

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter provides a brief overview on the theories of Bilingualism through Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA) theory. In addition, the writer presents some review of related studies. All theories are used to assist the writer in answering the research question.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

This study focuses on the Bilingualism, Bilingual First Language Acquisition and Code-mixing Patterns. For the Bilingualism, the writer uses Jean Lyon's theory (1996). Besides, the writer uses the theory from Elena Nicoladis and Fred Genesee (2006) for the BFLA. Last, for the theory about code-mixing, the writer uses Elena Nicoladis' theory (1994).

2.1.1. Bilingualism

Lyon (1996) said that bilingualism is connected with speaking of two languages or expression in two languages and it can be used to describe societies and individuals. Therefore, when people, who can be adults or children, speak with two languages, they are called as bilingual. 'Bilingual' is one of those words which most people use, but which eludes unambiguous definition. It is because there is no certain description about the indication of the balance between the languages either in the term of knowledge or in terms of the usage. Question mostly arise is whether a bilingual can be called as 'more bilingual' when he/she

acquire his/her second language more and which people can be considered as bilingual, the ones who are fluent in speaking of the two languages more than the knowledge they have inside or vice versa. Knowing and the fluency of speaking cannot be a standard to decide whether someone is bilingual or not.

In accordance with Saussure (1916) cited in Cobley & Jansz (1997) who first described in the field of language acquisition that *langue* (the knowledge of language) and *parole* (the use of language) as interacting but separate aspects of language development. According to him 'knowing is not the same as doing' (Cobley & Jansz, 1997, p. 57). Some societies who learn the second language at school may use the language even on holiday. Although they use the second language more frequent it does not mean that they are less competence in the first language.

Further, people usually easily misinterpret the term 'bilingual'. Many people argue that someone who has ever been speaking two languages has no guaranteed that he/she is a bilingual instead of having a balance skill of both languages. Lyon (1996) argues for the notion of the 'balance bilingual' which has proved largely unworkable and not useful. Therefore, the writer wants to emphasis that this research stands in the point of view that to be called as a bilingual, people do not have to have a balance skill on those two languages, but since they have lexicon of both language in their mind and can use them in varying degrees then they are bilinguals.

Moreover, there is still one case to be thought regarding the term bilingual when the subjects are children. In what way people can determine a child as

bilingual while his or her language is still rudimentary or incomplete. Some studies stated that although the children are still incompetence in mastering the language, children can be bilingual since they have parents who also learn two languages and use it in daily conversation including in talking to their children. Hence, the children will be familiar in using two languages during the conversation, then they automatically become bilingual. (Ronjat, 1913, De Houwer, 1990, Lambert, 1972 in Lyon 1996)

Lambert (1979) stated that bilingualism is stated as a phenomenon because people believe that each language is distinctive and unique communication system. Because of that, people try to learn and speak with more than one language in order to be unique. Many children grow up in families where more than one language is spoken on a daily conversation. Their parents may each speak a different language natively, thus exposing these children to two languages from birth (as quoted in Yip and Matthews, 2007). In addition, Beatens-Beardsmore (1982) in Lyon (1996) suggested that children who are acquiring the beginnings of two languages before the ages of three are sometimes defined as primary bilinguals while Lyon stated that the study in which focusing in the bilingual children is called as childhood bilingualism.

2.1.2. Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA)

Lyon in his book “Becoming Bilingual” (1996) stated that the bilingual acquisition of language, both simultaneously and sequentially, and childhood second language learning are all included in the term ‘childhood bilingualism’. He also suggested that children who are exposed to one language initially, and come

into contact with a second language during infancy are said to acquire their languages sequentially. While in simultaneous bilingual language acquisition the children have been exposed to two languages simultaneously from birth.

Many definitions have come up to explain about the childhood bilingualism. According to Müller (2009), research into multilingualism and bilingualism has established with general agreement that the ideal moment for learning a second language is birth. While Bialystok (2002) proposed that bilingual children are children who are learning two languages in childhood instead of just one. The three researchers defined the term of childhood bilingualism in different ways, but they all referred to one understanding of the simultaneous acquisition of two languages from birth which is generally classified under the study of Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA) as proposed by Genesee and Nicoladis (2005).

The study of BFLA has had a remarkably long history. Nicoladis (1994) talked briefly in her journal that one of the earliest systematic records comes from Ronjat who described the progress of his son, Louis. Later in 1949, Leopold published her daughter's detail reports in acquiring the simultaneous languages. Both researchers stated that learning more than one language at the same time affect impairment in the children's cognition. Moreover, Nicoladis (1994) in her journal also provided a contrast opinion came up from DeHouwer (1995) who begins to expose two languages from within a week and followed by McLaughlin in 1978 whose research concentrate more on the children under the third years of

age. They argue that the toddlers even can differentiate sounds of more than one language well.

