Olyan ciki, volt. Tudod, a diaper-rel alszom. A Maja meg észrevette, mikor mentünk aludni, és megkérdezte, mi az.

Mother: És, megmondtad?

Sarah: Meg, de azt, mondtam hogy 'diaper.' A Maja meg nem tud angolul.

'azt mondtam 'diaper', a Maja meg nem tud angolul'- **L2 to save privacy**, as a tool **to escape from an embarrassing situation**

Mother: Hát miért nem mondtad magyarul? Sarah: Így nem volt olyan ciki.

Mother.És, nem kérdezte az mit jelent?

Sarah: Nem, nem kérdezett többet. Úgy tett, mintha értené, hogy mit mondtam. Pedig én tudom, hogy nem értette. Csak nem merte bevallani. Tudod, milyen nagyra van magától. (7;4)

'Nem kérdezett többet' – L2 to disarm the roommate. **Constituting locally valued competences - socializing into local norms of conduct**

Sarah feels different – **group affiliation effort.**

Mother: What's wrong with speaking in English? Let your classmates know that you can speak English. At least they can practise it.

Sarah: (whispering): De az olyan ciki, mikor angolul beszélsz, azt hiszik, hogy nagyképűsködök.

Mother: You shouldn't be so shy! Be proud of it! (6;5)

'You should be very proud of it! 'high valorization of foreign language knowledge, the acknowledgement**. L2 competence makes distinctions in her position**, she obtains a valued personality.

Local valorization of L2 - reinforcement

Handling negative feedback/peer criticism

Képzeld, nem tudtam, mi az a 'melléknév' angolul. A Rámi meg kinevetett, és azt mondta: Nem is tudsz angolul! Olyan rossz, ha kérik, hogy fordítsak le egy szót, és nem tudom. Megkérdeztem a Brendy.t, és, képzeld, ő sem tudta. Mondta, hogy az ő anyukája is megnézi a szótárban, ha nem tud valamit. Én is mondtam is neki, hogy csak azt tudom, amiről mindig beszélgetünk otthon, meg, hogy te sose kéred, hogy ilyeneket fordítsak le. Ilyen nyelvtanos dolgokat sose mondunk angolul, csak úgy beszélgetünk, hogy mi van velünk, de attól még tudok. Persze, hogy nem tudok mindent, de te is mondtad, hogy senki se tud. (9;5)

peers' dichotomic distinction in categorizing **language** learners **as good or bad**

understanding of **the relative nature of language knowledge**- all skills and aspects of language are not developed equally. awareness of the interrelationship between social context and language knowledge

communicative vs. academic functioning

Sarah: A Matyi azt mondta, ha nem tudok folyamatosan beszélni, akkor nem is tudok angolul. De azt a Matyi nem tudja, milyen az angolt használni az igazi beszédben. Mondtam neki, ő lehet, hogy sok szót tud, de nem tudja összerakni. Én meg beszélgetek. Meg azt is, hogy mi otthon is angolul beszélünk kicsi koromtól. Utálatoskodnak, pedig én nem szoktam dicsekedni az angollal. Tudod, milyen vagyok. Erre ő csak annyit mondott, hogy persze, te mindent tudsz.

'Én meg beszélgetek' – validation of **using language for communication in naturalistic settings**

Mother: Ha nem is mindent, de már nagyon sokat. Amit nem tudsz, majd megtanulod. Amit tudsz, arra viszont légy büszke! 9;8)

reaction to peer provocation – **making distinctions between her and the peers'L2 competence** by the context of learning – Sarah's understanding of the difference in self-perception.

A Barbi meg olyan nevetséges! Annyit dicsekszik, hogy, ha már a külön angolon ügyes lesz, az anyukájával otthon is fognak angolul beszélgetni. Meg, hogy már most is a reggelinél tudta, hogy 'Drink tea'. Meg elmondta, hogy mit eszik, angolul. Nem is hiszem, hogy angolul beszélnek, csak azért mondja, hogy nagyképűsködjön. Én is nagyképűsködhetnék, mert sokkal jobb vagyok angolból, mint ő. Mégse mondtam, hogy mi meg állandóan angolul beszélünk otthon, mer nem akarom, hogy kérdezgessenek, hogy mér beszélsz velem angolul. (8;9)

The peers' language –related statements make Sarah **reconsider her right to speak L2.** Changes in self-perception.

