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Abstract

This case study investigates the acquisition of Russian in a language contact situation. It examines a simultaneous Swedish-Russian bilingual child born and raised in Sweden. Qualitative analysis is provided from age 1;4 to 8;5 focusing especially on the earliest stages (before the end of the critical period at 4;5). The aim was to investigate (a) whether the child reaches the same milestones as monolingual children, (b) whether there is evidence that two separate linguistic systems have been developed, (c) whether the child’s grammatical competence in both languages might be qualitatively different from that of monolingual children and (d) whether there is interaction between the languages. The hypothesis tested is that ample input is needed to construct and develop two linguistic systems on a native-speaker level.

The main result is that the two linguistic systems do not develop independently from each other; rather, 2L1s develop in permanent interaction where the weaker language – Russian – happens to be influenced by the stronger one – Swedish. The bilingual environment per se might lead to decreased structural complexity in the weaker language. Language dominance is viewed as a major determinant of cross-linguistic effects. This could lead to the development of a new individual variety of Russian (outside Russia).

The results confirm the hypothesis that, even though there was exposure to both languages from birth onwards, the amount of input in the weaker and grammatically more complex language (Russian) received before the critical period was not enough to completely develop full native command of it. The lack of input has an impact on the acquisition of morphology: some morphological categories may have been set randomly or not at all. The structures observed are more typical of L2 than L1 acquisition. Morphology may be considered a vulnerable domain since complex morphological rules in Russian cannot develop without ample input.

Keywords: language acquisition, childhood bilingualism, bilingual first language acquisition, language contact, language separation, input, dominance, mother tongue, Russian, Swedish, weaker language, language input, morphology, negation, Sweden.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Average length of sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFLA</td>
<td>Bilingual first language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSLA</td>
<td>Bilingual second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Child-directed speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Critical period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPH</td>
<td>Critical Period Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>MacArthur Communicative Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>Language acquisition device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Language 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Language 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLA</td>
<td>Monolingual first language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLU</td>
<td>Mean length of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPOL</td>
<td>One person one language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>Separate Development Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>Specific language impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Universal Grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- What’s your name?
  - Julia
- Where are you from?
  - From Sweden
- Where is Sweden? Is it in Russia?
  - No, not in Russia!
- Is it here, in Kurortnoye?
  - Well, no! It is a country! People do not speak Russian there, they speak Swedish!
- But YOU speak Russian!
- Oh well… or where they speak Russian the way I do. Well, let’s go and stand with our hands!

(From the conversation of two six-year-old children on the beach in Kurortnoye, Crimea)

1 Since the stress is on the letter у in this prepositional construction (and not on the preposition itself), it is a sign of the child’s innovation, not the construction that she heard before and remembered (which would have been the case if the stress were on the preposition). Note the substitution of static (where?) with dynamic (where to, on what?).
People meet and move to other countries all over the world, and Sweden has become a new home for thousands of people. It is also one of the countries where many Russians have settled over the past few decades, mostly due to political and economic instability in Russia. Some moved to Sweden for other reasons, such as university studies, work or marriage.

Mixed marriages are a common phenomenon nowadays, and the number of children growing up who have been exposed to more than one language is steadily increasing. This kind of situation, where one language is not frequently used in the community outside the home, is called family bilingualism (Genesee et al. 2004).

Simultaneous acquisition of two languages is thus not as uncommon as many people might think, and it is assumed there may be as many children in the world growing up bilingual as monolingual – if not more. In the majority of these cases bilingualism is a fact of life, not an option (see McCardle & Hoff 2006). However, in the case of mixed marriages, bilingualism (in most parts of Europe) is often an option. It is a conscious decision by the parents when, for various reasons, they choose to bring up their child bilingually. Skutnabb-Kangas (1984) referred to such cases as elite bilinguals since in most cases they freely decided to become bilingual. For such people, bilingualism is voluntary (which is also the case in the present study). The question of child rearing and what languages should be spoken to the children becomes crucial to almost every parent. Many of them worry whether they should bring up their children as bilinguals at all given still widespread concern that bilingualism may somehow be harmful to children. Others abandon the idea of a bilingual upbringing when they are confronted with difficulties, when bilingual development does not go so smoothly or when the

---

2 Multilingualism has been the default case in Africa and Asia (especially in India).
3 In some families parents choose not to bring up their children bilingually, and this decision should, of course, be respected (cf. Arnberg 1988).
4 However, no matter how voluntary it is for children, bilingualism in such cases always depends on the choice of the parents, and it is thus the parents’ responsibility to provide ample opportunity for both languages to develop.
5 As early as 1922, the Danish linguist Otto Jespersen stated that bilingualism was a disadvantage because children could not learn both languages equally well (Jespersen 1922). This idea was supported by many other researchers, and the belief that bilingualism hinders academic achievement (see Portes & Schauffler 1996) was especially widespread.
child refuses to speak one of the languages, usually the language not (or rarely) spoken in the community they live in.\(^6\)

In some mixed-marriage couples, one partner may be against bilingualism because he/she does not want to feel excluded from the community (and does not want to learn the language). Sometimes the concern may involve a fear that the child will be language-impaired because of dual language exposure. Some parents have even consulted doctors for advice (see Madden 2008). Even nowadays, doctors and nurses in different countries may recommend that parents stop speaking two languages with their children in order not to harm their overall development. The greatest mistake that pediatricians can make is failing to recognize or examine a child who has delays in language development, instead blaming his/her bilingualism (or bilingual context) for it (see De Houwer 2009:6).\(^7\) On the other hand, most parents of bilingual children strongly reject the idea that their children have somehow suffered from bilingualism. On the contrary, they believe that they benefited cognitively, socially and culturally as a consequence of being bilingual (Call- das 2006). Moreover, there is no research evidence that linguistic development in bilingual children as a group is slower than in monolingual children. Instead, similar ranges of variation are present (De Houwer 2009:6).

The dynamics of acquiring two languages may vary considerably but usually reach the same level as in monolingual acquisition at least in one of the languages. While a bilingual home may cause a temporary delay in the onset of both languages, the child usually catches up with his/her peers and becomes proficient before the age of five (Leung & Pion Kao 1999). The argument that bilingualism slows the child’s linguistic and cognitive development does not get much support in modern linguistics (Lightbown & Spada 1993).\(^8\) The works of Peal & Lambert 1962, Bain & Yu 1980, Bain 1974, Ben-Zeev 1977 and Bialystock 1999 among others have shown a positive influence of childhood bilingualism on cognitive abilities and mental processes (see Zalevskaja 2011, Kormi-Nouri et al. 2008, Bialystock 2004, 2005 for further reviews). Peal & Lambert (1962:20) described a bilingual person as someone “whose wider experiences in two cultures have given him advantages which a monolingual does not enjoy,” and experience with two languages gives him “superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities” (p. 20). “There is no question about the fact that he is superior intellectually,” concludes Peal & Lambert (ibid.). Kormi-Nouri et al. (2003) have also shown a bilingual advantage with regard to

---

\(^6\) In this case Russian.

\(^7\) Doctors have often recommended that parents should start with one language only and then successfully introduce the second one, usually when the child is around three years old and has mastered the basics of one language. Unfortunately, it is not that easy to introduce the minority language at the age of three, especially when the child does not really have a need to learn it.

\(^8\) This belief was common despite the lack of evidence for it (Romaine 1995/1998).
memory in children. Kormi-Nouri et al.’s (2008) study also showed that bilinguals performed better than monolinguals in various types of memory tasks (especially where episodic memory is concerned). However, Kormi-Nouri et al.’s later research (2010) showed that bilingualism can be both an advantage and a disadvantage⁹ and suggested that the degree of bilingualism should be considered an important variable in conducting research (cf. also Bialystock 2001, who suggested that being highly proficient in two languages plays an important role in a bilingual advantage). I believe that there is a strong need for studies in research on early bilingualism that take an initially neutral stance, without assuming that child bilingualism is detrimental or beneficial, that is, where bilingualism is viewed as providing benefits for cognitive or linguistic development. This study has been carried out with that important prerequisite in mind.

We also know that the two languages do not necessarily develop in the same way and one language may be/remain the weaker language. A balance between the two languages is very rare (Grosjean 1998). If the weaker language is the language of the community and thus the language of school and preschool, bilingual children are often judged only on the basis of their knowledge of the majority language.¹⁰ One problem may arise given that bilingual children could produce forms in some stages of their development that are different from the forms found in monolingual acquisition or even resemble those of children with specific language impairment (SLI).¹¹ It could be almost impossible at times to distinguish bilingual children from children with SLI.¹²

In the former Soviet Union, it was often thought that “children suffer from bilingualism” (Protassova & Rodina 2005:9). That was because of all the mistakes bilingual children made in Russian – or rather because this position served as an instrument for Russification, an ideology that advanced monolingual acquisition of Russian at the expense of other indigenous lan-

---

⁹ A bilingual advantage has been found in letter fluency and a bilingual disadvantage has been found in category fluency.

¹⁰ In cases of unbalanced bilingual children, it may also make sense to talk about a stronger and a weaker language. The processes that can be observed in such cases may be more similar to second than to first language acquisition (Schlyter 1993, Schlyter & Håkansson 1994).

¹¹ For more information about children with SLI in Sweden, see Håkansson et al. (2003); Salameh et al. (2002, 2004); Håkansson (2001). For children with SLI in Russia, see Kornev (2006).

¹² Nowadays professionals have only limited diagnostic instruments to distinguish language-impaired migrant children from those who will eventually catch up with their monolingual peers. In order to foster research on the question of diagnosis between normally developing bilingual children and children with SLI, a scientific COST Action was launched in April 2009 involving researchers from various European countries, where one of the objectives was to differentiate typical bilingual development from impaired development. Thus, there is a great need for studies describing harmonious bilingual development in order to show what is “normal” and what is still considered “abnormal” by so many people. It is also crucial for better understanding in what respects bilingual speech processing is unique.
guages in the former USSR. Yet even today some speech therapists in Russia diagnose children with “bilingualism” and consider deviations in Russian as some kind of retardation, if not an illness (see Protassova & Rodina 2005:9).

We know that children do not develop and proceed in exactly the same way (Nelson 1973). Thus, individual variation and divergences in language development can be great, even among children in the same family (see Ringblom 1998, 2004, 2010), and there is still a major gap in scientific knowledge in the field of bilingualism. Therefore, it is critical to describe what is normal in bilingual development and what deviations could be expected. If more parents, caretakers, educators and speech therapists knew what to expect, they would worry much less and concentrate on giving the child what he/she needs the most – love, care, time, support and encouraging linguistic input instead of worrying about what effect bilingualism might have. In conducting research on bilingual development, it is just as important to pay attention to deviations from normal (or rather expected) behavior instead of excluding them from the data since they may provide more information about (a) the child’s bilingual development and (b) linguistic practices in mixed marriages in general. These practices could have a greater impact on language development than was previously assumed.

Harmonious development in bilingual speech has been well documented in the literature while deviations from the norm are usually excluded (except code-switching and other related contact phenomena; see chapter 8). In Russian ontolinguistics, however, there is a strong tradition of studying these forms. They are commonly called innovations (following Stella Cetlin and her linguistic school) rather than deviations. The term “innovation” implies a creative process behind their construction: for example Я не могу тебе это обещать! – А ты мог!13 ‘I cannot promise you this!’ ‘Try to can!’ (Cetlin 2009:259). By concentrating on innovations, it will be possible to address a key theoretical question – whether language develops in the same way in monolingual and bilingual children – and in the event it does not, analyze the reason that could lie outside this process. This dissertation will by no means be able to answer this question in full. Yet my hope is that it will draw attention to the intriguing issue of the development of Russian in the situation of permanent contact with Swedish.

1.1. Aims of the study

The main purpose of the present investigation is to describe and evaluate the acquisition of Russian as a first language from birth in a specific language contact situation, in this instance as a minority language in Sweden. The subject of the study is a Russian-Swedish bilingual child, Julia, investigated

---

13 Russian has no imperative of the verb ‘мочь’ (can).
from birth until she reached 8;5 years. However, the analysis will concentrate on the so-called critical period (which ends when the child is approximately four and a half years old, according to Jürgen Meisel, or at most five; see also Černigovskaya’s (2009) research on brain plasticity). During the same developmental period (when Julia was four and a half), her parents separated, which could also have influenced the child’s subsequent linguistic outcome since multiple stressors took place. The data from her later years (from 4;6 to about 8;5) will also be referred to when theoretical issues need to be discussed or when questions of delayed L1 acquisition are contrasted with structures that are, at least in part, very similar to second language acquisition.

In this thesis I aim to investigate (a) whether the child goes through the same developmental (acquisitional) stages in both languages that monolingual children of the respective languages do, (b) whether there is evidence for her developing separate linguistic systems from very early stages of acquisition and (c) whether she achieves grammatical competence in both languages that might be qualitatively different from that of monolingual children. I also attempt to test whether there is any interaction between the languages involved, predominantly in the acquisition of negation.

As the first dissertation about Russian-Swedish bilingual acquisition, this study is mainly exploratory and descriptive in nature, with the aim of making valid observations. However, I also want to test the hypothesis that the child needs abundant input in order to construct and develop two linguistic systems on a native speaker level. If the child does not have access to adequate input, the two languages develop in such a way that the stronger language (L1 strong) will influence the weaker language (L1 weak), which will lead to divergent development in the two mother tongues, even in simultaneous bilingual acquisition. The child will have to use all the resources available to him/her in order for communication to take place when access to necessary grammatical constructions and lexical means is difficult.

---

14 The internationally defined period of early childhood spans the years from birth to eight years (Bredekamp & Copple 1997).
15 Stressful life events at critical developmental times can influence cognitive performance both acutely and over time. For example, Sliwinski and colleagues (2010) have studied the relationship between daily stressors and life events and cognitive decline by way of rumination (e.g., intrusive thoughts). Based on their findings, it is possible that a child who experiences multiple changes in the same developmental period could spend time having process thoughts about these events and spend less time on other cognitive processes. It is important to note that divorce or separation per se has to my knowledge not been linked to poor academic functioning among children. On the other hand, multiple psychosocial stressors during childhood have been linked to poor cognitive performance patterns. It is also important to note that such cognitive declines are not static and are reversible (for more information on mechanisms that explain stress and cognitive functioning over time, see Sliwinski, Hoffman & Hofer 2010; for brain development and contextual stress, see Blair & Raver 2012).
According to Slobin (1984:240), “every normal human child constructs for himself the grammar of his native language”; “it is the task of developmental psycholinguistics to describe and attempt to explain the intricate phenomena which lie beneath this simple statement.” I assume that children acquire their language(s) in daily interaction with other individuals in their linguistic community, by analyzing the speech around them and by constructing their language with the help of information they get from input (Tomasello 2003). This approach has also been chosen by the St. Petersburg linguistic school (see the works of Cejtilin 2000, 2009; Voejkova 2004, 2011; Gagarina 1997, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008; Gagarina & Voejkova 2009). Thus, I find it important to describe the input the child was exposed to in detail since it presents the context of his/her language acquisition (cf. also the interactionist approach).

1.2. On the nature of innovations

1.2.1. How to define innovation

Many features have been found to emerge when languages develop, many of which do not occur in adult varieties of the respective languages. Some of these features are obviously of a developmental nature, while others (at least when children acquire two languages simultaneously) seem to have their origin in cross-linguistic influence and related phenomena (these language contact issues will be discussed in more detail in chapter 7).

Mistakes that violate the established linguistic (or/and societal) norms are unavoidable in any process of language acquisition. Most children produce ungrammatical forms during the early stages of language development. As noted above, Cejtilin (2009:42) suggests applying the term “innovation” to such individual linguistic forms that contradict the accepted norms of the language. Several types of linguistic innovations have been found in monolingual Russian children: lexical, morphological, syntactic, lexical-semantic etc. (ibid.). The main characteristic of innovation is its creative nature: я разбудилась (проснулась) ‘I was wokened (I woke up)’. Innovations prove that the child not only imitates the speech production of the adults, but creates his/her own speech system by picking up speech units and rules for their usage and formation from the speech production of the adults around him/her (Cejtilin 2009:11).

The term “negative linguistic material” was introduced by Ščerba (1974), who also stressed the importance of studying innovations when investigating child language development. Since then, it was noted that many children

---

16 From Julia’s corpus.
produced similar forms totally independently of each other. The term has been used and defined by Clark (1993), Coseriu (1963), Gak (1978) and many others. The term “innovation” is, of course, not straight-forward because there are quite divergent instances of what could be called an “innovation.” Therefore it seems important to mention that in analyzing the Russian material of my informant, by “innovation” I mean the forms that are constructed by the child but are not present in standard Russian. The innovations may be both systematic and created ad hoc. Mistakes and innovations are not to be confused since, according to Stella Cejtlín, children’s innovations are the result of a creative process and are not deviations. Terms such as “novel naming units,” “novel word forms” or “innovative word forms” could be better synonyms for the term “innovation” than “deviations” or “mistakes.”

In bilingual acquisition, Ronjat (1913) was one of the pioneers who paid attention to the forms that showed interaction between the two languages. The examples he provided were crucial for the author. He chose to treat them seriously, not as slips of the tongue but as examples of a more general phenomenon. However, in some later studies many authors claimed that they did not find any influence between the languages (De Houwer 1990, Paradis & Genesee 1996, Meisel 1989). Even if some examples of deviations are found, they are treated as “performance errors” (Paradis & Genesee 1996). Of course, they may just as well be of this nature since the speech of bilingual children – like the speech of monolingual ones – is not without slips of the tongue, performance errors, occasionalisms, self-corrections etc.

However, the languages in most studies are genetically closely related to one another, and to date there has been a strong focus on data from Romance and Germanic languages, while Slavic languages have only recently gained more attention (cf. Polinsky’s work on heritage speakers in the US 1997, 2000, 2006, 2008; Protassova’s work on Russian-speaking children in Finland 1998 and in Germany 2011; Anstatt 2008, Dieser 2007, 2009; Anstatt &

---


18 Such forms were usually corrected by Julia right away: Я одевался… ой, ну одевался! ‘I dis…oh, dress!’ while real innovations were not corrected and the child thought they belonged to the language: кусты (кусты) ‘bushes’; ну как они могут это делать? ‘how can they do it?’ У меня живот урчит… а раньше никогда не урчал (8;5) ‘my stomach rumbles… and before it never rumbled!’ это никоновна… или никоновня? ‘it’s nobody’s or bodies no?’ (the child was trying to say никова, Eng: no ones). In Julia’s Swedish, such occasional forms have been found as well, for instance calling “toothpaste” (Sw tandkräm) ‘pasta’ (Rus: паста, зубная паста) or calling universitetet undersv<tytet ‘university/underversity’). However, they were incidental, and once the child was made aware of them, she hardly ever repeated them. Sometimes Julia was not sure whether the semantics of a particular Russian word corresponded to the Swedish meaning: Мам, а бåtarna? Simmar der(m) eller vad gör de(m) i vattnet? (4;2) ‘And what about boats… do they swim or what do they do in the water?’.
Dieser 2007; Gagarina 2003, 2005, 2008 and Meng’s 2001\textsuperscript{19} work on Russian-speaking children in Germany). Studies on children with genetically typologically different languages have also started to appear (Spanish-Basque, Turkish-German, Italian-Jakarta Indonesian\textsuperscript{20}). It has been suggested that the role of structural linguistic properties in bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) should be considered as well (Extra & Verhoeven 1998) since the structural properties of particular languages may affect e.g. the order of acquisition. Slobin (1985) has even suggested that the child first acquires the language categories that are simpler in a particular language. It is thus expected that the data from a child developing two genetically unrelated languages could shed some light in this debate and provide clarifications and a new perspective.

1.2.2. On the origin of new and independent forms

Since the processes of monolingual and bilingual acquisition are believed to be similar in nature, the speech of bilingual children cannot be free of innovations either. Thus, in the developing speech systems of bilingual children, there should be some forms that are not present in any of the linguistic varieties they are exposed to, i.e. either in L1 or L2. However, the question is whether the speech of bilingual children contains linguistic innovations that do not occur in either variety, the forms that are not common (or not present at all) in monolingual children acquiring the languages in question. If this turns out to be the case, then there will be a need to explain the existence of deviant forms: (a) Do these forms emerge as innovative and spontaneous results of language contact or (b) are they of a more intermediate, developmental nature and will therefore disappear with time, as they usually do in monolingual acquisition? (c) What role does language contact play in general when two languages are acquired simultaneously? Nonetheless, innovations in Russian attributable to language contact with Swedish may also be deviant when seen from the perspective of the standard norm.

1.2.3. Innovations and indications of SLI?

It is known that bilingual children often produce forms resembling those of children with SLI given their limited exposure to each language (see Thordardottir 2010, Leonard, 1989, Bedore & Peña 2008 for more information and further references\textsuperscript{21}). Since some of the linguistic markers are characteristic of both bilingualism and SLI, it can be difficult to diagnose

\textsuperscript{19} Meng explores Russian-German bilingual acquisition in Russian-German immigrants; however, the focus is on whole families (a total of 42).

\textsuperscript{20} Sorente 2007

\textsuperscript{21} See also www.bi-sli.org
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such children. Parents may therefore forego speaking the weaker language when faced with linguistic difficulties. They discover linguistic markers in their child’s speech that they consider “non-normal.” However, these difficulties are not usually clinical in nature. Children may (a) be late talkers, (b) not be getting enough input or (c) simply have typical developmental mistakes. It should be borne in mind that, since innovations are a normal consequence of constructing a language, it is only natural that they are present in language acquisition, whether it involves L1 or L2. The presence of innovations is not a sign of disorder but a sign that children construct their linguistic system on their own.

1.3. Bilingual first language acquisition and contact linguistics

Unfortunately, considering various kinds of research in the field of bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) – the simultaneous acquisition of two mother tongues from birth (see Meisel 1989, De Houwer 1990) – carried out in recent years, it is almost impossible to find an answer to the question whether BFLA and contact linguistics have any phenomena in common, since these two fields of research have developed largely in isolation from one another.

Following Andersen (1983), Schuman (1987) and Yip & Matthews (2000, 2007), I will attempt to bring the two approaches together (see also Ringblom 2012) since the issues they deal with are in a way closely related. Winford (2003:11), working with language contact phenomena, distinguished three kinds of contact situations: (1) those involving language maintenance – preservation of a language from one generation to the next, (2) those involving language shift – the partial or total abandonment of a group’s native language in favor of the acquisition of another language and (3) those that lead to the creation of new contact languages – languages involving a restructuring and mixture of elements from several languages. This division, however, is not straight-forward. Following the discussion in Winford (2003:11), many contact situations cannot be clearly assigned to one or another of these categories. Often there is an interplay between them.

Research traditions dealing with bilingual children usually distinguish three “distinct areas” (Okita 2002:28), where societal bilingualism is related to language contact while simultaneous language acquisition is not (ibid.). This is obviously quite surprising since language contact may be investigated at the individual level as well (Weinreich 1953). Yet BFLA is usually not discussed in terms of language contact. Rather, the parallel development of two languages has been treated separately. This may be due to the theoretical premise that bilinguals are essentially a combination (or even an addi-
tion) of two languages represented in one and the same person and that therefore the two languages are believed to develop independently of each other, which is known as autonomous development (De Houwer 1990, Meisel 1989). One of the consequences of this view is that bilingual children actually behave like monolinguals in each of their languages. Given this claim, a child who acquires two mother tongues simultaneously – in the present case Russian and Swedish – is expected to develop similarly (a) to monolingual Russian children in Russian and (b) to monolingual Swedish children in Swedish. Julia’s case will show that this, however, is not quite the case.\footnote{Since the goal of the study is the acquisition of Russian, we will not go into details about the development of the child’s Swedish here, except to compare her proficiency levels in both languages or when otherwise necessary (see also appendix 2).}

1.4. Bilingual language acquisition: double monolingual acquisition or acquisition of a second language?

Some psycholinguistic studies (Petito et al. 2001, Holowka & Petito 2002) suggest that there is no qualitative difference between monolingual and bilingual children who have regular contact with the two languages. De Houwer (2005:41) also stated that there is as yet no empirical basis to support the claim that bilingual children develop more slowly than monolingual ones. Meisel (2001) argued that quantitative differences cannot be proof that bilingual development is qualitatively different from monolingual development.

I do not deny that there may indeed be no neurophysiological differences between monolingual and bilingual children and that theoretically, given a sufficient amount of balanced input in the two languages, bilingual children can develop native-like proficiency in both of them; however, quantitative differences could lead to qualitative differences that in turn could influence the child’s ultimate development being qualitatively different from that of a Russian monolingual child. Protassova (1999) argues that a deficit in linguistic skills is best explained by sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic circumstances (such as the child’s situation at home), not by the child’s ability as such to become bilingual. Of course, the situation of a child who is born and raised in Sweden by one Russian and one Swedish parent will be qualitatively and quantitatively different from the situation of a child born in a monolingual Russian family in Russia. It is by no means possible to expect Russian parents in Sweden to create linguistic circumstances that are in every way close to those in Russia. Moreover, such an artificial linguistic and social situation would hardly have a positive effect on the child’s integration in Swedish society and as a result could even have a negative outcome overall.
It should also be kept in mind that, at the same time the child develops linguistically, he/she also develops physically and cognitively, and these different developments are all related. The general consensus nowadays seems to be that BFLA can be compared with first language acquisition. The only difference is that there are two first languages: L1 + L1 or, as De Houwer (2009:2)\textsuperscript{23} labeled them “language A” and “language Alpha.”

1.5. The importance of studying bilingual children

A bilingual child has been called a “perfect matched pair” (De Houwer 1990:1) for linguistic (especially cross-linguistic) research, particularly when we investigate the impact of language-specific factors (cf. De Houwer 1995). No matter what language combination we investigate, several independent variables seem to be controlled in bilingual children: mental age and the understanding of temporal, spatial and causal phenomena (see Tracy 1995:9). Thus, the studies of bilingual children can help linguists approach general problems in child language research and contribute to theories of acquisition “since bilingual acquisition can show us more clearly the limits of language acquisition” and “can teach us more and more about the potential for language learning in early childhood” (De Houwer 1995:222). De Houwer also noted that studying bilingual children is important because of the theoretical insights such studies can bring to the field of psycholinguistics (ibid.).

In order to understand the phenomenon of infant bilingual acquisition, it is important to study it from scratch, i.e. from the very first sounds of the child and above all to investigate what is going on around the child: the parents’ beliefs about language development and their language use, child-rearing practices, what parental strategies are used, what people the child talks to and how often, the role of siblings and their linguistic practices, the community in which the child is raised, parental background and environmental factors (see Scheffner & Hammer 2004:21 and Zalevskaja 2011:35-37 for a further discussion). Thus, in order to understand language acquisition in bilingual children, one must also understand the social-cultural context in which development takes place and describe it in detail.

1.6. The importance of the first years of life

In language acquisition, the importance of the child’s life between the age of one to three can hardly be overestimated since it shapes later development and learning (Nelson 1996; 2007; Perry 2000, 2002; Gopnik et al. 1987).

\textsuperscript{23} Following Wöleck’s suggestion (1987/88), cited in De Houwer (2009).
Children get around 70% of all their information about the world during these years and their brain develops through experience. Thus, it is important to construct the life of a child so that he/she can use his/her capacity to the maximum. The first three years are crucial for language development since the child acquires the basis of grammar during this time and accumulates substantial vocabulary. Furthermore, the physical development of the parts of the brain responsible for language development is more or less completed by the end of this period. If not enough work is done in the first three years, considerable effort will be needed later to compensate for what was missed (Kol’zova & Ruzina 2002). Thus, it is my intention to place great emphasis on a description of Julia’s development in her first three years since what happened during that developmental stage is considered to have a crucial impact later in life.

1.7. Structure of this study

This study consists of ten chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the main issues and structure of the dissertation and presents its purposes and aims. Chapter 2 sketches the situation in present-day Sweden and gives a short survey of some relevant features of the two languages involved, Swedish and Russian, with a special emphasis on negation. In chapter 3 a broader survey of the discussions around BFLA is given along with an outline of some theoretical approaches and previous research relevant to this study. Chapter 4 starts by presenting the subject of the study and goes into more depth, describing Julia’s interactions with her caregivers. Chapter 5 presents the methodology of this investigation and gives an overview of the data that form the basis of this study, the core of which is a case study of the acquisition of negation and related categories in Russian (chapter 6). Chapter 7 follows with a broader discussion of cross-linguistic influences (including transfer and code mixing as outcomes of Julia’s BFLA) observed in studying Julia’s acquisition of negation. Chapter 8 discusses language separation in early childhood, which leads in chapter 9 to a presentation of the input and Julia’s interaction with her parents and siblings. Chapter 10 concludes the present study and includes perspectives for future research as well as some methodological implications and implications for parents and educators.

---

24 See also Lenneberg (1967)
2 The place and the languages

2.0. Introduction

Language acquisition always occurs in interaction with other people (see e.g. Tomasello 2008, 2009). It is thus influenced by emotional, social and environmental factors. Since language acquisition is a complex phenomenon that includes both individual and external factors (see the discussion in Zalevska-ja 2011), these factors must not be forgotten even in linguistic discussions that focus on the acquisition of grammatical elements.

Julia did not start speaking on her own but rather as a consequence of everyday interactions with the people around her. And it is through these interactions in the specific environment she grew up in that she obtained her linguistic input, learned to understand the world around her, the (different) cultures and languages. This chapter will introduce the more general linguistic and social context in which this child acquired her languages in order to acquaint the reader with the situation in Sweden and some major differences between the two languages.

2.1. Languages in Sweden

Sweden is located on the eastern side of the Scandinavian peninsula in northern Europe. The official language is Swedish, which is spoken by almost every resident; Swedish is also the dominant language in the country. However, there is considerable linguistic diversity; over 150 languages are spoken in Sweden.

Since 2000, the Swedish Government has officially recognized five national minority groups – Jews, Roma, Sami, Swedish-Finns and Tornedalians (all of which have resided in Sweden for more than 100 years) – and their respective languages are protected. Since 1990s, there has been growing interest in the use of minority languages (for a further discussion and summary of the research, see György-Ullholm 2010). Actually, about 20% of the population is of foreign origin. A large number of residents in Sweden now come from Arabic-speaking parts of the world, and Arabic is the most frequently spoken language among immigrant children in Sweden (Hyltenstam 2005). Swedish enjoys great societal prestige, while e.g. Russian is
spoken by some 90,000 people in Sweden. Russian immigrants have never been a large immigrant group in the country. Today there are some 60,000 residents in the country from the former Soviet Union and some 16,000 Russian citizens living in the country.

Before 1975, immigrants were confronted with the problem of not being allowed to use their mother tongue. This problem is now history, and children are not only allowed to use their different mother tongues; such usage is also supported by the government and municipalities, which provide instruction in their mother tongue to children from various minority groups. Mother tongue instruction is provided as early as preschool and is offered throughout the children’s schooling. Access to mother tongue instruction varies from municipality to municipality. Some municipalities are more generous in providing such instruction while others are more restrictive. Even today, it is still controversial what the best way of bringing up a child bilingually is and how much mother tongue instruction is needed outside the home (see Siren 1991 for further discussion).

2.2. Typological sketch of the languages involved

Russian and Swedish are two typologically different yet distantly related languages with a common Indo-European origin. They differ in the following features: Swedish is a non-null subject language with SVO order, both in main and subordinate clauses. Russian is a flexible null subject (or optional pro-drop) language. The expression of subjects and the order of arguments in Russian are mainly constrained by discourse-pragmatic factors (cf. the functional sentence perspective, developed by the Prague School). In the following section, I will give a short survey of the structural features of the two languages involved, with a special emphasis on morphology and typological differences.

25 Including everyone who actually speaks Russian, regardless of the country of origin.
26 Russian, unlike Finnish, Turkish, Arabic, Assyrian, Persian, Spanish, Kurdish or Somali, is not a major immigrant language in Sweden.
27 According to Statistics Sweden.
28 According to the Russian Embassy in Sweden.
29 For further information see www.seb.se; www.mid.ru
30 The subject of this study (Julia) was offered one hour of mother tongue instruction in Hange municipality once a week at the age of 6; she continues her instruction today. During these lessons the child learned to read and write Russian.
2.2.1. Swedish

Swedish belongs to the Northern branch of the Germanic language family and is very closely related to Danish and Norwegian. It is the national language of Sweden but is also spoken as a minority language in Finland (about 4% of the native population in Finland has Swedish as their mother tongue). Swedish is spoken by over nine million people, and the number of speakers is steadily increasing due to immigration to the country.

2.2.1.1. Verb morphology in Swedish

The Swedish verb system consists of six finite verb forms – present, preterite, present perfect, past perfect, imperative and subjunctive – and four non-finite verb forms – infinitive, supine, present participle and past participle. The Swedish verb tense system is based on four verb tenses: present and present perfect and preterite and past perfect. They can thus be divided into two tense groups, one with a focus on “now/related to the present situation” and one with a focus on “then/the period before the past in focus” (for more details, see Teleman et al. 1999).

2.2.1.2. Word order in Swedish

Swedish is an SVO language with rather strict word order rules and structural/positional case marking, despite some variation, especially in main clauses. Some linguists would even argue that word order in Swedish is fixed (Philipsson 2007). Swedish declarative sentences end with falling intonation.

Given the lack of inflectional morphology, word order plays an important role in Swedish since it determines the syntactic functions of different words and phrases in an utterance.

As was noted, Swedish is a verb-second or V2 language, which means that the finite verb is always situated in the second position in main clauses (thus, the finite verb cannot be preceded by more than one constituent in a main clause). Even in subordinate clauses, V2 is the only possible syntactic position. But the placement of sentential adverbials is different in comparison to main clauses – situated before the finite verb in subordinate clauses but after the finite verb in main clauses. The default word order (in main clauses), as far as verb-dependent constituents are concerned, is that the indirect object normally precedes the direct object, as can be seen from (1), which represents the default word order for ditransitive verb constructions:

31The use of the imperative is restricted to imperative clauses.
32The subjunctive exists but represents a very marginal category for a limited number of verbs and is often replaceable by the preterite: Leve konungen! ‘The king shall live’ [subjunctive present tense in Swedish]; Hade jag pengar ... ‘If I had money ...’ – Vore jag hemma ... ‘If I were at home ... [subjunctive preterite].
33The two participles may also be used with an adjectival function (as attributes).
(1) Jag köpte mig [IO] en glass [DO],
   ‘I bought me (some) ice cream.’ 34

However, if the focus is on the role of the indirect object, this constituent can be moved to the right of the direct object but then has to be marked by a preposition (åt ‘for’ [+benefactive]):

   ‘I bought (some) ice cream for myself – and not for him.’

Swedish has a special place-holder constraint – elements that are obligatory but carry little or no information (Hammarberg & Viberg 1977, Viberg 2010), which can be considered a particular feature of the Swedish language. The place-holder constraint is primarily a syntactic phenomenon and refers to the obligatory use of a number of semantically more or less empty grammatical words which often lack equivalents in other languages35 such as the formal (dummy) subject det ‘it’: Det snöar ‘It is snowing’ or the use of som as a subject marker in indirect wh questions: Vi vet inte vem som har gjort det ‘We do not know who ([that]) has done it’. According to Viberg (2010) det tends to appear as a formal subject (or place holder) in agentless sentences or sentences with low agentivity.