Regarding those evidences, the theories of bilingual first language acquisition emerged. There are two comparable theories; the first theory stated that the children of dual languages are initially the same with monolingual. As Merrin Swan (1972) suggested (in Lyon, 1996, p. 53) that there are no fundamental differences between child's acquisition of one language and their acquisition of two. This opinion is supported by Volterra and Taeschner (1978 in Lyon 1996) who proposed a three stages model:

“Firstly the child has one lexical system for words from both languages. Secondly, the child recognizes that there are two lexical systems but still use them in one syntactic system. Last, the child speaks two languages differentiated both in lexicon and syntax (p.54)

The statement is balanced with the concept of being bilingualism proposed by Lee (1996) that bilingualism was conceptualized as an individual's proficiency in two language systems. But according to Paradis & Genessee, actually the development of both languages is interdependent, but the result of development rates would be distinct from monolingual (Paradis & Genessee, 1996 retrieved in Genessee & Nicoladis, 2005). Jim Cummins in Bialystok (1994) commented that it means that bilingual children have a limitation in the capacity of cognition.

Thus, nowadays Bilingual language acquisition has become the norm in many parts of the world and has fuelled a prevailing belief that young children can effortlessly acquire two or more languages (Petitto, 2001). Bilingual recently against the opinion that being a bilingual in young age becomes the impact of the language delay. In the theory of BFLA proposed by Genessee & Nicoladis (2005),

there is no negative effect for children who are bilingual because as stated before their language development follows the same pattern as that in monolingual children. Although the bilingual children might have difficulty in the rules of grammar, vocabulary—that cause the emergence of code-mixing and might never completely mastering the forms and usage of the language—which make the occurrence of language dominance. It cannot simply be inferred that it is due to the exposure of acquiring two languages simultaneously. But the reason may be various, started from social and educational variables, experiential factors, personality, age, and motivation (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994 in Clark, 2000).

Regarding the social variables, Vygotsky (1978) in Garman & Fletcher (1986) supported that children's participation in social interaction is a primary factor for language development. Moreover, Clark (2000) added that young children will become bilingual when there is a real need to communicate in two languages and will just as quickly reverts back to monolinguals when there is no longer a need. In short, children will only continue to use two languages if doing so is perceived to be valuable. Here, the role of parental and environmental input will determine the rates of language proficiency in young bilingual children, including the rates of language dominance (Nicoladis, 1994).

In addition, Nicoladis (1994) stated that one special characteristic of being bilingual is that the occurrence of code-mixing. While code-mixing itself is influenced by various explanations. The most common explanations of young children's code-mixing are parental input and language dominance. In which children use one language more frequently than another one.

2.1.3. Code-Mixing

Regarding the term language mixing in bilingual children, many point of view by the researchers emerged in various ways. Nicoladis (1994, p. 4) in the theory of BFLA proposed that explanations for language mixing produced by bilingual adults are very different from those which occurred in bilingual children. Language mixing in bilingual adults has been associated with proficiency in both languages (Poplack, 1988 cited in Nicoladis, 1994). Contrastly, Genessee (1989) still in Nicoladis (1994) stated that children's code-mixing are noted as a sign of confusion due to unseparated linguistic system to cover two different languages. Moreover, in accordance with Ronjat (1913 in Lyon, 1996) who suggested that children code-mix unconsciously or beyond their mind. Hence, adults' mixing is viewed as a sign of proficiency while in children it is viewed as a sign of deficiency (Nicoladis, 1994).

Besides, the language mixing is not various only in its definition, but also its addressment. Many researchers proposed language mixing to be stated as code-switching (see Arias & Lakshmanan, 2005; Cantone, 2005). While others, including the Genessee & Nicoladis (2005), and Tanja (2006) preferred to use the term code-mixing although actually the meaning are initially the same. Researchers who proposed the term code-switching were mostly employed by the research of adults. Miesel, (1994 in Cantone, 2005), defined code-switching as:

“The ability to select the language according to the interlocutor, the situational context, the topic of conversation, and so forth, and to change languages within an interactional sequences accordance with sociolinguistic rules and without violating specific grammatical constraint” (Cantone, 2005, p.2).