A múltkor is kérdezett valamit a Szandra, hogy mi az angolul, és mondta, ha olyan jól tudsz angolul, miért nem tudsz egy csomó magyar szót angolra lefordítani? Azt is mondta, hogy azt ember az anyukájától nem tud megtanulni angolul, csak, ha Angliában élnek. A nyelvtant meg főleg csak tanártól lehet megtanulni, az anyukájától nem tudja az ember. Én meg modtam, hogy de igenis lehet, én is tőled tudok, meg a Kasia is az anyukájával tanul magyarul. (8;9)

Peers' view: **valued L2 speaker identities build on the degree of expertise**, often identified with the category of nativeness.

good knowledge of language requires **native-like lexicon** and high **grammatical competence** controlled by an authorized person.

'De igenis lehet' - Starting to **build a self-confident bilingual identity**

Highlighting deficiencies and asymmetries in second language knowledge

Mother: What did you learn about in grammar lesson?

Sarah: A vonatkozó névmásokat, de azt nem tudom angolul, csak magyarul.

Declaring her **inferior state of L2 knowledge in academic functioning**

Mother: Relative pronouns.

Sarah: Milyen nouns? Hát ezt még soha nem hallottam.

Sarah: De ezt most elmondom. Tegnap a jégpályán próbáltunk.' 'És akkor a Maja úgy megrántotta a pulcsimat, hogy elesett az egész sor. Irtó muris volt! (10;2)

L2-L1switch - an additional resource to control the conversation giving an account of a funny case **to add a humorous effect.**

conversational repair – vernacular style

Mother: What's it in the picture?

Sarah: I don't remember. How begins?''Mondd az első szótagot, mummy.

asking for the interlocutor's help to clarify vocabulary and communicate tasks - mnemonic strategy

Mother: he…'

Sarah: Megvan: hedgehog! (Victoriously)

Mother: Underline the past forms of the verbs in the text.

Sarah: Mi? Most össze kell párosítani, vagy mit kell csinálni? (Translation of instructions are meant to help. L1 is used to help in carrying on with the activity.)

translates interlocutor-talk to herself**, L1** seems to function as a strategy **to promote understanding**

Mother: Find the verbs in the text then retell the story in your own words.

Sarah: Mi is az a 'verb'?

L1 plays an important role in the process of meaning making.

Mother: Ige. Read to yourself. (Sarah starts reading in English then switches to Hungarian.)

Sarah: Meglátogatták őket az elefántok… Most akkor mér támadták meg őket az elefántok? (Thinking aloud in a low voice.)

Sarah: Jó fejek ezek az elefánik! (Referring back to a text in English she was expected to retell as a part of her English homework.)

L1 contributes to generating a humorous moment and creates a cheerful atmosphere in the process of compulsory task fulfilment

Mother: Would you please start doing the task and find the verbs? (mother intersects impatiently being angry over her fussiness.) Read it again!

Sarah: Jó, csak mondjuk el magyarul is előtte! Különben tudok egy jót az elefántokról. Elmondjam? (8;5)

Translation into the mother tongue shows that L2 is not yet used at the level of thinking.

Mother: Read the sentences, then put them in the right order according to the pictures above. Then tell the story.

L1 as a **compensation strategy**, asking for reinforcement in Hungarian to promote understanding.

L1 to clarify vocabulary, to take a shortcut, make sure the instruction is understood.

Sarah: Na, most mondjuk el magyarul!

Mother: Why? I'll read it again, shall I?

Sarah: Ne, angolul nem biztos, hogy értem. Akkor most olvassam, vagy meséljem el a képeket, vagy mi? (7;4)

Mother: What did you do while I wasn't at home? I see you collected the walnut from under the tree and swept up dead leaves from the balcony. Nani says you visited grandma, so what was there, how are they?

Sarah: Jól. (Sarah answers reluctantly burying in some paper in front of her)

Mother: I asked you in English, please, answer in English, you know. (Signalling that I expect the answer in English to my English question.)

Sarah: Jaj, most nincs kedven annyit gondolkozni. Mondom inkább magyarul, még annyi leckém van! A mama meg olyan kajákat főzött, amit nem is tudok angolul. (9;3)

indicating the inappropriateness of **L2**, which is **challenging and time-consuming** – switch to L1 - an effort to overcome an emerging language-related problem

L1 to give voice to her opinion and adds to stylistic effectiveness.