2.2.1.3. Negation in Swedish

Negation in Swedish is expressed by (free) particles. The main means of expressing negation are inte, icke and ej, all meaning ‘not’. Inte is the most commonly used negation in Swedish while icke and ej are restricted to formal, written language and are not usually found in child speech so they will not be considered here. Swedish employs negated auxiliaries such as ska inte (‘will not’), kan inte (‘cannot’), vill inte (‘do not want’) etc. The basic word order in negative sentences in Swedish is: S V (Neg) O; i.e. V2. The position of a negation morpheme inte is thus [–finite]/pre-V:

(3) Han rör inte maten.
   pers.pron. V’fin. NEG O [+def.]
   ‘He does not touch the food.’

Where sentence negation is concerned, there is, as was noted above, a typological split between main and subordinate clauses:

(4) Jag tycker inte om äpplen.
   S V’fin. NEG verb particle O
   ‘I do not like apples.

---

34 This example illustrates what is typologically possible, not what is more/less natural in a given speech situation.
35 See Viberg (2010:124) for a further discussion.
(5) Han vet att jag inte tycker om äpplen.

‘He knows that I do not like apples.’

In subordinated clauses, sentence adverbials come before the finite verb (see Holmes et al. 1994). Thus, a Swedish child has to learn that the position of sentence adverbials may change place depending on the sentence structure, after the finite verb in main clauses, before the finite verb in subordinated clauses. The topic position of early child negation (e.g. inte röra! ‘do not touch!’) can be considered equivalent to its function: it denies the content of the following proposition, as is also the case in a logical notation:

\[ \text{NEG (P),} \quad \text{‘it is not the case [that ...]’ or, in speech act theory: ‘I deny/I do not want. [that ...]’}. \]

Thus, the child applies a semantic strategy, i.e. the denial of the following utterance/proposition – obviously the same as is normally used in formal logic: \text{NEG (proposition)}.

Swedish, unlike Russian, does not have double negation. However, Holmes et al. (1994:548) mention an interesting case of clausal adverbials with some sort of double negation in colloquial speech: \text{Det är inte till salu, inte}. ‘It’s not for sale now.’ A similar construction, \text{Inte är det till salu, inte}, involves fronting with resultant inversion as well as end duplication. Duplication of \text{inte} is rather common in spoken Swedish: \text{Kan du visa mig det? Inte nu, inte! ‘Can you show me this? Not now, I can’t.’ Du får inte göra det, inte. ‘You cannot (are not allowed to) do it’.}

In short, Swedish morphology is rather poor as far as negation is concerned. Yet there are several indefinite pronouns with merged negation – \text{ingen, ingen, inget} – that may cause problems in language acquisition because these forms are no longer overtly transparent; they represent some kind of a portmanteau construction: \text{inte + någon/nånt $>$ ingen, inte + något/nåt $>$ inget}.

2.2.2. Russian

2.2.2.1. Basic word order

While word order is relatively free in Russian, Russian is also an SVO language. The neutral word order in Russian is one where the subject precedes the finite verb and the object immediately follows the verb (as is also the case in Swedish):

(6) Юлия нарисовала домик

Julia.NOM paint.PST.FEM house ACC

‘Julia painted a house.’
The basic word order in Russian can be altered to achieve a special semantic/pragmatic meaning (e.g. emphasis). Intonation is very important here (as is phrasal stress, which makes emphasis possible36):

(7) Домик нарисовала Юлия
House.ACC paint.PST.FEM Julia.NOM
‘[It was] Julia [that] painted [a] house.’
Юлия домик нарисовала
‘It was [a] house that Julia painted.’

In declarative sentences with neutral word order, the subject precedes the verb and the direct object follows it, unless the object is a pronoun. In that case, and due to weak stress and the reduced semantic content of pronouns, the object tends to precede the verb (which is also the case in Romance languages). As noted above, any deviation from this rule produces a special pragmatic effect. In sentences with more than one object (i.e. where ditransitive verbs occur), the neutral word order is that the indirect object (IO) always precedes the direct object (DO), as is the case in many other Indo-European languages such as English, German and the Scandinavian languages (cf. also the description of Swedish above):

(8) Юлия показала маме свои зубки
Julia.NOM show.PST.FEM. mother.DAT REFLE teeth.ACC
‘Julia showed the mother [IO] her teeth [DO].’

2.2.2.2. Tense, aspect, mood

Russian has a rather simple tense system (present, past and future) but a very complicated system of aspect: perfective (PF) and imperfective (IPF) (cf. e.g. also French). An important characteristic of the Russian inflectional system is the presence of two lexical stems for each verb: the open base, which is related to the infinitive and ends with a vowel (смотреть – ‘look’) and the closed base, which is related to the root and ends with a consonant: смотреть (cf. Gagarina 2008:218, see also Dressler et al. 2006).

The majority of verbs form aspectual pairs by means of prefixation: suffixation and suppletion (делать – сделать ‘to do – to have done’). There are also a small number of verbs that are perfective in their unprefixed form (бросить PF, or дать PF – ‘to throw’ or ‘to give’). Perfective non-past verbs have a future reading, and imperfective ones denote present (see Gagarina 2003, 2008 for more information on the topic):

36 See Janko (2008).
Russian is a synthetic language that has tense, modal and phrasal auxiliaries. The auxiliary verb быть (‘to be’) is used to form the imperfective future in Russian. The auxiliary is a way to produce a future interpretation for imperfective verbs.

2.2.2.3. Russian nouns

The Russian language has no articles. The noun птица may mean ‘the bird’, ‘a bird’ or ‘bird’ depending on the context and the pre-textual information available. Russian nouns are distinctly marked for three genders, as are many other Indo-European languages, such as German, Icelandic, Faroese or New Norwegian37 (sc. masculine, feminine and neuter), although this is not the case in Swedish, and change for number (either singular or plural) and case. Russian still has six cases: Nominative (NOM), Accusative (ACC), Genitive (GEN), Dative (DAT), Locative (LOC) and Instrumental (INST), in sharp contrast to Swedish, which has only two case forms for nouns: unmarked and Possessive/Genitive, and three for pronouns: casus rectus, casus oblique and Possessive/Genitive (Holmes et al. 1994).

The possibility of altering the neutral word order in Russian as described is traditionally associated with its morphologically rich case system. A grammatical subject carries the nominative case. The Accusative usually marks a direct object. The Dative marks an indirect object as default. The Instrumental and Locative cases are normally used to express adverbials. Case marking is idiosyncratic, however.

37 Gender distinction is very important since adjectives, participles, ordinal (and some cardinal) numerals, past tense verbs, the conditional and some pronouns agree with their head noun in gender.
2.2.2.4. Negation in Russian

In Russian the negative element always precedes the main verb and usually does not need to be combined with an auxiliary or modal verb form. The most common way to form and express negation in Russian is by using *не* and *нет*, where in general the pro-clitic free-standing morpheme *не* means ‘not’ and the particle *нет* ‘no.’ When sentential negation is required, *не* precedes the finite verb and strict adjacency is required between the two elements. However, negation can also be expressed by paralinguistic means (e.g. by shaking the head or different vocalizations, as in many other languages). These ways of expressing negation are especially important in describing the early speech of a child. Russian also provides an inflection for marking the object of action (Accusative), which is a very early inflectional feature to emerge in child’s speech (Gvozdev 2005).

In Russian, double negation is predominantly the norm. The negative particle *не* is never omitted no matter how many other negative words are used: *Никто никому ничего не должен* ‘no one owes anybody anything’. *Не* always precedes the word it negates *должен*. If the verb in a phrase is negative, all indefinite pronouns in that clause should be marked as negative as well. *Не* usually follows the other negative parts of the sentence: *никто ничего не понимает* ‘nobody understands anything’.

Another characteristic feature of Russian is the Genitive of negation (GenNeg). GenNeg involves alteration between the Genitive case and two structural cases, NOM and ACC, where GEN is substituted for ACC or NOM when the whole sentence is negated (Partee & Borschev 2002). Many factors interact in determining the distribution and interpretation of sentences containing GenNeg: syntactic, semantic, morphological, pragmatic and stylistic (see Partee & Borschev 2004, 2006). Several factors contribute to the choice of Genitive, for example decreased transitivity of the verb (see Timberlake 1975). The sentence containing Subject GenNeg becomes impersonal: *маты не было* ‘mom was not there’ and impersonal sentences are generally difficult to acquire for non-native learners of Russian. A NOM- or ACC-marked NP is often interpreted as specific, while GEN is usually used to denote the non-specificness of the DO (direct object) of a negated verb. It appears in complements of verbs that are in the scope of sentential negation, in cases where the complement has no identifiable referent in the world (see Adamec 1973/1977 and Timberlake 1986 for a discussion on the topic). GenNeg may cause specific problems in the acquisition of Russian, especially Russian as a foreign or a second language.

Although inflectional morphology provides some difficulties even for monolingual Russian children, studies of child Russian have demonstrated that children handle morphological case and agreement correctly very early (e.g. Gvozdev 2005), and inflectional morphology is often mastered before the age of three (Cejtin 2009, Gagarina 2008). When children make mis-
takes, they use the Nominative instead of any other case (Babylonyshev 1993). However, completely sorting out all the cases (and other morphology) takes a long time – at least until the age of seven (Slobin 1966).

2.3. Differences between Russian and Swedish

Russian and Swedish show considerable typological differences. Compared to Russian, Swedish verb morphology is not particularly complex. Unlike Russian, Swedish lacks a specific verb form expressing aspect and subject-verb agreement. In Russian, prosodic interrogative markers exist together with syntactic and lexical markers. The use of intonation marks the interrogative function in a sentence.

As mentioned above, Russian has the category aspect expressed by PF/IPF opposition: the same action can thus be expressed by two verbs in Russian. The action of taking, for instance, is expressed by брать ‘to take’ (imperfective) and взять ‘having taken’ (perfective). The action of doing is expressed by делать ‘to do’ (imperfective) or сделать ‘having done’ (perfective); делала ‘she was doing’ (imperfective, fem.) or сделала ‘she has done’ (perfective, fem.). The child thus must not only learn twice as many verbs in Russian as in Swedish; she must also understand the difference between using perfective and imperfective ones. Such differences are believed to be semantic in nature and are acquired very early by monolingual Russian children, often as early as two (see the works of Cejtlin and Gagarina). In what follows, I will give a brief description of the differences between the two languages that are relevant to the present investigation.

2.3.1. Categories that are more difficult to acquire in Swedish

There are several categories that are more difficult to acquire in Swedish, such as the gender of nouns and third-person possessive pronouns. All these categories are found together with negation and are thus relevant to the present study. Swedish exhibits a relatively complex gender system, in which the gender of the noun cannot be defined based only on the noun form. The assignment of a noun to a particular gender is often arbitrary, as is sometimes the case in Russian as well. It is not only sexus, cf. the feminine ending in a consonant like тетрадь ‘notebook’ or кровь ‘blood’ vs. masculine nouns like голубь; here phonological rules can be misleading, and sexus does not play a role. Such nouns are difficult for monolingual Russian children to acquire (see the works of Gvozdev) and constitute problems in heritage speakers (see Polinsky 1997, 2000). However, in Russian, gender as-

---

38 Except in connection with word formation elements like -ing/-ning, which are always neuter/common gender.
Assignment is very regular, depending on phonological rules; only semantic gender (sexus) overrides formal gender assignment. Native learners of Russian seldom make gender mistakes after the age of five (Cejtlin 2009, Gvozdev 1949/2005). Swedish children usually take much longer to acquire their system. The question is what happens when the child acquires these two systems at the same time. Can full acquisition of gender take place despite Russian having a fairly clear set of linguistic cues that help the learner determine the gender of nouns?

2.3.2. Categories that are more difficult to acquire in Russian

The categories relevant to this study are the past and future (especially future analytic) tense of verbs (perfect vs. imperfect) and nominal inflexion. As noted above, in Russian one always has to decide whether the action in the past has been completed or not, while in Swedish one is only obligated to decide in a very few cases (e.g. Jag har bott i Sverige i fem år ‘I have been living in Sweden for five years’ [= I am still living there] vs. Jag bodde i Sverige i fem år ‘I lived in Sweden for five years’ [= I am not living in Sweden anymore]); no complex past tense verbal system has to be acquired. This is independent of the fact that there are some frequent irregular (or ‘strong’) verbs in Swedish (and in Russian as well).

Nominal case inflexion (depending on the verbal frame) is another category that is much more difficult in Russian. In Swedish, there is no longer any morphological case marking for syntactic relations – if we disregard the genitive as a semantic marker for possession. Cases, formerly overtly marked as nominatives, datives and accusatives, are distinguished by word order in present-day Swedish, often accompanied by prepositions.

The Genitive has become a semantic category, and the reversed order of NPs in the case of ditransitive verbs has to be marked by means of a preposition: åt: Jag köpte honom en bok vs. Jag köpte en bok åt honom ‘I bought him a book’ vs. ‘I bought a book for him’. In Russian, however, there are still six case markers. No simplification is possible, and all forms have to be learned. To reiterate, in Russian, unlike Swedish, double negation is the norm.

Keeping all this in mind, let us now look at the main theoretical approaches in language acquisition and at previous research in child language in general and BFLA in particular that are relevant to the present case study.
3 Theoretical approaches and previous research

3.0. Introduction

In Russian society, bilingualism is rather a longstanding issue since bilingualism has always been a normal and desirable way to bring up children in the Russian aristocracy. In the 19th century, many educated members of society learned foreign languages (such as French) from early childhood and even knew them better than Russian. The topic of a bilingual upbringing is thus well integrated in classic literature (see the works of Pushkin, Tolstoy etc). It has also been considered in psychology studies (cf. Vygotsky, Luria, Leont’ev) and in linguistics (Ščerba). Otherwise, research on bilingualism is a relatively new field of study in Russian linguistics, which following Imedadze’s pioneering work in 1960 on Russian-Georgian bilingualism has incorporated insights from different theories in bilingual research in general and in Russian ontolinguistics in particular.

Čirševa’s monography (2000) was, to my knowledge, the first contribution to Russian ontobilinguology (as Čirševa herself suggests calling “bilingual acquisition”). Her work presents unique material – a qualitative analysis of three Russian children acquiring English and Russian simultaneously. Čirševa looked at her material from many different angles, so her investigation was not just a valuable scientific contribution but also a helpful guide for parents and educators dealing with bilingual children in Russia.

Zalevskaja (2001) and later her student Rafikova (2009) made a distinction between natural bilingualism (естественное двуязычие) and “artificial bilingualism” (искусственное, учебное двуязычие; see Zalevskaja & Medvedeva 2002). “Artificial bilingualism” is nothing other than second (or foreign) language acquisition. Zalevskaja and Mochamed continued to discuss these intriguing issues, which involve various conditions under which bilingualism is formed (see Zalevskaja 2011, Mochamed 2011).

The didactic aspects of bilingualism have a fairly long history in Russian linguistics, and nowadays there are various works on socialization and di-
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39 See Voejkova (2012) for a review of classic studies on the acquisition of Russian as L1.
40 Research in child language, to use Stella Cejtlin’s term.
41 See also Čirševa (2011).
42 Now called Mochamed (see, for instance, Mochamed 2011).

Several linguists are currently working with Russian in combination with other languages outside Russian borders. The tradition seems to be especially strong in Germany – Anstatt (2008); Gagarina (2003, 2008), Meng (2001), Voejkova (2003), Dieser (2007, 2009), Mochamed (2011) – and in Finland, where Protassova (1987,1996,1998), Protassova & Mustajoki (2006) have contributed a large body of research on Russian language development and maintenance involving both children and adults. Their research includes not only descriptions of immigrant speech but also didactic recommendations for teachers who work with Russian as a mother tongue with immigrant children in school and preschool. One recent contribution, “Learning and Teaching Russian Language in Finland” (original title *Изучение и преподавание русского языка в Финляндии*) (Mustajoki et al., eds. 2010) deserves special attention; it covered every aspect of the situation of Russian in Finland. Annual conferences organized by Ekaterina Protassova in Helsinki have become popular for everyone working with bilingual children in everyday life. Linguistic conferences in St. Petersburg organized by Stella Cejtlin and her collaborators have also become a well-established forum for sharing knowledge on the acquisition of Russian together with other languages.43

However, in the large body of international literature written on bilingual acquisition in general, there are just a few studies that concern simultaneous acquisition of Russian in combination with other languages. Nonetheless, this work is very important since Russian, with its particular characteristics (rich morphology, perfective and imperfective aspects, free word order, great variety of word formation elements, developed system of nominal inflection to name a few characteristics) is certainly an interesting case in the research on BFLA, which could also lead to different outcomes, compared with studies dealing with closely related languages, which, for instance, show little inflectional morphology. These very specific characteristics of Russian could actually lead to different acquisitional patterns (in some cases even to delay acquisition and prevent it from being complete) in combination with other languages in the case of child bilingualism (see Vaalthera 2010, Nennonén 2000). The collection of articles “Путь в язык” (Cejtlin & Eliseeva, eds. 2011) by various Russian scientists (both living in Russia and outside its borders), which deals with different aspects of acquiring Russian as a first and second language, was the first real attempt to collectively address the
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43 Recently there has also been the possibility of participating in videoconferences in St. Petersburg.
problem of acquiring Russian as a first language and as one of two first languages. This collection of articles was, to my knowledge, the first book that has tried to integrate various problems in language acquisition under the same cover. What unites all the authors of the book is the belief that language acquisition is a creative process and every single individual creates her/his own linguistic system with the help of information she/he gets from input. Thus, the constructivist approach and Bondarko’s functional grammar44 (the linguistic approach that goes from content to form – not from form to content, as in the formal approach) serve as a basis for those studies and most studies inspired by the St. Petersburg school of linguistics. 


However, I am certainly not the first person to wonder about the way a child acquires his/her language, and there are several, often contradictory, theories in the literature that try to answer the question of why and how it happens (cf. e.g. Skinner 1957; Chomsky 1965; Piaget 1926; Eisenbeiss et al. 2009; Voejkova 2011; Cejtlin 2000; Lepskaja 1997; Tomasello 2003, 2001, 2000, 1992; Goldberg 2006 etc.). As Adele Goldberg concluded in one of her recent contributions (Goldberg 2006:230), “language is learnable. The task is to detail exactly how it is learned and why it is the way it is.” The issue obviously becomes even more complicated when it comes to the acquisition of two languages since one of the main challenges of a bilingual child is to be able to handle two developing linguistic systems under communicative pressure.

For the present research, various theoretical approaches were taken into consideration, both regarding language acquisition in general and BFLA in particular. In what follows, I will briefly review the most influential ap-

proaches found in the literature, emphasizing those that are relevant to this study.

3.1. Theoretical approaches to language acquisition

The debate on child language development was initially focused on nativist and developmentalist points of view. We all know that grammar is not present at birth. The important question, however, is what steps have to be taken to acquire one or more languages. Does language develop as a process, and if so what mechanisms are involved? The famous Chomsky–Skinner debate cannot be ignored by anyone working with language acquisition. Skinner (1957) offered an explanation of how language is learned, having developed a theory on stimuli and reactions (or responses). He argued that language learning is based on experience and that children acquire language because adults reinforce correct usage and reward those utterances that are most like an adult’s. The speech of the caretaker was seen as a model for repetition that the child memorized and repeated.

Two years later, in 1959, Chomsky expressed his disagreement, arguing for the non-learnability of language. He reduced the role of experience to a minimum, maintaining that linguistic knowledge is predetermined by genetic grammatical knowledge, where language acquisition (a concept that actually began with Chomsky) is guided by principles of Universal Grammar (UG). He maintained that Skinner’s model of observation, imitation and reinforcement cannot fully explain language development since children produce forms during the acquisition process that they have never heard from adults (Chomsky 1965). Indeed, Skinner did not really manage to explain the emergence of grammatical complexity. Chomsky’s response and his unique explanation were transformed into his focus on the universal properties of language. He proposed that children have an innate knowledge of the basic rules and constructions and asserted that there was a “language acquisition device” (LAD) that perceives regularities in the utterances a child hears without which language cannot develop. Some input in the mother tongue is necessary for the parameters to be set, but input is seen only as a trigger that activates LAD and helps to set the parameters. Thus, in theory, a minimal amount of input could be enough to set the parameters. However, the importance of input was highlighted as well among those in generative research (see Bonacker 1999, who worked on early second language acquisition of Icelandic and English and was, to my knowledge, the first to raise the issue.
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45 However, Brown et al. (1964), found almost no evidence to explain how mothers formed their children’s grammar. It is also worth noting that Skinner’s psychology focuses far too much on the broader principles of development and does not really pay attention to individual differences.
of the importance of input in a generative perspective). This idea was later developed at greater length in a study of simultaneous bilingual acquisition (see La Morgia 2011).

Chomsky’s theory also held that sequences of language acquisition are very similar everywhere in the world. Nonetheless, it has never really managed to fully explain bilingual acquisition (viz. the simultaneous acquisition of two languages) or how parameters are set when the two languages are acquired simultaneously, especially in cases where the two languages seem to influence each other. Still, Chomsky was correct in arguing that the relationship between speech sounds and meaning is not simply an association. His view emphasized the active role of the learner; however, his theory never really succeeded in properly explaining why a language can only be learned when the child has someone to talk to (cf. interactionist approaches, for example). Moreover, according to UG, grammatical development is seen independently of other developments.

Piaget (1962), on the other hand, maintained that language development reflects the stages of cognitive development through which the child progresses. His theory describes the “schemas” (or mental structures) of children as they develop from infants into adults. He argued that children actively construct their own understanding of the world through their interactions with their environment, (cf. also Tomasello 2003). Children play an active part in this relationship, and their understanding arises out of their existing knowledge of the world.

Recent theories (especially constructivism, emergenism and cognitive-developmental science; see below) have emphasized reinforcement and imitation, and assume that grammar is learned during ontogenesis. Language development is seen as a process of change that is adaptive to the environment, gradual, complex and ontogenetic. The relationship between experience and cognitive change was also emphasized in recent theories (see Tomasello 2000b). While no one nowadays really believes that language is learned entirely by imitating others, the role of imitation in language acquisition still deserves special attention since we cannot deny that young children imitate the people they see around them.

Bandura (1977), a social learning theorist, was among the pioneers who paid considerable attention to the role of imitation in acquiring a language. He believed that the impulse for development comes from the person and saw the imitation of models as the most important element in language learning. However, a decade later, in his new version of social learning theory – social cognitive theory – Bandura (1989) also placed greater emphasis on the cognitive processes as being central to development.

According to the emergenist approach, language (as part of general cognition) is learned mainly from experience with the environment (Tomasello & Bates 2001); interaction with partners and the partners’ reactions are seen as the main prerequisite for language acquisition. Halliday (1978) argued
that children learn the languages and social patterns of their surroundings and at the same time become part of the culture and social context of the environment.

Interactionist approaches (Piaget’s developmental cognitive theory, the information processing approach\(^ {46}\) and Vygotsky’s social interaction) stressed children’s active engagement with their environment and the context in which the language is acquired; they also emphasized the social context in which children grow up and their intentions to communicate meaningfully through interactions with others. However, Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s approaches differ. Piaget suggested that cognitive development begins with an innate ability to adapt to the environment; children learn to deal with their surroundings by developing a clearer picture of them. He saw the mind of the child as being solely responsible for taking in and interpreting information whereas Vygotsky saw cognitive growth as a collaborative process and believed that children learn through social interaction (see Papalia et al. 2007 for a further discussion).

In the present study I will try to show that the child’s social environment and the people that he/she interacts with play the most important role for language development, thus emphasizing the ways in which the child learns to use language in different interaction situations (cf. Bates & MacWhinney 1982, MacWhinney 1999, Conti-Ramsden & Snow 1990). I will also emphasize the role of adults and siblings in organizing and directing the child’s learning. Since language is a social act, the important role of caregivers (especially the parents) should not be forgotten when describing each stage of a child’s language development. Thus, the interactionist and constructivist approaches provide theoretical ground for this investigation.

According to Vygotsky, the child’s linguistic and mental development are dependent on each other, where language develops thought and thus language, while thought cannot be separated from the two. The different communicative situations the child is engaged in are central in Vygotsky’s theory. The more varied these situations are, the more stimulating they are for the child’s development. Vygotsky (1962) found it important to relate child language development to a child’s social development. The main purpose of the child’s language is to communicate, so it can only be viewed in a social perspective. A child’s language development progresses as a result of the interplay between the child and his/her caregivers; the role of the adults involved in a child’s upbringing and their role in helping the child to communicate and develop are thus strongly emphasized in Vygotsky’s theory as well. In the interplay between the child and the adults around him/her, it is important
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\(^ {46}\) The information processing approach (IPA) is a complete framework (not a single theory) that considers people as active thinkers about their world. It describes language acquisition in the context the brain processes information in, drawing comparisons between the brain and a computer – sensory impressions go in, behavior comes out – but what happens in between? (Cf. the discussion about relation input and intake in chapter 9.)
to pay attention not only to the quantity but also the quality of input that the child receives (see also Rontu 2005:58). The changes in this environment influence language development, as noted, for instance, by Döpke (1992) and Lanza (1997).

Bernstein (2000 [1970]) later developed Vygotsky’s ideas and claimed that children’s language development is part of their socialization process in the culture and environment they live in (cf. also Lepskaja, who interprets the speech of a child as a means to the child’s personality formation and finds a great deal in common between onto-and sociogenesis in the linguistic and cognitive ability of the child (Lepskaja 1997). Bernstein emphasized the relationships between the family’s social belonging and the child’s language development. The family’s social contacts outside the home also reflect the child’s language ability that he/she develops in his/her preschool years. However, Bernstein scarcely addressed child speech. On the other hand, there are many Russian scientists who have dealt in depth with child language and who deserve special attention here: I.A. Baudouin de Cortenau, A.N. Gvozdev, E.S. Kubrjakova, R.O. Jakobson, A.A. Zalevskaja, D.B. Elkonin, A.A. Leont’ev, K.F. Sedov, I.N. Gorelov, A.M. Šachnarovič, I.A. Sikorskij, E.I. Isenina and N. I. Lepskaja, to name a few. Zalevskaja (2012:33-47) argued that language is not separable from the physical process in a person, and all those processes taken together contribute to the acquisition of language as a living mechanism. In considering the acquisition of two languages, she found it important to emphasize the interplay of various factors both inside and outside the person. Thus, it is very important to describe these factors in detail, which will be done in the subsequent chapters. Leont’ev (1969 [2010]) noted that in order to give as complete a description of a subject as possible, it is not enough to use isolation strategies; the linguist should instead always be aware of the entire system (Leont’ev 2010:102). It is thus my intention to present this “system” the way it was, to present the whole reality that served as a background for Julia’s language acquisition.

One theoretical approach that deserves further emphasis here is the constructionist approach. Its main claim is that languages are learned (or constructed) on the basis of the input and general cognitive, pragmatic and processing constraints (Goldberg 1995, 2006; Tomasello 2003). The essence of this approach is that “speakers’ knowledge consists of systematic collections of form-function pairings that are learned on the basis of the language they hear around them” (Goldberg 2006:227). This approach emphasizes the role of grammatical constructions, i.e. conventionalized pairings of form and function. In her earlier book Constructions, Goldberg (1995) presented arguments for adopting a constructionist approach to argument structure. She extended her argument a decade later (Goldberg 2006), investigating the nature of generalizations in language, trying to explain how constructions can be learned and cross-linguistic generalizations can be accounted for.
Tomasello (2003) argued that children acquire language gradually, on a subconscious level, by beginning with concrete linguistic structures based on words and morphemes. Later the child makes generalizations and reflections on higher levels, building more abstract structures based on linguistic schemas and constructions (cf. also Luria 1956, Vygotsky 1972, Piaget 1926, 1997, who also talk about the gradual development of a child from concrete to more abstract). According to Tomasello, children move through specific steps in their language development: holophrases (12 months), word combinations (18 months), verb island constructions (24 months) and adult-like constructions (36 months). When the child starts to produce holophrases, he/she has already become skilled in communicating through gestures and vocalizations. At each step the child produces creative new items/utterances. Yet children are creative with their language in different ways at different developmental points. The learning is item-based and goes through three stages: (1) correct (2) not correct (3) correct. However, the prerequisites may be slightly different in a bilingual situation, as will be argued below, since the input is not sufficient, so even the third stage may not be quite correct but contain forms invented by a child. In other words, the second stage lasts much longer than in monolingual acquisition (cf. also “interlanguage,” see chapter 8).

Unfortunately, there is no single theory that successfully captures every aspect of language development and can fully explain them. I believe the answer lies in a combination of several theories: both in theories that suggest there is a biological basis for language acquisition and in those that try to provide a logical explanation, with an emphasis on imitation, for instance. Research nowadays should be more data-driven, not initially driven by a desire to support a particular theory. Only in this way can we contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex processes behind the child’s language development (and bilingual acquisition in particular). Already today some progress has been made in trying to reach more agreement between generative and functional approaches and in studying the interplay between the different factors that are important in language acquisition (see Voejkova 2011:30). Yet much more must be done in this respect, and my work is simply another attempt to add new insight to this discussion.

The underlying assumption in the present investigation is that language development is closely connected with the overall development of the child.
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47 However, it should be borne in mind that even in monolingual acquisition not all words go through a U-shaped development. Since the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary are two processes that run parallel to one other, everything depends on the time the word enters the child’s lexicon. If the word is acquired after the age of two, the child is usually aware of the word formation system in the language and is able to construct the required form on his/her own. If the word is acquired before the age of two, then the form is usually frozen to begin with and thus may be constructed correctly but used in the wrong way (see Cejtlín 2009 for a further discussion).
Language development should not be viewed as autonomous from the child’s overall development but rather as an important part of it. Thus, a brief overview of Julia’s general development during the first eight years of her life (the period considered in the present study) is thus provided in the appendix (Appendix 1).

3.2. Major controversies and theoretical approaches in BFLA research

Bilingual acquisition has been studied extensively in various disciplines and approached from different perspectives. This has resulted in a vast body of literature (see Wei 2000/2001, Bhatia & Ritchie 2004/2006, Meisel 2004, De Houwer 2009, Čirševa 2000 for reviews). However, this has also led to a lack of awareness among researchers in one discipline of the work done in others, not to mention studies written in various languages (Russian, for instance) that have not been able to find readers outside their country’s borders. Thus, there is still not a complete picture of language development in bilingual children. It is therefore important to try to integrate research from different perspectives and written in various languages when a study of bilingual development is being conducted.

Today there is more demand for information than ever from parents and educators given the steady growth in the bilingual population. This has already resulted in a number of parental and teacher guides published over the past few decades (Arnberg 1987; Baker 2000; Barron-Hauwaert 2004; Cunningham-Andersson & Andersson 1999; Harding & Riley 1986/2003; Baker 1996, 1995; Burhardt Montanari: “Wie Kinder mehrsprachig aufwachsen” 2000 (‘How children grow up as multilinguals’); Čirševa 2000; Madden 2008; Protassova 2005 etc.), with the contributions by Čirševa, Madden and Protassova to my knowledge the only parental guides on multilingualism published in Russian. However, there is demand for more such studies, and much work remains to be done in this respect, taking into consideration the latest findings and recommendations (see for instance György-Ullholm’s recent contribution, 2010, where the author suggests concrete, updated implications for parental advisory books).

In this study I aim to provide an account of how Russian develops naturally in response to stimuli in two languages and how the bilingual child forms her linguistic system. Some distinctions and issues in theories of bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) will thus be considered, and a brief review of previous research, including findings of special relevance to this investigation, is also provided. Moreover, I will attempt to review some of the most relevant literature on bilingual acquisition in general and the acquisition of Russian in particular. The more specific chapters concerning input
(chapter 9), negation (chapter 6) and language contact (chapter 7) will deal with relevant literature for those topics separately. However, before proceeding to discuss the literature the present investigation is based on, some important definitions are given.

3.3. On defining bilingualism and being bilingual

Bilingualism is usually defined as “the practice of alternately using two languages” (Weinreich ([1953] 1968:1); cf. Mackey (1970): an alternate use of languages by the same person. A bilingual individual is a person who actively uses the two languages in everyday life (Grosjean 1982). However, there are perhaps as many definitions of bilingualism as there are people dealing with it, which led Baetens Beardsmore to call bilingualism a concept with an open-ended semantics (Baetens Beardsmore 1982:1).

Unfortunately, the definitions of bilingualism do not usually include any discussion about degrees of bilingualism, although there is usually a difference of proficiency in the two languages. The distinctions often made are between “balanced” vs. “unbalanced,” “dominant” vs. “non-dominant,” “active” vs. “passive” and “additive” vs. “subtractive” (see Lambert 1974 for a further discussion). According to György-Ullholm, most researchers even nowadays do not emphasize differences in proficiency between the two languages and concentrate instead on discussing the overall linguistic repertoire of bilingual individuals (György-Ullholm 2010). Montrul, among others, speaks of bilingualism as a command of two languages, albeit to different degrees (Montrul 2008). This position seems somehow oversimplified to me since it implies that every person who has some command of two (or more) languages can be called bilingual. However, that is not really the case since most theoretical accounts do not include L2 learners in their definition of bilingual individuals. I therefore believe that the definition of bilingualism should include more than language proficiency.

Bilingualism is indeed a multidimensional phenomenon, and in describing bilingualism one should also consider the functions and attitudes associated with the languages involved, the speaker’s communicative competence (see Hymes 1972) and many other related and important factors. “Bilingualism arises as a result of contact. Whether it spreads throughout the community and is maintained depends on whether the conditions for its development are right” (Hoffmann 1997:3). These conditions are determined by individual and group attitudes towards the languages involved and bilingualism itself (ibid.). As Lanza (2007:45) emphasized, attitudes towards bilingualism, es-

48 Some of these notions have been criticized, while the notion of dominance (at least in early bilingual acquisition) was called into question at the recent International Symposium on Bilingualism 8, Oslo 2011).
pecialiy in early childhood, may have a great impact on parents’ linguistic practices (cf. also Mochamed 2011). Thus, in a study of BFLA one also has to consider the broader socio-cultural context in which the child acquires the languages.49

It is my assumption that bilingualism is closely connected with the issue of identity or belonging to some culture or nationality.50 According to Protassova & Rodina (2005:6), only those who feel at home in both languages are considered bilingual, which implies that the two languages should be considered native and learned from childhood. This does not then exclude proficiency in one language being lower. Both languages are usually equally close for a bilingual person (ibid.). Protassova & Rodina (2005) further noted that bilingual people are often offended when someone tells them that they make mistakes when they speak, since they believe that if it is their mother tongue, they can speak it the way they want (2005:7). According to the authors, they have all the right to do so.51 At the age of seven, monolingual children usually feel confident using the language and do not want to be corrected (see Prosdirnina & Eliseeva 2010:102). In the case of Julia, there were numerous cases of such rejections, especially at a later age. When she was corrected, the child would often protest by either explaining why she says it the way she does (example 14), claiming that the change does not really make any difference (example 15), or simply by commenting on her — in the child’s own view — rather high degree of bilingualism at the age of eight: “Для того, чтобы родиться тут, мы говорим очень хорошо”52 to be born here (in Sweden) we speak rather good anyway’.

