

INDIVIDUAL BILINGUALISM

David Lehner

"The ability of a person to use here and now two or more languages as a means of communication in most situations and to switch from one to the other if necessary according to the languages and the situation."

(Els Oskaar on bilingualism 1983:19)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore the notion of individual bilingualism. In this endeavor, we shall start with an examination of both definitions and descriptions of this phenomenon. We shall soon discover that the terms bilingualism, bilinguality, and bilingual lend themselves only grudgingly to clear definition and that the descriptions found within the literature are arbitrary because they are extremely dependent upon numerous, complex factors both internal and external to the individual bilinguals themselves. We will embark on the quest of examining ideas of how languages are thought to be organized within the bilingual brain; the use and function of the languages; the bilingual's linguistic and communicative competence; and the assessment of bilingual ability. Also included in our discussion will be various factors that are involved in language choices made by bilinguals. We shall end with a discussion of certain characteristics of bilingual speech: interference, borrowing, mixing and code-switching.

This paper will move from a discussion of bilingualism in general to more specific reference to child bilingualism. This is not a reflection of the view that adolescent or adult bilingualism are unimportant or uninteresting. In fact, the opposite is true. However, it is this writer's firm belief that an investigation into the inner theory of child bilingualism will offer a solid base for understanding the complexities inherent in bilingualism in general. Observations of my own

bilingual children will be inserted at various points of this discussion. Often, these observations will support a certain notion found within bilingual research literature. Sometimes, however, they will cloud issues and conclusions that have been drawn about bilinguality.

In many places this paper will be highly critical of some currently held ideas about bilingualism and in others it will be very supportive. A constant effort will be made to insert this writer's own opinions and ideas as they relate to the issues raised herein.

DEFINITIONS

To the minds of most, the terms 'bilingualism', 'bilinguality' and 'bilingual' are synonymous. Unlike Hamers & Blanc (1989), who make a distinction between bilingualism and bilingual in the sense that the former refers to both the individual and the society in which the bilingualism is found, while the latter deals only with the individual bilinguals themselves, this paper will take the stance that the two terms are equivalent. In addition, the term 'bilinguality' will also be utilized as a synonymous representation of the same phenomenon. Consequently, these terms shall be used only in reference to the individual bilingual unless otherwise stated.

At the very outset, it must be stated that the notion of 'bilingualism' can be too easily defined. That is to say, it is completely open to wide or narrow interpretation in accordance with the views each individual person has with reference to language and language use. Virtually everyone, from layman to linguist alike, has his/her own definition of the concept of bilinguality. More often than not, layman definitions carry within them either negative or positive connotations and even some linguists (who should know better!) are guilty of the same offense.

Let us begin with a definition of 'bilingual' from The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1979): 'Expressed in or able to SPEAK two languages' (emphasis mine). The Webster Dictionary (1961) tells us that 'bilingualism' is 'The CONSTANT ORAL use of two languages' (emphasis again

mine). The over-emphasis of the spoken medium is a frequent guest in 'layman-like' definitions of 'bilingual' and 'bilingualism' and this is erroneous because bilingual ability must stretch across the four language skill areas (speaking, listening, reading, writing). As we shall see later, each bilingual will have differing degrees of competence in each language and again in each skill area.

Weinrich (1968:1) states for us that 'The practice of alternately using two languages will be called bilingualism and the person involved, bilingual'. Neither this definition nor the ones in the above paragraph make any reference as to how competent one must be in both languages to be 'bilingual' and indeed, as Bloomfield (1933:56) has noted, '...the distinction is relative'.

The definitional distinction is very murky because it is a very common practice for definitions to focus on only one area of bilingual ability (most often speaking) and this is not correct for reasons of incompleteness. In fact, most definitions do not even consider 'non-linguistic' factors. For example, Baetens Beardsmore (1982) offers more than 35 definitions of bilingualism and only very few of these are multi-dimensional.

The degree of ability in both languages necessary to be called bilingual is vague and open to numerous interpretations as can be seen from the following 'bilingual' examples taken from Hoffmann (1991:16-17):

(1) the two year old boy who is beginning to talk, speaking English to one parent and Welsh to the other.

(2) the four year old boy whose home language is Bengali and who has been attending an English play group for some time.

(3) the schoolchild from an Italian immigrant family in the United States who increasingly uses English both at home and outside but whose older relatives address him in Italian only.

(4) the Canadian child from Montreal who comes from an English speaking background and attends an immersion programme which consists of virtually all subjects being taught through the medium of French.

(5) the young graduate student who has studied French for eleven years.

(6) the sixty year old scholar who has spent a considerable part of her life with manuscripts and documents written in Latin.

David Lehner

(7) the technical translator.

(8) the personal interpreter of an important public figure.

(9) the Portuguese chemist who can read specialist literature in his subject in English.

(10) the Japanese airline pilot who uses English for most of his professional communication.

(11) the Turkish immigrant worker in Germany who speaks Turkish at home and with his friends and work colleagues, but who can communicate in German in both the written and oral forms with his superiors and the authorities.

(12) the wife of the latter, who is able to get by in spoken German but cannot read or write it.

(13) the Danish immigrant in New Zealand who has had no contact with Danish for the last forty years.

(14) the fervent Catalanist who at home and at work uses Catalan only, but who is exposed to Castillian Spanish from the media and in the street and has no linguistic difficulty in the latter language.

How many of the above examples would be listed as 'bilingual'? Based upon the information above, it is the contention of this writer that all of them are, indeed, bilingual, with the possible exception of number (13), for whom more information is clearly required. Not all persons will agree with my assessment and this is because 'bilingualism' belongs to the realm of linguistic behavior and is open to numerous interpretations. These interpretations are further influenced by the assessor's own ideas about linguistic ability.

In essence, it should be clear that attempts to define 'bilingualism' and 'bilingual' are arbitrary. This statement is not an attempt to escape from the need to define the notion of bilinguality but rather reflects the reality of the situation. The simple truth of the matter is that bilingualism is not definable in a universally acceptable manner to all. Each person will have his/her own definition and that is his/her right. As for myself, I prefer the definition given at the very beginning of this paper by Els Oskar (more of which will be said later).

DESCRIPTIONS

As a result of the clearly recognizable vagueness and arbitrary nature of bilingual definitions mentioned above, we find ourselves being placed in a situation wherein description of the bilingual phenomenon would seem most expedient. This too, however, is no easy solution because there are numerous, complex factors involved in attempts to do so. This results directly from the fact that when we are talking about bilingualism, we are really talking about people. Each individual bilingual will have his/her own private profile which will differ in form from that of other bilingual profiles. Consequently, although an examination of bilingual description criteria is essential, we still shall discover that it is virtually impossible to accurately generalize in this area as well.