Sarah: Én gyorsan akarom mondani. De ha angolul mondom, az lassú, mert oda kell figyelnem. Bezzeg a Kasia nem gondolkozik, amikor magyarul beszél! Azért is van olyan sok barátja. Mondta, hogy az nem elég, ha veled beszélek, csak, ha Angliában laknánk. Mert ott a gyerekek is angolok. A Kasianak jó, róla azt mondják, olyan mintha magyar lenne. Jó neki!' A Kasiát sem tanítja az anyukája, mégis tudja a nyelvtant is, mert olyan sokat hallja, hogy megtanulja. Neki nem is kell tanulnia, csak úgy tudja. Te meg hányszor magyarázod a nyelvtant, de azt csak magyarul értem. Mother: Jó, de te nem iskolában tanulod az angolt. Az angol nyelvtant nem is tanultuk itthon soha, csak mióta iskolában is tanulod az angolt! (11;9)

assimilation effort – to be a member of the target language community

desire for native-like fluency – desired bilingual identity, **L1 is a reference point to assess proficiency in L2.**

Mastering a language without having community support in that language needs enormous efforts i.e., learning.

Defining group boundaries – Preserving alliance and privacy – orientations to what constitutes deviations from the norms of conduct (Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p. 176)

Mother: Sarah, why don't you go and play in the garden? You can take blankets out and play with dolls or play hopscotch, skipping rope, whatever. Only be in the fresh air, don't sit in the room in such beautiful weather.

Sarah: Ne beszélj már egyfolytában angolul! Most nem a Katáékkal vagyok!

Kata and Eszter belong to **two linguistically diverse communities:** Kata is an in-group, Eszter is an out-group member. **L2 - alliance and privacy - adherence to the norms.**

Mother: Why not? There is nothing wrong with it, it is good practice for both of you!

Eszter: Mit mondott?

Sarah: Gyere Eszter, menjünk ki játszani!

Eszter: De jó, hogy anyukád beszél veled angolul! Az én anyukám német tanár, de ő nem beszél velem németül, mert mi nem találtuk ki! Beszéljetek még angolul!

Sarah: Majd később (7,2)

the **peer's desire to experience bilingualism**

To endorse her appreciative stance, she explicitly regrets that her mother did not use German at home.

Mother: Offer some cookies to Zsófi.
Sarah: Most nem a Brendy-ék vannak ám itt, hanem a Zsófi!
Mother: Oh, sorry, then translate what I say to her.
Zsófi: Angolul beszélt anyukád?
Sarah: Aha.
Zsófi: Na, beszéljetek még!
Sarah: Hagyjál már!
Zsófi. Mér?
Sarah: Mer ilyenkor nem szoktunk. (8;4)

Own standards, values, identity are embedded in conversational behaviour.

an overt reference to her **apprehension against using English in public** - L2 use contravenes **the home established English speaking routine.**

Sarah: 'Már megint angolul beszélsz! ' ('Again, you speak English!')
Mother: A többi barátnőd vagy osztálytársad jelenlétében miért nem akarod, hogy angolul beszéljünk? Katáék előtt meg miért nem szólsz rám, hogy angolul beszélek?

Sarah: A Katáék meg a Kasia-ék az más, ők mindig itt vannak, olyan, mintha velünk laknának. Ha meg nem értik, megkérdezik, miről beszélünk, és én elmondom nekik. Egyébként én tanulok abból. (7,2)

The use of L2 – context and location-bound L2 in an inappropriate place – a **deviation from established discourse habits**

L2 in the 'wrong' place- displays inappropriate discourse behaviour.

language preference, social status and context are deeply intertwined.

Getting authority via L2

Dodó and Nani (Sarah's elder sisters): Mi az ott Sára?

Sarah: [tıgrıs]

The siblings' pick up on Sarah's articulation limitations making a laughable matter out of her inability to pronounce sound [r] - **teasing and mockery.**

Dodó and Nani start laughing.

Nani:[tıgrıs]? (The girls are giggling.)

Sarah:[tıgrıs]?!(angrily, putting the accent on the sound [s] at the end of the word.

Dodó: Mondd még egyszer!

Sarah: Tiger?!. (in a celebratory manner) (3;4)

Switch to **L2** – **a valuable linguistic resource**, a powerful weapon **to control the situation**, counterbalance the siblings' teasing and regain attention and status.

Sarah: Attila asked to use my chaps.

Mother: What is 'chaps'? I don't know.

Sarah: Hát a lábszárvédő.

contesting for the position of a competent L2 user

Mother: This word is new to me.

Sarah: Doesn't matter, mummy. You are not a horse-riding teacher.

understanding of the direct relationship between language proficiency and the context of learning

Sarah: Na, majd akkor azt is beleírod a könyvedbe, hogy te nem tudtad, mi az a 'chaps', és én modtam meg neked?'