(14)  8:0

JUL: Мы купим три вещей
‘We will buy three pairs of things.’
MOM: Три вещи, Юленька, да?
‘Three things, Julia, right?’
JUL: Нет, их же три! Значит, вещей!
‘No, they are three! So… three pairs of things.’

49 Cf. a sociocultural approach.
50 Cf. also Lepskaja (1997), who describes language development as inseparable from the formation of the child’s personality.
51 This was also correct in the case of Julia and her sister Susie, who, when corrected, answered “we speak our own Russian.”
52 The exact translation of для того, чтобы родиться тут would be: ‘in order to be born here…’, which is probably a transfer from the Swedish för att vara född här.
53 Probably talking about her sisters as well, although in that situation the discussion was only about her.
JUL: Буревестник так быстро полетел и мы слышали его кричать!  
'Burevestnik flew so quickly and we heard him to cry'

MOM: Как он кричал, да?  
'Ve heard him cry, right?'

JUL: Ну какая разница!  
'Well, does it matter?' (angrily)

Thus, I would suggest considering a person bilingual who not only has a command of two languages, but who also feels at home in both and considers them his/her mother tongues. The role of the individual him/herself is therefore more important here than the notion of proficiency. This definition should naturally also include bilingual adults. However, a discussion of bilingual adults is beyond the scope of this study.

3.4. Simultaneous vs. successive bilingualism

The field of bilingual acquisition is confronted with several challenging issues that remain controversial: Do the languages develop in a similar way and at the same rate as in monolingual children? Are the two linguistic systems separated from the very beginning? Do they develop independently or do they interact with each other? What is the status of the two languages: 2 L1s or L1 and L2? The relationship between bilingual acquisition and second language acquisition is another controversial topic in current research, and there is still no consensus in the literature. The definition of bilingual acquisition, though, is essential to the present study.

Some researchers mention an unfortunate equating of “second” language development with “adult” language development (see Nicholas & Lightbown 2008:27). However, the underlying assumption is that there are two distinct types of bilingualism (simultaneous and sequential), and the studies in these areas often use different research methods (see McLaughlin 1985, Meisel 2004). Studies on child bilingualism usually deal with children who either learn two languages from birth (sc. simultaneous language acquisition) or acquire them successively. Simultaneous language acquisition has also been referred to as “bilingualism as a first language” (Swain 1972).

There are thus two important parameters that should not be confused in discussing simultaneous acquisition (also called bilingual L1 acquisition, see Genesee 2000) and successive acquisition (when one of the languages is acquired before the other; in this case we talk about a first language, L1, and a second language, L2). The cut-off point between bilingual first/second language acquisition (BFLA/BSLA) is rather arbitrary. McLaughlin

54 The family’s pet seagull.
(1987, 1974) drew it at the age of three (which many researchers find too broad; see Romaine 1995/1998), while De Houwer set the boundary at the age of one month (De Houwer 1995:223) since the previously learned language may somehow influence the one that the child acquires later (see Meisel 2001 for a review). Lindholm & Padilla (1978) argued that we should speak of simultaneous acquisition only when a child has been exposed to two languages from birth. Deuchar & Quay (2000) used the term “bilingual acquisition” for cases where the child was exposed to both languages before the age of one. Montrul (2008) believes that simultaneous acquisition should occur before the linguistic foundations of the languages are in place. There is a serious practical problem with this division since many children who start as monolingual speakers of, say, Russian, are then exposed to the influence of the majority language (in this case, Swedish) if the child attends öppna förskolan (‘open preschool’), a popular form of child daycare in Sweden during the child’s first year(s) of life, or starts kindergarten at the age of one (which is also often the case in Sweden). Such children are sometimes considered neither simultaneous nor successive but rather “something in between” (see György-Ullholm 2010, Lanza 2007:48). György-Ullholm (2010) suggests adapting a more holistic approach and addressing this problem simply by using the terms “early childhood bilingualism” and “bilingual language acquisition.”

However, in order to more easily compare different case studies, the distinction between BFLA and SLA (second language acquisition) will be preserved in this investigation. Still, whatever cut-off point is used, Julia’s case will clearly fall under BFLA since she was exposed to the two languages from her first day of life (an unambiguous case of BFLA). Thus, in the case described here, BFLA will refer to the case where the child was exposed to both languages from birth onwards. In order to facilitate comparisons between different case studies, details about Julia’s age will be provided throughout the study, following Okita (2002:29), who emphasized the need for more details of the child’s language history.

3.5. Interdependence or developmental autonomy?

A question frequently asked by many parents, educators and scholars dealing with bilingual acquisition is: Do children start with one language (some kind of an overall linguistic system, as per the Unitary Language System Hypothesis, which they gradually differentiate into two separate linguistic systems, i.e. a mixture of two L1 – also known as the Gradual Differentiation Hypothesis)? Or do they form two linguistic systems and are able to distinguish between them from an early age? This is referred to as the Independent Development Hypothesis, Initial Differentiation Hypothesis or Separate Development Hypothesis. The second question presumes that children are able to
separate linguistic systems from the onset of their morpho-syntactic development. Although the notion of one vs. two systems of language acquisition in bilinguals has been a subject of debate for at least twenty years, the issue is far from being resolved and is still one of the most controversial points of disagreement in the literature on BFLA. In what follows, I will review some relevant literature that supports both theories, both in terms of lexical and morphosyntactic development.

3.5.1. The Unitary Language System Hypothesis (or Gradual Differentiation Hypothesis)

Volterra and Taeschner’s (1978) study is perhaps the most common one referred to in discussing what is called the One System Hypothesis. However, these authors were scarcely pioneers. The hypothesis was originally suggested by Swain in 1972 and then further elaborated by a number of researchers (Swain & Wesche 1975, Redlinger & Park 1980, Ervin-Tripp 1982, Taeschner 1983, Vihman 1985, Arnberg 1987, 1992). As early as 1949, Leopold considered the One System Hypothesis in his study of Hildegard’s bilingual development, writing that the free mixing of English and German vocabulary in many of Hildegard’s sentences was a common feature in her speech; the fact itself that she mixed lexical items proved that there was no real bilingualism as yet. Words from the two languages did not belong to two different speech systems but to one, according to Leopold (1949).

Volterra and Taeschner’s main contribution was their Three Stage Model of language separation (1978), developed on the basis of the data from two Italian-German bilingual children, Lisa and Giulia. This model can be summarized as follows: (1) In the first stage, the child has a unified lexicon without any cross-language synonyms but it contains mixed-language word combinations; (2) In the second stage, the child has two differentiated lexical systems from which multi-word utterances are constructed. However, in this stage there is only one basic grammar. The same syntactic rules are applied to utterances in either language; and (3) The third stage begins when the child produces equivalents and differentiates between two grammatical systems. Interference phenomena may still occur even through this stage. Yet it can be greatly minimized if the domains the two languages are used in are kept distinct (see for instance McLaughlin 1978).

Authors supporting the initial One System Hypothesis maintained that bilingual children are initially monolingual. Both languages form a single system and at the beginning the child learns both languages as one. Thus, the child has the task of separating the two linguistic systems before he/she can really be called bilingual; the second question is thus when this happens and how. The primary support for the One System Hypothesis is found in code-switches in the child’s speech, which are viewed as a sign of being unable to
distinguish at all between their languages, they would then use their languages indiscriminately regardless of context. Yet several studies have shown that bilingual children use their languages in context-sensitive ways (Lanza 1997 or De Houwer 1990, to name two). However, the important factor is that these children were often older than two. The question that still remains is what happens before the age of two.

Furthermore, being able to separate the two languages does not mean that the child does not mix (code-switch) between the languages or that the languages do not influence each other. The fact that some equivalents are missing or are present in the speech of the child should not be seen as proof of the child’s inability to differentiate between the two languages; rather this reflects the presence or absence of such equivalents in the input the child receives (see Lanza 1997). There may indeed be several possible reasons for early mixings. Genesee (2000) stated that mixing is part of the input and is thus available as a strategy for the child. Mixed utterances are again not necessarily evidence that the child has not yet learned to distinguish between the languages; mixings may instead be due to factors such as the lack of knowledge of the corresponding term in the other language or parental communication strategies. Thus, many researchers (Döpke 1992, Huss 1991, Lanza 1997, Rontu 2005, La Morgia 2011) focused on trying to understand the effect of parental input on the child’s linguistic output. The general consensus nowadays is that parental discourse strategies and consistency are sufficient for children to become competent bilingual speakers of the minority language.

Attempts to prove the One System Hypothesis have not been unproblematic, and several controversial findings have been reported. It was suggested that until the end of the first stage there should not be any translation equivalents in a child’s speech. However, most of the children had translation equivalents in their speech even before the age of two (Quay 1995, De Houwer 1995). Yet translation equivalents should not and cannot be considered proof of this hypothesis since the early words do not necessarily mean the same thing, so a detailed semantic analysis is necessary to make conclusions as to whether these equivalents are real equivalents (instead of synonyms that mean slightly different things to the child).

Vihman (1982, 1985) studied a bilingual Estonian-English-speaking child and showed that differentiation of syntactic rules starts out with universal rules that apply to both languages. Rules specific to either language are only developed later on. At the same time, other researchers have suggested that there is little confusion between the two languages and that they develop independently of one another. Meisel (1986) studied the development of word-order regularities and case markings in two French-German speaking children and found that the children were able to differentiate between grammatical properties of the two languages as soon as they began to use
multi-word utterances. Similar results have been found since then in many studies.

3.5.2. The Separate Development Hypothesis

As mentioned above, the One System Hypothesis has received a great deal of criticism in the literature. One of the arguments (see De Houwer 1987, 1990) was that the bilingual child’s use of lexical items from both languages in a single utterance does not constitute positive evidence of an initial “mixed language” stage and that sociolinguistic factors may be more relevant here.

An alternative model of bilingual language acquisition has thus been proposed, the Two System Model. Its original version was suggested early on by Padilla & Liebman (1975) and Bergman (1976) but was later developed by other researchers (Meisel 1986, 1987; Genesee 1989) and became especially known after the work of De Houwer (1990). Some proponents of this view believe that the child differentiates between the two systems on every level from the onset of language acquisition (Padilla & Liebman 1975, Lindholm & Padilla 1978, Genesee 1989), while others support this view only as far as morphosyntactic development is concerned (Meisel 1989, De Houwer 1990).

The researchers who support this model maintain that children are able to differentiate between the two linguistic systems they are exposed to from an early age. Moreover, children are extremely sensitive to the contextual environment of a given language (cf. Arnberg’s research) and are thus capable of using their language systems separately. Nowadays, the Two System Model is generally known as the Separate Development Hypothesis (SDH). One of the most influential studies here has been De Houwer’s (1990) dissertation on the morphosyntactic development of her friend’s daughter, Kate, who was bilingual in English and Dutch, two typologically very closely related languages (unlike, say, Russian and Swedish). In her conclusion De Houwer stated: “I believe it has been convincingly demonstrated that the Separate Development Hypothesis accurately describes a major part of Kate’s bilingual acquisition process” (De Houwer 1990:339). She maintains that she was able to show that “Kate’s developing morphosyntactic knowledge of Dutch could not function as a basis for her speech production in English, or vice versa. Instead, Kate mostly used Dutch morphosyntactic devices when producing utterances with only Dutch lexical items, and English morphosyntactic devices when producing utterances with only English lexical items” (ibid.). De Houwer has often been criticized for having based her conclusion on cases that “provided unambiguous opportunities,” i.e. cases that are so different in the two languages that there would be no possibility of using English devices in Dutch and vice versa (see Hoffmann 1997:78).
De Houwer’s study has become perhaps the most influential in terms of discussing the issue of the degree to which the morphosyntactic systems of the two languages influence each other. However, De Houwer’s concluding remark (concerning the majority of utterances) should not be forgotten; a legitimate question would be. What happened in the rest of the utterances? Keeping in mind that the two languages Kate was acquiring were closely related, there is another factor that should not be forgotten: Kate was already fairly old at the time of the study and, what turns out to be even more important, the data collection period did not exceed eight months. Thus, nothing is known about what happened before or after this age. A longer investigation of Kate’s morphosyntactic development would have been very welcome.

However, the Separate Development Hypothesis was later confirmed and supported by many authors (Deuchar & Quay 2000; Hulk 2003; Johnson & Lancaster 1998; Lanza 1997; Mishina-Mori 2002; Nicoladis 1999; Paradis & Genesee 1996; Quay 1995; Serratrice 2001, 2002; Sinka & Schelleter 1998; Unsworth 2003), and many researchers agree that at least balanced bilinguals are able to keep their languages separate.

However, some researchers were so eager to prove the validity of this hypothesis that they even claimed to be able to prove it on mixed utterances (see O’Neil 1998), having forgotten that the Separate Development Hypothesis concerns only monolingual utterances. Furthermore, the hypothesis originally was only valid for children brought up according to the one person-one language model and receiving balanced input in both languages – quite a few restrictions, in other words. It should also be borne in mind that SDH only concerns morphosyntactic development and thus has very little to do with lexical development or language acquisition during the one-word stage. This has often been forgotten by researchers. Still, it is known that lexical and grammatical acquisition are closely connected (see Cejtlin 2009).

SDH may thus be seen as a minimalist view of the Two System Model (both De Houwer (1990) and Meisel (1989) found support only for the morphosyntactic development). The maximalist version of the separate development view claims the separation of the two languages already at the one-word stage or even earlier. However, it is worth emphasizing that one should not confuse children’s ability to differentiate between the two languages and their autonomous development since the ability to differentiate may be dependent on the person and does not imply autonomous development.

3.6. On interference between the languages

It has been claimed that Bilingual/Multilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA/MFLA) children acquiring their two languages produce the same
 sorts of utterances, with similar types of errors as monolingual children (De Houwer 2009:289). It has also been found that bilingual children are able to distinguish functionally between their languages at around 1;10 and develop distinct properties in their grammars before 2;0. However, everyone with at least some experience in two languages knows that the languages influence each other in one way or another (Serrander 2011:9). Separated or not, the two systems under development tend to interact, so it may be important to look at the nature of this interaction and its origins. Even acknowledging the fact that grammars develop separately does not imply that the two languages do not have any influence on each other. It has also been argued in the literature quite convincingly that the two systems develop separately but not autonomously (Müller 1998).

A number of cases of cross-linguistic influence have been documented in BFLA (Döpke 1998; Hulk & van der Linden 1996; Schlyter 1994; Yip & Matthews 2000, 2007; Müller 1998, to name a few), and there is evidence that even the most proficient bilingual children are not immune to the influence of one language on the other. In BFLA it may be considered wrong to talk about transfer, since this term originates from second language acquisition and assumes that there is a first language and a second one (yet it also depends on the definition of “transfer,” which is by no means an uncontroversial issue). Since in BFLA both languages are acquired simultaneously, they are seen as two mother tongues (2L1); therefore, it seems to make more sense to talk about cross-linguistic influence when considering this kind of mutual interaction.

Vaahtera (2010), analyzing the speech development of her Russian-Finnish daughter Julia, concluded that in unbalanced bilingualism the more dominant language influences the weaker one, and she saw language interference as a necessary process in any bilingual development. Yet the state of the art in bilingual acquisition still seems to suggest that researchers hold divergent views on the issue of autonomous vs. interdependent development of the two languages. The problem, as I see it, is that researchers tend to deal mostly with balanced bilingual children. However, it is not uncommon in simultaneous bilingualism that one language may dominate and thus influence the weaker language (Schlyter 1993, Bernardini 2004, Bernardini & Schlyter 2004, Rontu 2005, Müller 1998). Another problem is that most studies on bilingual development deal with languages with little inflectional morphology (cf. Dressler 1985: 246).

While most researchers agree that bilingual children occasionally mix their languages, opinions differ greatly in trying to explain the reasons for mixing. Issues have been raised about the effects of language interdependence, and several studies have started to investigate how the languages interact in acquisition and use (still, in order to do this, one has at least to consider the possibility that this interaction is possible). It should
also be borne in mind that early bilingual separation does not mean that the developmental process of the two languages is identical.

Two directions have been proposed in the literature: developmental autonomy vs. interdependence, where interdependence is defined as “the systemic influence of the grammar of one language on the grammar of the other language during acquisition, causing differences in a bilingual’s patterns and rates of development in comparison with a monolingual’s” (Paradis & Genesee 1996:3). Three ways in which interdependent development can be identified have been suggested: (1) acceleration, (2) delay and (3) transfer. It should also be kept in mind that delay in one language may be consistent with dominance in the other. Acceleration is seen as an early development in the bilingual of a certain feature or domain in one language compared to monolingual speakers in this language (however, that is not necessarily an effect of language dominance). Delay is the opposite effect, when the development of one or both languages is slowed down compared to the regular monolingual’s development. Both acceleration and delay only create a difference in the developmental rate of the bilingual as opposed to a monolingual but not in the structural characteristics of the languages. Transfer, on the other hand, incorporates characteristics from one language in the other. It may also be the case that some features will develop autonomously while others will show interdependency effects.

The notion of (4) dominance is closely related to balanced bilingualism, although it is far from uncontroversial. Grosjean (1997:167) defined dominance as competence different in nature than that of monolinguals. However, dominance is defined differently by researchers and is often related to different aspects, for instance, fluency by Grosjean (1982), proficiency (as argued by Petersen 1988) or frequency (see Pfaff 1994). De Houwer (1998:258), following Romaine (1995/1998), questioned the need for the notion of dominance in general and its relevance to the notion of proficiency in particular, since in the literature on monolingual language acquisition it is not at all common to talk about proficiency; instead key notions are developmental stages and interindividual variation (see further discussion in De Houwer 1998:257-258).

The issue of how to measure dominance has also been raised. So far there is, to my knowledge, no unified measure of dominance. Is it lexical richness, grammatical complexity, relative fluency or something else? Whatever the measures are, it is important that researchers indicate how they arrive at their conclusions in a particular investigation when they define dominance. Moreover, when dominance is measured in one language, it should also be specified how it corresponds to proficiency in the other, since the concept of dominance implies two entities. Thus, if a child is dominant in one language, his/her other language is automatically weaker. However, it is more or less clear that the so-called ideal bilingual – a child who is equally balanced in both languages – is almost non-existent in real life (see Grosjean’s works),
and thus more research is needed that concentrates on describing situations that mirror the reality of children who are not as ideally bilingual as a “real” bilingual is believed to be. Even simultaneous exposure to the two languages from birth may result in the eventual dominance of one of the languages (Bosch, Sebastián-Galles 2001:73). But again, the notion of dominance should be clearly defined by the researchers who wish to apply it. In this study the main assumption is that the lack of input in Russian has led to the dominance of Swedish, in which the child received sufficient input.55

The question of what is “dominant” is not easy to answer. One must take into consideration that language develops all the time and dominance is not a static phenomenon but can shift in response to changes caused by interaction with the environment such as in schooling, traveling or spending more time in a particular language environment (see Bergman 1979, Lanza 1992, Leopold 1970 and Petersen 1988:486-487). This was also the case with Julia during her summer vocations in Crimea.

The following criteria have been suggested for defining the dominant language: the dominant language is (a) the one in which the child is most proficient and can communicate without needing to code-switch; (b) that used in the language context where the child spends most of his/her time. The final criterion is based on (c) the ratio of lexical and grammatical morphemes in the child’s use of each language (Petersen 1988:486-487).

Petersen also (1988:486) proposed the dominant language hypothesis: in word-internal code-switching, grammatical morphemes of the dominant language may co-occur with lexical morphemes of either the dominant or the non-dominant language. However, grammatical morphemes of the non-dominant language may co-occur only with lexical morphemes of the non-dominant language. There are additional factors that should be considered in determining the child’s dominant language: a marked preference for one language in situations where both languages could be used or a general reluctance to use one of the languages in utterances consisting of more than a simple “yes” or “no” (see Schlyter 1994:69). A smaller vocabulary and a shorter mean length of utterance (MLU) in one of the languages are further indicators. Schlyter (ibid.) noted that the weaker language often exhibits greater variation in the acquisition of grammatical phenomena, varying from errors to the complete non-existence of certain grammatical constructions. However, some of the criteria mentioned above are not always applicable.56

Very little is known about why the two languages do not develop in a similar manner. It thus remains to be investigated what factors determine substantial differences in the abilities of bilingual children (De Houwer

55 See also appendix 4
56 Code-switching should also be discussed in relation to identity, not just from the perspective of limited proficiency; still, for such young children, code-switching is seldom used for pragmatic purposes.
2005). Still, input has been found to play a major role in this development (Bonacker 1999, La Morgia 2011). Another crucial question that remains is: Will the weaker language develop separately from the stronger one?

3.7. Bilingual proficiency

The notion of proficiency is closely related to the notion of bilingualism since proficiency is often seen as a measure of bilingualism, even though proficiency as such is rarely included in the definition itself. A child learning two languages simultaneously can either achieve native-like proficiency in both languages or only in one (the latter being much more common; see Grosjean 1998). In real life, most bilinguals are linguistically unbalanced and possess a stronger and a weaker language (Montrul 2008, Rontu 2005). Montrul (2008) refers to incomplete acquisition as a synonym for non-native-like proficiency.

In BFLA we have 2 L1s, so BFLA should not be confused with successive bilingualism, where there is always an L1 and an L2. This brings us to a very important issue: Do bilingual children exhibit the same patterns of acquisition and the same rate of morphosyntactic development as children who acquire only one language as their mother tongue? Or, more succinctly, is the process of BFLA similar to that of monolingual L1 acquisition?

In early studies on bilingualism there was no agreement among researchers on children’s general language development. While some studies reported native-like control of the languages in their subjects, others indicated native-like proficiency in only one of the languages. There also seems to be some controversy about language differentiation and lexical knowledge in children. “From a very early age, most young bilingual children are able to use the language that is expected of them in a particular situation” (De Houwer 2009). It is the word “most” that I would like to emphasize here. And what qualifies as “from a very early age”? In her argument De Houwer referred to Sinka & Schelletter’s 1998 study; she noted the possibility of switching easily between the languages and emphasized that switching is mostly determined by sociolinguistic factors, such as (1) their interlocutors’ choice or expectations, (2) the place of interaction and (3) the topic (see De Houwer 2009). She maintained that “[b]oth in the way that they easily switch, and that they usually switch for clear sociolinguistic reasons, bilingual children resemble bilingual adults right from the start” (2009:46). On the other hand, she admitted that “the level of knowledge and skill that BFLA children have in one of their languages can differ quite dramatically from the levels of knowledge and skill in the other” (2009:47). One language can develop as a stronger and the other as a weaker language (ibid.). De Houwer further agreed that there is a lot of variation among BFLA children
in how well they speak and understand each of their languages at a particular age (2009:48). She assumed quite correctly that “uneven development of the two languages in a BFLA child is the rule rather than the exception” (p.48). De Houwer further claimed that young bilingual children (starting from around the age of two) “can speak each of their languages without noticeable systematic influence from the other” and “children over age two develop their two languages independently from each other” (p.48). Yet the relation between two developing languages in a young child is a question that is far from being resolved and still occupies the minds of many researchers. Nonetheless, while BFLA children may have different levels of skills in each of their languages, they usually speak one of their languages well and at an age-appropriate level.

Up to now, very little was known about the linguistic skills of bilingual speakers of minority languages and what types of gaps they have in their knowledge (Montrul 2008:8). Thus it is crucial to describe in more detail the linguistic situation of more children with new language combinations, in order to present an accurate, realistic picture of their bilingual development in the given circumstances. It is important to describe “the deviations” in great detail in order to show that even very proficient bilingual children make mistakes that are not typical in monolingual acquisition. Otherwise there is a risk that all proficient bilingual children will be classified as “balanced,” whereas in real life they are not. And the crucial question is what makes them “deviant.” It is especially important to consider languages with rich morphology. A greater understanding is needed of these kinds of learners, and it is thus hoped that this study will be a welcome contribution to the discussion.

3.7.1. Levels of attainment in non-pathological L1 acquisition

Adler (1977:14) claimed that “whether a person in his future life really masters two languages completely is decided in early childhood. When he does not learn the languages then he will never be completely perfect in both.” An interesting observation here is that this notion of bilingual implies that, if the person learns the languages in childhood, he/she will be proficient in both. However, reality shows this is not always the case; many factors play a role in whether a bilingual child becomes proficient or not. But does proficiency mean perfection? Since native speaker competence continues to be the benchmark against which bilingual competence is often measured, it is vital to understand what native proficiency really is. Furthermore, practitioners also

---

57 Definitions of what can be considered a “minority language” are far from uncontroversial. The range begins with very small languages (seen in absolute numbers) and ends up with sociologically or politically based definitions, often based on non-linguistic criteria. However, more about minor (i.e. small) languages (in absolute and relational terms) can be found in Sherzer & Stolz, eds. (2003).
often think in terms of monolinguals. As Montrul (2008) noted, the most common research approach to understanding the process and outcome of bilingual acquisition is to compare it with a target monolingual norm. However, many researchers are beginning to question this basis in monolingual grammars and suggest investigating bilingualism in its own right, which is also the approach chosen for this study. However, a brief review of the main findings in the acquisition of Russian as a mother tongue by monolingual Russian children is still very much relevant here. This kind of research has a long tradition both in Russia and outside the country’s borders and deserves special attention. For a more detailed description and analysis of the earlier work done in Russia, see Voejkova (2012).

Normally developing monolingual children acquire the basics of their native language grammar by the time they are three to four years old (O’Grady 2005, Snyder 2007); otherwise, the essentials of a native speaker’s competence are usually in place by the age of three (see also Gagarina 2008, Montrul 2008, Cejtlin 2009, Gvozdev 1949/2005). Substantial work has been done in the past few years at the St. Petersburg Child Research Centre by Stella Cejtlin and her students and associates. The recent work of Eliseeva (2008) is based on a longitudinal study of her daughter’s lexical and phonological development and represents a very welcome contribution to the field. As in the present study, Eliseeva used both video and diary data in her analysis and pays special attention to Lisa’s development before the age of 2;0 (but detailing the main developmental paths in the child’s development between the ages of two and three). Unlike most studies on language acquisition, Eliseeva pays a great deal of attention not only to Lisa’s production but also to her comprehension. The processes of imitation in lexical formation and the order of acquisition all make this volume a valuable contribution. A lot of work has been carried out by younger researchers (see for instance the collective monograph “Освоение русского языка как первого и как второго”, 2010 ‘The Acquisition of Russian as a First and Second Language’). These new contributions all make the comparison between monolingual and bilingual acquisition easier.

This process is obviously not error-free and contains child-invented forms (“innovations;” see Cejtlin 2009). Children usually go through a short period when their speech is somehow different from the norm and contains developmental mistakes, which in a way could resemble incomplete acquisition. Yet I believe such mistakes can disappear given sufficient input in different registers and styles that the child should be exposed to. There is now evidence that bilingual children, just like monolingual ones, seem to go through the same milestones of language development (see also chapter 4).
3.7.2. Incomplete acquisition

The term “incomplete acquisition” is usually used about adult learners and older children whose exposure to L1 was interrupted or reduced after they were exposed to L2 (Montrul 2008). In American linguistic literature, one usually speaks about incomplete acquisition in discussing language proficiency in heritage speakers.\(^\text{58}\) Incomplete acquisition is indeed a common phenomenon in immigrant societies when the parents move to another country with their children.\(^\text{59}\)

Montrul (2008:20) refers to incomplete acquisition as “the outcome of language acquisition that is not complete or attrition in childhood”. She further continues: “incomplete L1 acquisition occurs in childhood when, for different reasons, some specific properties of the language do not have a chance to reach age-appropriate levels of proficiency after extensive exposure to the L2 begins” (ibid. p. 21). In this study I will broaden the definition of the term because of the lack of a better term to describe the language acquisition of this particular child. I will thus use Montrul’s definition with one modification, referring to incomplete acquisition even in cases where a child acquires 2 L1s (BFLA) and where exposure to one language does not reach the specific threshold of the amount of input needed for ‘complete’ (or target-like) acquisition.

The term “attrition” refers to cases where a specific property was mastered with native-like accuracy, remained stable for a while (Montrul 2008) and was then lost. This term may be relevant for BFLA in discussing dominance shift, i.e. when power relations between the two languages change. This is often due to changes in the amount of exposure to each language, such as when a child spends several months in the country where his/her other language is spoken; this is the case for Julia in Crimea (cf. 3.6). However, these two phenomena are not mutually exclusive (Montrul 2008).

For Russian language attrition in adults and older children, the work of Maria Polinsky, who described and analyzed what she calls “American Russian” (2006, 2007) deserves special attention. Polinsky (2007) distinguished between two types of acquisition: complete and incomplete, where complete results in full native competence and incomplete is acquisition interrupted in childhood. Polinsky investigated language attrition referring to two related phenomena, both of which result from insufficient access to input in a given language (or impoverished input):

---

\(^\text{58}\) Polinsky (2007) defined heritage speakers as early sequential bilinguals whose first language is a minority language of the society in which they grow up; they learn this language before they acquire the majority language, but the latter then becomes their dominant language.

\(^\text{59}\) It should, however, be emphasized that the case described in this study is not a case of a heritage speaker but of bilingual acquisition since the two languages were acquired at the same time.

---
(i) First language loss as a result of forgetting the language system due to the influence of another, dominant language.
(ii) The process whereby a given grammatical system undergoes a significant reduction (under conditions of immigration) when it is passed from one generation to the next, i.e. incomplete learning of a language system (Polinsky 2007:26).

Both phenomena are clearly relevant to describing Julia’s outcome in Russian. Polinsky argued that it is important to distinguish between the two groups of semi-speakers, those who can be characterized as (a) forgetters and those who can be characterized as (b) incomplete learners (ibid.). However, both characteristics may be present in one and the same speaker, as will be argued below, since the child can actually acquire a particular feature during a longer stay in a Russian-speaking environment but forget it shortly after returning to Sweden (which was the case with Julia after she returned to Sweden from Crimea – cf. “dominance shift” mentioned above).

However, Polinsky talks mostly about heritage speakers, a completely different category of language learners than the one Julia belongs to; although there are various similarities between the two, they are still not to be confused. Polinsky (2007) also appealed for more studies on uninterrupted acquisition of Russian since, unless we understand the uninterrupted scenario, we will not be able to understand the process of interrupted language acquisition (ibid.). Recent work by Eliseeva (2008), based on a longitudinal study of her daughter’s lexical and phonological development, partly fills that gap.

3.7.3. The relationship between the weaker and stronger language

Different hypotheses have been suggested for the relationships between the two developing languages in situations when there is no balance between them. In this section I will briefly refer to the most influential of them, with a special emphasis on those that are relevant to this study.

According to the Balance Effect Hypothesis (Keston & Jiménez 1954, Macnamara 1966), since bilinguals develop skills in one language, they pay for it with a decrease in skills in the other language. There is no empirical evidence for this view; however, unfortunately, nowadays it continues to influence people who for various reasons are against a bilingual upbringing. It has also been claimed that bilingual children may lag behind monolingual children in language development (four to five months) because they have more to acquire and differentiate (see Swain 1972). However, it is still not quite certain what is meant by language delay (cf. Arnberg 1981) since var-

60 In my opinion, the concept of the incomplete learner can even be applied to children who did not get a sufficient amount of input before the critical period was over.
The age of acquisition is perhaps the most significant factor in predicting outcomes of acquisition (Montrul 2008). It has been suggested that children are successful in acquiring their mother tongue because they are exposed to it during a biologically determined period of time that is crucial for developing their linguistic skills, which is known as the critical period (cf. also the Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH). As early as 1953, Penfield & Roberts proposed a biological foundation for language acquisition, and Lenneberg (1967) claimed that the capacity for L1 learning can get lost if it is not activated and exercised during the critical period. He argued that after puberty the brain loses its “cerebral plasticity,” thus limiting the child’s language learning ability (ibid.). The idea of a critical period has found considerable support in the generative approach since the activation of LAD and parameter settings can only happen in early childhood (see Roeper & Williams 1987). The concept of a critical period, despite its controversial nature, is nowadays accepted by many researchers of different theoretical backgrounds (see Voejkova 2011:26).

While a number of investigations have argued that there are many similarities between acquiring L1 and L2 (see for instance Cejtlín 2011) and that it is also possible to acquire a second language in a native-like manner, Hyltenstam & Abrahamson (2003) maintained that it is possible with the help of a thorough linguistic analysis to reveal significant differences between these groups of speakers. They thus identified a clear distinction be-
tween native and near-native speakers (see also Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam 2009).

However, like in the discussion of an age boundary between BFLA and SLA, there is still no agreement among researchers as to what age one should draw the boundary for the critical period (if one believes at all in its existence). Meisel proposed a boundary for the critical period of zero to four years, while Montrul draws the line at the age of seven, claiming that if linguistic input and socialization occur before six or seven, the child has a remarkably good chance of developing a full linguistic system. However, for ethical reasons, it is scarcely possible to directly assess evidence for a critical period (see Montrul 2008).

There is reason to talk about “the first critical period” (ending around the age of five) and “the second critical period” (ending at puberty); in order to achieve the best results in learning a language, one should start learning it before puberty (see the discussion in Voejkova 2011:26-27, who also suggested considering the factor of age in language acquisition rather than a critical period). The critical period or ‘the factor of age,’ the late onset of acquisition, is considered the main reason for non-native-like attainment in L2 acquisition (Montrul 2008).

The biological explanation is still the most common explanation for why children successfully acquire their L1. However, it has not been accepted by all researchers, and many still treat the critical period as a myth that still exists about bilingualism (see Zalevskaja 2011:35). Thus, even though the question about the influence of age in language acquisition has been studied extensively over the past few decades, it is still far from uncontroversial. While not rejecting the idea of a critical period, I would still like to emphasize the importance of input, especially of reaching a so-called input threshold without which complete acquisition of certain characteristics of the L1 is not possible, which in its turn leads to language deprivation.

The learning mechanisms themselves may be subject to maturational constraints, which is consistent with the Critical Period Hypothesis (Montrul 2008). The second reason given is that the amount of input a child receives may be not enough to fully develop and sustain [my emphasis] the linguistic system, even though exposure to the language occurred before the critical period was over. This makes the age of acquisition a necessary but not sufficient condition for native-like attainment (Montrul 2008:6). The verb “sustain” is especially important here since, once acquired, a particular linguistic feature does not stay unchanged over a lifetime; it may be subject to language attrition, especially if the child does not continue to receive enough input. Learning and forgetting and then learning again are two natural parts of the process of development, which I believe continue through life. In the case of Julia, this was manifested in the disappearance of double negation, for instance, which was acquired during her weeks-long visits to Crimea. Upon her return to Sweden, the child lost the feature after just a few weeks.
It is thus not enough to have abundant input over a short period of time, even if it is one month or so. It is also important that the child continuously receives enough input.

The critical period issue is certainly far from being settled. Yet every contribution to language acquisition can be a valuable addition to that debate.

3.9. Individual differences and learning strategies

There is strong evidence in research that, given positive psycho-social circumstances, children who acquire their second language in early childhood may not be distinguishable from native speakers as they grow older (György-Ullholm 2010). However, individual differences and learning strategies have also been found to be of great importance.