AGE OF BILINGUAL ACQUISITION

The age at which one becomes bilingual is often discussed in the literature because it may result in tremendous differences in that person's bilinguality. "The age of acquisition plays an important part, not only in respect to cognitive representation but also in other aspects of the bilingual's development, particularly his linguistic, neuropsychological, cognitive and sociocultural development.' (Hamers & Blanc, 1989:10). The age of the advent of bilingualism will also affect the area of context of acquisition (which will be discussed later) in the sense that an early age of bilingual development will most normally indicate a 'home' context, whereas, a later age bilingual start normally points to some sort of 'structured' learning situation.

The terms 'early' and 'late' bilingualism are frequently encountered in bilingual descriptive writings. Haugen (1956:72) refers to a dichotomy in reference to 'early bilingualism'. Thus, he speaks of 'infant' and 'child' bilingualism, with the former indicating cases of bilingualism starting from birth until the age of three, and the latter being comprised of those cases occurring from the age of three until the onset of puberty. After puberty, bilingualism would be described as 'adult bilingualism'.

It is a commonly held notion, especially among laymen, that 'earlier is better' when it comes to bilingualism. This same idea has been argued back and forth in the field of SLA (which most often entails discussion about 'older' second language learners, who, by definition, have already acquired a first language). No absolutely convincing evidence has been put forward in the field of SLA to completely support the contention that 'earlier' is necessarily always better than 'later' because older learning of another language also entails some advantages. This topic has been generously dealt with in SLA research literature and therefore, we will not enter that sticky issue here. However, with regard to bilingualism, most laymen will readily accept a child as being a 'true' bilingual and reject the idea that one who had started his/her bilingualism past puberty is bilingual even though that person has no problems in communicating and understanding a language other than his/her first. This, it seems to the mind of this writer, is a mistaken notion because what matters most in bilingual assessment must necessarily be how well the bilingual handles his/her languages, not at what age (s)he started.

However, age of acquisition is important in some respects-most notably in the development of laterality, which determines the roles of the two brain hemispheres in verbal processing. Stark, Genesee, Lambert & Seitz (1977) found that multilingual experience at an early age seems to speed up the onset of cerebral dominance. Genesee, Hamers, Lambert, Mononen, Seitz & Stark (1978) conducted a language-recognition test on three groups of balanced French-English bilinguals (infant, child, and adolescent) and found evidence of different cerebral strategies: infant and child bilinguals used more left hemisphere processing than did adolescent bilinguals. This finding was confirmed by another experiment carried out by Vaid & Lambert (1979). F.W. Carroll (1978b) discovered that the age of bilingual experience was crucial in determining the language processing role of the left hemisphere. The tasks performed in these experiments differed and these, as well as other, experiments have shown that hemispheric processing is dependent upon the task to be performed...'but that the strategies of processing are neither the same for the different types of bilinguals nor controlled in the same way'. (Hamers & Blanc, 1989:43).

The above experiments point to an interesting question in the sense that early bilingual experience may somehow influence the preferred language processing strategy and suggest that L2 learning may be different for children and adolescents (however, this has not been unquestionably proved). It must, however, be pointed out that, although it would seem that early bilinguals would be more apt to utilize the left hemisphere for language processing, this is not necessarily true in all cases (see F.W. Carroll, 1978a). The degree of competence in both languages is also a determining factor in language processing from a hemispheric perspective.

THE BILINGUAL LEARNING/ACQUIRING ENVIRONMENT

The environment (context) in which the bilingualism occurs is also considered important in description attempts. The unstructured acquiring by infants and children of two or more languages ('natural bilingualism') is referred to as 'primary bilingualism' by Houston (1972). This most commonly occurs in cases of 'childhood' bilinguality, wherein the bilingualism is achieved within the context of either a 'separate' or 'fused' environment. Separate contexts are cases where the child acquires his/her bilingualism either through the so-called 'one-parent-one language' system or when one language is acquired/learned in one country and the other in another. A fused environment, on the other hand, is one in which the child is presented with linguistic code input by both parents using both languages.

There is no clear word out on which of these two types is 'better' and indeed, it would seem to the mind of this writer that both could result in a similar degree of bilinguality. In a fused environment, the proficiency of both parents in both languages would be the major determining factor. If both were very proficient in their 'other' language then the child would conceivably receive the kind of input essential for high competence in a bilingual sense. However, problems could arise in those cases where one (or both) parents possess a low proficiency level in one language. This may result in 'unbalanced' bilinguality wherein one language is clearly 'stronger' than the other. This type of problem, however,

could be temporary if the parents were aware of the problems and knew what kind of steps had to be taken.

The possible shortcomings of a separate context would most probably be seen in the over-extension of language use to all persons of the same gender as the parent who used that language with the child. Thus, if the father spoke only English to his children, there is a chance that they would speak to, and expect from, other males, only English. This type of problem is only temporary, however, as the children would soon discover that not all males they encounter would speak English if they resided in a country where the main language was something other than English. This same type of problem could manifest itself in terms of skin color as well.

Another question that comes readily into mind here is the possibility of both types of learning environments being used instead of simply one or the other. This would seem to be a natural progression in the sense that as the child becomes more bilingual, (s)he would begin using both languages at various times in his/her development. This too, would depend upon the bilingual ability of the parents. Obviously, if one parent is a monoglot, the child is not going to use the other language in interactions with that person. If, on the other hand, both parents are bilingual-but have chosen to use the separate context, with each of them speaking his/her 'stronger' language-the time will come when the child discovers that his/her parents speak both languages and this naturally would lead to situations wherein the child could try to use both languages with his/her parents.

At this point, it would seem appropriate to introduce my own family's bilinguality in order to comment upon the issue of context. I am a native speaker of English and my wife is a native speaker of Japanese. Both my wife and I speak both languages. We live in Japan and have twins, one boy and one girl, who are 4 years old. These children are bilingual in Japanese and English. We have utilized the separate context in their upbringing-the children spoke only English to me and Japanese to their mother during the first three and one-half years of their lives. Now, our home context is becoming slightly 'fused' with both languages being used by everyone. This was a natural progression and was not artificially induced by the parents. Generally speaking, however, we still lean to-

wards a separate context with each of us mainly speaking our native language to the children.

With 'infant bilingualism' (sometimes also referred to as simultaneous bilingualism) the child's languages are labelled as La and Lb; whereas in those cases where one language has been acquired first and the other(s) only after that, the common conventional signs are L1 and L2. This is also sometimes called 'consecutive bilingualism'. Thus, in my family we have both cases because both my wife and I learned our second languages (English and Japanese respectively) in a 'consecutive' sense while our children are products of a 'simultaneous bilingualism'.