Mother: Hát persze, hogy beleírom! Látod, én sem tudok mindent! (11;3)

a clear reference to the present research project a documented **recognition of her L2 knowledge**

Mother: Most akkor nem értem.

Mother: Mért akartad, hogy a múltkor az iskolában az öltöző előtt angolul beszéljek veled?

Mother: Fura volt, mert ott általában nem szereted, ha angolul csevegünk.

L2 - respected, gives her credit, self-confidence; winning the 'in-the-know' position in the local peer group

Sarah: {mΛmi}, hát azér, hogy az Eszti lássa, hogy tudok.

Sarah: Mióta tudja, hogy te angolul beszélsz velem, nem is olyan nagyképű! (10;7)

L2 to shape hierarchical social order based on the differences in English language knowledge.

Mother: És te jó vagy angolból? Ügyesen dolgozol? (And are you good at English? Are you good at your job?)

Sarah: Hát Andi néni mindig engem küld el a naplóért. A Szandi azt mondta, hogy nem lesz a barátnőm, mert mindig én megyek a naplóért. Szerintem irigykedik. (Well, Aunt Andi always sends me for the class registration book. Szandi said she wouldn't be my friend because always I go for the class register. I think she is jealous.) (8;9)

L2 lends her authority and constitutes **emotional gain,** a **favourable position** in the class

L2 gives her the opportunity to make Szandra jealous and **counteracts her self-possessed speech style.**

Finding ways to enhance learning strategies
Bilingualism is adopted as a medium to enhance learning and serves as a device for differentiating herself in terms of L2 language knowledge Cekaite & Björk-Willén, 2012, p.179

Sarah: Éva néni mondta, hogy kérjük meg az anyukákat meg az apukákat is, hogy segítsenek az angol tanulásban, mert tudja, hogy sok apuka meg anyuka beszél angolul manapság. Sőt örülne, ha otthon is beszélgetnénk angolul a testvéreinkkel, vagy szüleinkkel. Én mondtam, hogy mi szoktunk, meg amikor a Kasiáék meg a Brendy-ék nálunk vannak. Így legalább tudom gyakorolni a beszélgetést, az órán úgysincs mindig idő rá. Te is mondtad, meg Éva néni is mondja, hogy csak az órán nem lehet megtanulni. Úgyhogy jó, hogy sokat beszélünk! Meg mondtam, hogy mi minden este olvasunk angol mesét.

Mother: Legyél is nagyon büszke magadra! Sarah (9;1)

eagerness to meet her teacher's expectations the importance of L2 knowledge, **getting outer reinforcement and justification from authorities of knowledge.**

Her **valorization of foreign language knowledge** is a reflection of her language learning environment – language learning has a high prestige in the family, a positive attitude to language learning - her **orientations to language and identity development.**

Mother: Azért beszélek veled angolul, hogy megtanuld a nyelvet, és így az órán is meg a nyelvvizsgán is könnyű dolgod lesz, gyerekjáték lesz az egész!

Sarah:.'Jó, de a dolgozatban nem azt kell tudni, hogy mit csináltam ma! Ott azt kell tudni, ami az órai anyag! Amikor én megyek nyelvvizsgázni, akkor velem is leülsz tanulni, mint a Nanival? Meg kéne tanítanod a nyelvtant!'Mert azt úgy nem lehet, hogy csak úgy beszélünk ebéd közben, meg ilyenek? Sőt, amikor nyolcadikas leszek oroszul is elkezdünk tanulni, utána meg franciául és lengyelül is akarok. (10;7)

Understanding of **the difference between language of schooling and language of home,** ability to differentiate between integrative and instrumental motivation.

Hello Mami! How are you? Because I am very well! But if you are not well then now you will got a good time. The tail is biginning.

When I was bourn you spoken with me in English. My first world was: moon, car, koffie. I know these. But, that how was it, I don't know. Who knows it, it's you mami. When I have given my diaper, I don't said 'pelus', I sad 'diaper' , because you spoken whit me alway and only in English ENGLISH! Yes, I know that I say that 'I wont speak in English with you mami! But now I see that how mutch words I know and it's werry werry good. Oh! Sorry, not only words, but I know to make expressions. And all this things I know due you! Now I see! Grandma said, that when I was there, I always said those English words, and grandma said, that she doesn't understand nothing. This was when I don't went in the nursery, but I was with my grandma and granddad. Mami, I want a question from you. You will write this composition in that, I don't know, in **your** composition? Not my'n, but **your** composition. In your. Sure! He, he! That's why I lifing. I know that you remember werry much, because it was only November when I put a question: How is 'sure'? Write down. But now I know it. Ok! I want ONLY **THIS THINGS**, so you are not fritened, YES? It will go on! Only not this way. (10;7)

reference to **personal struggles and dilemmas an individual in the bilingual environment** might undergo.