Gagarina (2008) investigated the acquisition of verb categories in child Russian from the onset of verb production until the age of three to four. The focus on the grammatical categories of the verb was motivated primarily by its defining role in the grammatical system of Russian (Gagarina 2008). She discussed the individual strategies that children use in mastering verbs and took up the notion of a morphological spurt, discussing how it leads to the interaction of various forms and their further organization into a system. In investigating the acquisition of verb categories, Gagarina (2008) claimed that verb categories are established in three main periods: (a) form reproduction, (b) active form production and (c) the acquisition of the system and norm. During the process of system establishment, children make similar errors in some domains of verb morphology, while at the same time showing a highly learner-specific performance in others.

Čirševa (2000) found proof of what could be called a “relief strategy” in the speech of one of her informants, who preferred the English frog to the Russian лягушка, button instead of пуговица etc., while her second informant simplified the words instead: he omitted syllables, reduced clusters that were difficult for him to pronounce and replaced sounds that were difficult to articulate (cf. also similar findings in Dieser (2007) for bilingual Russian-German acquisition and Eliseeva (2008) for monolingual Russian acquisition). Gagarina (2005) came to a conclusion similar to Čirševa’s in discussing Ball and мяч (German and Russian for ‘ball’) in Russian-German bilingual acquisition.

This finding is not new in the literature. Leopold (1949) reported in the diary of his daughter’s linguistic development that the child tried to avoid difficult expressions and structures in the weaker language. Čirševa suggested that there are several different ways of language acquisition available to children and the strategy they choose depends on their individual character-

---

61 See the discussion in Bondarenko & Dobrova (2011:85-87).
istics. She provided several examples of Andrej’s early preferences and suggested that the reason the boy preferred *cup* to the Russian *чашка* was the difficult articulation of the Russian word and there being no need to pronounce the more difficult Russian equivalent. Čirševa (2000) concluded that the way the active lexicon of a bilingual child is formed depends on several factors: (a) the setting/environment in which the child grows up, (b) the individual characteristics of the child and (c) the difficulties of articulation. The notion of articulatory difficulty is far from being settled in the literature at present (see Gagarina 2005).

Considering that the strategies mentioned above are found only in very young bilingual children (after their vocabulary spurt62 children generally do not pay attention to phonological complexity anymore and try to pronounce every word; see Eliseeva 2008), this is not very surprising since the child has access to both words. In his/her attempt to pronounce the more difficult word (like in Julia’s case, the word *машину* instead of *bil* ‘car’), the child might try to pronounce the Russian word *машину*, simplifying it to such an extent that the word may not even be recognized by her interlocutor. In having tried and not being understood, the child may simply start using another alternative available to her and – given the easier articulation of the Swedish word, *bil*. The child was understood, which made her continue to use the word. This guess naturally needs empirical support, but in my opinion it is a very likely reason why so many children both in the literature and in real life have been reported to prefer the “easier” word. Such observations may perhaps only be made by parents, since they are most often with the children and can make notes of such developmental issues, compared to a researcher, who comes to visit the child every two weeks for half an hour or so. While the method of investigating one’s own children may have some disadvantages (see chapter 5), this tradition has a relatively long history, both in monolingual and bilingual acquisition research.

3.10. Previous longitudinal studies (done by parents)

Language development has always fascinated parents and researchers. By keeping diaries, they can investigate children who learn different languages and describe their language development. Diaries have always been used in linguistic research, and research on child bilingualism in particular has a long history of diary studies.

One of the most valuable contributions in Russian ontolinguistics63 was the fundamental work of Gvozdev, “From the first words to the first class”

---

62 When the child is around twenty months old.
63 The term was introduced by Cejtlin in 1997 and means the linguistic study of child’s speech (see Cejtlin 2009:10).
(2005⁶⁴), which included a detailed diary of his son Ženja’s linguistic development. Gvozdev not only described what his son said at particular moments of his development but also made valuable linguistic comments on the way the child developed his language. This work has been as important in Russia as Leopold’s diary study in the West (see below) and is used in the writing of Master’s theses and PhD dissertations to the present.

However, while the importance of Gvozdev’s work can hardly be overstated, in order to reach some objectivity in research, the number of case studies should be expanded (see Cejtlín 2000:12). This gap is being filled by Cejtlín and her associates, with students and researchers keeping detailed diaries of their children’s linguistic development and later using the notes in their own studies. Several volumes have already been published with authentic material that contains not only careful linguistic analysis but a great deal of examples in order for readers to analyze and generalize on their own («Две девочки: Соня и Надя» ‘Two Girls: Sonya and Nadja’. «От нуля до двух» ’From Zero to Two’; «От двух до трёх. Дневниковые записи» ‘From Two to Three: Diary Notes’; see Eliseeva 2008 for further references). However, these volumes are difficult to access outside Russia and thus are still used mostly by Russian students and researchers who connected through a biannual conference in language acquisition held in St. Petersburg, where these volumes are distributed.⁶⁵

Ronjat’s (1913) study is much more widely known in the West than Gvozdev’s work, although I doubt that every researcher quoting it read the original. Ronjat lived in France and observed the linguistic development of his own son Louis for five years. At the end of this period, the child spoke both languages with monolingual fluency. The father consistently used the one person-one language strategy, speaking only French to Louis while Louis’ mother spoke German. In front of Louis the parents spoke German to each other. The parents were so consistent in their language use that if the child asked the father for a German equivalent of a French word, the father would not answer and send Louis to the mother (who was much less strict when Louis asked for the word in French). The child could distinguish between the two languages even before the age of two. However, he mastered the phonemes of both languages at 3;5, which was a bit later than for monolingual children. Louis was a balanced bilingual with just a few signs of interference between the languages, and at the age of fifteen he still maintained equal fluency in both languages. The question may be asked: What was the main

⁶⁴ The original work was written much earlier, in the 1940s; see also Gvozdev 2007.
⁶⁵ However, the Russian L1 literature has sometimes been criticized for using little experimental data and for having little connection between practical studies and theoretical approaches to child language and for emphasizing minor notions with little interest in developing a more global picture “to construct a general acquisition theory” (see Polinsky 2007). This view is, of course, subjective. The notion of a linguistic experiments was introduced in Russian linguistics early on, by Ščerba, and has been used widely since then.
reason for such high proficiency in the two languages? Was it because his father was very consistent and always corrected the child when he made mistakes in French? Was it because he even asked the mother to correct Louis when he made mistakes in German? Was it constant correction that helped or simply that both parents spent a lot of time with their son or the fact that the family was well-off and could afford several servants in the house (including, of course, German ones)? Nor should it be forgotten that the family made regular trips to Germany as well to visit the mother’s relatives. Perhaps a combination of reasons led to Louis’ high proficiency in both languages (cf. the notion of “elite” bilingualism mentioned in chapter 1). The main factor perhaps was the quality and quantity of input that the child was exposed to in both languages.

Ronjat’s work was followed by Leopold’s four-volume study (1939–49), which is still considered one of the main contributions to the field of bilingualism. He kept notes on his daughter Hildegard, who grew up mostly in the US hearing German from her father and English from her mother. Leopold paid a great deal of attention to the question of whether a child had one or two lexical systems at the early developmental stage. As far as Hildegard is concerned, she was not able to separate the two languages in her vocabulary by the time she was two, nor could she associate the languages with specific people, even though her parents were consistent in speaking different languages to her. In her third year, however, Hildegard treated the two languages as separate linguistic systems and could translate between them. Yet her English became dominant. Leopold also reported on his second daughter and noted that he was much less successful with her; she became only a passive bilingual.

After Leopold’s work there was a period of silence of over ten years until 1960, when bilingual research again attracted the attention of linguists, with the appearance of Rüke-Dravina’s (1967) dissertation on Latvian-Swedish bilingualism and Imedadze’s work (1967) on Georgian-Russian bilingual development. In Imedadze’s case, the child was born and brought up in Georgia; some family members communicated with her in Georgian, others in Russian. Imedadze paid considerable attention to the topic of early objectivation in early bilingual speech. In 1987 a work was published on Hungarian-Russian bilingualism in Hungary by Jarovinskij & Fabricius, with the mother communicating with the child in Hungarian and the father in Russian.

In the early 1980s Taeschner (1983) wrote about German-Italian bilingualism in Italy; here, the mother communicated with the children in German (her native language) and the father, a native speaker of Italian, in Italian. The parents were very consistent in their language use with the children. The parents always spoke Italian to each other; in order to encourage her daughters to respond in German, the mother consistently applied the so-called "wie?-Strategie" (sc. ‘what? strategy’), pretending not to understand
Italian. The parents – like in the case of Ronjat – tried to correct the children’s mistakes, but such attempts were not found to be successful. They therefore started to give correct models instead (the strategy was also applied in Julia’s family).

The girls were observed from age 1;6 to 5;0 and 4;0 respectively. They started using equivalent vocabulary items at around thirteen months. Taeschner emphasized the importance of the acquisition of synonyms by bilingual children because they usually learn the different equivalents in different contexts, have two pragmatic-semantic fields and have to generalize across them. When children are capable of doing this, they understand that the names for things are arbitrary. The two girls seemed to develop in both languages similarly to monolingual children speaking their own languages. It was noted that the girls were sometimes reluctant to speak German in the second stage of language development was also mentioned. At that time, Italian became the dominant language.

Taeschner saw the quantity of exposure to the minority language as the most important factor for establishing fluent bilingualism. One interesting feature of child-directed speech in the Taeschner family was their teaching-oriented approach, which was observed in Julia’s family as well and will be discussed below (see chapter 9). Porsché (1983), writing about a German-Italian child in Germany (the mother communicating with the child in German, the father in Italian), paid a great deal of attention to quantitative aspects of lexical development in bilingual children as compared to monolinguals and to the issue of understanding versus production in lexical development. Kielhöfer & Jonekeit (1983) lived in Germany with their two sons and collected data (albeit rather anecdotally) until the children were four and five years old. The mother was a native speaker of French and the father was a monolingual German speaker. The parents also applied the One Person One Language (OPOL) principle and the boys were at home with their mother until they started preschool at around the age of three. They therefore received varied input from their mother, who liked to sing and read to her children. The results showed some interference between the languages, mostly from German to French, which was the children’s weaker language.

The authors emphasized the importance of a good emotional relationship between the children and the parents and the children’s language development.

Vihman (1985) dealt with the acquisition of Estonian and English in the US, where Estonian was the home language and English the community language, and discussed the word category distribution in Estonian and English as well as quantitative aspects of lexical development in bilingual children compared to monolinguals. Saunders (1982) raised his three children – Frank, Thomas and Katarina – bilingually by consistently speaking German to them (regardless of whether monolingual speakers were present) even though it was not his own language. However, he had an excellent command of German, which he acquired in his schooling. The family lived in Australia
and the mother spoke English to the children. However, she was rather tolerant of her children when they spoke German to her and occasionally even used some German words as well. The parents spoke English to each other. The children used English playing with each other. When the children tried to speak English to their father, he pretended not to understand them. Frank always addressed his father in German while Thomas did not speak German in kindergarten. However, his fear vanished when he began school and met other bilingual children. Saunders’ children seemed to follow the one system model (cf. Taeschner 1983) of language acquisition. By the age of twelve and thirteen (for the sons) and six (for the daughter), the children were fluent in both languages, yet English was clearly dominant. Naturally, this is not surprising since the father was the only source of German for the children. However, he had a very warm, special relation with his children and spent a lot of time speaking and reading German to them (cf. Kielhöfer & Jonekeit’s (1983) observation mentioned above).

Fantini (1985) described the language development of his English-Spanish bilingual son Mario in the US. The mother’s native language was Spanish, which was the language spoken in the family. Fantini describes Mario as a coordinate bilingual since he acquired each language from separate speakers. However, his earliest English words were pronounced with a Spanish accent, and his mixing at the lexical and morphological level went on until 2;8. His parents knew many languages, and that interest was passed on to the child, who loved to try phrases in a new language. By the age of five, Mario was fully bilingual and bicultural and had positive feelings about his identity. However, he was Spanish-dominant when he entered kindergarten, and his English deviated from that of his monolingual classmates, which attracted the attention of a teacher who wanted to send him for speech therapy. Later, however, Mario became a balanced bilingual, and speakers of English and Spanish considered him a native speaker of the two languages. Such studies by linguists investigating their children thus show that bilingual children are capable of learning two languages relatively easily and are on par with monolingual children’s acquisition of one language (Lindholm & Padilla 1978).

Hoffmann’s (1985) study concerned the trilingual development of the couple’s children (which lasted until the children were eight and five years old). However, since it is also a study made by a parent, it will be referred to here as well. Although the parents lived in England, neither was a native speaker of English. The mother spoke German to the children (German was her native language and she was the only interlocutor of the language with her children) while the father spoke Spanish (his native language, the language of communication between the parents and also the language spoken by most of the au-pairs in the family). The results of the study indicated that the children became dominant in English even though the language was introduced much later to the children.
Mikes (1990) presents a study on bi- and trilingual acquisition, simultaneous acquisition of Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian with German as a third language for three children – Vuk, Uva and Egon – where only one interlocutor – their grandmother – spoke German and the language was not spoken in the community. The four children who participated in the study lived in Novi Sad in the former Yugoslavia, where both Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian are used, with Serbo-Croatian being the dominant language of the community. Both Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian were used in the children’s microenvironments, but by different people. The author investigated the lexical development of bi-and trilingual children in the framework of verbal interactions between children and their interlocutor in different languages and observed how the children acquired their interactional and communicative competence. She used the interactional-pragmatic approach, which enabled her to understand how successful communication is possible between an adult and a child despite the differences between the child’s segmentation of reality and that of an adult, instead of taking a certain hypothesis as a starting point for her analysis. This approach also enabled her to follow the process of acquiring early multilingual vocabularies in the course of interactions between the child and his/her interlocutor communicating in different languages. In her work she demonstrated the application of the interactional-pragmatic approach to a semantic analysis of early vocabulary. She offered evidence for the claim that multilingual children acquire two or more lexical systems from the beginning. All the children acquired different languages under different sociolinguistic conditions. Most children acquired one language at home and another spoken both in and outside their home (majority language).

Yukawa (1997) reported three cases of L1 Japanese loss and recovery by two siblings who grew up as Japanese-English bilinguals from birth and had different pre-attrition proficiencies in Japanese. The study described the lexical and syntactic changes of their Japanese and examined the nature of their language loss. However, the research in this field is still limited, and new informants with new language combinations are needed to identify additional patterns and make better generalizations.

Over time, the trend in bilingual research has shifted, and researchers have become more focused on large sample studies. Furthermore, a number of measures and analytic tools have been developed in the field of child language research. Nice (1925) was the first to measure the average length of sentences, which was later developed by Brown (1973) into mean length of utterance (MLU), which measured morphemes; this led to greater accuracy. Another major methodological work is the MacArthur Communicative Inventory (CDI) developed by Fenson et al. in 1994. Their parental reports have been adopted for over twenty languages. However, parent-researchers still continued to investigate their own children, and new studies have
emerged that use new methodological tools (cf. Qi 2004, Dieser 2007, Vi-

Nevertheless, while we can now record children’s speech and the number
of tools and computer programs for sampling and analysis has increased
substantially, it is not the case that the quality of research has improved. The
problems of reliability have not been totally addressed by technology. Espe-
cially if the material is not transcribed soon afterwards, it may be quite unin-
telligible to the researcher at a later stage (see Hoffmann 1991). Thus, the
combination of a diary and video recordings may be the best way for a par-
ent-researcher to collect data nowadays, as will be argued in chapter 5. How-
ever, before proceeding to the methods used in this study, a presentation
of the subject seems in order.
4 The subject of the study and the family situation

4.1. The subject of the investigation

The subject of this study is the author’s third daughter, Julia. The child was born to a Russian mother and Swedish father and lived in Stockholm, Sweden, for the entire period of the study except for short periods when she went to Russia or Ukraine. Julia has two siblings – Susie (five years older) and Victoria (ten years older) – and is thus the youngest of three girls.

Julia was a healthy baby, weighing 3.5 kg and 50 cm long. Her father was present at the birth and roomed with Julia and her mother in the hospital for ten days. Then she started developing problems with her tonsils so that by the time she turned two they were enormous. The child was often tired and sick, so it was decided her grandmother from Russia would come to stay with the family to help them take care of the child. After repeated observations by the doctor, it was suggested that Julia should have her tonsils operated on. The operation took place at the age of 3;4 and went well. After that Julia had basically no health problems at all.

4.2. Julia’s earliest linguistic development (before the age of one)

Julia started babbling at around three months. At around two months, the child could reply with a smile to the speech of an adult (as well as when someone she loved came close to her), and at three months she turned her head in response to a sound. At around three to four months, Julia reacted

---

66 Julia was born on January 8, 2004.

67 The mother got an infection during the delivery and had to stay in the hospital for much longer than usual; the father was present the entire time and took care of both the mother and the child.

68 Her Russian grandmother’s visits had a strong positive impact on the development of Julia’s Russian.

69 At around 05;5 months (22 weeks) Julia seemed able to distinguish familiar people from unknown visitors who came to visit her or her mother. She would not cry but was rather reserved with them.
when the conversation with or around her was over. It is interesting to note that already at the age of three months the child could distinguish a smile from the talk and replied with a smile to a smile and with the sounds of happiness to speech addressed to her. At the age of six months, Julia babbled in syllables: mamama, bababa.

At around five months old, the child learned to understand easy questions such as ‘Does little Julia want to sleep (informal)?’ The child would immediately start singing aaaaa. A few months later, at around 07:5–08:0 Julia could distinguish a question from a statement. Julia’s milestones in babbling follow approximately the same pattern as that suggested for monolingual Swedish children (see Lindblom 1997):

- **Milestone 1:** crying, vocals iii, uuu
- **Milestone 2:** sounds of satisfaction: glottal and velar sounds formed far back in the mouth: ngaa, gaa
- **Milestone 3:** play with front consonants: boo, biii
- **Milestone 4:** syllable babble: bababa, mamama

At around seven months Julia understood her name (even though she was named fairly late, after she was more than three months old). Before that, Julia was called by various family and made-up names. At almost the same time, she found a lamp when asked где лампа? ‘where is lamp?’ (Rus) or var är lampa? ‘where is lamp?’ (Sw). Such simple questions were frequently asked by Julia’s family, and Julia was usually praised when she was able to identify the object her parents were asking for. At around eight months, Julia would turn in response to her name. She loved linguistic play with her mother and when her mother repeated Julia’s earliest vocalizations after her. At around 07:5 Julia said her very first word: mamma (which is the same in both Russian and Swedish). Other words began to appear after that, for instance, pappa (also the same in Russian and Swedish) at around eight months. At this age Julia could understand a great deal and could even “answer” easy questions much more readily than just a month before. She listened very attentively to the conversations of adults (even among themselves) and would often turn her head and look at them as they spoke. She would also become very happy when they “noticed” her and said something

---

70 It is very likely that Julia did not understand the question as such but rather reacted to the situation as a whole, to the intonation, to the timbre of the voice. Already at the age of 01:5 it was noted that Julia reacted differently to peaceful music and dance music.

71 There was no agreement in the family about a suitable name and everyone insisted on their choice.

72 However, children usually start to pay attention to their name at around five months; according to Usakova 2004, who in turn refers to Juszcuk, this can even take place at three months. Before that time, they do not usually see any connection between a word and themselves. Since Julia was named so late, the child did not have a chance to understand the connection any earlier.
nice to her. Often the child would even take an active part in such dialogues by trying to repeat what the adults said, even trying to hold the pauses etc.

It was impossible to see any signs of Julia’s bilingualism at this age, except that she did seem to understand certain words in context and could associate the word *sova* and *спать* with sleeping and *кушать* and *два* with feeding. Otherwise, for people who observed Julia, it was simply impossible to see whether she was Russian or Swedish. Swedish people saw her as a Swedish child and spoke Swedish to her and Russians saw her as a Russian child who was by no means different from children in Russia. At the age of nine months, she would produce very difficult vocalizations that were even reminiscent of sentences; however, such “sentences” were equally incomprehensible in Russian and Swedish.

At the age of nine months, Julia could point at different objects that were known to her. When asked to point at a lamp, she did it with great pleasure. However, when she was asked to point at a *universitetssjukhus* (‘university hospital’) when the family was gathered in the kitchen, the child thought for a long while and then pointed at something indefinable up in the air. Often, when she was uncertain, Julia would point at another unknown subject in the hope that it was that what was wanted. It was at about this time, at around nine months, that Julia started to create her own names for different things and by the age of ten months she already had a couple of ‘real’ sound imitations as well, such as *av av* (for the dog) and *mjau mjau* for the cat. She would even use the same sound combination for a particular object.

At eleven months Julia started “talking” a lot and had long conversations with her parents in her own language. She managed to mix Russian and Swedish prosody in such a way that it was impossible to hear whether the child was speaking Russian or Swedish. When monolingual Russian and Swedish speakers came in contact with Julia, they still saw her as a representative of their own language since her baby language sounded equally Russian and Swedish.

The syllable structure of Julia’s earliest words consisted of a consonant and a vowel. The child preferred an open syllable: CV (consonant–vowel or CVCV), which also characterizes the language development of Swedish children (see Håkansson 1998). Julia had a tendency to start her words with a consonant and said *паль* instead of *упал* (‘fall down’). She was also very early in pronouncing nasal consonants such as *m* and *n* and did not substitute them for the dental *d* and *t*, which is very common for small children. Even though more and more new words appeared in Julia’s speech, it was still often very difficult to understand her. Her “sentence” usually contained only one (understandable) content word but the rest of the flow seemed to have no meaning (for the interlocutors). However, while her parents often did not understand what the child said, they tried to pretend that they really did and that they cared about it. “Dialogues” like the following one were thus very common:
JUL: a nä mä pa mamma!
’a nä mä pa mommy’
DAD: Ja, mamma. Mamma kommer snart. Mamma ska bara äta klart.
’Yes, mommy. Mommy will be here soon. Mommy will just finish eating’.

Adults would often interpret Julia’s earliest vocalizations and “translate” them into their own language (see chapter 9 for a further discussion). As Julia grew older, she would try different ways of saying the same thing, which often meant that she would try speaking in a different language. Sometimes she would even try Swedish with people she never used Swedish with (like her grandmother): when the grandmother did not hear that Julia cried babushka to her, Julia repeated: mormor! (‘grandma’ in Swedish). When she talked to herself in Swedish at the end of the second year, Julia would often translate the utterance into Russian when her mother was around. However, this was not the case during the child’s first year of life. But it is believed that the grounds for this behavior were laid very early, perhaps even during the very first months of the child’s life, when her parents interpreted her earliest vocalizations and translated them into their respective language (see chapter 9).

4.3. Julia’s language background

Julia had regular and consistent exposure to both of her input languages from birth (her first exposure to the two languages occurred within the period of one day). She was addressed in either Russian or Swedish\(^{73}\) and the parents identified themselves by using primarily one language with Julia, known as Grammont’s rule (Ronjat 1913). It has frequently been argued that using Grammont’s rule is the best way to avoid language mixing by the child. In contrast, children exposed to extensive mixing by adults would be expected to demonstrate relatively high levels of mixing (Genesee et al. 1995).\(^{74}\)

---
\(^{73}\) The parents spoke Swedish with each other.

\(^{74}\) It is also a commonly held belief that parents who raise their children bilingually should keep the two languages separate, a strategy referred to as “domain allocation” (see Scheffner Hammer 2004:23). Popular versions of this strategy include:
- one-place/one-language, in which one language is used in a certain place such as the living room and another language elsewhere;
- a language/time approach, in which one language is used at specific times of the day and the second language at others;
- a topic-related approach, in which a particular language is associated with particular topics (see Bhatia & Ritchie 1999; Romaine 1995).
Russian was spoken by Julia’s mother, Russian grandmother Lidia and various Russian friends of the mother. While Julia’s mother mostly used Russian with her child, she sometimes spoke the language that felt most natural in a particular situation (for instance, if the utterance was meant to be understood by everybody, Swedish was used). Julia’s father did not speak much Russian. His language was almost always Swedish (except for a few single words of Russian that he knew and liked to pronounce, usually greeting phrases and food items). He also understood quite a few words and expressions. He could follow the children’s Russian development until about the time when their vocabulary spurt began. After the age of 2;0 and 2;5 especially, it was difficult for him to catch up to the girls. Swedish was spoken by the father’s relatives, neighbors and friends and in kindergarten. Julia’s siblings also spoke Swedish to her until the child was around five years old. She was also exposed to Swedish outside the home. Julia tried to speak Russian with her mother whatever country or situation she was in.

The father worked full-time outside the home throughout the study while the mother cared for Julia full-time from birth and started working part-time at the university when the child was one year old. When the mother was at work, Julia’s Swedish grandmother Mia took care of her (about twice a week) until Julia’s Russian grandmother Lidia arrived and stayed with the family for several months.

While the parents’ desire was to provide an environment that was equally balanced between the languages, and the conditions of the household appeared to support that desire, it was almost impossible to provide equal exposure to both languages, especially after the child entered Swedish daycare.

It was estimated that before Julia was one year old, about half of her total language input was in Russian and half in Swedish; after one year though, the proportion shifted to approximately 40% Russian and 60% Swedish given Julia’s increased exposure to her siblings’ Swedish friends and other Swedish-speaking acquaintances visiting the house. The proportion was more preponderantly Swedish even more when the child started nursery school at the age of ca 1;7 (August 2005) and became ca 80% Swedish (and ca 20% Russian) on weekdays and somewhat lower on weekends, when the mother spent more time at home with the child. Appendix 4 presents the

Unfortunately, researchers often use anecdotal reports as indications of their rates of mixing with the children and do not systematically document parental language use with the children (Genesee et al. 1995). The present study is different since it pays close attention to the parents’ linguistic input.

Julia’s siblings did not like it when their mother spoke Swedish to them; when she did, they would never answer her in Swedish.

The siblings spoke to their mother almost exclusively in Russian.

At the time the data were collected, she lived in Sweden. Some data were collected in Ukraine during family’s summer visits there.

These calculations are only estimates and are not based on any specially designed calculations.
estimated frequency of input in each of the languages Julia was exposed to during her childhood.

During the family’s annual summer holidays in Crimea, which usually lasted between one and two months, Julia was continuously exposed to a wide variety of contexts. For one month she would be taken to the seaside, to the circus and theater, to the city and to tea parties with neighbors and friends; she was exposed to a variety of people who spoke Russian, played with monolingual Russian friends and relatives etc. Thus, during the summer, she was basically immersed in Russian, which was spoken by both adults and children. This not only led to a substantial improvement in her Russian proficiency but also made Russian associated with fun, holidays, seaside, swimming, new friends and many animals, but most of all relaxation and time spent with her relatives.

It is important to note that the parents’ attempts to bring up Julia bilingually were fully supported by the rest of the family and the family’s friends, since all of them had seen the positive results for the older girls, Susie and Victoria, who were bilingual. Thus, the attitudes in the child’s environment to her developing bilingualism were very supportive.

Julia’s parents separated when the child was 4.5 and the older sister Victoria made a decision to speak only Russian to her sisters in order to expand Julia’s Russian input, which decreased substantially after the parents separated, when Julia and Susie were with their mother only every other week. Occasionally, though, the siblings spoke Russian to Julia prior to that as well, especially when the family was in Crimea or when other Russian language speakers were present.

4.4. The socio-cultural context of Julia’s earliest linguistic development

In order to understand the language acquisition of bilingual children, one must understand the socio-cultural context in which development takes place, and specifically the contexts and discourses in which they are included. One must also understand what is going on around the child: the parents’ beliefs about language development, child-rearing practices, what parental strategies are used, what people the child talks to and how often, the community in which the child is raised and environmental factors (cf. Scheffner Hammer 2004:21). The different types of interaction that Julia was involved in were a vital part of her life. I believe her life resembles the lives of many other children growing up in similar situations. I will therefore try

---

79 Julia’s greatest passion in life.
80 It is a common tradition in Sweden to let children live every other week with one parent when the parents are separated or divorced.
to describe the discourse practices of her home and environment from the child’s perspective.

Julia was present during most activities at home. She was often in the room during her siblings’ piano lessons and was with them when their friends came over. She was often taken to the homes of friends and relatives as well as to her mother’s workplace and various political meetings and campaigns, where mainly Swedish was spoken around and to the child. Julia has been around her mother since she was born, observing the environment from her baby carriage or the arms of her loved ones. She was spoken to the entire time, and it was explained to her what was going on. This short episode when Julia’s mother was preparing her siblings for a piano lesson can serve as an illustration:

Mother holding Julia (nine months old) in her arms:

Victoria will have a piano lesson soon… we need to find a chair for her…. We will put it here… shall we put it here, Julia? And where is her notebook? Here it is… A biig book….look… (Julia looks at the notebook) well, everything is ready now… (Diary notes, October 2004).

Julia was taken to the theater for the first time when she was three months old and to the circus when she was seven months old; since then she has followed along with her family to wherever they visit. In addition to several trips to Spain, Julia was taken to Crimea every year. She also travelled to the north of Sweden every April when the family went skiing and tried out her first skis as soon as she learned to stand on her own. Julia attended regular gymnastic classes together with her mother or father starting at the age of one and a half. The classes were held once a week and ended with a public performance each term. Julia learned to do many exercises that the average child her age could not perform and has continued with gymnastic classes and competitions to the present day.

The child was frequently taken to the swimming pool and on boat trips to Finland, which she enjoyed. She took part in all the children’s activities on the boat ever since she was a baby and always enjoyed having many children around. She started taking swimming lessons at the age of four and has continued with them to the present. In her gymnastic and swimming classes Julia would speak Russian to her mother when she needed to address her, no matter how many Swedish children were around.

When Julia was one year old, it did not seem to bother her that other children in the playroom spoke Finnish. She replied to them in her baby language just as she would reply to her parents. However, when she was two, she already noticed the difference; when she was addressed in Finnish, she did not respond at all or if she did, she responded in Russian. She often used Russian if a language other than Swedish was spoken to her.
someone spoke Russian to her with a foreign accent (even a slight one), she would reply in Swedish. An example of this is the following: Her mother’s Hungarian friend, Anita, who works in Moscow and speaks almost flawless Russian, came to visit the family in Sweden. Julia spoke to her in Swedish even though Anita addressed her in Russian, probably because of Anita’s slight Hungarian accent. No matter how much Anita tried to make Julia speak Russian to her, the child would answer in Swedish\(^\text{81}\) (while at the same time answering her mother in Russian).

4.5. Julia’s interaction with her caregivers and her language experience

Julia was raised by her parents and her Russian grandmother Lidia, who came to visit the family each year and stayed for several months. She went to a monolingual Swedish nursery school, Pysslingen, from the age of ca 1;7 (August 2005), where she spoke Swedish to her teachers and the other children.\(^\text{82}\) The child occasionally used Russian words even while speaking to her teachers, which is not uncommon in simultaneous bilingual acquisition. However, during a regular parent-teacher conversation with the nursery school teacher when Julia was 1;9 (almost 1;10), it was noted that in November 2005 Julia stopped using all Russian words with her teachers at the nursery school. Perhaps this was when she finished building the core grammars of the two languages (cf. Köppe & Meisel 1995) or, as people around Julia used to comment, “she started to differentiate between her two languages” (see chapter 8 for a further discussion).

Since this study is based on observations of naturally occurring parent-child interactions, it is important to note the parents’ interaction styles (see Bloom, Lightbown & Hood 1975). It is known that parents have their own ways of communicating with a child and transmit linguistic and paralinguistic information in their interaction. We assume that Julia learned her two languages through her increased capacity to interpret interactions with her parents and other caregivers, which will be explained in more detail in chapters 8 and 9.

The conversations between siblings were mostly carried out in the dominant language, Swedish. However, Russian was used much more frequently when the siblings were in Crimea. Sometimes the siblings’ language would

---

\(^{81}\) It may also be the case that it was not the Hungarian accent that bothered Julia but the fact that Anita was not a person she was used to speaking Russian to; perhaps Julia felt the need to speak Swedish to unfamiliar people.

\(^{82}\) Prior to nursery school she visited öppna förskolan (the “open nursery school” that young children visit together with their parents, spending a couple of hours together with other parents and children playing, singing and eating) in Haninge once or twice a week.
shift to Russian in Sweden as well, especially when other Russian speakers were present or when their mother entered the room. It is known that the continued use of two languages in communicative naturalistic settings is required for bilingual development (Adler 1977; Cummins 2000). In other words, natural input conditions are needed since “an unnatural input condition may create a socially unnatural environment for language use that can lead to bilingual children’s failure to acquire pragmatic competence” (Hammer et al. 2004:24). In what follows, I will try to describe in as much detail as possible Julia’s interaction strategies with her primary caregivers.

At first glance, Julia’s parents followed the one person-one language strategy, where the mother spoke Russian to the child and the father spoke Swedish. However, it was not always possible for the mother to stick to this strategy, either for pragmatic reasons, because someone else who did not speak Russian was involved in the conversation, or simply because some concepts were more easy to explain in Swedish, as noted by the mother in Julia’s diary:

> Sometimes I feel such an uncontrollable desire to speak Swedish to Julia, especially when I am explaining something to her and do not get the response I want or simply when I am not really sure whether she understood me or not. Most often I can suppress this wish, but at times I still hear myself saying: “Юльенька, это твоя полочка… Julina hylla” ‘Julia, this is your shelf (Rus)… Julia’s shelf (Sw)’ 1:9.

In places where speakers of Swedish were present and seemed to listen, the strategy applied was to speak both languages at the same time: first Swedish, addressing Julia and everyone else present, then Russian, addressing only Julia.

(17) 2:8

COM: Julia brings a package of ice cream to kindergarten and shares it with her friends. She takes one ice cream at a time and gives it to each child. Then she returns to the package and takes another ice cream. Mother thinks it would have been clever to take the whole package at once:

MOM: Du ska ta hela påsen, Julia. Возьми всё.
‘You should take the whole bag, Julia (Sw). Take all of it (Rus)’
JUL: Tack! – ‘Thanks! (Sw)’

COM: Julia is never ashamed of speaking Russian in front of her friends; she says very loudly addressing her mother:

JUL: Оливер тоже мороженое!

As was noted above, after the parents’ separation, when Julia was 4:5, the siblings started to speak Russian to each other.
‘Oliver also ice cream (Rus)’ (sc. Oliver also wants some ice cream)
COM: Julia gives the ice cream to Oliver.
MOM: Julia, gå och sätt dig på din plats. Пойдёшь на место?
‘Julia, go and sit in your seat (Sw). Would you do that? (Rus)’
JUL: Нет место. Смотреть (смотреть)... тут камеру
‘No seat. Look. Here camera... (Rus)’
COM: Julia sees the camera and does not want to go to her seat but instead
wants to look at the camera that is standing on the other table, which
she now discovers.
MOM: Här ska Julia sitta, äta glass i lugn och ro som alla andra barn.
‘Julia is supposed to sit here, eat ice cream quietly like all the other
children. (Sw)’
COM: Julia comes back to me as though she wants something.
MOM: Julia, du måste sitta precis som alla andra barn (Sw).
‘Julia, you have to sit down like all the other children.’
JUL: Самуэль... тоже мороженое
‘Samuel... also ice cream’ (Rus).