Simultaneous bilingualism occurs, by definition, informally. However, consecutive bilinguality can be the result of either 'informal' or 'intentional' (structured) learning. Informal learning cases would be those like the child of immigrant parents while intentional learning could be those children attending certain bilingual (immersion) programs. It is also possible to consider that consecutive bilinguality could be the result of a combination of informal and intentional learning factors. Structured learning resulting in bilingualism (secondary bilingualism) has also been called 'achieved bilingualism' (Adler, 1977).

Also related to the area of context is the presence or absence of both languages in the child's immediate, surrounding experience. Hamers & Blanc (1989:10) speak of 'endogenous' and 'exogenous' bilinguality. An endogenous language is the mother tongue of a community but it may or may not be institutionalized. An exogenous language, in contrast, is an official tongue having no speech community. This contextual factor can obviously have an affect on a child's bilingual development depending upon numerous components in a psychological sense.

The relative sociocultural status of the two languages in a community is also related to context. That is, dependant upon whether or not the two languages are 'valued' socially, the child's bilinguality will manifest itself in different forms. In short, theory holds that if both languages are valued, the child will receive maximum benefit from his/her bilinguality. Some believe that this 'maximum' benefit is an enhancement of cognitive flexibility. If, however, one of the lan-

guages is not socially valued, this can result in a delay in cognitive development and consequently, the child will not receive all of the possible benefits available from his/her bilingual and cognitive ability. Lambert (1974) has labelled these two situations as 'additive' and 'subtractive' bilingualism. These terms are very clearly biased in tone with the former implying that bilingualism has somehow enriched the bilingual in a positive way, whereas the latter is tinged with the idea that somehow, one language (usually the first) has been damaged by the acquisition of the other. Although this is certainly true in some cases, this writer believes that Lambert's terms are over-utilized in bilingual descriptions. That is, any form of bilingualism should be considered in a positive sense first and foremost. It only becomes negative should the bilingual person be unable to come to grips with the reality of his/her bilingual situation. This is most true in cases of child bilingualism. In short, if society does not value one of the child's languages, the support must come from the home context. It is up to the parents to make the child aware and proud of his/her bilinguality should social support be lacking.

My children are fortunate with respect to the above factor. That is, Japanese is the official tongue of the country they live in and English is highly valued from an educational point of view in Japan. Consequently, Lambert would label their case as one of an additive nature. Sadly, in Japan, some other languages lack such societal support and bilingual children of Japanese and some South East Asian language(s), for example, absolutely require support from the home context to insure that their bilinguality does not manifest any negativity.

The labels 'incipient bilingualism' (Diebold, 1961) and 'ascendant bilingualism' (Batens-Beardsmore, 1982) refer to an increase in the bilingual's ability to use two languages. On the other hand, 'recessive bilingualism' (Baetens-Beardsmore, 1982) indicates a decrease in that ability. These labels are more a reference to the linguistic skills of language use, rather than social value.

The cultural identity of bilinguals is absolutely vital in terms of describing bilingualism. If the bilingual can be recognized by each group as a member then that bilingual is also bicultural. Balanced biculturalism often leads to balanced bilingualism. The reverse case, however, is not necessarily true. That is to say, a

bilingual can be 'linguistically' fluent in terms of both languages and yet, identify with only one of the groups. In some cases, a bilingual may lose his/her affinity with his/her L1 culture and identify only with the L2 group. Berry (1980) also speaks of bilinguals who have renounced their L1 culture but have failed to identify with the L2 culture group. Such individuals he labels as 'decultured'. These types of situations are most commonly found in older bilinguals. In the case of simultaneous bilingualism, the children may be linguistically bilingual but may not have had a chance to make real-world ties with one of the cultures. These are not cases of 'deculturation' because one of the cultural links has yet to be made. In these cases, the parents must make concerted efforts to expose their children to the other culture. This is expensive and time-consuming, but it is a necessity.

My children have been exposed to both Japanese and American culture. Holidays in both countries are observed as much as possible. Efforts are made to associate the children with other bilingual families in Japan in order to celebrate various American cultural traditions. In addition, my children have spent time in America and will continue to do so on a regular basis. Many parents are under the mistaken notion that bilinguality will 'just happen' and focus exclusively on linguistic aspects. However, cultural identity is a necessity that cannot be overlooked. Raising children in a bilingual and bicultural way is not a haphazard enterprise. Planning and forethought are required.

BILINGUAL MENTAL REPRESENTATION

A common question in the realm of bilingual studies is how the two languages are organized in the minds of bilinguals. Weinrich (1968) uses the term 'interference' in the speech of bilinguals to refer to the affect that the two languages of a bilingual have on each other. He posits three basic types of mental organization with reference to linguistic sign and meaning for bilinguals: A; B; and C. We shall touch briefly upon these here.

In type A, a bilingual links a 'signifier' (linguistic sign) from each language with a separate semantic meaning. In type B, two linguistic signs are identified

but regarded as forming a single unit of meaning. Type C refers to bilinguals who learn a new language with the help of another. This entails reference, made on the part of the learner, not between the object and the word in the 'new' language, but rather first between the word in the L1 and the new word in the L2, and eventually extending to the object (meaning) via the L1. Weinrich calls type C 'subordinate bilingualism' because to his mind it describes a situation wherein the L2 is very much influenced by the L1. (See Hamers & Blanc, 1989; and Hoffmann, 1991).

Ervin and Osgood (1954) call type A 'coordinate bilingualism' and types B & C 'compound bilingualism'. These two are distinguished from each other in that a coordinate system entails correspondence between translational equivalents in the two languages and two different meanings/representations. A compound network, on the other hand, involves a system wherein two linguistic signs/words (one from each language) correspond to the same set of meanings or representations. The following shows the distinction between these two systems using English and Japanese.

compound bilingualism

L1 'star'

one concept 'star'/'hoshi'

L2 'hoshi'

coordinate bilingualism

L1 'star'=(concept)star

L2 'hoshi'=(concept)hoshi

(Adapted from Ervin/Osgood, 1954)

The difference between these two systems of organization has nothing to do with the degree of bilingual (linguistic) competence. That is, neither type is any more or less proficient than the other in terms of bilingual ability because of the organizational makeup of his/her bilingual system. However, there are some interesting correspondences between the type of system and the age of acquisition. Hamers & Blanc (1989:8) state that '...an individual who learned both languages as a child in the same context is more likely to have a single cognitive representation for the two translation equivalents, whereas one who learned a L2 in a context different from that of his mother tongue will probably have a coordinate

organization, that is, he will have separate representatives for two translational equivalents'.

Hoffmann (1991:20) discusses the work of Wolk who points out that sociolinguistic factors have a significant affect on mental transfer and linguistic behavior. As Hoffmann aptly notes, bilingual research to this point in time has failed to sufficiently take these factors into account and we have been forced to accept a somewhat murky basis for bilingual descriptions.