The definition proposed by Miesel above is very complex. He focuses not only in the grammatical elements, but also in the social relation. It is because adults often code-switch due to various reason, such as switch for affective function, to show solidarity, status, and metaphorical switching (Holmes, 2001) Otherwise, Genessee & Nicoladis (2005) suggested that the language mixing or what they called as code-mixing is the use of elements (phonological, lexical, morphosyntactic) from two languages in the same utterance or stretch of conversation. In this thesis, the writer prefer to use the term code-mixing by concerning the language mixing in bilingual children as a way to avoid confusion within the code-switching that used to analyze adult language. But, although the researchers above defined the term of language mixing in various ways, but the meanings will tend to be the same when they are applied in the children's utterances.

In order not to misinterpret, let us now turn to the elements which can be used to determine whether an utterance contains code-mixing or not. The writer got the elements from Nicoladis (1994) which stated as following:

1. Children code-mixing contains a sort of lexical items, including nouns, verbs, and adverb which are mixed. Moreover, Arias & Lakshmanan (2005) added that children sometimes also mixed in bound morpheme or a word containing elements from both languages.

(e.g. Juana, no *pushes* Elmo *en mi* house
[Juana, don't push Elmo in my house])

2. A code-mixing at least contains of two words of utterance in two languages or one word in L₁ and one word in L₂.

(e.g. English-France, “see *cheval*”[horse],
Kalimantanese-Indonesian, “La’bu [jatuh] semua”)

3. Code-mixing can be two or more words with one or two times of mixing.

It means that the children can use L_1 then mixed to L_2 and turn again to L_1 .

The children who use this type of mixing are those whose age are over 2 years old. This sort of mixing can also be called as syntactic mixing.

(e.g. “We can see a movie *si* you want”= English → Spanish → English
[We can see a movie if you want])

4. Code-mixing in children can be within utterance (intra-utterance mixing) and between utterances (inter-utterance mixing). these types of code-mixing will be explored more in the following paragraph.

2.1.4. Types of Code-mixing

According to BFLA theory, there are two kinds of code-mixing that occur in bilingual children. But as well the term code-mixing in bilingual children, the term of kind of code-mixing used by many researchers are also distinct. Arias & Lakshmanan (2005) called the two types of code-mixing with inter-sentential and inter-sentential while Genesse & Nicoladis (2005) and Petitto (2001) as intra-utterance and inter-utterance mixing. Arias & Laksmanan (2005) stated that Intra-sentential switches are those utterances where there is language mixing within the sentence while inter-sentential are switches at the sentence boundary. The meaning proposed by Arias & Laksmanan is similar with the meaning proposed by Genesse & Nicoladis, because they all referred to the mixing occurred both within and between utterances. Thus, the writer decided to use the term proposed

by Genessee & Nicoladis because they are in the boundaries of BFLA theory which is used by the writer. The explanation and examples of both types are given below.

2.1.4.1 Intra-utterances mixing

As stated before, according to the theory of code-mixing proposed by Nicoladis (1994), intra-utterance mixing is the evidence of mixing within utterance. She also suggested that there are at least three levels of linguistic analysis which are relevant in describing intra-utterance mixing: phonology, syntax and lexicon. But phonological and syntactic mixing are difficult to be identified in young age because phonological intra-utterance mixing means to blend two words which sounds similar. For example, Vihman's son, Raivo, used the word [nu:et], a blend of the English word "new" and the Estonian word "uued", meaning 'new, plural' (Vihman, 1981 retrieved in Nicoladis, 1994). But it will be very difficult to find Javanese words that have the same sound with Indonesian word in utterances.

Next, syntactic mixing is particularly hard to identify in young children because it must be distinguished both from normal adult usage and from monolingual children's usage (Genessee, 1989 cited in Nicoladis, 1994). Furthermore, the writer would like to give some limitations in determining the utterances produce by children which contain intra-utterance mixing to make the difference between two types of code-mixing more clear. According to the analysis done by Arias & Lakshmanan (2005), the occurrence of the intra-utterance mixing can be seen in the utterance which:

1. Have two or more lexical words that are mixed in the same utterance.
2. Have words contain suffixes in L₂ while the participant produce the word in L₁ within the same utterance.

2.1.4.2 Inter-utterances mixing

Rates of inter-utterance mixing are not commonly reported. To inter-mix means that a child has to code-mix between utterances. It is the use of an inappropriate language in a particular linguistic context. Genessee & Nicoladis (2005) stated an example, addressing an utterance entirely in Japanese to a monolingual French person is an example of inter-utterance mixing. Nicoladis (1994) added that this kind of code-mixing is important in studies of young bilingual children in the one-word stage because they will not yet be capable of lexical intra-utterance mixing because it needs for minimal two words of utterances.