The phrases Оливер тоже мороженое ‘Oliver also ice cream’ and Са-
муэль... тоже мороженое ‘Samuel... also ice cream’ are especially inter-
esting in that Julia prefers non-verbal constructions at the stage monolingual
Russian children frequently use verbs. Such constructions are called “verb
holes” in Russian (глагольные дырки) and the reason for them is far from
clear. One assumption could be that this is due to Julia’s verbal vocabulary
being very small. On the other hand, the verb ‘to want’ that is mis-
singing in this
case is a frequent one; and the child certainly knows it and is clearly able to
use it. The explanation that seems to be much more plausible is that Julia
may sometimes have difficulties choosing the correct form of the verb (the
third person singular, for instance), which is usually never a problem for a
monolingual Russian child. Perhaps it is not a competence error, but a pe-
rformance one. Given the time pressure, the child has difficulty forming the
correct form of the verb.

The mother sometimes only used Swedish (in order to involve everyone
in the conversation). The child addressed her mother in Russian even though
the mother spoke Swedish to her. Julia simply felt that it was more natural to
speak Russian to her mother everywhere, in every situation. This is interest-
ing since immigrant children often speak the majority language to their par-
ents if the parents speak the majority language to them. Kopčevskaja –Tamm
(2000) mentioned cases where parents were ashamed to speak Russian to
their child when they were outside the home. As a result, even though the
parents promoted the use of Russian at home, the child would still refuse to
use it in public since Russian was associated with something that should be
used at home. This was definitely not the case in this situation, and the child
must have realized that the reasons for code-switching were only pragmatic.

The reaction of people to Julia’s speaking Russian with her mother was
neutral, probably because most of the utterances were translated and no one
felt that they were being out. However, from the video recordings it was clear that some children might look at her in surprise. It is interesting to note that Julia would sometimes deny that she spoke Russian with her mother:

(18) 2;8

JUL: Ещё хочу мороженое! Ещё.
   ‘Want more ice cream. More!’ (Rus)
SISSI: Vad säger du?
   ‘What are you saying?’
JUL: Ещё хочу мороженое, мама! (looking at her mother)
   ‘Want more ice cream, mommy!’ (Rus)
COM: All the children look at Julia.
SISSI: Pratar du ryska med mamma nu?
   ‘Are you speaking Russian with your mother now?’ (Sw)
JUL: (shaking her head)
SISSI: Inte? Göör du inte?
   ‘You aren’t? You aren’t doing it?’ (Sw)
COM: Mother answers Sissi’s question.
MOM: Hon vill ha mera glass.
   ‘She wants some more ice cream’ (Sw)
COM: Mother saves the situation, translating Julia’s utterance both to Sissi (the kindergarten teacher) and to all the children so that no one feels excluded.

The child ignored Sissi’s question and emphasized the word *mamma*, meaning that the utterance is meant only for her and no one else. It really was, since all the children were allowed to eat only one ice cream; by speaking Russian Julia may have hoped to get two, since no one else would understand what she said.85

The strategy of translation was also used in conversations with Julia’s father. When the utterance was meant only for Julia, it was not translated. When it was meant for her father as well, it was either translated right away or repeated in Swedish. It is worth noting that often the part of the utterance that was meant for Julia would be said in Russian but the part meant for her father was said in Swedish:

(19) 2;9

JUL: Snorig
   ‘Runny nose’ (Sw)
MOM: Snorig. Сопельки, да? Пойдём вытрем сопельки. Pappa kan följa

---

84 However, note the presence of the verb here. Despite some tendency to verb holes, the fact that Julia sometimes used verbs shows that she knew them and was able to use them as well.
85 This was very normal behavior for Julia at that time. She always tried to get benefits from whatever situation she was exposed to.
med oss och filma lite mer. Пойдём вытрём сопельки.
Runny nose (Sw), Runny nose (Rus), yeah? Let’s go and wipe it (Rus).
‘Your dad can follow us and film some more (Sw). Let’s go and wipe your nose ’(Rus).

Julia applies the translation strategy too, translating everything said in Swedish to her mother:

(20) 2;8

SISSI: Var[t] ska vi åka imorgon?
‘Where shall we go to tomorrow?’

CHILD: Buss!
‘Bus!’

JUL: Автобусик!
‘Little bus!’ (Rus)

COM: Julia looks at her mother and translates the utterance of the child sitting at the table.

Julia realized from the earliest stages that there were two different languages (or rather different words) spoken around her that were apparently associated with different people. The child was so context-sensitive that she even used the few English words she knew in what were – in her view – appropriate contexts: saying “bye bye” only to people her Russian grandmother said “bye bye” to (neighbors, for instance, who often visited during the day). However, it was not easy for the child to understand what language went with whom, since everyone seemed to understand everything.

The material is full of examples where her “monolingual” Swedish father either showed his full understanding of Russian utterances addressed to him and even responded to them. Below is a clear example of a response in the “wrong” language was accepted:

(21) 1;4

DAD: Ska du ha korv?
‘Do you want some sausage?’

JUL: a! (and puts it in her mouth)
‘Yes!’

DAD: Pappa smacka?
‘Dad taste?’

(With Julia puts the sausage in HIS mouth).

GRANDMA: Tommy, do you want any sandwiches)?

DAD: нет
‘No’ (Rus).

---

86 Grandmother usually spoke English to Tommy (Julia’s father).
Another example of a mixed utterance comes from the “monolingual” Russian grandmother talking about Julia: "Вот этому товарищу надо to sleep (Eng) и тогда мы начнём! ‘This fellow has (Rus) to sleep (Eng) and then we will start (Rus)'". This did not happen very often, but it did at times, and Julia could obviously be influenced by that as well. However, I believe it is difficult to find a completely monolingual home nowadays and even “monolingual” speakers in Julia’s environment used Swedish words in an otherwise Russian utterance:

(22) 2;0

COM: Julia and her Uncle Sasha, who lives in Moscow and comes for a visit every now and then, are sitting eating breakfast.
JUL: (points at the sausage): колбаска!
‘Sausage’ (Rus)
SASH: Колбаска только у нас, а у вас – kolv!
‘Sausage (Rus) is only [sc.] in Russia, and you have kolv! (’sausage’ Sw)
COM: Julia looks at the sausage and then at her uncle. Silently the child puts the sausage in her mouth. Even though it was meant as a joke, the child gets the information that kolv (Sw) ‘sausage’ and колбаска (Rus) ‘sausage’ are two different things and are not to be mixed.

(23) 2;5

COM: The whole family is gathered together eating ice cream. The parrot (a family pet) is flying around in the kitchen.
JUL: Oj, fågel! Inte vara…(unclear meaning)
‘Oh, bird! not to be…’
GRANDMA: Вон тебе и fågel…
‘That’s quite (Rus) a bird (Sw)!’
JUL: Inte äta glassen (talking to the bird)87
‘Do not eat the ice cream! (Sw)’
JUL: Nääää! (after having seen that the bird ate some of the ice cream any way)
‘Nooo!’
JUL: Dumma fågel… dumma… nej!
‘Stupid bird… stupid… no!’ (Sw).

It is hardly possible for the child to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong since there is nothing right or wrong for her when it comes to language choice, just the desire to make herself understood and apply every method available to her. Being understood was Julia’s primary wish, when

87 In this example, the child was so preoccupied with the parrot eating her ice cream that she did not even react to the grandmother’s greatest linguistic “crime”: Вот тебе и fågel! (“That’s a kind of a bird!” (Sw)).
she was talking with her interlocutors. It was not the form, but the function that mattered for the child.

Julia’s interaction with her father was always in Swedish. However, the father understood Julia’s earliest utterances in Russian and sometimes even replied to her in Russian (as well as he could), which was noted in the very first transcriptions. Until about her second birthday, neither of Julia’s languages was dominant, but the more she went to nursery school, the better her Swedish became. After Julia turned two, her Swedish can be said to have become her stronger language for the following reasons:

1. Her Swedish input was greater than her Russian input because she went to a Swedish preschool and spoke Swedish there.
2. She often switched to Swedish even when she was supposed to speak Russian with her mother.
3. The child would often speak Swedish while playing with her dolls or pets.

Julia’s Swedish seemed to be equivalent to that of a Swedish child of a similar age, and she experienced no trouble communicating with Swedish-speaking adults and children (see appendix 2 for an analysis of Julia’s linguistic performance when she started school that was made by an independent expert). According to the CDI, Julia’s vocabulary was also equal to that of an average Swedish child. When she was around two years old, Julia’s Russian was also rather good for her age, even though she lacked a familiarity with slang and idiomatic expressions typically used by Russian children. However, as she grew older, her Russian contained more and more features arising due to contact between the two languages. At three, the difference between the languages was even more apparent, with Swedish having become a clearly stronger language in the sense that she could clearly communicate any age-relevant thought in Swedish, which was totally impossible for her in Russian, and the child needed to use the means available in Swedish in various ways.

Yet Swedish was not always automatically the preferred language choice. Up to the age of eight, Julia always tried to speak Russian with her mother and Russian grandmother (as well as to various Russian visitors who came to visit the family) and would protest when her mother addressed her in Swedish, even when it was done in situations where only Swedish speakers were present. Julia also wanted to save Russian for intimate situations where private topics were discussed. In general, she neither liked her mother speaking Swedish with her nor wanted her to:

88 However, note the opposite tendency after the age of five.
Mom, I was really ashamed today when you said to me really loud: Go and pee now. You want to pee! (Sw). I was really ashamed! Don’t speak Swedish to me so that everyone can understand. And don’t speak Swedish to me at all!”
5 Methods and approaches

5.1. Case study as a research method

This chapter describes the methodology chosen for the present investigation and justifies the choices made. It also discusses the validity and reliability of the tools used for the study so that my results can be easily compared with other studies on bilingual development.

In psycholinguistics, the intensive study of an individual child is considered a better method than studies designed with large numbers of subjects, where it is only possible to control a limited number of variables. However, everything depends on what is being studied. By studying a single case, it is possible to see what is really going on in the family and how the child develops. Djuric’ et al. (2010:178) argued especially for the importance of deviant case studies since they cast light on the exceptional and untypical. Such studies are also important for identifying underlying causes (ibid.). Hersen & Barlow (1976) also emphasized the importance of case studies. Platt (1988:20, cited in Deuchar & Quay 2000), argued that “case studies … are more likely to uncover unanticipated findings as the details are explored. This openness to surprise and availability for multiple purposes is a real strength.” Feagin et al. (1991:6) mentioned some fundamental advantages of using a case study in research:

1. A case study permits the grounding of observations and concepts about social action in natural settings studied at close hand.
2. A case study provides information from a number of sources over a period of time, which allows a more holistic study of complex social networks.
3. A case study allows the investigator to examine continuity and change in life word patterns.
4. A case study encourages and facilitates theoretical innovation and generalization.

It is also believed that only in-depth case studies can provide a realistic account of ongoing processes in development (Qi 2004). The main limitation of this method is its questionable generalizability. However, this work is not conducted in isolation. I will offer some comparison with other bilingual children and studies on childhood bilingualism in order to address this limi-
tation. Research is cumulative, and there is already a considerable body of research about bilingual first language development available (De Houwer 1990, Deuchar & Quay 2000, Lanza 1997, Saunders 1982, 1988, Qi 2004, Caldas 2006, Yip & Matthews, 2007, Vihman 1996 to name just a few). This provides a solid basis for comparing the findings of one study with others and gives the investigator the opportunity to verify case studies (see the discussion in Qi 2004).

Subjectivity is a limitation of case studies. However, this can be overcome by inter-judge reliability measures (cf. Qi 2004). Furthermore, the advantage of being there when things happen, understanding the course and consequences of different actions, or, as Caldas (2006) calls it, being “on-site” most of the time is much more valuable than all the disadvantages mentioned above. Thus, I believe that the positive features of a case study outweigh the limitations noted above. As a first study on Russian-Swedish bilingual acquisition, my work is intended to capture and document as much as possible, to trace the development of this particular child and try to explain the reasons behind the results observed. Thus, the advantages of having just one child in the study are numerous since we could observe her in every situation, all day long.

5.2. Data collection

This study followed Julia from the time she was born over a period of eight and a half years. Julia started school (grade 1) at the age of six, a year earlier than most children in Sweden. However, not all the analyses reported in this study involve the entire period. As mentioned, the main emphasis is on the earliest stages, since my underlying intention is to show that what happened during Julia’s early childhood and infancy had an impact on her linguistic development later on.

Julia’s mother (sc. the investigator of the present study) kept diary records almost daily from the time the child was born until she was four years old. After that time the notes became more sporadic, but not less frequent than once a week (given that the child lived one week with her mother and one week with her father). The diary method is still considered the simplest and most basic type of naturalistic study in language acquisition (see the discussion in O’Grady 2005:198-203). Julia’s diary included a written record of her general development, first sounds and first words as well as the situations in which they were produced, the exact date and information about pronunciation and meaning. The main task of the mother when she started her diary was (a) to test the validity of the autonomous development hypothesis and (b) to trace the order of acquisition of different grammatical catego-

89 As do many children in Sweden when their parents are separated.
ries. However, as time went by, the goal shifted somehow when the languages did not show any independent development; instead, considerable interaction between them was noted, and the main research question became (c) to document and explain the origin of this interaction.

All the words were spelled to reflect their pronunciation. Since the diary was always lying on the kitchen table, everyone in the family who wanted to could write down their observations there as well, along with Julia’s mother: her grandmother Lidia, sometimes Julia’s sisters, Susie and Victoria, and Julia’s father. Every summer notes were made by Julia’s cousin Sonya (eight years older), who also followed Julia’s linguistic development and loved to make notes about the features she found interesting (as far as deviations from the standard norm were concerned). When Julia was older, she knew that the book was about her and loved to look through it since it also contained pictures of her and some of her early paintings. Later, she started decorating the diary on her own – mostly with the stickers she got for her birthday or after a visit to the doctor. The diary was decorated with various stickers to attract Julia’s attention and to make it clear that it is a book about her.

I believe that from a methodological point of view diaries are just as important as any other method. Many successful studies of language acquisition were conducted only with the help of the diary (Leopold 1949, Gvozdev 2005, Elyseeva 2008 and in part Voejkova 2004 and Cejtlin 2009). For many purposes of this study, the diary notes were even more important than the video recordings, as they contained all the new information, i.e. all the new words and phrases said by Julia at the exact age they were produced. It was impossible to have a video camera ready every time something interesting happened. The diary thus served as a necessary complement to the video recordings. At times, a mini-disc recorder was also used when necessary (for instance in the car, when I wanted to capture an interesting conversation that was going on).

Diary records on Julia’s linguistic and overall development were kept from birth onwards and are contained in eight volumes. Mini-disc recordings of Julia’s “talks” were made at least once a month from the time she was one week old and had returned home from the hospital. Mini-disc sessions took place until the production of her first word. Julia was videotaped every week in multiple contexts and natural settings from the age of one and a half, when she had a production vocabulary of approximately fifteen words (“word” in the sense of a clearly discernable unit of utterance), until June 2010, when the child was six and a half years old. After the age of three, video recordings were made once a month, and after the age of four, every other month given that the child was not living with me every week. After the age of six,

90 In Sweden children get a sticker (usually with “Bamse,” a popular Swedish cartoon teddy bear) when they go to the doctor.
only diary records and very sporadic video recordings are available and include mostly retelling or reading tasks or tasks focused on Julia’s executive functions (the Tower of Hanoi, the Stroop test etc.). Until the age of 4;5 the child was observed with each parent and with both on separate occasions and filmed in free play interactions or during meals, bath time, eating, playing with her toys and siblings, painting, exercising, diaper changes (until about 1;7) and other typical everyday activities. I tried to make the situations as natural as possible in order for the recordings to represent Julia’s typical day and to capture everything that would happen even if the video camera were not present.

In most previous studies, the bilingual mother was always present during data collection. However, this method has a serious disadvantage since there is no strict control over the monolingual mode the child is in (Qi 2004). As Grosjean noted, a bilingual’s “language mode” refers to the state of activation of the bilingual’s languages and language processing mechanisms and in each mode, each language is activated or deactivated to a degree dependent on contextual features such as the monolingual or bilingual abilities of the participants, the purpose, situation and discourse (Grosjean 1998). No controlled situations were created (with the exception of retelling tasks at the age of six to eight), but since similar situations were regularly repeated, some kind of controlled situation was created automatically.

The data (video recordings and diary notes) were collected mostly in Sweden. Some data were also collected in Ukraine during the family’s month-long summer visits there and in Spain, during the family’s vacations there. The primary data reported in this study come from 80 videotapes, each 65 minutes long, made mostly by Julia’s mother but at times also by her father and her nursery school teachers. The recordings were made at the nursery school once a month except in periods when the child was sick or on vacation. The equipment used was a Sony 800x digital zoom optical 20X Carl Zeiss camera and a Sony mini-disc recorder with a sensitive microphone intended for recording speech. The video camera was often left on a stationary tripod during the recordings. Despite there being serious disadvantages (like not having control over the situation if the child moves), there are more advantages to having a camera on a tripod. Perhaps the main advantage is that the camera could simply remain there without the mother (who usually made the recordings) distracting the child.

Julia became aware of the presence of the camera very quickly. She was interested in watching “Julia’s films” and would often run to the camera and cry “a se, a se, a se!,” which meant fär se (‘let me see’ (Sw)). When the camera was placed on a tripod, though, Julia did not react in the same way and was rather indifferent to its presence. However, when I came close to the camera, she immediately started to cry her famous a se ‘let me see.’

Quay identifies many other advantages to using a tripod, such as the tripod and the camera becoming fixtures in the child’s natural environment and
an environment for data collection being created, whereby there is a reasonable chance that the child could in fact draw specifically on her knowledge from one or the other of her two languages (Quay 1995). This advantage was also true in Julia’s case, since the camera always stood on a tripod ready for use, either in the kitchen or living room, and was thus a natural thing in the child’s environment, a part of the furniture in the house, which made it possible to capture the child’s natural linguistic environment and language use.

Each recording session lasted for around 30 minutes, depending on the child’s mood. When Julia was younger, the recordings tended to be shorter. She was filmed every other week in at least two separate 15-minute sessions, one with each parent and one with the siblings or the whole family together. Nothing special was arranged for the purposes of the recording sessions since I wanted to make them as natural as possible and preferred to make a recording of an everyday situation that would have happened anyway, even without the camera being present. I share De Houwer’s view that in deciding on the data collection method, a choice should be made in favor of naturalness (De Houwer 1990).

A special calendar was kept on the wall where the days of the recordings were marked as well as how long they were and who the participants were. Those notes helped me keep track of what was going on. Some of the recordings were not very helpful from a linguistic point of view because Julia was either silent or said just a few words; however, those very videos might say a great deal about the overall situation in the family (socialization, turn taking, cultural-specific phenomena, the child’s physical and cognitive development etc.). Collecting the data, I tried to have a balanced combination of single- and multi-interlocutor situations since these situations were all a natural part of Julia’s everyday life.

Because Julia’s siblings had many friends who came to visit them several days a week, I found it necessary to make a recording with them as well since those situations were very natural for Julia and she was very happy to be around older girls. Susie’s friends often felt they had to do something special when they were recorded together with Julia and tried to give her different picture recognition tasks or other activities focused on Julia’s linguistic production. After a couple of minutes, though, the girls tired or forgot about their “teaching” role and simply started to play with Julia and Susie as they would have done otherwise.

The multi-interlocutor situations were very frequent since the child was seldom alone with only one adult but was instead part of a large group of various adults and children. Visitors and friends were a natural part of Julia’s

---

91 Many studies use recordings less frequently, once a month. However, frequent recordings – especially in combination with diary records – help to document many more of the changes in a child’s speech.
92 Julia’s sister.
home environment, and she was used to having at least one of her siblings’ friends sleep over. Thus, the recordings often included the friends of Julia’s siblings as well, which makes this study different from previous ones. Shorter video sessions were also made during Julia’s regular activities, such as her playschool, concerts and gymnastic class. Those recordings were important for keeping a track of Julia’s overall development, a summary of which is given in Appendix 1.

The recordings at Julia’s nursery school were made almost every month from August 2005 to summer 2006. The main purpose of the recordings there was to trace the development of Julia’s language proficiency in Swedish when she was in a bilingual environment and to determine the exact point of language separation and the way the child communicated in preschool before and after she understood that she was dealing with two different languages. The recordings in nursery school were also made in order not to repeat Leopold’s mistake of making recordings only when one and the same parent is present.

The first recording in preschool was made by Julia’s mother, and subsequent ones were made by the nursery school teachers. A special letter was sent to all the parents in Julia’s nursery school group, Minibussen (‘Little bus’) (see Appendix 5), describing the purposes of the investigation and asking for permission to make video recordings in the school when their children were present as well. Nearly all the parents responded positively, especially the mother of another bilingual child (an English-Swedish bilingual). Unfortunately, one mother was against it, which created more problems than expected, since the teachers were not allowed to make recordings when that mother’s daughter was present. I therefore had to wait for the opportunity when she was sick or absent from the school for another reason. It should be noted that without the help of the teachers who agreed to make the recordings, even under such complicated circumstances, valuable data from the school would not have been available, and this investigation would not be as complete as it is now.

The recordings at the nursery school usually lasted 30–40 minutes, except for one month, when it only lasted 10 minutes, since Julia was sad and did not want to be recorded. For a time, she was not talkative at all (just before she turned two years old, when her mother started to be away from Julia for much longer than before) and would mostly sit in a corner and be sad. This period lasted around a month, and the nursery school teachers talked to the mother about the consequences of her being away for too long. Otherwise, Julia was a very sociable, talkative child who did not mind being recorded, even if she was aware of it. However, the camera became such a natural part of her life that she considered it more common than deviant. Even Julia’s father got used to getting up in the morning or eating dinner with the video camera on. In addition to the diary notes and video and minidisc recordings,
MacArthur’s Communicative Development Inventories (CDIs) were used to measure the child’s linguistic growth.

Thus, the primary data for this study consists of the following:

1. 80 x 65 minutes video recordings (collected in Sweden and Ukraine)
2. Diary notes kept by the present researcher, Julia’s grandmother, occasionally her older sisters, Victoria and Susie, and the father (eight volumes)
3. Monthly CDI inventories (until the child was 3;5)
4. Mini-disc recordings (from the time the child was 0;2 to 1;4).

Since no external observer was present during the data collection, it can be stated that the naturalness of the data has been preserved.

5.3. Transcription and analysis

The contents of the tapes were written down and transcribed orthographically usually as soon as the tape was finished and removed from the camera. The transcription contains both linguistic and non-linguistic interaction as well as the relevant context. The transcriptions were verified by a second transcriber. Some sessions were later transcribed in CHAT format using the transcription conventions for analysis by CLAN software available through the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES, MacWhinney 2000, MacWhinney & Snow 1990) and coded for the language and addressee of an utterance.

The linguistic categories coded were the following:

- Russian only
- Swedish only
- Single-word utterances that could be either language (words that could belong to either Russian or Swedish, for example *mamma*, *pappa*, *lampa* and proper nouns)
- Unassignable (see Genesee, Nicoladis & Paradis 1995 and De Houwer 1990:86, who speaks of “non-language-specific utterances”)
- Mixed
- Child-invented forms (innovations).

It is often suggested that dictionary definitions be used to categorize words as either Russian or Swedish. Vihman & McCune (1994) considered

---

95 The categories used were utterance-based, cf. De Houwer (1990).
the problem of identifying a child’s earliest words and suggested only taking account of the words based on clear adult targets. However, when it comes to child utterances, not everything is as straightforward; an utterance such as *ta* is used to mean *kofta* (‘sweater’) in Julia’s speech, but *ta* is not included in the dictionary (at least not in that definition).

The parents’ utterances were transcribed orthographically. The utterances of all the participants were transcribed as well, and their actions were coded when they clarified the discourse (see also Genesee et al. 1995). Julia’s utterances were transcribed using broad phonetic transcription⁹⁴ (see De Houwer 1990:14, where it is noted that this is necessary for children under age two). Some prosodic dimensions of Julia’s utterances would have been useful in making judgments about the language of the utterance (see Nicolaidis & Secco 2000, Johnson & Lancaster 1988). However, transcribing prosody is beyond the scope of this investigation.

Child-invented forms are a focus of this work and were analyzed individually. Some researchers choose to exclude such forms from their analysis (see Genesee et al. 1995, who classified them as unknown),⁹⁵ but I considered these forms too important to be excluded. Indeed, I found them to be so important that I chose to look at them more closely. They can hardly be slips of the tongue, and many of them were used for several years. Even at the age of seven and eight, the child continued to create new ones. Below I present some innovations found in Julia’s speech at the age of seven:

Спрятай ‘hide’; послевчерка (позвавчера) ‘the day before yesterday’; сквётить водичку ‘spill the water’ (from the Swedish verb *skvätta* ‘to spill’ and a Russian suffix); просыпай меня (буди) ‘wake me up’; спарать ‘save’ (Swedish verb *spara* ‘save’ and Russian suffix); прорвется ‘save’ (from the Swedish noun *tuffs* and the Russian suffix -ik); дырочные носки ‘socks with holes’; долго-долго назад (давно) ‘a long long time ago’; обрезать волосы (обрезать) ‘cut hair’; я беззубная ‘I am toothless’; кто лучше расчесывает: я или Соня? ‘who is combing hair better? Me or Sonya?’; Нету лучшей мамы чем тебя! ‘There is no better (i.e. better + superlative morpheme -est) mom than you are!’; Брать срятую (делать прививку) ‘take an injection’ etc.

It is interesting to note that not all of these forms are formed under the direct influence of Swedish (those are marked with an asterisk). Some (such as долго-долго назад) are most probably calques from Swedish (for *länge – lange sedan* ‘a long time ago’). Others are purely Russian inventions (спрятай ‘hide’, беззубная ‘toothless’). Analogous formations as in спрятай ‘hide’) occur in monolingual Russian children as well. However, these forms

---

⁹⁴ Broad transcription indicates only the more noticeable phonetic features of an utterance (cf. narrow transcription, which shows more information about the phonetic variations of the specific allophones).

⁹⁵ Which is the same as ‘unassignable.’
are hardly common in the speech of monolingual Russian children at the age of seven.

As far as slips of the tongue are concerned, they were noticed by the investigator but not considered a part of the corpus. Slips of the tongue are usually very visible if the recordings and notes are done by the researcher herself. As the child grew older, she started to correct them on her own, and it was very easy to see what a slip of the tongue was and what her innovation was: без трусов! (without pants! (8;5)).

It is also interesting to note that what was analyzed as a “mistake” in earlier data would later be categorized as a slip of the tongue, since the child started correcting herself: они не могут это делать... не могут ‘they can’t do it... can’t!’ (8;5). Such self-corrections are interesting per se since they show that the child has become so conscious about her language use that she is able to correct herself or at least hear that something is wrong: они по- бужут... ну ты понимаешь меня... не побежут а что-то другое это, ну ладно ‘they will ran... well, you understand me... not ran but something else, but you understand me’ (meaning ‘run’) (7;9). On the other hand, at the age of eight, the forms such as мне это не нравится ‘it is not likes by me’; они уже были проснутое ‘they were already upwoken’; я не могу видеть его ‘I am not able to it’ (sc. I cannot see) (смотреть этот фильм – since it is meant for older children); у тебя это неправильно (ты была неправа) ‘it is wrong by you’ (sc. you are wrong); я самая худая дочь на свете ‘I am the worst daughter in the world.’ Such forms were repeated over and over again and became a part of Julia’s vocabulary; they are of course analyzed as innovations rather than slips of the tongue.

The analysis of innovations (or error analysis, if you will) will thus be the main method of analysis in this study. This method is frequently used in Russian linguistics (see Zalevskaja 2009:70), and the analysis of innovations helps us find the rules that the child applies for language construction (Cejtlin 2011:166). However, this method is not used frequently anymore in studies on BFLA, where the focus is entirely quantitative (but see Yaron Matras’s analysis of Ben, Matras 2009:9-38). This is a pity since we lose the beauty of language creation per se as an entity that is worth attention on its own. To paraphrase Potebnja, we often analyze language as though we were analyzing a plant the way we see it in a herbarium, i.e. not the way it grows in real life but as artificially prepared for scientific purposes (see Potebnja 1976:465, as cited in Zalevskaja 2011:46). And what I wanted to do was to show the bilingual child’s language development in all its diversity, with descriptions of the situations in which the child acquired her language, taking into consideration the variety of factors and their interplay.

96 Yet just a few months later: Kráko! такие жирные! Даже не могут летать! Я не могу прямо! А Буревестник – он намного, намного лучше их летает! – no self-correction in не могут.
5.4. Pros and cons of using the researcher’s own children as subjects

One advantage of doing a case study is that the researcher is able to provide a rich source of data from which other studies can be designed (see Nicoladis & Secco 2000). Yet, like with every other case study, this one is not necessarily generalizable to other children. Parents in particular are in the best position to observe the linguistic development of their children. According to Deuchar & Quay (2000:4), “the parent can be present over a much wider range of situations than an investigator who makes scheduled visits.”

This study is an acquisition study, where every step shows some development, no matter whether it is in Russian or Swedish. Diary notes show this process (progress) and, if a child is healthy, it is only natural that her language develops. It is so much easier for a parent to keep regular track of the subject’s language change. This has been observed by many researchers. As Yukawa noted, “the researcher can keep records of all the significant activities and comments that the subjects do/make at home, which may not be obtainable from non-linguist parents. The researcher also gets greater access to the subjects’ lives at the daycare/school than anybody else” and “such field notes play a very important role” (Yukawa 1997:79). The researcher is also able to grasp tiny and rapid changes in the subject’s speech development that might not be noticeable to the outside researcher who comes to make recordings twice a week.

Yet it is thought that “the researcher is so close to the subjects that it is easy to manipulate input of the target language and thus using the researcher’s own children endangers the objectivity of the research” (Yukawa 1997:78). I did not have any particular expectations regarding the research outcome. On the contrary, the purpose of writing this dissertation was to explore the process of language development of Russian in a bilingual environment, which I hoped would be important to other parents raising their children as Russian-Swedish bilinguals. Dromi also argued that there is a danger of “mother investigators” overestimating the knowledge their children have (Dromi 1987). On the other hand, Qi (2004) noted that in several studies, where the investigator is not the parent, “information gleaned from parents may be variable in quality and detail.” In this study I have done my best to give as objective and detailed a picture as possible of this child’s linguistic development and the surroundings in which the development took place.

Considering both the negative and positive consequences of using the researcher’s own children, it was judged that the latter outweighed the former as long as a detailed description of the subject’s linguistic life is included in the report (see also Yukawa 1997:79). I believe that investigating one’s own children is a separate field of studies that, as in other fields, has its advantages and disadvantages. The purpose of the study should guide the resear-
cher in deciding which method is most appropriate to use. For the purpose of this investigation, there was no other method that is more appropriate than researching my own child.

5.5. Cumulative vocabulary

From the very first days of Julia’s life, her mother kept track of her development, which as time went on also included all the new words she said. However, to complement these diary records, both parents filled out Swedish and Russian adaptations of the standardized parent report instrument, the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory (CDI) Infant and Toddler forms. In contrast to the diary (where the data are production-based only), the Infant CDI also helps to gather information about comprehension. This is why the two methods complement each other. Toddler forms are useful at an age when it becomes impossible to exhaustively list every new word (because the child simply talks too much). The Russian form was adapted for Russian by the Department of Child Speech at the Herzen Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg, in 2002. The Swedish version was created by M. Eriksson and E. Berglund (see Eriksson & Berglund 1999, 2002).

The Russian version lists 454 words on the Infant form (which is to be used between the ages of eight and fifteen months) and 765 on the Toddler form (which is to be used after sixteen months). The Infant Swedish form contains 409 words frequently produced and understood by infants between eight and fifteen months of age, arranged in 22 semantic and grammatical categories. The Toddler form is used for children between fifteen and thirty months of age and contains 714 words. The upper bound of the CDI (thirty months) reflects the fact that most children with typical development produce so many words by that age that parents can no longer keep track of them. However, the Russian form was used for a slightly longer time (until the child was three years old, since she was not able to say all the Russian words listed on the CDI by the age of thirty months). For the purposes of this investigation, it was more important to compare Russian to Swedish using the same measure (CDI) and determine the number of words the child knew. It should be noted that the CDI vocabulary list is a rough estimate and not a true inventory, since it does not exhaust the list of possible words that children might say (or understand, for the Infant forms). Many words are input- and environment-specific, and the active lexicon of some children may include words that they are typically not yet expected to know (like different names for car brands and various insects – колорадский жук ‘Colorado beetle’; божья коровка ‘lady bug’; оса ‘wasp’; пчела ‘bee’; мука ‘fly’; мокрица ‘wood louse’; гусеница ‘caterpillar’; бабочка ‘butterfly’; кузнечик ‘grasshopper’; саранча ‘locust’; сверчок ‘cricket’; муравей ‘ant’; имель
'bumble bee' etc. – which were part of Julia’s early vocabulary, something that is generally not the case with such young children).

The Swedish form is better adjusted to Julia’s linguistic situation and is more suitable for my purposes than the Russian one, which targets Russian culture. The words that Russian children come in contact with in their everyday lives are very different from the words that are common for Swedes. The same is true for Russian sound imitations that I never used in my speech (e.g. chick – for ‘to switch on’ and chuch chuch for a train97). Perhaps a modified version of the CDI is needed for Russian-Swedish bilingual children, based on the words from their Swedish input.

The instructions on the Infant form ask parents to mark the words their child comprehended in one column, and the words their child comprehended and produced in another column. The vocabulary scores were the number of words marked by the parent, with one number for comprehension and another for production. On the Toddler form, parents were told to mark only the words their child produced. The CDI instructions indicate that the parents should mark the words that the child says even if the pronunciation is incorrect. It is not specified in the instructions for the CDI that the child’s words should have identical meanings to those of the adults – just that the child has begun to use them in ways their caretakers can respond to (Pearson et al. 1997). Although parents are not asked to specify the referent of a word on the CDI, the mother added this information in cases where she found it necessary.

Evidence of the reliability and validity of the CDI is reported in Fenson et al. (1994, 2000). The CDI is more effective than previous parent-report measures because it relies on the parents’ recognizing, rather than recalling, the words in the child’s vocabulary. In addition, the two forms of this inventory focus on emerging behavior at times when these behaviors are current and limited in number. While the forms were originally intended for the parents to fill out, other caregivers and people who know Julia well and spend enough time with her contributed as well. Julia’s Swedish grandfather, for instance, filled out the CDI after having spent the whole week with Julia skiing.