BILINGUAL COMPETENCE

Two diametrically opposed views have been put forth to deal with the question of how proficient one must be to be labelled as a bilingual: the maximalist view and the minimalist view. These represent, to the mind of this writer, 'all or nothing' attempts to describe bilingual competence. As we shall see, there are problems inherent within each of them. However, we shall also see that there exists an alternative way of viewing bilingual competence and we will deal with that shortly.

Maximalist view labels of bilingual competence include such expressions as 'perfect bilingualism', 'ambilingualism' and 'true bilingualism'. In essence, the maximalist stance is one of complete mastery in all four language skill areas (speaking, listening, writing & reading) in both languages. Representatives of this view include Bloomfield (1933); Christopherson (1948) and Oestricher (1974). For these scholars, the only 'true' bilinguals are those who are able to demonstrate equal (high level) control of both languages in all skill areas. This view is also the one most widely held by the layman-in short, those who know nothing of the true nature of bilinguality. Regretfully however, even some modern-day linguists (who should know better) talk of the 'perfect bilingual'. To this writer, this type of thinking is closely akin to Chomsky's much misunderstood (and often misinterpreted) concept of the 'perfect speaker/hearer'. Note, for example, that Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1970:141) talk about an ambilingual as one '...having complete control of two languages and makes use of both in all uses to which he puts either'.

Just like Chomsky's 'perfect speaker/hearer', the ambilingual unicorn remains undiscovered. That is, no 'perfect bilingual' has yet to be unchallengingly documented across all four skill areas in both languages. As Hoffmann (1991:21) pointedly asks, "Who could ever have identical linguistic ability in both languages...who would habitually use both languages for the same purposes, in the same contexts?" Obviously, no person ever could or would! It is absolutely impossible to imagine a natural situation wherein a bilingual would be required to perform the same linguistic skills in both languages for the same purpose in all four skill areas.

On the other hand, Haugen (1953) is a tried and true minimalist. He holds that bilingualism starts from the first time a person produces meaningful utterances in another language. A minimalist view would accept as bilingual the very slightest indication of ability in another language in any one of the four skill areas. Obviously, such a small requirement for membership into the 'bilingual tribe' would include anyone and everyone who had taken a lesson in a foreign language and was able to use even canned expressions such as 'How are you?' and 'This is a pen'.

EQUILINGUALISM

From the above discussion it becomes clear that both the maximalist and minimalist views are insufficient in terms of explanatory power for describing bilingual competence. One view (maximalist) is far too restrictive in that it requires linguistic skills in two languages to be of the highest level across the spectrum. It is surely a waste of time to search for a 'perfect bilingual' that meets the absurdly high standards of the maximalist banner. On the opposite side, the broad 'we accept anything that even slightly resembles bilinguality' (minimalist) view does not give enough credit to what real bilingual ability requires. Under minimalist standards we could go as far as to say that virtually everyone in the world is bilingual because the overwhelming majority of people everywhere know of some word or phrase in another language! The logical conclusion of an examination of these two views is that bilinguality must lie somewhere between them.

That is, it must lie in the notion of 'equilingualism'.

Hoffmann (1991:22) notes that 'We would expect a balanced bilingual to possess roughly equal proficiency of the two languages but with no implication that the knowledge this bilingual has in either language is compared to monolingual standards'. This idea of equilingualism is tied to the fact that bilinguals have a tendency to be more fluent in some skill area uses in one language over the other. As a result, they have a 'dominant' or 'stronger' language and a 'weaker one'. In cases of adolescent or adult bilingualism the dominant language is conventionally listed first and therefore, a Japanese-English bilingual is not the same as an English-Japanese one and the two should not be construed as equivalent, (for child bilinguals, 'stronger' is often replaced with 'preferred').

This writer is of the opinion that the general attaching of these bilingual tags is misleading because in each of the four major skill areas a bilingual will have a different linguistic configuration. For example, when it comes to writing, an English-Japanese bilingual may be dominant in English but with respect to speaking it could be Japanese (depending upon the situation) or it could be that the bilingual is almost equivalent in terms of preference for either language in a certain skill area (again very dependant upon the situation). In short, each bilingual will manifest his/her own individual, 'special' configuration for each skill area.

Among bilinguals the concept of 'preferred language' also refers to the tongue in which the bilingual feels psychologically most comfortable. With regard to this issue, it may surprise some to learn that the 'preferred' language is not necessarily always the 'stronger' one-although this is certainly true in most cases. Both the dominant and preferred languages can conceivably switch positions throughout a bilingual's life depending on various, complex social and psychological factors.

With respect to 'preferred' language my children already exhibit some clear patterns even at this time. My son obviously prefers English, while my daughter is clearly more comfortable in Japanese. This appraisal comes, not from the interactions they have with their parents-as they normally use English with me and Japanese with their mother-but rather from observations of the two of them

David Lehner

playing together. My son will often use English, to which my daughter usually replies in Japanese. They will go on like this for a while and then one of them will switch to the language the other is 'pushing'. Interestingly, when they play with other bilingual children there seems to be a constant 'jockeying' for code use and the interactions between all the participants are often mixed. They seem, however, to come to an (often tacit) agreement among themselves and only one language will be used for an extended period of time. The code used by these bilingual children will change from time to time as they interact. My children, it should be mentioned, are able to use either language according to the situation. That is, when they interact with monolingual speakers of either language they will use the monolingual's language exclusively once they discover that their conversational partner is not able to use the other one.

THE MEASUREMENT OF BILINGUAL COMPETENCE

By this point, it should be clear that bilingualism can be discussed, defined and described only in extremely relative terms, taking into account a vast array of factors-psychological, social and linguistic. However, one very important question does stand out and has been hinted at throughout the foregoing discussion: How is bilingual competence best measured? We shall now spend some time wrestling with this issue.

Up until now, bilingual ability/competence has generally been measured using monolingual standards. However, except for the 'ambilingual' (whom we have yet to find) this seems to be a misguided method of assessment. To the mind of this writer, linguistic ability is a composite whole of all language skills and strategies available to the individual person (monolingual and bilingual alike). In the case of bilinguals, linguistic competence is a totality of two language systems which work together and compensate each other in terms of language use. After all, doesn't bilingualism imply a 'two-language' ability? If so, how can we, strictly speaking, discuss these two languages in isolation from each other? And yet, what has just been stated here is open to attack. How is it possible to argue that we should not look at the languages separately? Indeed, we must do that.

Where does this leave us? It is this writer's contention that a bilingual's two languages can be kept separate in terms of production but not in terms of competence. By measuring only the production of bilingual language use we are not truly examining bilingual competence. This is a very problematic, and yet, important statement. In short, it is my firm conviction that bilingual competence must be measured/assessed in terms of 'specific competence' (Hoffmann, 1991) or communicative competence.