In analyzing this participant, the writer wants to make a clear classification which can show whether he produced a sort of inter-utterance mixing or not. According to the result of Arias & Lakshmanan (2005) and Genessee (2006) the condition of mixing between utterances as follows:

1. When the child switches from L1 to another language L2 while he is speaking in the different sentence.

For example:

M : No...which is your favorite color Isabella?

I : Mmmmm. Pink

M : Pink, Wow

I : *Mi duele a barriga*
[I have a stomachache]

2. When the participant switches to use another language (L2) while the interlocutor speak to him with one language (L1).

for example in Genesee, 2006:

Mother: What's this one?

Child : *cheval* [horse]

Mother: What's that one?

Child : cow

2.1.5. Factors Influencing the Rates of Code-mixing

According to BFLA theory, research on child bilingual code-mixing has been pursued with two primary goals in mind – to identify its grammatical and its functional properties in order to determine if it is rule-governed or a sign of confusion.

2.1.5.1 Grammatical Properties

When two languages are used in the same utterance, grammatical incompatibilities between the languages could arise (e.g., different word orders). These in turn could result in patterns of language use that are awkward or illicit (Genesee & Nicoladis, 2005). Indeed, the commonly held perception of code-mixing is that it is an ungrammatical form of language use.

BFLA according to Genesee & Nicoladis (2005) stand in point of view that in order to code-mix in ways that respect the grammars of the participating languages the child has to acquire language-specific grammars and must also be

able to co-ordinate them during production. Therefore, by paying attention to the evidence of the grammatical constraint will also acknowledge the researcher to decide whether the participant experiences the confusion due to the exposure of two language or he really do master the language. Genesee & Nicoladis also stated that if constraints are operative from the outset of two more-word productions and if they are essentially the same as those attested in adult code-mixing, this would suggest that code-mixing grammatically emerges with bilingual grammatical development.

Furthermore, the opinion above is supported by Poplack (1980) in his study of Equivalence Constraint. According to him, code switching is allowed only at those positions where the juxtaposition of L₁ and L₂ elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e. at points where the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other. Otherwise it can be considered as violation. For example:

X : Dónde está ese paño *blue*?
 [Where is that blue cloth?]

In Nicoladis (1994) it is stated that many researchers have examined grammatical constraints on intra-utterance code-mixing by bilingual children learning a number of different language pairs. And all conclude that child bilingual code-mixing is grammatically constrained because children usually mix the two languages at points in an utterance where the grammar of both languages is concordant; they seldom mix at points where the grammar is not concordant.

2.1.5.2 Functional Properties

Research on the functional properties of child bilingual code-mixing indicates that there are multiple explanations that are often related to performance factors (Genesee & Nicoladis, 2005). According to the the researchers, the elements of functional properties are divided into: gap-filling and context-sensitivity. Both of them will be elaborated in below:

Gap-Filling. According to the theory of BFLA, the occurrence of filling gaps is common explanation of child bilingual code-mixing. On this view, code-mixing reflects that the children's proficiency of both languages is still incomplete. According to the lexical-gap hypothesis stated in Genesee & Nicoladis (2005), bilingual children mix words from language X when using language Y because they do not know the appropriate word in language Y. In support of this possibility, it has been found that young bilingual children mix more when they use their less proficient than their more proficient language (Genesee, Nicoladis & Paradis, 1995; Lanvers, 2001 cited in Genesee & Nicoladis, 2005). They also mention:

In a direct test of the lexical gap hypothesis, Genesee, Paradis and Wolf (1995) found that two young BFL learners (MLU ranged from 1.09 to 1.55) were more likely to code-mix words for which they did not know translation equivalents -- this was true for Wayne 100% of time and for Felix 65% of the time (p.15).

While mixing to fill lexical gaps because of incomplete mastery of their languages is one explanation of child code-mixing, it can also be true for otherwise fully proficient, older bilinguals because lexical knowledge in both languages of the bilingual is seldom equivalent, as noted previously.

Context-Sensitivity. According to BFLA theory by Genesee & Nicoladis (2005) there are many factors that make children to code-mix and the most important thing that should be considered is interlocutor, topic, and the purpose of the interaction. Evidence that child bilingual code-mixing is sensitive to interlocutor variables is well documented. Most researchers report that bilingual children tend to use their languages appropriately with different interlocutors so that, for example, children who are raised in bilingual homes where parents tend to use only their native/dominant language with the child generally use more of each parent's language with that parent than with the other parent (Genesee & Nicoladis, 2005).

2.2. Indonesian language varieties and Javanese language varieties.

In this study, the writer concern with Indonesian varieties and Javanese varieties.