Julia’s parents filled out two CDIs for the child every month. The mother filled out both forms since she is bilingual. Grandmother Lidia filled out the Russian CDI when she was present and even Victoria, who was eleven to twelve years old by then, did this as well. Thus, Julia had at least two Swedish and sometimes two Russian versions each month. The mother tried to get the younger sibling, Susie (seven years old), to fill out the form, but the girl could not quite understand what was expected of her and how she could know which words Julia used. She would often ask Julia to repeat the word

97 According to the results of my questionnaire, many first-generation bilingual Russian adults tend to use Swedish sound imitations with their children.
written in the CDI and then marked that word on the form as though the child knew it. Since Julia could basically repeat all the words, including even the most difficult ones, the results of Susie’s forms were clearly not reliable. However, the fact that Julia was able to repeat all the words was interesting in itself. When Susie was old enough to understand how to fill out the questionnaire, Julia was old enough to know almost all the words in it. The nursery school teachers were asked to fill out the forms as well, but they found the task impossibly difficult. They were afraid they would “guess” wrong because they were not really sure which words Julia knew and which words she did not know. Thus, it was clear again that CDI forms are only intended for the parents and should be filled by them (or by grandparents when possible and when close contact is established). It should be noted that the mother sometimes filled out both the Infant and the Toddler forms for the same age.

In addition to the CDIs, the parents and the Russian grandmother wrote down all the new words the child said in order to construct Julia’s early lexicon, indicating at what age each new Russian or Swedish word first appeared. A diary of Julia’s linguistic and physical development was kept since the child was born (and even before). I believe it is important to note developments that are both physical and language-related (cf. Deuchar & Quay 2000). At first, it was possible to keep an exhaustive list of Julia’s words, but it became difficult after her word spurt.

Most words in Julia’s lexicon had the same meaning as they do for adults. However, there were some words that had a somewhat broader, i.e. less specific, meaning (semantic overextension), and in other cases a narrower meaning (semantic underextension) than the “real” word. An analysis of these words merits a chapter of its own and is the topic of another study. But in order to give an idea of what they were, I have presented some of them in Appendix 3.

It is also worth noting that under- and overextension both belong to the normal developmental path in monolingual acquisition. The most attested polysemous word in Julia’s speech at that time was the deictic word *den* (‘that one’), which meant everything from ‘snuff’ to ‘birthmark’ (accompanied by pointing at what a particular *den* stood for at that moment). ‘Den’ was used both in Swedish and Russian contexts. The word was very frequent in Julia’s speech because it could substitute for just about everything and was very practical when the child did not have access to the word needed or the word (phrase) was too difficult to pronounce:

(25) \[1;9\]

MOM: Юля, пойдём чистить зубы
‘Julia, let’s go and brush our teeth’
JUL: Цисизу
Tsisizu (trying to imitate the sounds)

MOM: Скажи: чистить зубы!
‘Say: brush your teeth!’

JUL: Den! (pointing at her teeth)
‘That one!’

Another frequent word that Julia used at around two years of age was не най ‘do no’ (simplification of не знаю ‘don’t know’). Julia used it when she really did not know the answer to a question (or did not want to answer) and accompanied it by shaking her head:

(26) 1:9

MOM: Юленька, что это?
‘Julia, what is it?’

JUL: Это
‘This.’

MOM: Вот это. Что это?
JUL: Не най!
‘do no’
6 Acquisition of negation and some related categories: from first sounds to sentences

6.1. Introduction

(27) 3;3
JUL: Я не вижу!98
   'I no see'
MOM: Нету вижу, а не вижу.
      'Not I no see, but I do not see'
JUL: /silence/
MOM: Скажи: «не вижу»!
      'Say: I do not see'
JUL: Hery могу!!!99
      'I no can!'

The main purpose of this chapter is to map out the course of acquisition of negation (both its forms and functions100) in bilingual development. There are other categories directly related to negation that will be considered here as well since they appear in close interplay with it. In the production of negation in utterances, the child cannot avoid producing forms that also show the status of her acquisition of aspect, case, number and gender since these grammatical categories are intertwined as far as inflectional languages are concerned. Negation, as we know, is a multi-dimensional structure that involves other structures, which have to be mastered in order to produce more complex negative utterances (see Dulay et al. 1982).

Negation is also a popular subject in the field of first language acquisition research that has been treated in many languages. However, while there are numerous studies on the development of negation in monolingual children, studies about bilingual children are still limited (see the discussion in Bonacker 1999). Many studies deal with the acquisition of negation in English L1 (Bellugi 1967; Bloom 1970, 1991; Bloom & Lahey 1987; Bloom et

98 This phrase is impossible for a monolingual Russian child of this age.
99 The usage of не могу ('I can’t') is probably overextended here and means, in this context, не хочу ('I do not want'). This phrase was overextended during this period of Julia’s language development (see below). Nor is the phrase possible for a monolingual Russian child.
100 The term “function” should always be understood as pragmatic function.
al. 1975, Brown et al. 1971; Déprez & Pierce 1993; Drozd 1993, 1995, 1997; Harris & Wexler 1996; Klima & Bellugi 1966; McNeill 1968; Pea 1978, 1980; de Villiers & de Villiers 1979; Wexler 1994, to name some). As far as Swedish is concerned, the most prominent study may be the one by Plunkett & Strömqvist (1990) for Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. Another important contribution was made by Dooley & Håkansson (1999). There have also been some studies for Dutch (Hoekstra & Jordens 1994), French (Déprez & Pierce 1993, 1994), German (Wode 1977) and Russian (Murašova & Semušina 2007, Petrova 2009).

Among the studies dealing with bilingual children, we can mention Bonacker (1999) for Icelandic and English; Haznedar (1995, 1997) for Turkish and English; Gillis & Weber (1976) and Milon (1974) for Japanese and English, Ravem (1968) for Norwegian and English, and Wode (1983) for German and English. However, all these studies deal with L2 acquisition (i.e. successive or [early] sequential bilingualism).


Traditionally, negation has been studied with the focus on the development of the function or form of negation (see Choi 1988). Few studies made an attempt to combine the two (Tam & Stokes 2001, Schachter 1986). Yet form-function analysis studies are necessary since they can show how a bilingual child constructs his/her languages. Because this study takes its departure in construction grammar (Goldberg 2006, Tomasello 2003), we will attempt to describe the main steps in terms of how a child construes it. Several important issues need further investigation and will thus be considered in this chapter:

1. What are the main functions of negation in the child’s speech? At what developmental stages are these functions acquired and how are they used?
2. What constructions are the first ones to be acquired?
3. Are there structures that are not typical of monolingual acquisition?

6.1.1. Why negation?

Negation is a universal category that has important pragmatic functions and occurs early and very frequently in children’s production. It is also a key category in philosophy and (formal) logic. As noted above, negation inter-

---

101 See Bonacker 1999 for other references.
102 Schachter (1986) made a form-function analysis and found evidence of a rich, complex system, observing regularity in form and function in the learner’s use of negation.
acts with other grammatical categories, and its placement can also tell us about the functional architecture of syntactic representations in the child’s grammar (Bonacker 1999). The functions of negation develop at an early age and are more universal than language-specific; nonetheless, the morphological form of negation is language-specific. Thus, negation is interesting from a typological point of view since it represents one of the categories that seem to be more difficult to acquire in Swedish, at least as far as morphology is concerned, which is due to formally diverging realizations of negation (cf. inte, ej, icke, aldrig and o- in word formation).

Klima & Belugi (1966, 1973) investigated the data of three American children, Adam, Eve and Sarah and proposed different stages of acquisition of clausal negation. The first stage is when children undergo exclusively sentence-external negation: no/not + nucleus or nucleus + no. They maintained that there is no clear evidence that the child even understands that the negative element is embedded in the auxiliary of adult speech (Klima & Belugi 1973:341-342). In the follow-up discussion, many researchers argued that all children start off with sentence-external negation (see the discussion in Bohnacker 1999).

It has also been suggested that the first sentences of children generally have the basic word order of their native language (see Brown 1973, Weist 1983; see also Lust 2006 for a review). However, according to Lust (2006), the hypothesis that children begin with a general non-linguistic “cognitive”-based word order could not been confirmed. Thus, it may be interesting to look at word order in a child who acquires two languages simultaneously and see whether her word order resembles that of Russian or Swedish.

6.1.2. The forms and functions of negation

Negation can be expressed in different ways: by (a) lexical and (b) syntactic means, (c) gestures or (d) changing prosody. Across languages, clausal negation is expressed through free-standing negation particles, clitics, negative auxiliaries or verbs. Swedish employs the particle inte as well as negated auxiliaries such as ska inte (‘will not’), kan inte (‘cannot’), vill inte (‘do not want’) etc. In Russian, negation is expressed by the proclitic particle ne (‘no, not’), which is used for all types of negation (however, see negated existentials). In summary, all finite Russian verbs may have proclitic negation whereas in Swedish the grammatical status of the negation particle is that of an adverb, which occurs in different syntactic positions in main and subordinate clauses (cf. Jag jobbar inte i dag ‘I do not work today’ vs. Han säger att jag inte jobbar i dag. ‘He says that I do not work today.’ (Observe that the position of the negation particle in the English translations remains the same. It is always post-verbal.))

Whatever that may mean when dealing with bilingual children.

103 Whatever that may mean when dealing with bilingual children.
The development of the form is dependent on the typological differences between the languages (Bloom 1970). Some researchers refer to the differences in development between analytic and synthetic languages (Niemi 1994). Negation can also be discourse-oriented (or anaphoric) or syntactic (non-anaphoric). Anaphoric negation is a special type of negation that refers backwards to negate some aspect of a previous utterance:

(28) 2:6

DAD: Julia, vill du ha mera?
   ‘Julia, do you want more?’
JUL: Nå
   ‘No.’

Syntactic negation negates some aspect of the same utterance where the negation device occurs (*Jag vill inte ha kakan!* ‘I do not want to have the cake’; *Man kan inte göra så!* ‘You cannot do it that way!’; *Det finns inga barn på dagis!* ‘There are no children in kindergarten!’). Syntactic negation can be either clausal (negating a clause) or phrasal (negating the adjacent constituent, which traditionally has been called “word negation”). Negation can be also used as a determiner or quantifier (cf. negated forms such as *none* < *no one*, a transparent portmanteau formation).

There are several typologies of negation to be found in the literature. One of the most famous one is that of Bloom (1970:173):\(^{104}\)

- non-existence
- rejection
- denial.

What is missing in Bloom’s typology, however, are such important categories as disappearance, prohibition and self-prohibition (children telling themselves not to do something, for instance immediately before touching a forbidden object or at the moment they touch it (Pea 1980:158-166)). Other functions have also been proposed (Murašova et al. 2007). Murašova et al. suggest adding the following categories to Bloom’s typology:

- impossibility of making something (inability, helplessness)
- undesirability
- reproach
- protest (*не так!* ‘not like this!’)

\(^{104}\) This typology is basically semantic.
6.2. Negation in Julia’s data: comprehension and production

Before I proceed to discuss the acquisition of negation in this child, something should be said about the three main periods in the acquisition of grammar. The main assumption here is that every period of a child’s linguistic development represents a complete system in its own right, characterized by its own rules and mechanisms, which are sufficient for communication during some early developmental stage (Kasevič 1998). At the age of 1;9, for instance, Julia was not able to say “I almost fell down” and only used the word ramlja (‘fall down’ INF) when she almost fell off her chair. She also used the same word (in the same form) when she dropped her sandwich. Thus, contextual information is very important for understanding the child’s early utterances.

Louis Bloom (1970) was the first to observe that the child’s underlying semantic intention in holophrastic utterances contained more information than his/her surface utterance. Just like Bloom’s “mommy sock” (Bloom 1970), one can distinguish phrases in Julia’s data like мама сий ‘mommy tea’, which meant both ‘mommy’s tea’ and ‘mom, give me some tea’. The context was also crucial for understanding such phrases – when the child used a name as a possessive adjective, for instance when she said “Victoria!,” meaning ‘Victoria’s violin,’ or ‘mamma,’ meaning books, papers and folders – as well as so-called nonce words, such as каша кона, which in the context meant ‘the porridge got spilled’. Such words and phrases were usually unique creations and rarely used afterwards. Many utterances were thus highly context-dependent and would often be impossible to understand correctly without the relevant context: Mamma, kom! Sitta! ‘Mom, come sit down!’ The mother thought that the child wanted her to sit down and did so, but Julia protested and said: nej, nej! ‘no!’, marking in this way that she wanted help to sit herself down. The same was true of many single words: the word bebis (‘baby’) could mean not only ‘a small child’ but also ‘feed me with a spoon as though I were a baby’ (1;7).

Nejo godasaka in Julia’s data [sc. Sw goda saker/godis ‘[lit.] good things’] meant ‘My rice crisps are finished,’ and the same phrase was used to say ‘Do not take away the rice crisps. Perhaps I want some more.’ Cejtlin (2000) calls these periods of development “temporal systems,” and in her view they have their own logic and rules. She suggests looking at them from “within,” i.e. not from the point of view of adult grammar but rather from a child’s perspective, which I also do in this chapter. Gagarina suggests the following periods in the acquisition of grammar (see the discussion in Gagarina 2008:85-101105):

105 This classification is based on the monolingual acquisition of Russian.
1. Pre-morphological period106
- Holophrase: 1;3 – 1;8
- Telegraphic utterances: sentences containing more than one word (usually two): 1;8 – 1;10

2. The period of comprehending morphology as a system
- the formation of the first morphological forms: 1;10 – 2;1
- the use of inflexions to show syntactic relations between the words (conjunctions and prepositions are not used yet to denote grammatical relations in the sentence): 2;1 – 2;3
- the period of using functional words to mark syntactic relations between the words: 2;3 to 3;0

3. The comprehension of morphological norms

- the complete acquisition of all types of declension and conjugation: 3;0 – to 7;0.

These systems change over time and have an impact on each other, becoming more and more complex. Thus, by the age of three, a Russian child is expected to comprehend the main rules of morphology and be able to use them in his/her own sentences. However, Russian does not follow the same developmental time span in the situation of bilingualism – given specific challenges that the bilingual situation presents (both intralinguistic and extralinguistic).

Before a discussion of Julia’s first forms in the production of negation, a few words should be said about language comprehension.

6.2.1. Understanding negation

The first case of understanding of negation was noted at the age of seven months, probably because of the frequency of input and the need to understand situations that denote danger. At the age of one year, the child understood more than she could formulate (which is generally the case for all children). Here are several examples that show Julia’s understanding of negation:

**Seven months**

When she nursed, Julia would often bite her mother and would not stop even when her mother said нет (‘no’) or нельзя (‘not allowed’). Julia would continue biting without understanding what was demanded from her. Yet, at the

age of seven months, Julia suddenly stopped biting when she heard the word *нет* (‘no’). After a few minutes, the child tried to bite her mother again. When she heard *нет* (‘no’), she stopped doing so immediately. That scenario was repeated several times. Every time the child stopped biting, her mother kissed her and said *васька* (‘sweetheart’). After that episode, Julia would always stop doing something when she heard *нет* (Rus ‘no’) or *nej* (Sw ‘no’).

**Eight months**

Julia started to crawl, crawling a lot in the kitchen. Suddenly she saw an iron standing on the table with a cord hanging from it, which the child tried to reach. When her mother saw it, she cried *Nej nej, nej!* (*нет, нет, нет!*), and the child did not touch the cord. At this age, Julia also easily understood questions such as *Do you want to eat?* She shook her head if she did not want to. On the other hand, when asked the question “Have you pooped?”, the child never admitted it (probably because she was ashamed) if it really happened and sat quietly without saying anything.

**Nine to ten months**

Julia loved to pick up remnants of food and put them in her mouth when she crawled in the kitchen. Her mother did not approve, and the child would stop doing it when she heard *не*ْля*я* (‘not allowed’).

Even though Julia understood prohibitions and warnings such as *no* in both languages at the age of seven months (in line with typically developing (TD) monolingual children), the child did not always obey when she heard the word. Nor was she comforted when she heard it. Julia was at home with her Swedish grandmother Mia. All of a sudden Julia asked: *А мама?* (‘Where is mother?’). When the child heard that her mother was at the university (which literally meant that she was not at home), she started to cry bitterly (ten months). In this situation Julia reacted by crying to the situation as a whole. “Mother” + “university” meant that the mother was not at home and thus the child started to cry.

**6.2.2. Reaction to negation**

Julia’s reactions to negation were different, depending on her age. In the beginning she mostly listened and obeyed. At the age of seven to nine months, Julia understood the word *no* and immediately stopped doing something she was not allowed to do, for instance, biting. As she got older, she cried, refused to do as she was told and showed a desire to do what she wanted to do and not what she is told:
**Eighteen months**

Julia was sitting quietly in the kitchen playing with her mother’s wallet, taking out all the credit cards and tasting the contents of the wallet. When her mother saw this, she tried to take the wallet from the child, and Julia started to cry and hold the wallet close to her chest, crying *iiii* (meaning ‘do not take it from me, it is mine’). The child did everything in order not to give the wallet to her mother since she wanted to continue playing with it. Around 1;5 there were numerous examples of her refusal to obey, often accompanied by crying loudly or/and turning her head away or/and spreading her hands:

(29)  

**1;4**

COM: Julia has just taken out all the credit cards from her father’s wallet and tries to put them back.  
VIC: Har du satt in alla kort där, Julia?  
‘Did you put all cards back, Julia?’  
JUL: Mama! (cries loudly, wanting Victoria to go away)  
‘Mom’  
VIC: Ska du lägga tillbaka alla kort?  
‘Will you put all the cards back?’  
JUL: a... och  
‘and’  
VIC: Och  
JUL: och (turning away from Victoria)  
VIC: O, Julia! Inte så!  
‘Julia, not like that!’  
JUL: nä nä... (crying). Nä! Ä NÄ! (waving with her hand)  
VIC: Ska du ställa tillbaka den?  
‘Won’t you put them back?’  
JUL: nå da (crying loudly and spreading her hands)

(30)  

**1;10**

COM: Julia is sitting on her training pot on the kitchen floor.  
MOM: Будем писать?  
‘Shall we pee?’  
JUL: Нå нå буд, буд!  
‘No, will not, will not!’  
COM: The child refuses to go to the toilet even though she wants to.

**One year seven months**

The mother pours Julia’s medicine in a spoon and asks the child to open her mouth. Julia turns her head away and shakes it several times, indicating that she is not going to.
With time Julia learned to accept that *no* is ‘no’, yet she also learned that *no* from one person did not necessarily mean *no* from someone else. In the example below, we can clearly see how the child looks for support from her older sister, Victoria, and then from her father – perhaps they would let her play with Susie’s telephone:

(31a) 1:6

COM: Julia is trying to reach for Susie’s telephone.
JUL: дай, дай, дай!
‘Give, give, give!’
SUS: Man får inte leka med telefonen!
‘You are not allowed to play with the phone’
JUL (accepts it but looks at Victoria, hoping that Victoria would say ‘yes’)
COM: Victoria does not react. Julia looks at her father with the same purpose:
JUL: Дай э!
‘Give me’ (Rus)
DAD: (repeats after the child) Дай э!
JUL /pause:/ pappa? (Julia is surprised that her father was speaking Russian to her107)
DAD: A? (not understanding the child’s reaction)

(31b) 2;5

Julia was looking through the pages of a book. Her mother took the book away from the child because she was afraid that she might destroy the pages. Julia wanted to take the book back from her mother, crying да-да-да (дай, дай, дай ‘give-give-give’). The child became a lot calmer when she was offered another book that she started to look through. She was also able to do it very carefully with great precision, saying *Julia kan!* ‘Julia can’.

6.2.3. Production of negation

6.2.3.1. Pre-verbal negation: gestures

When the child started to produce negation on her own, the way was now free for her to build her own grammatical constructions. During the early stages of her communicative development, however, gestures were the main means of communication, and Julia expressed many of her thoughts/intentions with the help of them. Gestures were also used as an independent communicative unit. The gestures the child acquires between eleven and twenty-one months show semantic differences as early as during the pre-verbal stage and are either transmitted by adults or based on the

---

107 Already at this stage, the child seems to be aware that there is a mother’s language and a father’s language and the father should use his language, Swedish, not Russian. The fact that Julia herself spoke Russian to him did not seem to bother her.
child’s natural reaction (for more on gestures, see Cejtlin 2000, Murašova et al. 2007). Because the child does not yet see herself as a subject of speech, many errors are possible even in the use of gestures, which is very common for monolingual children as well (see Cejtlin 2000). In order to become a real means of communication, the gesture has to be associated with a stable, permanent sense and has to be repeated and supported by adults; otherwise overgeneralization is possible there as well.

Julia’s first gesture, goodbye, appeared at the age of ten months. Later she usually accompanied it by whispering ka (Russian for noká ‘bye’). Before the emergence of that gesture, the only documented gesture was shaking her head, which appeared approximately at the age of eight to nine months when the child did not want any more food or milk. She would either throw the bottle on the floor when she was not hungry anymore or shake her head no. Julia’s gestures usually were very transparent and not language-specific: disagreement was expressed by a negative shaking of the head, the disappearance of the object by spreading her hands (usually encouraged by the adults in Julia’s surroundings, accompanying it with borta (Sw ‘gone!’) or nemy (Rus ‘not’). At the age of 1;2 Julia reacted to her mother’s absence for the first time. When asked where her mother was, Julia just spread her hands and said: borta (Sw ‘gone’). This diary note was made by her Russian grandmother Lidia, and the Swedish word borta was used to her. This was the first time the child simply stated that her mother was gone. Before she would usually cry when she saw that her mother was absent. Here the child needed to answer a question and needed a word for that.

Gestures, however, did not disappear with emergence of words. Indeed, the child would use them more frequently, as though she did not really rely on her linguistic ability and wanted to support it with a gesture (also observed in monolingual children; see Lepskaja 1997). She still expressed negation with the help of gestures since this way of expressing negation was present in the speech of adults around the child, along with their verbal production:

\[1;4\]

COM: The mother gives Julia another spoonful of porridge. The child eats it (without any appetite). The mother gives her another spoonful:

MOM: Последняя
‘The last one’
JUL: Shaking her head no
MOM: Gives her another spoon
JUL: Turns her head away

---

108 Which is normal, since adults also use gestures.
Julia would often turn away, showing denial sometimes (especially at 1;6, accompanying it with the sound “muuuu”). Often she would simply throw a toy from the table that she did not want to play with or food she did not want to eat. After 1;5 Julia often used gestures in combination with a loud cry meaning ‘I am tired of it, I want a change of scenery’:

I was holding Julia with one hand and the receiver in another and was talking to my friend. After a few minutes the child started to squeal and groan. She probably wanted a change of activity. I still went on talking to my friend. In the adjacent room Susie and her friend were playing and laughing. Julia wanted to join them and, using a clear pointing gesture ‘there’, started to move with all her body in the direction of the room (1;6).

It is worth noting that some gestures became associated with certain interlocutors. Julia made a sign of the cross, for example, only to her mother and sisters when they left the house and never to anyone else since these three people were the only ones associated with the sign, which was made by Julia’s Russian grandmother, when they left the house. Thus, the child’s gestures were sometimes “person-specific.” Julia’s first constructions of negation overtook her gestures and added more specific content to them (cf. Clark 2009).

6.2.3.2. Verbal negation

Pre-morphological period: The proto-language

The first case of the production of negation in this proto-language was at the age of nine months, when the child pronounced a word, asj, when she was unrolling toilet paper (which was not allowed). Before that age Julia would often repeat the word after me. It is worth noting that, at that age, the child was pretty much aware of what she was allowed and not allowed to do and would often crawl to the bathroom in order to unroll the toilet paper in peace and quiet. However, she was afraid to do it in her mother’s presence and, as in the example mentioned above, would say asj, showing that she understood that what she did was not approved of.

At the age of 1;2, Julia reacted verbally for the first time to her mother’s absence. When asked where her mother was, the child said: Bota! (Sw borta! ‘away, gone!’). Just a month later, at the age of 1;3, Julia said the word nā for the first time in the function of refusal, when her mother tried to give her a second helping of porridge (after the child had already eaten one). After that, she used it all the time to refuse more food. Before that, the child would express refusal with the help of gestures (for instance by shaking her head). The function of refusal was very important for Julia since she was often offered more food than she could eat and more activities that she was capable

---

109 The word appeared frequently in the mother’s CDS.
of doing. The use of negation was thus motivated by a need to express communicative intentions.

According to Bloom (1970), one of the first functions of negation is expressing non-existence, which is also found in Julia’s data. However, Julia’s material also shows that other functions (which are much more important for this child) can also take the primary position in her lexicon. This is in line with the intentionality model (Bloom & Tinker 2001), which emphasizes the child’s motivation in acquiring language (the tension between engagement and effort that drives language acquisition forward). While non-existence was expressed by the Swedish word borta, refusal and denial were rendered by the more language-independent lexical item nä (which was Julia’s general negation element at her earliest stage of language development) or simply by uu:

(33) 1:6
VIC: Gunga?
‘Swing?’
JUL: uu
COM: Julia is showing denial with her body movement (meaning ‘no’)
(one sees clearly that she does not want to)
MOM: Oxa te xoer (addressing Julia)
‘She does not want to’

Julia marked negation – as well as approval – with the help of intonation, just like adults:

(34) 1:7
DAD: Va[d] ä[r] de[t]? Ägg. Kan du säga ägg?
‘What is that? Egg. Can you say egg?’
JUL: Nej.
‘No.’

The sound blä was used when something tasted bad (often observed at 1;7). The expression of non-existence, when it comes to food and objects, was not as important for Julia since everything she needed was always there for her. The second documented instance of borta in the function of non-existence was noted in Julia’s speech just a couple of months later, at the age of 1;5, when she spread her hands and said pta (Swedish: borta Sw ‘all gone’). The gesture of spreading her hands was not necessarily accompanied by whispering pta and could be used independently. It was noted that even after Julia started to express negation with the help of words, the words from her protolanguage such as nā, muu and äää were still there, which was not the case.

110 Perhaps by using different words for different functions, the child tried to avoid any polysemy of the sign.
111 The child said pta (< borta ‘away’) both in Russian and Swedish contexts.
for sound imitations such as *kap kap*, which disappeared as soon as the verb *regna* (*to rain*) appeared in the lexicon.

The fact that Julia’s first word was *nä* was not a coincidence since it could be used in both Russian and Swedish contexts. In Julia’s speech *nä* could also be used with a prolonged vowel, which emphasized her desire not to do something:

(35)  1;8

MOM: *Ska vi sova?*  
‘Shall we go to sleep?’
JUL: *Nää!*  
‘Nää’

The same can be said about the proto-words *ni, neä, u* or *m* that Julia used very often:

(36)  1;9

VIC: *Ska vi byta? Byta? Меняться?*112  
‘Shall we change (your diaper)? Change’ (Rus)
JUL: *Niiiiii!*  
‘No!’

(37)  1;8

MOM: *пойдём купаться?*  
‘Shall we go swimming?’
JUL: *Neä*113  
‘Nope’

Julia even said *tack* meaning ‘no’, derived from Swedish *nej, tack!* ‘no, thanks!’114 The child also preferred words that started with *n* to express negation at the earliest stages of her development. Even the English word *no*, which the child heard exclusively as passive input, was acquired relatively early. Thus, by the age of 1;7 Julia had the following means for expressing negation: *nem* ‘no’ (Rus), *no, nej ‘no’* (Sw), *borta ‘all gone’* (Sw), *nä, niii* and *blä* Swedish sound-imitating *blä* was used even by her mother in the meaning of ‘disgusting, not tasting good.’ Most of these words were not used interchangeably but had their specific functions, with *borta* used only to express non-existence and the disappearance of an object; *blä* when something did not taste good, and *nii*, *no* and *näää* when she did not want to do something, while *nej* and *nem* (‘no’) were mostly used in answering ques-

---

112 Note that Victoria changed languages (translating from Swedish into Russian) in order to clarify what she had just said (see chapter 9 for a further discussion).
113 *Neä* was also used in response to her father and Swedish grandmother Mia.
114 Semantic innovation.
tions (for instance when I asked her in the morning whether she wanted to have some porridge the child said *nej*, meaning ‘I do not want it’). These words were used to reject something or to say that something was absent:

(38)  

(MOM: Нету сока больше?
‘Is there any more juice?’
(JUL: Нет
‘No’)

In order to emphasize that she does not want more, the child would sometimes express negation in both languages – probably because of the double input from her environment or because similar strategies were noted in adults. The general impression from the pre-verbal period was that Julia’s first proto-words belonged to some unified system with a set of unified phonemes not yet differentiated into Russian or Swedish and which could be used in both linguistic contexts depending on the meaning the child wanted to express. This can be compared with Leopold’s findings (Leopold 1954) that a bilingual child has a slightly broader experience with sounds than monolingual children, yet their phonemes are not differentiated by language.

6.2.3.3. Holophrases

At around 1;4 Julia started using holophrases in the context of negation (single word utterances that stand for the whole proposition):

(39)  

VIC: Vem ska lägga alla kort i pappas plånbok?
‘Who is supposed to put all the cards in father’s wallet?’
JUL: nå nå nja…117 (probably an attempt to say *не знаю* ‘don’t know’)
VIC: Vet inte? Не знаешь?
‘Do not know?’ (Sw – Rus)

The chunk *не могу* (‘cannot’, pronounced as *могу* ‘can’t’) was used very frequently – both in Swedish and Russian contexts and was polysemous at this stage of development. The phrase could mean both ‘do not want,’ ‘will not’ and ‘cannot’.118

115 The term “holophrase” will be used to denote the children’s early single-word utterances (which generally signify that children may intend a whole proposition by a single word).
116 The first holophrastic utterance was noted on February 20, 2005 (1;2), when the child said *паль* ‘fell down’ for the toothbrush that fell down. Holophrastic utterances in the context of negation appeared a couple of months later.
117 Note that the child tried to choose the forms that would suit either language.
At around 1;8, other words appeared: Неда! (нельзя ‘not allowed’) and Ни как (‘it does not go, does not work’). The word Неда! was used by the child when I wanted to take away the camera from the kitchen, where Julia was used to it standing. Later Julia would even use the same word when Victoria wanted to open a juice box. Then Julia would say нельзя ‘not allowed’ [sc. to open the juice]. The word Ни как (‘it does not go, does not work’) was used when the child was unable to do something. At 1;7 Julia said Ни как! when she could not put on her jacket. The word was also used in a Swedish context (even in preschool, just like the word на (Rus ‘take’, which was also used in the sense of ‘to give’).

In describing the functions of negation, we should remember that many words and phrases can only be understood in their context (see the discussion on Julia’s не могу). This phenomenon is called “overextension” and has been found in monolingual children as well. However, Russian children do not overextend that verb. Still, we cannot call it a transfer effect since in Swedish this verb cannot be used in the sense of ‘will not’ either. At 1;8 Julia also used the English phrase I can’t, talking to me when she could not open the shampoo bottle. That may be because many foreign visitors had come to visit the family that summer and the child may have picked up some English words, even though they were never used with her directly. However, this was the first equivalent of не могу (‘I cannot’), which was used by the child since she was 1;4 and she did not have any other translation equivalents. Nonetheless, the use of I can’t was only accidental and disappeared after a couple of uses, probably because it was not supported by input anymore. The Swedish negator nej (‘no’) was also used in her speech with her mother. In this period Julia started to reply more and more in Swedish to her mother, as we can see from the examples below:

(40) 1;8

JUL: Не — trying to climb from the bath tub
COM: Mother continues to bathe the child. Julia cries: JUL: Нэ могу! Слута бада!
‘I cannot! (Rus) Stop bathing!’ (Sw) (probably meaning ‘I do not want’).

MOM: Юля, ты покакала?
‘Julia, have you pooped?’
JUL: Nej
‘No’
MOM: Поменять тебе памперс?
‘Shall I change your diaper?’

(41) 1;8
JUL: Nee
‘No!’
MOM: А ты хочешь пить?
‘Do you want to drink?’
JUL: Нā
‘Noope’
MOM: Не хочешь?
‘You don’t?’

COM: Julia shows the living room where she pooped that morning. One can clearly see the child is thinking about what happened in the morning and is relating to it now.119

When the child clearly indicated that she did not want anything, she also used hand movements and usually repeated the negation twice: Nej, nej! (‘no, no!’ with reduplication). When I wanted to mark negation, I might also use Swedish as well:120 Nej, Julia! Так нельзя! ‘No, Julia. It is not allowed’ (when I saw that Julia was painting in the wrong book. The child stopped immediately) (1;8). At around two years old, both Swedish nej (‘no’) and Russian нет (‘no’) were frequently used by the child. However, nej was usually used in a more general sense, whereas нет tended to be used to reject something that the child did not want (or as a protest), as in the following example:121

(42) 1:7

COM: Susie sees Julia eating yoghurt with a fork and takes it from her:
SUS: Юля!
‘Julia!’
JUL: Heeer!
‘Noo!’

COM: the child protests when she is not allowed to eat with a fork
SUS: Вот с этим (с этой)122

119 It is also clear that the mother applied various strategies to elicit Russian input from Julia, like repeating the Russian word да ‘yes’, marking for the child that this was the desired way of talking to her.

120 It should be emphasized that the input was already mixed at times, which could also contribute to non-differentiation of some negation elements by language in Julia. Later on, the child learned to apply this strategy for pragmatic purposes.

121 We had the impression that the meaning of Russian нет ‘no’ seemed much stronger for the child than the Swedish nej.

122 Susie’s ungrammatical form Вот с этим (‘with that one’ – the wrong form of the Instrumental case) deserves special attention since the child understood the function of that case but the form was wrong, just like the phrase тебе не можно быть такой весь день (‘you cannot be like this for the whole day’ when Julia was being fickle). The analytic phrase не может-
'With this one (INSTR)'

COM: giving the child a little spoon she should eat with

In the following example, *nej* ‘no’ was chosen when she was talking to her Swedish-speaking grandmother.\(^{123}\)

(43) 1:7

MIA: Ska du ha den här? (giving her a bottle)
‘Do you want this?’
JUL: Nej! (very clear)
‘No’
JUL: da da da (дай, дай, дай)
‘gi, gi, gi’ (give, give, give) (Rus)
COM: reaching for the telephone she wanted to take
MIA: Nej, inte telefonen!
‘No, not the telephone!’

When Julia started preschool, Swedish *nej* was increasingly common in her speech. Whereas Russian *нет* was used very frequently at 1;7, by 1;9 it was increasingly replaced by Swedish *nej*, even when she talked to her mother:

(44) 1:9

MOM: Что ты сделала? Дай!
‘What have you done? Give [it to me]!’
JUL: Nej! Neej! (protesting, not wanting to give me the shampoo)
‘No, noo!’ (Sw)
MOM: Дай!
‘Give [it to me]’
JUL: Nej! (pushing away my hand)
‘No!!’

(45) 1:9

MOM: Помыть тебе голову? Надо душек взять\(^{124}\)…
‘Shall I wash your head? We need to take a shower …’
JUL: NEEEEJ!
‘Noo’
MOM: Ok! Ok! Садись. Давай просто тельце тогда мыть. Садись.
‘OK OK. Sit down. Let’s just wash your body then. Sit down.’

no (‘not allowed’) is used instead of the expected *не́льзя* (‘forbidden’). These forms were transmitted to Julia through Susie’s input when the children chose to speak Russian to each other (which was not very often at the time, but it is worth mentioning). The construction *вот с этим* has also been observed in Russian monolingual children (Stella Cejtlin, personal communication). This is not very surprising, though, given the syncretism of the Locative/Instrumental case.