The communicative aspect of language use has been highly touted in the field of SLA for the accurate assessment of learner competence in another tongue. This should also hold true in the case of bilinguals as well because it is precisely the 'communicative competence' of using two codes, in alternation, to communicate that reflects genuine communicative ability in the highest possible sense. The quote by Oskaar at the beginning of this paper refers directly to bilingual communicative competence. It implies that bilinguals should not be expected to use both languages in every possible situation. Such an expectation is most often heard from those who are misguided as to the true nature of bilinguality. As Hoffmann repeatedly stresses in her outstanding book (1991), reality does not demand that a bilingual use all of his/her language skills in every situation.

The time has come to lay to rest the idea that a bilingual must be 'perfect' in both languages and in all skill areas. It is absolutely imperative to accept the reality that there exist different degrees of functional bilingualism. Each bilingual will use his/her linguistic codes for very distinct and specific purposes-with varying levels of ability in each skill area and in each language.

Therefore, even though we must, at this time, assess bilingual competence by looking at the languages in isolation from each other, it is this writer's sincere hope that the future will allow us to find ways of accurately measuring the totality of bilingual competence in a communicative sense that incorporates each bilingual's specific linguistic abilities. When we examine bilingual ability, let us keep in mind Hoffmann's idea of not expecting a bilingual to use both languages in all situations and in all skill areas. Indeed, we must use the notions of stronger and preferred language for assessment purposes. That is, if a bilingual would normally use language A in a certain skill area, let us assess him/her using only

David Lehner

language A criteria as it is unnatural to ask him/her to perform the same skill in language B. Bilingual assessment cannot be done sweepingly or in a generalized manner because each bilingual will have his/her specific competence which is the manifestation of the uses to which (s)he puts the language skills.

How a bilingual is measured/assessed in terms of proficiency will depend upon whether the assessor holds a maximalist, minimalist or equilinguistic view of bilingualism. From the arguments laid out in this paper, it would seem that the problems inherent in both the maximalist and minimalist views would necessitate the use of equilinguistic standards only. Standards that look at each bilingual as an individual with specific preferences as to which language (s)he uses in a specific situation.

The remaining portion of this paper will focus on bilingualism with specific reference to children. Currently held notions about child bilingualism shall be presented and these will, at times, be illustrated with references to bilingual children that this writer has had the chance to observe.

BILINGUAL CHILDREN

The maximalist and minimalist views of bilingualism, as well as the terms 'early' and 'late' bilingualism, help explain why adult bilinguals are, more often than not, thought of as people who 'learned' another language rather than 'acquired' it in a natural way. Indeed, many people consider child bilingualism as the only true form of bilingualism. As noted previously, this is not an accurate assessment because it is no way guaranteed that a child is always a better language learner than an adult. This point aside, the terms 'early' and 'late' bilingualism should only be taken as a reference to the age at which an individual became bilingual. In the vast majority of cases, early bilinguality refers to a natural learning environment while late bilingualism may be either natural or artificial in the sense that it occurred in primary and/or secondary school in formal learning situations.

It should be noted at the outset that this writer takes the stance that a bilingual's linguistic competence is a combinational whole, a oneness, wherein the two

languages should not be seen simply as separate entities. It is, as Hoffmann (1991:74) notes, '...a composite ability which may manifest itself in the expression of competence in one language and the other, and, in addition, also in a system that combines elements of the two and enables the speaker to use speech strategies not normally at the disposal of the monolingual',

The decade of the '70s saw the emergence of two opposing theories with reference to the child bilingual's mental representation of his/her languages: the unitary language system view and the separate (or independent) language system view. It is to a brief discussion of these that we shall now turn.

THE UNITARY VIEW

This theory holds that the child does not make an initial distinction between the two language systems (s)he has access to. In short, a hybrid system consisting of both code systems is utilized by the child. These two systems are thought to become separate only after some time has elapsed (See Volterra and Taeschner, 1978). This view resulted from observations of early developmental stage mixing of both languages by young bilingual children. It has a high level of support in the field because it is a neat package that offers an acceptable explanation of child bilingual mental representation at an early stage of linguistic development. Supporters of this view include Saunders (1982a & 1988); Arnberg (1987); McLaughlin (1984) and Grosjean (1982).

THE SEPARATE VIEW

The basic idea of this hypothesis is that bilingual children can and do make an early differentiation between their two languages. In essence, it is thought that the two languages are completely independent from each other in a developmental sense and that there is no hybrid system stage. Supporters of this view include Meisel (1986 & 1987); Genesee (1989); and De Houwer (1990).

EVALUATION

Which of the above views sounds most plausible? According to recent research results, there seems to be more support for an independent rather than a unitary view at this time. This is based upon the assertion that language mixing by bilingual children is a sign of two imperfect and separate systems existing and operating together rather than two languages influencing each other in one common system. (See the writings listed at the end of the above paragraph).

However, because we do not possess completely accurate description methods for bilingual evaluation, a unitary system is a possibility. It seems to the mind of this writer that mixing would be more of a sign that two languages are connected together in one system rather than separate because if they were separate, it would seem plausible to expect less mixing than more. That is, why would a bilingual child be forced to jump from one separate system into the other if they truly were separate? Also, why does it have to be a case of one theory or the other? That is to say, can we state that ALL bilingual children have either a separate OR a unitary make-up? Couldn't it be different for some bilinguals based upon context of exposure and/or other factors? Wouldn't it be possible to hypothesize that some child bilinguals have a unitary system make-up and others have an independent one? Hoffmann (1991:79) points out another very plausible explanation: '...if one sees children's early linguistic competence in terms of several systems rather than just one, it becomes possible to argue that some systems are separate and others are fused'.

Basically, however, this writer believes that it really does not matter much which of the ideas just presented is true. The main point here is that only when the systems can be employed in a truly communicative manner can the child be labelled bilingual (Voltera & Taeschner, 1978). However, prior to this 'true' communication, synonyms and equivalents between the two languages is a sure sign that the child is becoming bilingual. Important herein are the issues of mixing, over-extension of meaning in the two codes and how the bilingual keeps his/her languages separate. True bilingualism demands a real command over the two codes and the ability to keep them separate.

BILINGUAL CHILDREN AND LANGUAGE CHOICE

It is a common feature of child bilinguality that at some point in time the child will discover that (s)he has two separate linguistic codes at his/her disposal. The beginning stages of language use by young child bilinguals are almost always filled with an abundance of code mixing and this points to a growing awareness on the part of the child that two codes exist. Exactly why mixing takes place on such a large scale in the early stages is not known but it seems to be a signal that the child is trying to come to grips with the reality that (s)he is using two different linguistic codes.