Sarah's apprehension of speaking English - feeling different is often the greatest source of concern - her negative **self-perception was a transitional phenomenon,** and she is proud of her L2 competence – expressing her gratitude towards the mother for giving her the opportunity to acquire a second language

a language-related episode with the grandmother **-** a social site to emphasize her **'in-the-know' position** regarding L2 proficiency against the grandmother who does not speak English at all.

reference to the present dissertation; her **pride** and overwhelming **satisfaction** felt **over being the focus of attention and the subject of scientific research**.

Sarah indicates her negative attitude to bilingualism as a transitional phenomenon Sarah's conclusion - a clear sign of **adapting herself to the bilingual background** - a manifestation of her approval of being raised with two languages 'It will go on! – a manifestation of cooperation effort, motivation and strategic thinking and learning.

Appendix H - Samples of Sarah's writings

Excerpt 12

Today in the school we spoken about what will we do for the family for Christmas. I think this will be a werry good present. And Márti néni doesn't know what will I do. She sad everything, but this she doesn't because she doesn't know me. When she tell this I think about this composition… Today when I make my homework I maked a little table with this representation: KNOCK! If you will come in! Then I sad to you that I do my homework. Then you cam in, but you don't knockd the door and rushd in my room, however there was that 'KNOCK!'… I lide on the exercise book, and I don't noticed that next to me was this paper. But I was happy because only a werry little was write on it Oh! I don't knowd that how I will put it under the tree, but it's succesful. I love you mami! Merry Christmas! When I write the composition for you it was a werry bad feeling because I don't want to tell about that. But a little it was difficult because Nani noticed it. I lide on it, so that she doesn't see it. Yes! Sorry! So I don't noticed that next to me there is Nani. Mami, don't look such angry because I said it for her. I think it's werry 'ciki'. Sorry, mami, that I say in Hungarian, but I don't know it in English and it isn't in the Hungarian-English dictionary. Ok, it isn't will happen again! I said for Nani I LOVE YOU**!!!** So now everybody knows my composition, Dad, Nani, Dodo and I. And you can tell everybody and you can show everybody because it is yours. (8;4)

Excerpt 13

Mami, why did Nani cry when we went to horse riding? Don't you remember? You know that when papa camed with us…. Mami, you remember when we were in that restaurant next to 'Aranybulla'? It was werry werry bad, there was werry cold. The food wasn't good…but it was Bandi's birthday and I or we like Bandi. He is werry cute. Besides, in addition many things happened with me and there were you and the family too. (9;2)

Excerpt 52

Sarah: Hello Mami! How are you? Because I am very well! But if you are not well then now you will got a good time. The tail (tale) is biginning. When I was bourn

you spoken with me in English. My first world was: moon, car, koffie. I know these. But, that how was it, I don't know. Who knows it, it's you mami. When I have given my diaper, I don't said 'pelus', I sad 'diaper', because you spoken whit me alway and only in English ENGLISH! Yes, I know that I say that 'I wont speak in English with you mami! But now I see that how mutch words I know and it's werry werry good. Oh! Sorry, not only words, but I know to make expressions. And all this things I know due you! Now I see! Grandma said, that when I was there, I always said those English words, and grandma said, that she doesn't understand nothing. This was when I don't went in the nursery, but I was with my grandma and granddad. Mami, I want a question from you. You will write this composition in that, I don't know, in **your** composition? Not my'n, but **your** composition. In your. Sure! He, he! That's why I lifing. I know that you remember werry much, because it was only November when I put a question: How is 'sure'? Write down. And now I know it. Ok! I want ONLY **THIS THINGS**, so you are not fritened, YES? It will go on! Only not this way. (10;7)

Appendix I – Research consent form

Appendix I – Research consent form

I confirm that I have read and understood the information about the research as provided by the researcher.

I have been given sufficient information about this research project. The purpose of my participation as a participant and an interviewee in this project has been explained to me and is clear.

I confirm that I had the opportunity to ask questions and the researcher answered any questions about the research to my satisfaction.

I consent to use the data of research, publications, sharing and archiving as explained by the researcher.

I consent to being recorded as part of the project.

I voluntarily agree to participate in the research.

Berczeli Sára _____ _____

Name of Participant Signature

Machata Marianna _____ _____

Researcher Signature