\(^{123}\) However, note the presence of ‘da da da’, which meant *дай, дай, дай* ‘give, give, give’ (Rus). Julia would usually say the word *Дай* (meaning *на – ‘take’*) even to her Swedish grandmother and used the words *никак* and *не могу* even in preschool.

\(^{124}\) Meaning to take the shower head, not a transfer of English ‘take a shower’ in the mother’s speech here.
6.2.3.4. Multi-word utterances: sentences containing more than one word

Before the child discovered morphological markers and started to create her own forms, there was a period of “telegraphic speech” (Brown 1973; viz. an early form of sentence use consisting of only a few essential words; see Papalia et al. 2007, Cejtlin 2009). Telegraphic speech is a common phenomenon and is known across different languages (see Lust 2006). It is also called “pivot grammar” by some researchers.

Julia started actively using two-word combinations in her speech at the age of 1;7: Den-дай! Ee! (‘That one! (Sw) give me (Rus)! Her! (feminine)’ while stretching her hand) (sc. give me the sunflower seeds). The phrase was said to the mother when the child saw her eating sunflower seeds. After a few more seconds the same request was made with the help of Дайа дайа дайа! (‘give give give!’). The child started to apply every means available to her in communication in order to get what she wanted and to express what she wanted. She cried angrily neja godasaka! (here: Sw: riskakor) ‘rice cookies’ when I tried to take them away from the table.

Other documented two-word utterances in Julia’s speech at the age of 1;7 were:

раппa комма (when she saw that her father came into the kitchen) ‘papa come’

Думma папpa (when asked: är pappa dum?) ’stupid dad’

Mamma, titta, mamma! (when she saw a video camera) ‘mom, look, mom!’,

which meant ‘mom, I want to look at the film with you.’

At 1;7 two-word utterances were still rare and few, by 1;8, only a month later, the child had started to use them all the time: A gunga? ‘Shall we swing’?; Поди пать! (иди спать ‘go to bed’); two words in the imperative, Открыть! (‘open,’ sometimes just кить) when she wanted to open a box of matches. However, Victoria refused to do it and Julia protested: Neej! (‘No’); Иди, мама! (‘go away, mom!’); Titta! Носик! (‘Look! Nose!’); Titta! Kolla! Bomb! (‘Look! Check it out! (Sw) Here (Rus); Молоко нету! (pointing at the milk package, which was empty).

It is interesting to note that, while the first phrase was addressed to the mother, the second one was meant for the child herself; she was just thinking aloud. When the mother heard it, she repeated after Julia both in Swedish

125 Said to her mother
126 All three forms are used just to be on the safe side.
127 The child does not distinguish between NOM and GEN yet.
128 The child started looking at the package and said to herself: бо-та ’all gone’ (1;8).
and Russian: Borta! Hemy! (‘Gone!’ Sw; ‘Gone’ Rus). However, the first two-word utterances with negation came several weeks after the affirmative ones. The early multi-word sentences produced by the child during this period deviated from adult speech heard in the input. Julia’s first negative sentences consisting of more than one word appeared at the age of 1;8 and showed clause-internal negation:

(46) 1;8

COM: Julia is sitting and painting in her book.
SUS: Dansa? (asking Julia whether she wanted to dance)
JUL: Nej dansa!
‘No dance!’

The first sentential negation is marked by putting a negative element (a general negator nej used at that time, outside the nuclear utterance: dansa; NEG [dansa]). In this way, the child marks that she does not want to dance but would rather sit and paint in her book. Before that stage, Julia would always pronounce nej (‘no’) on its own in one-word utterances. In this sentence Julia’s nej dansa is not a repetition of Susie’s question and is definitely a self-standing utterance created by the child in order to negate a proposition: ‘I do not want to dance.’ After that, the child used them all the time.

Julia’s first three-word utterances in Russian appeared approximately at the same time, at the age of twenty months: мама! Мар би (комара убей) ‘Mom, kill the mosquito!’ It was followed by another: Мама! Я сю (хочу) nuno! (‘Mom, I want to drink’) – the first examples of combining a subject and a predicate, which paves the way for the first syntax. Leopold (1954) reported that this structure occurred about the same time for his daughter Hildegard. However, not all of the earliest three-word combinations were comprehensible:

(47) 1;8

DAD: Var är ögonen?
‘Where are your eyes?’
JUL: Nä! (does not want to show)
DAD: Var är näsan?
‘Where is your nose?’
JUL: Inte nä…
‘Not no…’
DAD: Inte näsan?
‘Not your nose?’
JUL: titta…o ram (wants to look at something else)
‘Look!’ (Sw)… ‘there’ (Rus)
COM: speaking both languages to her dad
DAD: Näsan
‘Your nose’
COM: marking the desired word
At around 1;10 the child not only learned to produce multi-word utterances but also to pronounce more difficult words like *kadetti* (‘spagetti’); *so no* (спокойной ночи – ‘goodnight’), *gotiki* (колготки) ‘tights’ etc. As is also noted in monolingual acquisition, after the word spurt the child usually stops paying attention to phonological difficulty and pronounces all the words she wants to pronounce (cf. Eliseeva 2008). By 1;10, more and more word combinations containing three words, both in Russian and Swedish, started to appear, and most were very easy to understand: *där är lampa* ‘there is lamp’; *du är dumma* ‘you are stupid’ etc. However, there were no self-constructed morphological markers yet, and Julia used her earliest nouns and verbs without distinguishing number, gender, person, tense or aspect. By 1;10 Julia also started using copula constructions: *Jag är klar*. ‘I am ready’. Only a month later, the copula was found in her negative utterances (also with the function of disappearance): *Tomten är borta!*129 ‘Santa Clause is gone!’ (1;11). The child tried to use Russian and Swedish words in separated contexts (at least when possible, i.e. when she knew the Russian alternative130):

(48) 1;10
MOM: Будем писать?
   ‘Shall we pee?’
JUL: Нэ, нэ будэ будэ! (не будем, не будем).
   ‘No, will not, will not!’

(49) 1;11
MOM: Нету водички?
   ‘There is no water?’
JUL: Нэ
   ‘No’

However, after just a few months in a monolingual Swedish daycare center, Swedish started to replace Russian, and Julia’s responses in Swedish, even with her mother, became much less frequent. Nor were Russian alternatives very accessible: *Nej sörder!* ‘Not destroy!’ (sc. ‘Do not cut my painting!’) (1;11). By this time the child was old enough that she was not satisfied simp-

---

129 Also in the function of nonexistence.
130 That was, however, the case only with familiar people. At the age of 1;7, when guests spoke Russian to her, Julia would often answer in Swedish and vice versa.
ly repeating the utterance after her parent. She wanted to perform more difficult tasks, like translating the phrase into another language. By 1;10 Julia also created an increasing number of unique sentences on her own, trying to explain what is happening:

(50) 1;10

COM: The whole family including her Swedish grandmother Mia and aunt Linda are sitting in the kitchen eating dinner.
MIA: Vad gjorde du nu då?
   ‘What did you do right now?’
JUL: ram…
MIA: Tappar du?
   ‘Do [sc. did] you drop [something]?’
MOM: “Ramla” säger hon. Det är inte ramla! Kasta heter det!
   ‘Fall she says. That is not fall! Throw is the right word!’
MIA: Jag tyckte det såg ut som om du höll på att fladdra med det…
   I thought it looked like you kept waving it …’
JUL: Nej du!
   ‘No, you!’
MOM: Så sitter hon och kastar allting på golvet och så säger hon “ramla”!
   ‘So, she is sitting and throwing everything on the floor, then saying fall!’
LINDA: Som Vi ca… hon sa “borta” i stället! Kastar hon tallriken och säger “borta”!
   ‘Just like Vica ... she said all gone instead! When she throws a plate, she says gone!’
MIA: Vad är det som har ramlat där?
   ‘What fell down there?’
JUL: Ramla! Lamla!
   ‘Fall! Lall!’
MIA: Ja… va ä de som har ramlat?
   ‘Yes … what has fallen down?’
JUL: Lamla!
MIA: Är det kött? Kan du säga “kött”?
   ‘Is this meat? Can you say meat?’
JUL: Ramla kött!
   ‘Fall meat!’
MIA: Ja. Ramla kött. Hoppar det ur tallriken?
   ‘Yes. Fall meat. Does it jump from your plate?’
JUL: Ja!
   ‘Yes!’
MIA: Nej! Jag tror du ljuger!
   ‘No! I think you’re lying!’
VIC: Hon ljuger alltid!
   ‘She’s always lying!’
The word order here is V–S instead of S–V. It is also interesting to note that this word order is supported by the Swedish grandmother, Mia, who repeats the “wrong utterance” after the child. Even though the child was speaking Swedish, she preferred the pattern verb–subject (or verb–object, if we understand the utterance as Jag tappade köttet ‘I dropped the meat’).

This syntactic pattern was fairly common both in Julia’s Swedish and Russian at the age of 1;10. By the age of two, Julia already used many phrases consisting of three words in Swedish with varying word order (since some phrases were chunks, not analyzed by the child into separate parts): vill inte kyckling (‘do not want chicken’); Julia vill inte (‘Julia does not want’); inte hjälpa dig (‘not help you’); vill inte mamma kaka ‘want not mom cookie’.

Before the age of two, nominal and verbal inflexions were basically absent in Julia’s Swedish speech. The child was thus putting words together without using any inflexions. A similar tendency was noted in Russian as well: нет гулять (‘no go out’); нет спать (‘no sleep’);\(^{131}\) He bok! ‘no (Sw) [a special] book! (Sw)’ (sc. ‘this is not the book I meant/wanted’ (2;0). Russian functional words and Swedish nouns are used. Perhaps the word bok ‘book’ was treated by the child as part of her Russian vocabulary since during the earliest stages she only used that word and not the Russian книга (even though she understood it very well and could go and bring the book when asked to do so in Russian).\(^{132}\)

It is interesting to note the word order in the Swedish phrases inte pusa (‘not kiss’) and inte hjälpa dig (‘not help you’) since the negative element in Swedish is usually used after the verb. Still, this word order should not be seen as interference from Russian, where that word order would be used. This word order is accepted in Swedish CDS, and many parents would put the negative element inte first in addressing their children: inte röra bordet! (‘do not touch the table’), inte göra så! (‘don’t do that’).\(^{133}\)

However, in Swedish, negation is post-verbal, and the verb is used in the imperative: gå inte (go[INF] NEG; vs. English do not go)! In declaratives/main clauses, the placement of negation is the same: jag går inte hem (I go[PRES] NEG ADV ‘I do not go home’), where the negative element is placed after the finite verb. However, there is a special type of negation which is only used in motherese, where prohibitives are expressed with pre-verbal negation and the infinitive of the verb (see Dooley & Håkansson 2005).

\(\text{\footnotesize \(\text{\(\text{131}\) Ženja Gvozdev also used to say }\text{Нет корми} \text{‘no feed’}[\text{Gvozdev 2005}].\)}}\)

\(\text{\footnotesize \(\text{\(\text{132}\) However, after the age of two, Julia’s Swedish contained an increasing number of nominal and verb inflexions: Jag mår illa (2;0) ‘I feel bad’, Vica ramlat (2;2) ‘Vika fell down’, Julia druckt färdigt vatten (2;3) ‘Julia drunk up all the water’; hämta boken (2;0) ‘fetch the book’; inte leka fonen (2;1) ‘do not play with the telephone’; telefonen, telefonen! Mamma, spring (2;2) ‘telephone, telephone! Mom, run’. Prepositions were absent in Julia’s Swedish speech at the age of two: kissa pottan ‘pee [into the] pot’ (2;0).\)}}\)

\(\text{\footnotesize \(\text{\(\text{133}\) Normal Swedish constructions with the imperative would be the following: rör inte bordet (не трогай стол)! ‘don’t touch the table’; gör inte så (не делай так)! ‘don’t do that’!}\)}}\)
(51)  
2;3  
DAD: Inte röra  
‘NEG touch–NonFIN’  
JUL: Inte röra  
‘Do not touch’

Julia’s father places the negation pre-verbally and then uses the verb in the infinitive form of the verb. Julia mirrors his production: inte röra ‘do not touch’; inte sova ‘do not sleep’; inte öppna väskan ‘do not open the bag’; inte öppna burken ‘do not open the box’ etc. The same pattern was found in Swedish children (see the Strömqvist corpus in CHILDES, Plunkett & Strömqvist 1990), where their informant, Markus, used the same verb in the infinitive and placed the negation pre-verbally. Dooley & Håkansson (1999) argued that structural differences between prohibitives and negative declaratives can account for the relatively late acquisition of the syntax of negation in child’s speech, and since prohibitives dominate in speech directed at small children, they should be taken into consideration when investigating the linguistic surroundings of the language learners (ibid.).

Many phrases are learned as a whole and are not separated at this stage, for instance the Swedish phrase vill inte; thus phrases such as vill inte mamma kaka (‘want not mom cookie’) are considered normal for this developmental stage (viz. two years). Modals and auxiliaries with adjacent negation are treated as unanalyzed negative modals by the child during this period of linguistic development (for a further discussion, see Bellugi 1967, Leopold 1949), and negation at this period can be referred to as sentence-external.

(52)  
2;0  
MOM: Юля, пойдём гулять?  
‘Let’s go out.’  
JUL: Нет гулять  
‘No go out!’

In the example above, the child may simply treat нет ‘no’ as the equivalent of the particle “ne”.

The example below shows that Julia’s syntactic development is ahead of her morphological development. She is clearly able to use a phrase that consists of several words; at the same time, the case marking is absent (which is a clear difference from monolingual Russian children): Мама, Юля нету! (= у Юли нету) (2;1).\footnote{\textsuperscript{134} NOM + нету (= ‘Julia’s chips are gone’)}
A new stage in Julia’s linguistic behavior began when the child started constructing her own sentences and the Swedish word inte became the general negator, taking over the meanings that previously were expressed by other means: inte мама на лекции ‘there is no mommy at the seminar’ (2;4); inte есть Юлину грушу ‘don’t eat Julia’s pear’ (2;4). The negative element inte (‘not, don’t’) in the last sentence is still placed outside the nuclear utterance есть Юлину грушу (‘eat Julia’s pear’), even though at the age of 2;4 the child increasingly used constructions with inte (‘not’) in the middle of the sentence.

The following examples show once again that the telegraphic speech that often goes unnoticed in the speech of many monolingual Russian children (and is not even present in the speech of some, for instance Lisa E.135) is used over an extended period in Julia’s case. Julia seems to have difficulties with the acquisition of inflectional morphology in particular, since morphological marking is really delayed, especially compared to her development of syntax, which is in line with monolingual acquisition: ручка inte мокрый136 ‘pencil no wet’ (2;4); Мама нет очки.137 Сюзи нет очки. Бабушка очки! ‘Mom no glasses. Susie no glasses. Grandmother glasses’ (2;3). In ручка inte мокрый ‘pencil no wet’ the child moves the negation marker from the beginning of the sentence to the middle, which is also an important step in language construction. However, Julia still uses the nominative case instead of the genitive after negation. In phrases the child heard often, the correct case was used: мама, нету почты! ‘Mom, no mail’ (2;3).

6.4. Morphological period: from frozen forms to linguistic innovations

From 1;10 to 2;1 the child enters a new developmental period – that of comprehending morphology as a system (see Gagarina 2008). At the age of around two years, most Russian children are capable of constructing forms with the correct case and number, and many of these forms are used with corresponding prepositions or fillers (Cejtlin 2000). However, this was not for monolingual acquisition and may be different in bilingual settings. Gvozdev’s son Žen¬ja started to comprehend the Dative at the age of 1;8 – 1;9 (Gvozdev 2005) and was using morphological forms productively. By the age of three, children are very proficient in constructing morphological forms on their own with the help of information they get from input (Cejtlin 2009, Gagarina 2008). But not all researchers share this view. According to Tomasello (2001), children are able to use abstract morphological rules not

135 Lisa Eliseeva.
136 This is more a problem of gender agreement, though.
137 The Genitive of negation has not been acquired yet.
earlier than around the age of three; before that they learn language units by imitative learning. This might depend heavily on the morphological complexity of the respective language.

De Houwer (2009), presenting the milestones for BFLA children’s early language development, suggested, in line with Tomasello, that the child should be able to produce short sentences with at least some bound morphemes or closed class grammatical words only at the age of thirty to thirty-six months (which corresponds to the child’s third birthday). On the day of Julia’s third birthday, she easily conversed with her younger friends in Swedish:

\[
\text{Jag fyller tre år i dag!} \quad \text{‘I turn three today’;} \quad \text{Inte du!} \quad \text{‘Not you’;} \quad \text{Du är bara två!} \quad \text{‘You are just two!’;} \quad \text{Jag vill också tända ljuset} \quad \text{‘I also want to light the candle’;} \quad \text{Jag måste ju också få tända, inte bara du!} \quad \text{‘I also need to light it, not just you!’;} \quad \text{Vänta, vi ska dela på den här!} \quad \text{‘Wait, we shall share it’;} \quad \text{Inte dessa!} \quad \text{‘Not these’;} \quad \text{Kan jag också få den gröna?} \quad \text{‘Can I also get the green one?’;} \quad \text{Det räcker inte här!} \quad \text{‘It is not enough here’;} \quad \text{Jag vill också ha meringu} \text{ë} \text{r!} \quad \text{‘I also want meringues’;} \quad \text{Oh, jag har ont i min rygg!} \quad \text{‘Oh, my back hurts’;} \quad \text{Jag kan också hjälpa till} \quad \text{‘I can help as well’.}
\]

When the question of schooling arose, she was also compared to the children in her age group as well as older ones in order to determine whether she should go to the preparatory class or to first grade. There are thus certain acceptable ranges within which certain things should happen in normal language development, and a range of accepted clinical milestones is usually used for speech therapy and for comparisons between individual children. The identification of linguistic milestones in child development is clearly a controversial issue since children develop individually. But in everyday life it is simply impossible to avoid reflections about child language and the age norm. Many parents are interested in looking at such milestones to see how well their child is developing and whether he/she is lagging behind. Especially parents of bilingual children are interested in the norm ranges (see Madden 2009) since they are often afraid that their child could lag behind because of his/her bilingualism (the belief that bilingualism can harm overall development is still widespread among parents). What is often missing is the milestones of normal bilingual development. De Houwer (2009) presents such milestones in her book *Bilingual First Language Acquisition*:

\[\text{For a further discussion, see Madden (2008) and Arnberg (1984).}\]
Milestones in BFLA children’s early language development

*Adapted from De Houwer (2009:37)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When? (roughly)</th>
<th>What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months of age</td>
<td>Babbling in syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 12 months</td>
<td>Comprehension of many words and phrases in each of the two languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soon after 12 months</td>
<td>Production of what sounds like single words in one or two languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 months</td>
<td>Noticeable increase in the number of different words produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around 24 months</td>
<td>Production of combinations of two words in one breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 36 months</td>
<td>Production of short sentences with at least some bound morphemes and/or closed class grammatical words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around 42 months</td>
<td>The child is mostly understandable to unfamiliar adults who speak the same language(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around 48 months</td>
<td>Production of complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 to 60 months</td>
<td>Ability to tell a coherent story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A key to some indications:**

- 12 months – age 1, start of the second year of life
- 24 months – second birthday, age 2, start of the 3rd year of life
- 36 months – third birthday, age 3, start of the 4th year of life
- 48 months – fourth birthday, age 4, start of the 5th year of life
- 60 months – fifth birthday, start of the 6th year of life

However, this table does not indicate that languages interact with each other and that at some point of language development forms that have resulted as a consequence of language contact are possible. These milestones are obviously subject to individual variation and depend on the child’s development. Just as De Houwer indicates, at around 17–20 months there was a noticeable increase in the number of words used by Julia (so-called vocabulary spurt, which is also common in monolingual children). However, not only did she produce words that were either Russian or Swedish, but from approximately December 2005 (when she was around two years old) she started using forms that she seemed to create on her own by using both languages simultaneously: *бolluk* (*бoll: мяч+ук* 'ball'), *бижкэ* (*пчёлкэ* 'bee'), *зубборсте* (*зубная щётка* ‘toothbrush’), *To ээ ош* (*Вика+s+телефон* ‘it is Vica’s phone’). Even though by this time the child was aware of the two languages in her surroundings, this does not mean that her two developing linguistic systems did not interact (see the discussion in

---

139 Only a few examples with derivational morphemes are presented here.
Russian children also exhibit a “morphology spurt” (see Gagarina 2009). Perhaps, Julia’s morphology spurt was manifested in constructing these kinds of mixed forms.

When Julia was two years old, her parents often heard it said that she spoke very well for her age. That was in Swedish. As far as her Russian is concerned, at that age (1;11 – 2,0) it was almost impossible to find entirely Russian material in her data (both in videos and the diary). She spoke only Swedish even when she talked to me.

The age from about 2;1 to 2;6 was a very interesting period in Julia’s development, both in physical and linguistic respects. In her physical development this was a period of independence, and the child wanted to do everything on her own: eat, drink, dress. As soon as someone tried to help her, she cried: Släpp! Сама! ‘Let go (Sw)! Myself (Rus)’. Julia even wanted to swim in the lake on her own (which was naturally very dangerous since she just went deeper and deeper into the water; when someone wanted to help her, she cried her mantra Släpp! Сама!, almost disappearing under the waves). Julia also wanted to brush her teeth on her own. However, when she saw that her parents were helping her older sister as well, she accepted their help.

With respect to her linguistic development, that was the period when the child tried to understand the difference between the words that were used in her surroundings as synonyms: a note in the diary from 2;1 indicates that Julia was desperately trying to understand the difference between попугайчик (‘parrot’) and птичка (‘bird’), both of which referred to the family pet, Sasha. The child was also very sensitive to language use patterns and wanted adults in her environment to be consistent. This was also a period of great linguistic productivity, and many phrases were created using two languages at the same time: птичка упре ‘bird up’ (2;2); ta bort сумка мамина! ‘take away bag mommy/mother’s bag (2;3) etc. Her speech at the time contained a lot of prefabs and ready-made phrases that she actively used (sometimes with certain modification): Тихий ужас и шакмар (кошмар) ‘How terrible! How horrible (horrible)!’ (2;3).

At the age of around thirty months, the child eagerly produced sentences with at least some bound morphemes and/or closed class grammatical words. By then Julia seemed to be even more productive than before when she created her own forms, which often consisted of elements from both languages. Predicate holes and a desire to avoid verbs were still a marker of her Russian: Юля кофе. Юля на bordet koфе ‘Julia coffee. Julia on the table

---

140 This phenomenon is called a recast and is extremely common in monolingual children as well.
141 The word coffee is a controversial one because it is an international word with similar pronunciation in many languages. However, by the time Julia was 2;5, her phonological systems were distinct and one could clearly hear which language the child was speaking. The soft Russian кофе could not be confused with the Swedish accented kaffe.
coffee’ (drinking) (2;5). Julia created her own morphological forms in Russian as well: нету головку (не голову!) ‘not head’ (2;5); саранча нету ножка (у саранчи нету ножки) Я должна была забыть это! ‘the locust no leg. I must forget it’ (I must have forgotten it) (2;6); я болею там животике ‘I sick there stomach’ (2;5); Камара плохая ‘mosquito bad’ (2;6); Я купальник буду купаться ‘I swimming suit will swim’ (2;6) etc.

Such forms as нету груша ‘no pear’ (NOM), for instance, are also present in monolingual Russian children, but at much earlier stages:

(53) 2;2
JUL: Мама, дай грушу! ‘Mom, give me a pear’ (ACC)
MOM: Юля уже съела грушу? ‘Has Julia already eaten her pear?’
JUL: Да. Вкусная груша. Нету грушу. (NOM) ‘Yes, good pear. No pear.’ (NOM instead of GEN after negation)
MOM: Нету груши, да? ‘No pear (GEN), right?’
JUL: Нету…. ‘No’

And in Swedish:

(54) 2;4
DAD: Vad gör pappa? ‘What is dad doing?’
JUL: Åker bilen (definite form of the noun: bil + en) ‘Goes [by] the car’
   (the correct expression would have had the use of an indefinite form åker bil ‘goes by car’)

(55) 2;1
Pappa hem med bilen (observe the presence of a preposition) ‘Dad came home with a car’ (2;1);

(56) 2;1
Jag pratar med mamma. ‘I am talking to my mom.’ (2;1).

(57) 2;4
DAD: Vad gör mormor? ‘What is grandmother doing?’
JUL: Blandar! ‘Mixing!’

The correct form blandar is used here: 3pers.sg.present tense [actually, the same for all persons]. The use of NOM instead of GEN after NEG is a typi-

---

142 This does not mean that the child avoided all the verbs, however.
cal mistake both in Julia’s speech and in the speech of Russian monolingual children. However, while this innovation disappears rather early in monolingual children, in Julia’s speech this form was frequent long after the age of five. Yet, approximately at 4;3 the child understood that something had to be done and that the use of NOM after NEG in Russian is not quite correct; she started using an even more un-Russian-like construction, не есть (’there is no’) instead of нет (’no’) (which, in my opinion, was the calque of Swedish har inte in Russian). After не есть (’there is no’), the use of NOM seemed more legitimate to the child: У меня не есть мед (’I do not have honey’); У тебя не есть чай (’you do not have tea’) etc. From the child’s point of view, it was rather logical since the original construction (without negation) is formed by placing a noun after есть: У меня есть мед (’I have honey’); У тебя есть чай (’You have tea’).

In the example below, the child adds a negative element by placing it outside the whole utterance. Thus, one can really say that she tries to create an utterance ‘another way round’ (Cejtlin 2000).

(58) 3;4
MOM: Дай мне мыльные пузырики
’Give me soap bubbles’
JUL: Не есть пузырики
’No is bubbles’ (I do not have soap bubbles here; do not know where they are)

The transformation of making the affirmative construction into a negative one is indeed very logical. These constructions differ only with respect to the presence/absence of the negator. In Standard Russian, on the other hand, they would also differ by changing the predicative type of the sentence: the construction turns into an impersonal one, which is obviously not logical and thus difficult to acquire. However, it is rather natural for Russian speakers, and impersonal constructions such as Мне больно ‘I have a pain’; Тут жарко ‘It is warm here’ and У меня не было времени ‘I did not have time’ are very frequent in Russian.144 Before impersonal constructions were finally acquired at the age of 8;7 the calques of Swedish constructions were used.

143 It should be noted that the form нет (’no’) historically emerges from не есть (’not exist’) and it is sometimes still used by Russian speakers in order to relieve something said before, for instance: Это не есть хорошо ‘it is not good’.

144 Calques of Swedish constructions were used very frequently in Julia’s speech for a long time since Swedish became the dominant language, and unidirectional calquing is clear evidence of language dominance. Calques had not disappeared from Julia’s speech even at the age of seven:
MOM: Юля, нельзя так много есть!
’Julia, it is not good to eat so much!’
JUL: Я могу есть сколько я хочу. Я все равно не иду на витк
’I may eat as much as I want. I don’t put on weight anyway’ (7;10)
By the age of 2;6 other elements of negation appeared in Julia’s speech: (нельзя маме в пижаме ‘not allowed mom in pajamas’), which was said by the child when her mother sat down at the table in pajamas and wanted to eat breakfast). The words нет and нету slowly lost their function of general negator in Julia’s speech and started to be used in their main function: the function of non-existence: у меня нету пластырь ‘I have no bandage’ (2;6); Сюзи уроки, я нет уроки. Юли нет уроки ‘Susie lessons. I no lessons. Julia no lessons’. GEN is used in the function of a subject146 (2;6).

Negators such as нельзя (‘not allowed’) and нет (‘no’) as synonyms for нету (‘there is no’), никогда (‘never’) appeared when Julia was in Crimea after just a few weeks there. The child would often try all the words available to her at the moment. The words нельзя and нету were used interchangeably for a while (as was the case with many other synonymous words, until the child learned the difference between them). It is rather obvious that the abundant input had a clear impact on the development of her early grammar. Had Julia stayed in Crimea for another couple of months, she would have mastered the basics of Russian grammar and developed a full native command of it. Her progress in Russian language development observed during summer trips indicates that the child needed to be exposed to much more Russian input than she was exposed to in Sweden: Вике нету трогать эту. Сюзи нельзя трогать. Бабушка трогать. ‘Vica no touch it. Susie not allowed to touch. Grandmother touch.’ (2,6); Эту нет горячая, мама! Кормить! ‘This not hot. Feed!’ (sc. ‘The food is not hot anymore! Feed me!’) (2,6). нету Юле больно (= Юле не больно; ‘Julia does not have pain’; 2;5). It seems that the child knows the word order is wrong but cannot do anything to correct the situation (like in the example below, about gluing stickers and not being able to do it). Julia sometimes tried to translate the Swedish word inte into Russian. However, her Russian translation was not accurate since she used нету instead of не when translating inte:

(59) 2;5
JUL: Snigel inte dum!
   ['The] snail [is] not stupid!
(And then translating to her mother:)
Snigel нету плохой
   ['The] snail (Sw) not bad’

Нету was also used frequently instead of the conditional conjunction чтобы не (‘in order not to’) and in imperatives: Это комары нету куса-

145 Note the emergence of prepositions in the child’s speech, which marks a new period.
146 One can of course argue that perhaps it is simply the preposition у that is dropped here (cf. у + ju-liii); however, this form was very frequent in Julia’s data.
‘This mosquitoes not to bite?’ ([sic] ‘Is this is for mosquitoes not to bite?’) (2,6). However, нету remained Julia’s preferred way of expressing negation in Russian: Мама, нету стай! (не читай). ‘Mom, do not eed!’ (sc. ‘read’) 2;7. Я нету ходила босиком! ’I no went barefeet!’ (2;6); Я нету плохан. ‘I no bad’ (2;6). The pronoun I was still used in the nominative instead of the dative case: я нету больно там ‘I no pain there’. When corrected, Julia refused to say не instead of нету:

By the end of the summer Julia also understood this form and occasionally started to use it on her own: Не ешь, Вика... Нету ешь! ‘Do not eat, Vica! No eat!’ (2;7). Self-corrections also became increasingly common in Julia’s speech when she was exposed to Russian input only. The example below shows how telegraphic speech changes right in the child’s own utterance: Я нету пить кофе. Я пи… пью чай. 148 ‘I no drink coffee. I der… drink tea!’ (2;7). However, since the child returned to Sweden shortly after that, she never had enough time to practice the form and hear it in her input to understand the contrast between нету and не. At the age of three, Julia was still using нету: Я нету маленькая! (‘I no little!’). Only in prefabs like не хочу (‘do not want’) was the correct particle used: Не хочу музыка! ‘Do not want music (NOM)’ (3;0). Нету was also used in the imperative: Нету слäcka! ‘No switch off!’ (3;1).

It is important to note that a pronominal construction, у меня ‘by me’, which contains a preposition, appears before the construction PREP + NOUN. Thus, we should talk not only about the acquisition of a case as such, but about the case in a particular function. By already being able to use GEN in the function of a subject (Юли ‘Julia’ in the sentence Юли нет уроки ‘Julia no lessons’), the child does not put the word уроки ‘lessons’ in GEN. This is a structural function of the case and not a semantic one. However, it is interesting to note that such constructions are acquired later in monolingual Russian children as well (cf. Cejtlin 2009).

By 2;6 the child made progress in acquiring GENNEG (after having spent the summer in Crimea), and both forms were used in her speech: Я нету уро-

147 Julia asked this when she saw me putting body lotion on. In Crimea, Julia was used to people often applying something to their bodies so mosquitoes will not bite them.

148 Self-correction. See chapter 8 for more on self-corrections.
‘I no homework’; Сюзи уроки ‘Susie homework’; Юли нет уроки ‘Julia no homework’ (2;6); Нет муха ‘No fly (NOM)’; (2;6). In Нет сту- ли ‘No chair’ (2;6), the child is trying to create something different from NOM (Is this an attempt to use genitive of negation? It could, however, also be a non-target-like NOM plural). It is also worth noting that during her summer visits to Crimea, where the child spoke only Russian, Swedish inte was basically gone from Julia’s production and had been replaced by the Russian нету and нет, which became the general negator and corresponded to the Russian particle не. The construction нет горячий ‘no hot’ in the example below is impossible in monolingual Russian acquisition, and there were very few cases of her using нет instead of не:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(61)</th>
<th>2;6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUL: Это нет горячий, мама? ‘It is no warm, mom?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOM: Нет ‘No’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL: Это тоже нет горячий? ‘It is also no warm, mom?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Нету was still often placed outside the proposition: Нету Юли больно! ‘No Julia pain!’ (2,5); Мама, нету купальник мокрый! ‘Mom, the swimming suit no wet!’ (2,5); Вика нету спит ‘Vica no sleep’ (2,5); Мама, нету Дружок! (NOM) ‘Mom, no Druzok’ (name of a dog) (2,5); Бабушка, нету ножка! (NOM) ‘Granny, no leg!’ (2,5); Я нету писала в штанами! ‘I no pee in my pants’ (2,5); Я нету гладить Дружку! (Я не гладжу Дружка ‘I no pet Druzok’ (the dog) /Wrong case formation (ACC) (2,5); У меня нету пластырь (NOM) ‘By me no bandage’ (2,5). Little by little (by July 2006), after one month in Crimea, the child started to replace нету with нет (which is found in monolingual Russian children): Нету муха (NOM) ‘No fly’ (2,6); Я нет убить бабочку151 ‘I not kill butterfly’ (I do not want to kill a butterfly or I will not kill a butterfly) (2,6).

Нет and не are used interchangeably in many phrases. Even the phrase не надо (‘don’t’) appears and is sometimes replaced by нету (in the sense of не): нету писать маму (не надо писать на маму!)152 ‘no pee mom’ (sc.

---

149 This phrase is impossible for a monolingual Russian child, who acquires impersonal constructions with relative ease.
150 This phrase, on the other hand, is quite possible since the preposition always appears after case marking.
151 When Julia found out that she spoke this way when she was little, she was very surprised and said: Неужели я могла так плохо говорить? Хм… Сейчас бы я так никогда не сказала ‘Could I really speak this bad? Hm… Now I would never say anything like this’ (Julia 7;5). As we see, at the age of 7;5 Julia was perfectly capable of producing complex phrases like this.
152 Said about a kitten that was sitting on the mother’s knee.
‘don’t pee on mom!’; absence of any preposition) (2;6). However, *inte* (corresponding to Russian *не*) was not totally gone and was still used before adverbs:

(62) 2;6
MOM: Юленька, поехали к врачу
‘Julia, let’s go to the doctor’
JUL: Inte nu, mamma! Inte щас
‘Not now (Sw), mom; not now (Rus)’

The phrase *Inte щас*153 ‘not (Sw) now (Rus)’ is definitely the child’s own innovation and could not be heard in the input. With time *inte* disappeared completely, and the child tried to construct phrases using only one language:

(63) 2;9
MOM: Юля, иди буди Сюзи!
‘Julia, go wake up Susie!’
JUL: Мама, Сюзи не вставается! (innovation)
‘Mom, Susie [is] not upppotten (sc. will not go up)’!