How the bilingual child chooses which language for each and every communicative event is an extremely interesting question. The possible choices may be summarized as follows:

BILINGUAL CHILD WHEN SPEAKING TO:

monolingual in language A (will choose) Language A	monolingual in language B (will choose) Language B	bilingual in language A or B (will choose) Language A or B
(Taken from Hoffmann 1991)		

Obviously, no commentary is required for interactions with monolinguals. However, cases of bilinguals interacting with each other are extremely interesting. The same factors that determine monolingual language register choices are involved in bilingual exchanges and both adults and children are influenced by them. These include:

- (1) Setting-which refers to the time, place and situation.
- (2) Participants-which refers to the age, sex and other socioeconomic factors.
- (3) Topic-which refers to what is being discussed.
- (4) Function-which refers to the purpose of the interaction, e.g. greetings, information exchange, apologizing etc.

Each of these will influence in some ways the language choice of bilingual children. Before looking at the more important ones, a few words should be said about the linguistic proficiency of the bilingual child in each language and how this may affect language choice. A bilingual child may choose one language over the other in a bilingual exchange situation for psychological or psycholinguistic reasons. Most often the choice is related to how confident the child feels in a certain language and with a certain person. As mentioned previously, the ideas of 'dominant' (with adults) and 'preferred' (for children; Dodson, 1981) come into the picture here.

A very important factor in child bilingual language choice has to do with the persons involved in the verbal exchange. Numerous studies have shown that bilingual children address one parent in one language and the other in another. The fact that some bilingual children may tend to address all other males in the same language that they address their fathers has already been mentioned. It can also result from skin color. Consequently, a white person in Japan would most probably be addressed (initially) in English by an English-Japanese bilingual child regardless of whether or not that person was able to speak English. It is also true that bilingual children address other bilinguals in either language and will do more code mixing with other bilingual speakers.

I would like to illustrate this point with an experience that I had with a close friend's bilingual daughter. We were having dinner together at my home when I received a telephone call from a Japanese colleague. Prior to this time, I had not spoken Japanese in front of this 8 year old English-Japanese bilingual. All of my interactions with her had been in English. I had to speak Japanese to my colleague and after I had hung up the phone, she asked me why I could speak Japanese and her mother couldn't. (Her mother is a monolingual anglophone). I told her that her mother liked English and that I liked both. Since that time, we have spoken in both languages with code-switches occurring.

My own children are also often aware of when they are speaking to other bilinguals and when they are dealing with monolinguals (in either language). They have started to sometimes 'warn' me that this or that friend of theirs is coming over and that I shouldn't use English with him or her. They have also

repeatedly 'informed' me that my in-laws do not speak English.

The setting wherein a bilingual child acquires his/her bilingualism can affect language choice. That is, if one of the languages is a 'home' language, the child may elect (initially) to use the home language when at home regardless of who may be present. The influence of the mother has been widely noted as being a determining factor in language choice. The mother's attitude towards languages, along with other environmental elements are strong determining factors in a bilingual child's language choices.

All persons, monolingual and bilingual alike, utilize language for specific purposes in the real world. My children will use Japanese when asking for candy or permission to do something when they ask their mother. However, they will instantly switch to English if their request is denied and ask me for the same thing. They apparently seem to think that they have a better chance of success in using their languages in this manner. This would seem to support one of the findings in child bilingual literature, namely that employing languages in this manner conveys a certain meaning and/or has a certain desirable affect.

The topic being discussed can have an influence on language choice by bilingual children once they have reached the age of having hobbies, favorite TV programs, sports and etc. My children have recently started to ask in English for videos that are in the English language. They also ask in Japanese for Japanese TV programs. Obviously, the topic being discussed is a factor in language choice.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD BILINGUAL SPEECH

Early bilingual research literature is filled with 'warnings' against raising children bilingually. These warnings most often take the stance that a bilingual environment will confuse and impair the mental development of a child. Examples of irregularity in child bilingual speech are often illustrated in order to make this point. These views are based on the ideas of language 'purity' rather than communicative competence. They result from the view that monolingual standards must be utilized in language competency assessments. However, if bilingual

competence is viewed in a holistic manner (Grosjean, 1985a), the picture changes greatly. That is, interference, mixing, and switching are not viewed as signs that something is amiss in terms of linguistic code acquisition. In fact, these so-called 'irregularities' most often occur in times of great excitement or fatigue and code-mixing is known to be far more prevalent in bilingual encounters than in those where a bilingual is interacting with a monolingual. In the final segment of this paper we shall examine certain aspects of bilingual speech in more detail in order to show that warnings against raising children bilingually are mistaken.

INTERFERENCE

Throughout the literature on bilingualism one encounters constant reference to the transfer of elements from one code into the other. In the earlier works, interference was always looked upon in a negative manner because it indicated a deviation from the norms of 'proper' language use and thus, was suspect for reasons of violating the 'purity' of the language in question. On this issue, Mackey (1970:569) has enlightened us to the fact that 'Interference is the use of features belonging to one language while speaking or writing in another'. Notice, that no mention is made of 'norm' or 'deviation' in this definitional statement and indeed, in bilingual matters, these terms are suspect when used in a general sense. Mackey contends that there is a major difference between interference and borrowing-with the former belonging to the 'parole' and the latter to the 'langue' and that interference is most probably related to and influenced by psychological, situational and discourse factors. Grosjean (1982 & 1985a) distinguishes between interference and borrowing by stating that the former is unconscious and the latter, conscious. However, this contention is not widely accepted by other scholars in the field. Interference is thought to differ from code-switching and borrowing in the sense that interference is something that would be found in the speech of bilinguals when they interact with monolinguals, while both code-switching and borrowing would be used in verbal interactions between bilinguals. In short, this is a definitional distinction.

It has been also posited (Grosjean, 1982 & 1985a) that bilinguals are cognizant of the fact that borrowings and code-switches will only hamper communication efforts with monolinguals and therefore are avoided on principle. However, Hoffmann (1991:96) points out three factors that have to be taken into consideration here: First of all, bilinguals do not always consciously control their speech in order to avoid borrowings and code-switching. Second, that situational and emotional factors also have an affect on interference-especially in the area of phonology when agitation is present; and lastly, that distinctions between code-switching, borrowing, mixing and interference are less clear in the case of very young bilinguals. She contends that this results from the fact that the language systems are still forming and some of them may be fused in the early stages.

Interference features have been observed at all levels of of bilingual language development-phonologically, grammatically, lexically and even in spelling. Phonologically, this could take the form of a foreign accent or a transference of one sound from one language into the other. Grammatically, one may witness a transference of word order, while a lexical example may be the overextension of meaning between the two codes. Spelling conventions in one language sometimes appear in the written work of the other.

This writer takes the stance that 'interference' in its pure form most often occurs in very young bilinguals prior to a complete separation of the codes. This is most likely unconscious, but there still is the possibility that the young learner is 'hypothesis testing' in his two codes. After complete separation has taken place, however, the term 'interference' has to be attributed to fatigue and emotional states. It is not likely that it occurs in a conscious manner. In older bilinguals, 'interference errors' are most likely attributable to slips of the tongue and when bilinguals are jointly interacting with monolinguals and other bilinguals in both codes.