2.2.1. Indonesian varieties

Following Soedarman et.al (1990, p. 21), Indonesian varieties are divided into two types in terms of standardizing varieties; standard Indonesian and colloquial Indonesian. Standard Indonesian generally is used in informal situation and it usually follows the standard rules of the languages. It is less influenced by regional languages, for example: tidak bisa, satu kilo. While colloquial Indonesian is a variety of language which does not follow the standard rules of language. It is used in informal situation and mostly influenced by other regional languages, for example: ndak ada, ndak boleh.

2.2.2. Javanese varieties

Javanese varieties are varieties of a language which is used by people who live in Java. In Indonesia, we have varieties of East-Java, West-Java and Central-Java. Each of them is different. Compared to Indonesian language, it is impossible to say anything without indicating the social relationship between the speaker and the listeners in terms of status and familiarity. Status in this case refers to wealth, descent, education occupation, age, kinship, and nationality. According to Geertz (1974), there are three different levels of Javanese which express status and/or familiarity to the speakers in the language. They are as follows:

1. *Ngoko (ngoko level)*

It is low level of Javanese. This level is divided into 3 sub-levels:

a. *Ngoko Madya (ngoko mid-level)*

Ngoko madya is used by lower class to address someone who comes from the equal class as the speaker, but they are not intimate or familiar with each other, e.g. *Apa sampeyan arep neda sega?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

b. *Ngoko biasa (common ngoko level)*

The speaker uses this level to address person with whom they are familiar with and persons who are not high status. The speakers are usually two close friends of equal rank, e.g. *Apa kowe arep mangan sega?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

c. *Ngoko sae/alus (fine ngoko level)*

Ngoko sae or alus are used between prijaji who know one another well and are of equal status and regard each other, e.g. *Apa panjenengan arep dhahar sega?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

2. *Madya (mid-level)*

Madya is placed between ngoko and krama level. It is a mid-level as the speakers use this level to persons of low status who are not intimate and to persons of high with they feel ease, e.g. *Napa sampeyan ajeng neda sekul?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

3. *Krama (krama level)*

This is employed to person from high status. It is more refined than madya. This level is devined into 2 (two) sub-levels, they are:

a. *Krama inggil (high krama level)*

This level is used by two high prijajis who are not intimate to each other, e.g. *menapa panjenengan bade dhahar sekul?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

b. *Krama biasa (common krama level)*

This level is also used by prijajis, e.g. *Menapa sampeyan badhe dhahar sekul?* (Are you going to eat rice?)

But since the writer limits the study only on varieties used by East-Javanese child of 3 year old, so the level may occur is the level of Ngoko Biasa, because it is the most common level used by people in the range of Surabaya region during their daily life. Moreover Zidan also used some dialects of Central Javanese people, because his father is a male from Klaten.

2.3. Review of Related Studies

Many researchers have been made concerning the theories of code-mixing in bilingual children, especially in the term of Bilingual First Language Acquisition by Fred Genesee and Elena Nicoladis. Regarding the previous studies about the language mixing in bilingual children, many critics emerged and argued that many studies done by researchers are invalid due to the close relationship between the participants and the researchers. Therefore, the recent researches took the children who have no relation with the researchers as the participant and also pointed out that code-mixing is not the sign of confusion.

Comeau et al (2003) in their journal article explained about their research in which the results indicate that children were sensitive to the language choices of their interlocutors and that they were able to adjust their rates of mixing accordingly; further, they appeared to do this by matching their language choice with that of their interlocutors on a turn-by-turn basis. The following research is done by Katja Francesca Cantone (2005). She examined four young children in doing her research which is entitled Code-Switching in Italian-German Bilingual Children. The study used both qualitative and quantitative analysis in order to answer the question that all mixes uttered by the children can be considered as grammatical and as instances of code-switching. As the result the researcher found that bilingual children at the age between two and five years, do not have a problem in acquiring two languages simultaneously during their toddler years. Furthermore, Raquel Rias and Usha Lakshmanan (2005) stated that even from the beginning of the data collection period the Spanish-English bilingual child whom

they have observed was able to choose her language according to the interlocutor and language context.

The theories and procedures used by researches above are similar with the theory used by the writer. But the researches explain only in the term of the types of code-mixing besides providing proof that children's code-mix is not viewed as a sign of confusion. While the feature that distinguishes this study from those related ones above is the elaboration of the reasons which may influence the children in doing code-mix, especially by examining factors from the children themselves rather than the social environment. Last, the writer will try to elaborate in more detail, because the researchers above have not stated about the factors that might influence the occurrence of code-mixing throughout their studies.