BORROWING

All languages borrow lexical terms from each other. This has always been a

common feature of languages and will remain so. The borrowed terms may stay the same in both languages in terms of meaning and pronunciation or they may change slightly or greatly in both areas or just one. They may be used by only a select few people or they may become widely used by the entire population. They may last for only a short time or they may be long time members of their new linguistic environment. Grosjean (1982) utilizes 'language borrowing' to refer to words that have passed from one code into another and are used by monolinguals. These terms are distinguished from cases in which a bilingual borrows because in such cases, the words are used spontaneously, with adaptations in morphology. Such words are labelled by Grosjean as 'speech borrowing'. Language borrowing belongs to the realm of 'langue', while speech borrowing represents examples in the 'parole'.

Japan is very interesting with respect to language borrowing. Many English (and other language) words have entered the lexicon of monolingual Japanese speakers. In all cases, the pronunciation has changed in accordance with Japanese phonological patterns. As far as meaning is concerned, the borrowed words sometimes change in the Japanese environment. This has caused some 'problems' in the case of my children. They often ask me how to say a certain 'Japanese' word in English and often my answer is almost the same, with the only difference being in terms of pronunciation. My children still often make pronunciation 'mistakes' by using the other pronunciation when the terms come up in one language. They are, however, able to correctly produce (for the most part) in both phonological manners when asked.

As illustrated by my own children's example with respect to speech borrowing, it is difficult to accurately describe what is taking place because parts of both linguistic codes are most probably fused at this time. However, speech borrowing is most likely caused by laziness, fatigue or emotional stress in young bilinguals (just as it is in the case of adult bilinguals). It should be kept in mind, however, that we cannot rule out the possibility that speech borrowing is sometimes carried out through the child bilingual's conscious choice. My children sometimes use one pronunciation in the 'wrong' way and it is clear that they are joking about it. My son often copies my daughter's Japanese-like pronunciation

of some English words. In these cases, it is quite clear that he knows her pronunciation is wrong and he enjoys pointing this out to her and me! My daughter usually responds by demonstrating that she does know the 'correct' pronunciation but then uses the other pronunciation as a joke. Clearly, something conscious is involved here.

Adult bilinguals will use speech borrowing in interactions with other bilinguals because they consider it to be more appropriate or to the point in a certain situation. When this occurs, there is no misunderstanding and, in fact, such cases add interest, intimacy and/or humor to the exchange. Bilinguals have the ability to come up with new, creative linguistic creations utilizing both codes in bilingual interactions. These are a manifestation of individual creativity and result from conscious choices. They are not products of error or confusion.

CODE-MIXING

Code-mixing has been closely scrutinized in recent years both in adult bilinguals and child bilinguals. Intra-sentential switches are often labelled as either 'code-mixes' or 'code-mixing'. However, Poplack (1980), McLaughlin (1984); and Appel & Muysken (1987) have proposed that code-mixing includes changes in phrases and whole sentences (including exclamations and tags).

In cases of adult bilinguals it is extremely difficult to see any difference between speech borrowing and code-mixing because of the way these two features overlap. True code-mixes by adult bilinguals often appear to be a sign of habit and this is appropriately thought of in a negative manner. However, in the case of bilingual children, code-mixing raises some interesting theoretical questions. It is certainly true that both adult and child bilinguals possess two different language systems which they are able to keep and utilize separately. However, what does code mixing by young child bilinguals (under the age of three) tell us about their underlying linguistic systems? Although it is impossible to speak with assurance as to why code-mixing takes place in young bilinguals, certain possibilities do exist. We shall now look at some of these:

- (1) In cases where the bilingual child has acquired one item in one code but

not yet in the other, (s)he may use the only device available at that time to express a certain notion or grammatical meaning.

(2) Even if the child knows equivalents in both languages, one may be temporarily unavailable for use at a given moment because of excitement or fatigue and this will result in the child using an equivalent form (or one the child thinks is equivalent) to express the desired concept.

(3) A child bilingual may choose the less complex of the two code equivalents to express a notion. This may take the form of using a smaller word or an easier grammatical structure.

(4) If the child bilingual is exposed to mixed input (s)he will often use mixed speech—at least in the very early stages.

The occurrence of mixing is bilingual speech diminishes with age according to language development research data. However, exactly why this happens is not clearly known at present. It has been argued by some that a reduction in the amount of mixing indicates that the two linguistic codes have completely separated. Others believe that once a child's language has reached a higher degree of sophistication, the need to mix is greatly reduced. It has also been proposed that growing awareness, on the part of the child, about socio-linguistic norms and linguistic clues in the environment are the reasons for less mixing.

CODE-SWITCHING

The issue of code-switching, defined here as the alternate use of two languages within the same utterance or during the same conversation, has long been the bane of the bilingual as far as monolingual are concerned. However, it is most probably the highest level of bilingual speech from a creative aspect point of view. Code-switching has been described by unenlightened monolinguals as a sign of linguistic decay, even though monolingual speech itself is also full of code-switching in the form of style shifts. Such style shifting is almost never thought of as linguistic decay when it occurs in only one language, even though it may be criticized for social etiquette reasons.

Both young and old bilinguals code-switch in their interactions with other

bilinguals and this happens after they have become aware of speaking in two separate linguistic codes. Therefore, it is not a case of early developmental language mixing. This implies that the bilinguals must reach a certain level of competence in both languages prior to the conscious act of code-switching becomes possible in the middle of an utterance or conversation. Bilinguals will often intimate with each other to employ code-switching depending upon various social and situational factors. On the other hand, in formal situations between bilinguals who have little in common besides their linguistic affinity, there may be a constant effort not to switch. Bilinguals differ greatly in how they feel about code-switching (both their own and their conversational partner's). Some are very easy-going about it and others may signal to their conversational partner that it should stop if they view it as a sign of laziness or linguistic impurity.

The main point to keep in mind about code-switching is that it is not something that occurs in every situation and across all boundaries. It is definitely not something that is haphazard in nature. Virtually every example of bilingual code-switching occurs in conjunction with the grammatical rules of the 'host' language—that is, the language into which the switches are made.

The reasons for code-switching are numerous and complex. They are related to context, situation, and personal factors. They are also governed by the degree of closeness that the bilinguals feel towards each other. More code-switching will occur between bilinguals who know each other well than in cases of first time meetings. They are conscious manipulations of two linguistic codes in one conversation and as such they should never be construed as signs of linguistic decay. In fact, to the mind of this writer, code-switches among bilinguals are as natural as style shifts among monolinguals. The only time that code-switching should be seen as questionable is when it occurs frequently in a verbal exchange between a bilingual and a monolingual.

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to examine the phenomenon of bilingualism. It has pointed out that the early literature on this subject defined bilingualism in very

open terms, tinged with bias and based upon monolingual standards of language use. Hopefully, such misconceptions have been destroyed or at least, weakened. We have seen that a great many types of people may be called bilingual. It has also been stressed that there is no definite 'true' definition of bilinguality-each of us is free to embrace the definition of our choice. One may choose to look at bilingualism from a strong (maximalist) view, a weak (minimalist) view, or anywhere in between.

We have also looked at the salient features involved in attempts to describe bilingualism. Each of these factors carries with it implications of difference in bilingual development matters. The age at which bilingualism begins; the context in which it is learned (acquired); the possible types of mental organization; how competent one has to be in order to be considered bilingual; and the issues of strong, weak, dominant, and preferred language, clearly demonstrate that bilingualism must be examined in very relative terms.

It is the contention of this writer that the notion of equilingualism is of paramount importance in any discussion about bilingualism. Maximalist and minimalist views of bilinguality must be rejected for the reasons already discussed. There must be a rejection of monolingual standards and norms (as they are presently employed) for the assessment of bilingual ability. A bilingual's linguistic competence must be seen as the sum of what (s)he can do with his/her languages in a communicative sense and it must be borne in mind that bilinguals do not (and should not be expected to) apply each of their languages, in all four skill areas, to the same uses and in the same context.

The characteristics of bilingual speech: interference, borrowing, mixing, and code-switching are not simply clear-cut cases of linguistic decay or signs of imperfect acquisition of the two codes. This is especially true in the case of adult bilinguals and may apply to child bilinguals as well. Research has shown that code-switching is not haphazard because it occurs consciously and is rule-governed. Code-switching between bilinguals must be viewed in the same manner as style-shifting among monolinguals. It must be remembered that the same factors that influence monolingual style choices also involve themselves in the case of bilingual interaction but in the latter, two languages must be taken into consid-

eration.

The days of looking at bilingualism through monolingual glasses are gone. It is the hope of this writer that bilingualism be looked at for what it really is: a rich, versatile, linguistic tool employed by the bilingual individual in the manner that (s)he sees fit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, M. (1977) *Collective and Individual Bilingualism: a sociolinguistic study*. Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987) *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Arnberg, L. (1987) *Raising Children Bilingually: the pre-school years*. Multilingual Lingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (1974) Development of the Compound-Coordinate Distinction in Bilingualism, *Lingua* 33, 123-27.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- Christopherson, P. (1948) *Bilingualism*, Methuen, London.
- De Houwer, A. (1990) *The Acquisition of Two Languages from Birth: a case study*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Diebold, A.R. (1961) Incipient Bilingualism, *Language* XXXVII, 97-112.
- Diller, K.C. (1972) 'Compound' and 'Coordinate' Bilingualism: a conceptual artifact, *Word* 26, 2, 254-61.
- Dodson, C.J. (1981) A Reappraisal of Bilingual Development and Education: some theoretical and practical constraints, in Baetens-Beardsmore (Ed), *Elements of Bilingual Theory*, Free University of Brussels, 14-27.
- Ervin, S. and Osgood, C. (1954) Second Language Learning and Bilingualism, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology Supplement*, 139-46.
- Genesee, F. (1989) Early Bilingual Language Development: one language or two? *Journal of Child Language* 16, 1, 161-79.
- Grosjean F. (1982) *Life with Two Languages*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Grosjean, F. (1985a) The Bilingual as a Competent but Specific Speaker-Hearer, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6, No. 6, 467-77.
- Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A. & Stevens, P. (1970) The Users and Uses of Language, in J. Fishman (Ed) *Readings in the Society of Language*, Mouton, The Hague 137-69.
- Hamers, J.F. & Blanc, M. (1989) *Bilinguality & Bilingualism* University of Cambridge.
- Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the America's: a bibliography & Research Guide*, Publications of the American Dialect Society, 26, Alabama.

- Hoffmann, C. (1991) *An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Longman, Inc., New York.
- Houston, S.H. (1972) Bilingualism: naturally acquired bilingualism, in *A Survey of Psycholinguistics*, Mouton, The Hague, 203-25.
- Jackobovits, L.A. (1968) Dimensionality of Compound-Coordinate Bilingualism, *Language Learning* 3, 29-56.
- Lambert, W.E. Havelka, J. & Gardner, C. (1959) Linguistic Manifestations of Bilingualism, *American Journal of Psychology* 72, 77-82.
- Lambert, W.E. and Tucker, G.R. (1972) *Bilingual Education: the St. Lambert Experiment*, Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Mackey, W.F. (1970) The Description of Bilingualism, in J. Fishman (Ed) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, Mouton, The Hague 554-84.
- Macnamara, J. (1967a) Bilingualism in the Modern World, *Journal of Social Issues*, XXIII 2, 1-7.
- Macnamara, J. (1967b) The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance: a psychological overview, *Journal of Social Issues*, XXIII, 2, 58-77.
- Macnamara, J. (1976c) The Effects of Instruction in a Weaker Language, *Journal of Social Issues*, XXIII, 2, 121-35.
- McLaughlin, B. (1984) *Second Language Acquisition in Childhood*, Vol. 1, pre-school children (2nd Eds), Hillsdale, London.
- Meisel, J. (1986) Word Order and Case Marking in Early Child Language: evidence from simultaneous acquisition of two first languages (French & German), *Linguistics* 24, 123-83.
- Meisel, J. (1987) Early Differentiation of Languages in Bilingual Children, in K. Hyltenstam & L. Obler (Eds) *Bilingualism Across the Life-span: in health and pathology*.
- Oestreicher, J.P. (1974) The Early Teaching of Modern Language, Education and Culture, Review for the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe 24, 9-16.
- Oskar, E. (1983) Multilingualism and Multiculturalism from the Linguist's Point of View, T. Husen & S. Oppen (Eds), *Multicultural and Multilingual Education in Immigrant Countries*, 17-36.
- Paradis, M. (1972a) Bilingualism and Aphasia, in H.A. Whitaker & H. Whitaker (Eds), *Studies in Neurolinguistics* 3, Academic Press, New York, 65-121.
- Poplack, S. (1980) Towards a Typology of Code-Switching, *Linguistics*, 18, 582-618.
- Saunders, G. (1982a) *Bilingual Children: guidance for the family*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Saunders, G. (1988) *Bilingual Children: from birth to teens*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, J. (1984a) *Bilingualism or Not*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Volterra, V. & Taeschler, T. (1978) The Acquisition of Language by Bilingual Children, *Journal of Child Language* 5, 2, 311-26.
- Weinrich, U. (1968) *Languages in Contact*, Mouton, The Hague.