At around 2;5 Julia also discovered word order and played with the pragmatic effect achieved by changing it: *mamma inte дома; inte mamma дома; nej, mamma inte hemma!* (‘mom is not at home’); *bajsade bebis* (VS) (the correct word order in Swedish would be: ‘[the] baby pooped’ (SV); *Сюзи любят... любят Сюзи* (when she heard her mother’s phrase *все любят Сюзи* ‘everyone loves Susie’). *Inte* becomes a general negator at this stage, making all the other ways of expressing negation peripheral: *mamma, inte pyjamas åka dit* (мама, не в пижаме ехать туда = не едь туда в пижаме; Eng: *mom, don’t go there in pyjamas!* (2;5).154 (compare: *не* + verb in Russian). *Jag också vill inte*155 ‘I also do not want’ (said in a Russian context).

When speaking Russian, Julia seemed to translate the Swedish *inte* (‘not’) and use it in Russian utterances, where this word became the general negator. The child – like before – usually placed it outside the affirmative utterance: *Нету Юли больно* ‘no Julia pain’ (2;5); *мама, нету купальник мокрый* ‘Mom, no swimming suit wet – mom, the swimming suit is not wet anymore’; я *нету писала в штаны* ‘I no pee in my pants’ (2;6).156 There

153 Сейчас ‘now’.

154 Perhaps the main reason here is due to the difficulty of performing a sentence, what Chomsky has called “performance” (and not competence).

155 The child has not acquired the correct idiomatic Swedish expression yet, which is *heller inte*, which means that *också* has to be replaced by *heller* when negated (‘not either’).

156 In monolingual Russian children’s speech, the negator is usually placed either at the beginning or end of the sentence (but only at the one- or sometimes two-word stage). The main characteristic feature of Julia’s linguistic development is the disproportion in the development
were, of course, some exceptions: *Buka nemy суm* (‘Vica not sleep’). They increasingly became a pattern as the child grew older: *Kucu nemy följa mig!* ‘Cat no follow me!’ (2;9). (The phrase was said when she wanted the cat to follow her for a walk, but it refused). *Tam nemy batterier* ‘No (Rus) batteries (Sw)’ (2;9). *Hemy* was naturally also used in its original sense ‘there is no’: *Hemy nagellack* ‘No (Rus) nail polish (Sw)’ (2;9). *Vi ska gå upp och åka pulka på snö där uppe. Tym nemy snö!* ‘We can go up there and go by sledge on the snow up there! There is no snow here!’ (2;11).

6.5. Conclusion

The first case of understanding negation was noted at the age of seven months. In producing negation, Julia’s main means of expression during the pre-verbal stage were (a) gestures, (b) mimics and accompanying vocalizations: shaking her head, pointing with finger, palms, turning her head away etc. In her non-verbal gestural language, there were common semantic means of expression for both languages. During the first stages of the verbal period, the child seemed to have a common proto-language with non-language-specific proto-words from both languages to express the functions of impossibility, irritation, discomfort, prohibition etc. The first case of producing negation in Julia’s proto-language was at the age of nine months, when the child reacted for the first time to her mother’s absence (non-existence). At the age of 1;3, Julia said the word *nä* for the first time in the function of refusal. However, while non-existence was expressed by the Swedish word *borta* ‘all gone’, refusal and denial were rendered by the more “neutral” lexical item *nä*.

Thus, during the entire pre-morphological period (1;3–1;8), Julia tended to use a single common negator in both languages in the function of rejection and denial: *nä*, since this term is understandable in both languages and thus satisfies the communicative needs of the child at that stage of development. There were even some “synonyms” that were noticed at the same time when the child did not want to do something: *nì, nà* (equivalents to the English word *no*). When Julia really did not want to do or have something, she would lengthen the vowel and say *niiii* or *nääääää*. In the function of non-existence, only the word *borta* ‘all gone’ was used both in Swedish and Russian contexts (however, only until the Russian word *nemy* appeared several months later). When something did not taste good, the child said *blä*. The word *nej* was used as an answer to a question, and, most often, to reject a proposition. *Nej* was also used with visitors who came to see the family, Swedish relatives and even with the mother. *Naja* (1;7) was a light form of

of different components in her language system. However, here the negation is not outside the core utterance.
rejection, when the child knew that someone was playing with her. The Russian phrases ни как 'does not go', не могу ‘cannot’ were often used interchangeably in Julia’s speech, where the meaning of не могу was broader than in its original sense (which persisted for several years), while the word ни как was mostly used in its literal sense. At the end of the pre-morphological period, the child became aware of the presence of two different linguistic varieties in her surroundings (two variants of her mother tongue, if you will), where one had to be used in kindergarten and with Swedish relatives and the other with her mother and Russian grandmother.

At the age of around two years, Julia started using forms that seemed to be created on her own by using both languages simultaneously: бollик (бoll: мяч boll+ик ‘ball’), биски (пчёлки ‘bee’), зубборст (зубная щётка: ‘toothbrush’), Вика с fon (Вика+s+теле fon: ‘it is Vica’s phone’) etc. Whereas before the child was two, she placed negation outside the nuclear utterance and did not analyze chunks (вил intе мамма kaka ‘mom does not want a cake’), at around 2;3 she started moving NEG from the beginning to the middle of the sentence: мама нет очки ‘mom no glasses’. By the age of three, Julia still used нету (‘no’) as a general negator in Russian: я нету маленька ‘I no little’; он нету плохой ‘he not bad’; мы нету тут ‘we not here’. General negators are not common in the speech of monolingual Russian children, and no period of using a universal negator has been noted in the literature. In Julia’s data, it is possible to talk about overgeneralization of the negator intе in all negative constructions.

Julia also acquired constructions without negation earlier than corresponding structures with negation: the copula was first used in an affirmative utterance before it was used together with negation. The child’s seemed to be using a negative utterance as a positive one, but the other way round. Julia’s negation seemed to contain positive information from her earlier developmental stages, repeating the positive structure, while adding new information to it as well. Julia transformed a positive construction into a negative one in a very logical way: just adding a negator to the otherwise affirmative utterance. In Russian, this transformation is not possible, and the two constructions differ by changing the construction into an impersonal one. For Russians, impersonal constructions are quite natural and easy to acquire, while for Julia they were and remained a major source of problems for several years.

It appears that some special mechanism has to be switched on in order for the child to acquire impersonal constructions in Russian (which are a typical Slavic invention) on a subconscious level. The phrases such as Я нет уроки ‘I no homework’ are totally impossible in the monolingual acquisition of Russian. We also see some delay in the acquisition of impersonal constructions (not just difficulties in their formation), since phrases such as Юли нет уроки ‘Julia no homework’ are possible for monolingual Russian children as well (prepositions are always acquired later than the case). However, when
the child is four years old, such constructions are impossible in the unpathological acquisition of Russian as L1 in a monolingual environment (for a description of pathological language acquisition, see Kornev 2006).

To summarize, we can say that at the age of 3;5 a Russian child is expected to comprehend the main rules of morphology and is able to use them in his/her own sentences. This, however, was not the case with Julia. Although she learned to use some prepositions, auxiliaries and past tense forms, she showed some delay in the acquisition of Russian morphology, which could be observed in her use of a reduced case system (the nominative was used instead of the Prepositional, Genitive and Dative; the wrong gender was assigned; there were violations of agreement, and proper names were not inflected).

With respect to different patterns of language acquisition, it is worth emphasizing that telegraphic speech, which is basically absent in Russian children (cf. Lisa Eliseeva), was very prolonged in Julia’s case. Since Julia was always understood, she may not even have been looking for a case in her input. The main characteristic of Julia’s development is the disproportionate development of different components in the language system. Julia’s syntactic development was clearly ahead of her morphological development: at the period of multiple phrase formation: мама, Юля нету (мама, у Юли нет) ‘mom, Julia no have’ (the child had no declination yet).

As for the acquisition of the structural function of a case, structural functions are acquired later than semantic ones in monolingual acquisition as well, although in a bilingual environment, the situation seems to be even more complex.

| In the acquisition of negation, Julia moved from (a) gestures via (b) interjections to (c) Modifier-Propositional-Chunks and later to creating (d) (simple) grammatical constructions. At this stage, the child seemed to have a (e) common grammatical system that later would develop into (f) more complex constructions and (g) two separate grammatical systems. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a | b | c | d | e | f | g |
| gestures | interjections | Modifier-Propositional-Chunks | simple grammatical constructions | common grammatical system | more complex constructions | two separate grammatical systems |
7 Language interaction in a contact situation: the place of innovations

7.1. Introduction

The analysis of Julia’s linguistic material (see chapter 6) has shown that the two developing systems interact with each other even after the child has become aware of the presence of two languages in her environment. Julia goes through a stage of language interaction when she makes use of both languages in the same utterance. I believe this stage is natural in bilingual development, which once again shows that language acquisition is a creative process in which the child actively constructs his/her own language (cf. Swain 1977, Tomasello 2003, Goldberg 2006, Ciejtlin 2009). The question that remains unanswered as yet is whether a child who acquires two languages simultaneously constructs her linguistic system according to the same laws that monolingual children use or according to the laws that children acquiring second language follow. This question is especially complex since we do not even know for sure whether children who acquire their mother tongue and children who acquire a second language actually do this in the same way (see for instance the discussion in Brown 1973, Mc Laughlin 1984, Ciejtlin 2009). After a closer look at the innovations found in Julia’s material, it may be possible to answer this question.

This chapter will consider innovations that are both the direct and indirect results of language contact. It will be argued that unique, bilingual innovations should be expected in simultaneous bilingual acquisition since they belong to the process of normal language development. They should not be considered a sign of disorder but a manifestation of a typical transitional developmental process (cf. the definition of the term “interlanguage”). However, the crucial question that remains is what is the nature of these innovations and how can they be classified. Overall, Julia seems to follow the acquisition order similar to that for monolingual children, although some Russian structures were acquired later and others clearly in a different way. While Julia’s Swedish developed according to monolingual norms, her Russian exhibited several features that are not present in monolingual data on Russian children, for instance:157

157 The innovations present in monolingual children were naturally also found in Julia’s data: ты даваешь (даёшь) мне твои очки ‘you are giving me your glasses’ (3;5); там нет горя-
Inte есть Юлину грушу!
‘Not (Sw) eat Julia’s pear’ sc. ‘Do not eat Julia’s pear!’ 2:4

Inte мама на лекции
‘Not (Sw) mom at [the] seminar’ sc. ‘Mother is not at the seminar’ 2:4

He bok!
‘No [a special] book!’ sc. ‘This is not the book I meant/wanted’
a Russian functional word + a Swedish noun 2:0

не ещё (= больше не надо)
‘not more’ sc. ‘Do not want more’ 2:0

Bollux: ‘Boll (Sw) + мячик (Rus)’ ‘little ball’ 2:0

Jag vill inte спать! [Sw: inte mer: ‘not any more/no longer’]
Sw chunk + Rus Verb
‘I do not want to sleep’ 3:6

Это было дождь (Был дождь). А сейчас ( = сейчас) не было дождя!
‘It was rain.’ And now ‘it was no rain’ (А сейчас дождя не было). 3:6

Я могу спрятаться och (Sw) спать ‘I can hide and sleep’ 3:5

Med нас (‘with us’) Rus с нами Sw: med oss
ons (Rus on + Sw hans ‘with us’) 3:5

Я хочу писать этим красном (этим красным фломастером)
‘I want to write with this red one’ 3:7

Это мои pengar. Я ska betala их.
‘It’s my money. I will pay for it’. 3:6

Я не могу смотреть (я не вижу)
‘I cannot look’ (I do not see) 3:7

Мне больно тут. Я i skogen fått больно
‘I have pain here. I got hurt in the forest (Sw).’
få больно – ‘get’ (Sw) ‘hurt’ (Rus) 3:5

MOM: Не целуй обувь!
‘Don’t kiss your shoes’
JUL: Я нету целую. Я нюхаю.
‘I no kiss. I smell.’ 3:5

чая вода ‘there is no hot water there’ (3:5); the absence of GEN is basically not found in non-pathological acquisition of Russian at the age of 3:5, which allows us to speak of some delay in Julia’s acquisition of Russian.
A key question that needs to be answered is which of these deviations can be classified as developmental errors and which are the result of language contact. The examples that include borrowings of Swedish or Russian lexemes (whole lexemes, lexical stems or derivational suffixes) in the other language are not hard to classify as being contact-induced: Я хочу водичку такую måla ‘I want water (Rus) for painting (Sw)’158 (3;6). It is instead less prototypical cases such as я не могу пить ‘I cannot drink’ in the sense of закончился сок ‘The juice is over’; комары пьют кровь (кровь) ‘mosquitoes drink blood’; смотри мне ‘look me’ (instead of на меня ‘look at me’) that are of interest here. Thus, looking closer at Julia’s linguistic innovations may help us to consider the topic of bilingual acquisition from a completely new perspective.

7.2. On defining innovations

It has been observed that ungrammatical forms (in our view, innovations) are used by most children and belong to the process of language construction (Cejtlin 2009). By innovations in this investigation, we mean forms that are constructed by Julia but not present in the variety she is exposed to. An analysis of the reasons for their emergence may also help us understand the rules that govern speech production (see Cejtlin 2012:2, Zalevskaja 2009:69).

Since the processes of monolingual and bilingual acquisition are considered to be similar, bilingual children’s speech should not be free of innovations either. Thus, in the developing linguistic systems of bilingual children, there should be some forms of the language varieties they are exposed to that are not present in monolingual children, since the nature of input in monolingual and bilingual environments is obviously different. On the other hand, the innovations that are common in the monolingual acquisition of a language are present as well: (wrong) regular inflection in Swedish: gådde (gick) ‘went’; gädde (gav) ‘gave’; det är honoms (possessive pronoun, correct: hans) ‘that belongs to him’ etc. In Russian: нет гулять ‘no go out’ (NEG outside the nuclear clause); мама, Юля нету (у Юли нету) ‘Julia does not have’; NOM + нету; этот вилк ‘this fork’ (cf. Cejtlin 2009). Yet since the term “innovation” does not cover contact-induced changes that are already present in the input of the child, the picture for bilingual children is really difficult. How can we sort out “real” innovations created by the child from “false” innovations that also occur in the input? This implies that we must have total control over the input, which is hardly possible in practice. However, as a parent, it is easy to define which forms were present in the

158 The child meant the water where she could wash her paintbrush.
input and which were not, which is another advantage of investigating one's own child.

Categorizing and classifying the innovations of bilingual children, it is important to remember that not all innovations are due to bilingualism. It is necessary to distinguish between the forms that are due to children’s linguistic development in general and those that occur because of their familiarity with more than one language. Four types of errors are distinguished in the literature (see Dulay & Burt 1974):

- developmental errors
- interference-like errors
- ambiguous errors (cannot be classified as either interference or developmental)
- unique errors.

We use the term “innovation” rather than “mistake” or “error” in this study in order to show the creative nature of this process. Still, even the distinction between the terms “error” and “mistake” is often blurred. Mistakes are usually considered slips of the tongue, generally one-time events that the speaker is able to recognize and correct if necessary. An error, on the other hand, is usually systematic and reflects a lack of grammatical knowledge. Errors tend to occur repeatedly and are not recognized as a mistake by the learner (see Gass & Selinker 1984 for a further discussion). This view, however, is not adopted by all researchers. It is important to remember that the innovations considered in this study are not occasional slips of the tongue since they do not occur just once in Julia’s data; rather, they are a regular part of her repertoire and often exist alongside the correct form. Although at the age of four the child did not yet comprehend double negation, correct forms were observed during her summer vacations in Crimea as well: я никогда не ела такого вкусного омлета с помидорчиками ‘I have never eaten such tasty scrambled eggs with tomatoes’ (3;6).159 Thus, alongside the mistakes that resemble second language acquisition, we find absolutely “perfect” Russian sequences, both at earlier stages (as noted above) and later stages of ontogenesis:

(64) 7;5
JUL: Почему ты сердце нарисовал на ноге?
‘Why did you paint a heart on your foot?’
VIC: Почему бы и нет?
‘Well, why not?’
JUL: Почему бы и да? На, держи.

159 While in Ukraine, Julia would also pick up a typical Ukrainian pronunciation of the Russian phoneme ‘г’, for instance, and several instances of ‘г’ instead of ‘г’ were noted: бехом (pronounced as /behom/).
‘Well, why yes? Here you go.’

COM: Giving sun lotion to Victoria

JUL: Хотя… здесь почти ничего нету уже.
‘There is almost none here.’

It is worth emphasizing that it is not the frequency issue that is important but the fact that such forms are present at all. As Cejtlin (2009) has shown quite convincingly, children from Azerbajdzan who learn Russian as L2 exhibit error patterns that are not present in the monolingual acquisition of Russian. Before a discussion of changes in Julia’s Russian morphosyntax, a closer look at some typical bilingual innovations is needed.

7.3. Distinguishing between different kinds of language contact phenomena

As the terms denoting different contact phenomena (such as code-switching, mixing and borrowing) are not used by all researchers in the same way, it makes comparisons across studies difficult (Romaine 1998). Thus, it is crucial to define what each term means in every investigation. Since terminological issues have been broadly discussed previously (see Auer 1995), only the most important aspects relevant to the present study will be dealt with here. A distinction will not be made between lexical and semantic interference, since it is assumed that lexical interference implies semantic interference as well (and the other way round). It is impossible to talk about the lexical level alone without taking into account semantics – viz. that the meaning of the word somehow changes, whatever transformations we mean. The same can also be said about morphological and syntactic interference, where semantics comes in as well (cf. also Bondarko’s School). We should likewise bear in mind that boundaries between lexical and morphological categories can be often blurred in Russian because of its rich morphology.

7.3.1. Cross-linguistic influence, interference or transfer?

I will start by discussing some terms that are often used as umbrella terms in discussing various language contact phenomena – cross-linguistic influence and mixing. Sharwood-Smith & Kellerman (1996) adopted the term “cross-linguistic influence” to take into account cases where one language influences the other (see also the discussion in De Houwer [2009:282], who applied the term in the same sense). This term includes borrowings, influence between the languages etc. Weinreich (1953) used the term linguistic “interference” to categorize cases of deviation from the norms of either language that occur in the speech of bilinguals as the result of familiarity with more than one language: Ta bort myxy! ‘Take away (Rus) the fly (Sw)’ (3;7);
Что? Твоя свинья! (Sw: ‘din gris’), here meaning ‘what a pig you are!’ (8;5).

We know that one of the two languages of a bilingual child usually dominates and thus influences the weaker language. A qualitative and quantitative imbalance between the languages leads to dominant language interference in the production of the weaker one (Saunders 1982). Thus, when a child creates new constructions in one language that can be traced back to the influence from the other, we are dealing with examples of transfer. In transfer, structures from one language are borrowed, replicated or code-copied into the other temporarily (Paradis et al. 2003, Heine & Kuteva 2005): Я сегодня, возможно, получу трёхназерв ‘Today I will probably get exercise pain’ (Sw) (8;5). Such constructions, however, are subject to improvement, given sufficient input in the weaker language.

Even though there is ample evidence for instances of transfer today, some researchers still argue that “to date there is almost no evidence that BFLA children’s weaker language systematically uses morphosyntactic rules from the stronger language” (De Houwer 2009:287). The issue of systematicity is in a way misleading. De Houwer (2009) argued that occasional examples of cross-linguistic influence from one language on the other “do not detract from the validity of the SDH as long as they do not show any systematicity” (p. 282). By “systematicity” De Houwer means that cross-linguistic influence is used “in a majority (more than three-quarters) of relevant contexts at a particular age or within a short period of time (say, two weeks)” (p. 283). But who sets these rules? Most studies have collected recordings not more than once every other week, so it may be difficult to provide such material (if necessary). Moreover, even if we collect material every day, we can hardly collect all the utterances the child produces, just a small number of them (assuming we make recordings for only a half an hour; even during that time it is not certain the child will speak the entire time). With such restrictions, it is scarcely possible to prove the existence of any cross-linguistic influence at all. Two weeks is certainly not a sufficient period of time as a basis of judgment. The primary distinction between slips of the tongue and deviations that occur regularly may seem important, but it is not really the frequency of particular forms that is the main issue but their presence at all, as we noted above. The innovations that are not present in the monolingual data of such languages should get much more attention in research. Otherwise, it is not surprising that De Houwer claimed that “clear examples of cross-linguistic influence in young bilingual children are very hard to find” (De Houwer 2009:288).

We know that the weaker language does not usually show any influence on the developmental patterns of the stronger one (unless a dominance shift

---

160 See Hammes & Blanc (2000) for a further discussion on transfer.
occurs; see Yip & Matthews 2007 for a description of such cases). Since most studies of bilingual children still describe cases with closely related languages (except Vihman 1985, Mishina 1999, Yip & Matthews 2007, 2000 etc., it may be more challenging to see what happens in cases of a structural conflict between the languages involved (ibid.). More comparative research is therefore needed. What is missing in this discussion is the case of innovations, i.e. the child’s own creations that are not transferred directly but rather the indirect result of language contact.

Taking a closer look at Julia’s innovations, we have seen that the main difficulty for Julia lies in the structural conflict between the two languages, Russian and Swedish, with one difficulty, for instance, being the building of impersonal constructions. Such constructions do not exist in Swedish, which is perhaps the main reason for Julia acquiring them much later than monolingual Russian children. Even at the age of eight, she was still making mistakes in their formation, although the situation temporarily improved during her Russian grandmother’s visits and on her trips to the Crimea. It took numerous corrections to improve forms such as она называется Келли ‘her name is Kelly’ and sometimes even я называюсь Юля ‘my name is Julia’. The forms were always there when the child did not control her speech. The last example may sound quite shocking since the form seems to be relatively frequent. On the other hand, the question ‘what is your name’ is usually answered by giving only a name, ‘Julia’, not ‘my name is Julia’. Phrases like Ты знаешь кого-то как называется Марио? (8;5) ‘Do you know anyone who is named Mario’ were not completely gone from Julia’s production until 8;5 (although they started to co-exist with correct ones to an increasing extent). They disappeared entirely only at the age of 8;7, after the child had spent almost two months in a monolingual Russian environment. On the other hand, after that visit the child also became more conscious about her speech and seemed to control it and reflect upon what she was saying. However, this period is outside the scope of this study.

We should remember that a particular form may be the result of language contact, a form that the child has created on his/her own or is his/her own construction, but not necessarily transfer as such, even though it may look like it at first. For instance, Julia’s favorite construction первое (‘the first one’), which remained in her repertoire for almost seven years and was used in the sense of вначале ‘first’, as in the example below, may be seen as a clear example of transfer. On the other hand, it may be argued that we can talk about calquing Swedish constructions or even semantic extension, see Gardner-Chloros 2009:144 for a review.

161 In spoken Russian it is almost impossible to hear the difference between первое and первая, which is why it may have been difficult for the child to hear the correct pronunciation from the input she received. On the other hand, it may also be a transfer from the Swedish först ‘first’ since Julia used it in the sense of вначале ‘first’ all the time. However, this was a very frequent form, so the difference should have been heard.
where the meaning of the Russian word первое ‘first’ is broaden to express the meaning of the Swedish word först ‘first’. The child perhaps just did not understand the “inner form of the word” or did not pay attention to it (cf. Cejtlin’s “generalization” 2009:4):

(65)  6;0

JUL: Первое пришла Josephine, потом пришла я!
   ‘At first came Josephine, then I came’ (cf. Sw: först kom Josephine)
MOM: Надо говорить вначале!
     ‘One has to say “first”’.
JUL: А где мы слышали ‘первое’?
     ‘Well, where did we hear “at first”? 163

Intuitively, the term “transfer” is perhaps more applicable in second language acquisition (SLA) rather than in BFLA (cf discussion above), where the two languages carry mother tongue status. Thus, I will apply this term about the interaction between two L1s as well, even in this case, when bilingual development is unbalanced. In a case when one language is stronger and influences the weaker one, the term “transfer” is applicable for the influence of structures of one language on the other. The term “cross linguistic influence” will be used as the umbrella term to cover all instances of language contact phenomena.

7.3.2. Mixing

Most empirical investigations on bilingual acquisition have found evidence of mixing on the phonological, lexical, phrasal, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels (see McLaughlin 1984, Genesee 2007:321 for an overview). However, rates of mixing vary considerably among different studies – as do the reasons for these mixings. Mixings have been seen both as accidental performance errors and as signs of linguistic confusion. Up until now, they have often been regarded as an indication of an ongoing process of language separation or development of language awareness. Some authors (see Rontu 2005) go one step further and regard children’s mixings as code-switchings, which in turn are used as a communication strategy from the very beginning. However, it should be emphasized that the subjects in such investigations (who treat code-switchings as a communication strategy from the very beginning) are usually over 2;0. 164 That is, after the age at

163 On the other hand, this construction was also used even when the word could not be substituted by первая ‘first’: Первое, я буду играть. Потом делать уроки ‘First I will play. Then I will do my homework’ (6;8).

164 The age range for when children start code-switching is between 2;0–3;0 and 5;0–6;0, when they acquire more subtle pragmatic and sociolinguistic abilities; see Meisel 2007:337.
which Julia became aware of the presence of two languages. The notion of mixing is very important since it has implications for the debate on the one-versus two-system theory, and many studies have used the notion of mixing as proof of a child’s linguistic confusion. However, what is important is not whether mixing occurs but rather what is mixed (Kohnert & Bates 2002).

It has been suggested that bilingual children mix since they have been exposed to mixing in their environment (either by their immediate caregivers or by other speakers). De Houwer (2009:287) also claimed that only forms that are not heard in the input can be said to constitute evidence for cross-linguistic influence. We know that the child constructs his/her own forms from all the input available. I overheard Russian mothers in Sweden who spoke Swedish to their children and were constantly making the same kind of errors like omitting the copula, for instance jag ___ här ‘I here’ instead of jag är här ‘I am here’ or omitting the preposition på in a phrase like titta TV ‘to watch television’ (Sw titta på TV). In such cases it would not be surprising that their children, when they start to speak Swedish, would also make the same kind of errors (given that they do not get enough Swedish input from sources other than their mothers). Such cases can be traced back to input patterns, whereas cases such as никто будет есть эти семечки ‘no one will eat these sunflower seeds’ (the absence of double negation) (3;7); Что такое по-русски тёй? ‘What is Russian for тёй?’ (3;8); никак снимать этот вещь 165 ‘does not work to take off that thing’; что неправильно с вот этим камером 166, это то, что он для тобо ‘what is wrong with that camera is that it is too thick’ (8;2) cannot. In order to understand all the possible sources of mixing, Genesee et al (2007:322) suggested studying language models of the people bilingual children are exposed to. This will be done in more detail in the next chapter. What we are attempting to do here is to explain the forms that were not found in the input that Julia was exposed to (although I am aware that we cannot completely control input).

According to Deuchar & Vihman (2002), bilinguals use function and content words differently in mixed utterances, with content words being language-specific and tied more closely to the language context than functional words (which seem to be available in both language contexts irrespective of language choice and can thus be considered language-neutral). Mixing need not imply processing limitations but the fact that the two systems interact and the structure of one language or words in that language are applied or used in the other: Тёй от всё были нехорошше! Ты только тамк этого! ‘Imagine if (Sw) everyone was bad! (Rus). Just (Rus) imagine that!’ (4;6). Юля gjorde dena сама ‘Julia did it (Sw) herself’ (4;10).

---

165 Masculine instead of feminine in вещь (Rus ‘thing’).
166 Masculine instead of feminine in камера (Rus ‘camera’).
7.3.3. The differences between children’s and adults’ mixings

While adults also mix their languages, their mixings are usually referred to as code-switching or code-mixing (Sridhar & Sridhar 1980, as cited in Genesee 2003) and adult code mixings are usually rule-governed communicative devices that are used to achieve various communicative goals (to emphasize something, to quote a phrase etc.). In adult code-switching, the mixing of elements from the languages is performed in such a way that it follows the syntactic rules of both languages (Poplack 1980167) and follows highly structured syntactic and sociolinguistic constraints. What was thought to distinguish children’s mixings from adult mixings was precisely the lack of compliance with linguistic rules (Genesee 2003). Conversational analysis of children’s code-switchings has shown that children too use their switchings for specific communicative purposes (Rontu 2005, which, along with Lanza’s pioneering study [Lanza 1997], provided a new perspective for understanding code-switching in infant (or early) bilingualism).

Rontu relates code-switching to such factors as the subject of the conversation, the art of activity, the participants and the relationship between them. She distinguishes three main functions in the code-switchings of her subjects: emphasis, contrast and language choice related to the person addressed (Rontu 2005:294), which is in line with previous investigations (Fantini 1985, Saunders 1988). Rontu also pays attention to code-switching that leads to language change and even refers to such switchings as “transfer” (Rontu 2005:292).168 Such a qualitative view on language mixing is a very interesting approach. As was mentioned, it is not the number of mixings that is interesting but the quality of them: What kind of mixings are there? And what is their function? Can the term “code switching” be used as the umbrella term for all the mixings in children’s speech? In order to answer this question, let us take a closer look at what code-switching actually is.

7.3.4. Code-switching

Meisel defines code-switching as a specific skill of a bilingual’s pragmatic competence to select the language according to the interlocutor, the situational context, the topic of conversation etc. and to change languages according to sociolinguistic rules, without violating grammatical constraints (Meisel 2007:337). Thus, what is interesting is not only the structure of mixings but also the reasons for it. Myers-Scotton’s definition of code-switching is the selection of forms from an embedded variety in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation (Myers-Scotton 1990). The term “matrix language” is used for the main language in code-switching utterances (in

167 However, Poplack’s claim has been rejected in numerous empirically based investigations since then.
168 Meisel (1989) calls such instances “fusion.”
this case Russian), and the term “embedded language” refers to another language, which also participates in code-switching but with a lesser role (here: Swedish). Both in earlier (1993) and later research (2002), Myers Scotton has claimed that code-switching and its psychological motivations constitute an important mechanism for other contact phenomena. However, code-switching also requires linguistic competence in both languages. Some researchers have even suggested using it as an indicator of bilingual proficiency (for example Poplack 1980). Most researchers agree that code-switching is consciously applied in order to clarify a misunderstanding, to emphasize a point, to exclude someone from the conversation, to express a certain idea when activities have been experienced in only one of the languages or when some concepts or words are more simple or more salient in one language (see Arnberg 1987). Myers-Scotton also talked about “selection,” which implies conscious, purposeful choice and not sporadic mixing.

An expression or lexical item from one language may more readily come to mind than the equivalent expression in another language, which in turn may simply be the result of the frequency with which the individual uses both languages in daily communication (Dimmendaal 2011:200). Dimmendaal did not see code-switching as necessarily a conscious effort by the speaker (ibid.) but rather compared it to the use of registers and considered the following functions: filling temporary lexical or semantic gaps, circumventing lexical taboos in one of the languages, expressing one’s social identity, as an ideological statement, (re)negotiating one’s social position during a conversation, achieving a humorous effect, expressing solidarity, employing it a distancing strategy in a conversation, to exclude others from the conversation. However, in discussing code-switching in children, we cannot apply definitions for adults. If we disregard the notion of consciousness, then there is basically no difference between mixings and code-switching in young bilingual children. Thus, I would still suggest saving the term “code-switching” for purposeful language change, in order to achieve some communicative effect. The identity issue may also be relevant for a young child. Even at the age of 3;5 Julia would always try to speak only Russian to me in shops, on buses and when mostly Swedish speakers were present. Another criterion for code-switching that may be important here is that the switches are not morphologically or phonetically integrated into the base language:

(66) 7;3

Я не хочу шведскую маму, которая bakar bullar. Шведские мамы – они trikiga. Они följer regler, а ты – хорошая мама. ‘I do not want a Swedish mother who (Rus) bakes buns (Sw). Swedish mothers (Rus) – they are (Rus) boring (Sw). They (Rus) follow rules (Sw) and you… you are a good mother (Rus).
Я пошла с Эриком и Малином и встретила мою бывшую учительницу… и Эрик сказал, что она была läskig... ну это страшная... Страшная два. То есть страшная один это full, а страшная два – это läskig! 'I went with Erik and Malin and met my former teacher…. and Erik said that she was scary (Sw)... well, it is ugly…. ugly two. That is, ugly one is not handsome and ugly two is scary' (Sw).

The child definitely needed a word to express the meaning of a word, läskig, that did not really correspond to the Russian equivalent страшная 'ugly'. However, none of these criteria works all the time and can thus be considered reliable (see discussion in Park 2000). Some words may be morphologically unmarked in both languages: Это мой språk!171 ‘It is my (Rus) language (Sw)’ (7;5). Code-switches are accompanied by pauses, which may also be an indicator of the child’s awareness of using two different language systems. Arnberg (1987) also noted that children used the language they had experienced certain activities in. There is no clear reason for code switching here, but some things are easier to express in a certain language. It implies certain associations: Julia was told to put her seatbelt on: Зачем? Jag kommer i alla fall inte hamna i fängelse för det! ‘What for (Rus)? I will not go to prison for it anyway (Sw)!’ (4;11).

Even when she was in Crimea (at the time, the three girls still spoke Swedish to each other), Julia would use Russian words while talking Swedish to her sisters: Ska jag gå efter kupatyx? ‘Shall I go after (Sw) swimming’ (Rus); Kan du lägga det på berget? ‘Can you put it on (Sw) the shore?’ (Rus)? Ska vi gå på muren? ‘Shall we go (Sw) to [the] sea?’ (Rus) (3;6). Nonetheless, such phrases were only used on summer vacations to Ukraine.

Multi-word sequences also constitute prototypical code-switching (Park 2000): Om jag fyller år i morgon, тогда мне нужно очень много спать! (= долго) ‘Since I have a birthday tomorrow (Sw), then I need to sleep a lot’ (meaning: ‘for a long time’). (4;11)

Mamma, когда я буду большая, var kommer jag att komma ifrån? ‘Mommy, when I am big (Rus), where will I come from (Sw)?’

Мама: Что ты имеешь в виду?
‘What do you mean?’

169 Morphological mixing.
170 Code-switching.
171 The reason for mixing here is obvious: the Russian word язык is treated by the child only as a part of her body, not as a language she speaks. In that sense she is used to the word språk ('language'), which she also uses here. As far as morphology is concerned, there are clear signs of morphological integration here; see gender concord: мoй språk ‘my language’ (where språk from the perspective of the Russian system is a prime candidate for masculine gender).
Code-switching, as mentioned above, often has a pragmatic function, even in children. Nishimura also (1995, 1997) talked about metaphorical code-switching – when some words and concepts are easier to express in one language to create a certain communicative effect: У меня через двадцать дней sommarlov! ‘I have summer vacation (Sw) in twenty days’ (8;5). The Russian equivalent of the word sommarlov is obviously not as easy for Julia to access (even though by the time the child was eight, that word was certainly known). Thus, sometimes words can be easier to express in Swedish simply because they are either not known in Russian or are more time- (and energy-) consuming to remember.

It is clear that by the age of 6;0 the reason for Julia’s mixing is not that the child is unaware of the presence of two different languages in her environment; it would be naïve to argue she could not separate her systems. However, it is just as naïve to argue that the child consciously chose to use those words in particular in her story to achieve a certain communicative effect:

(69) 6;9
Они забыли släcka ljuset и всё brann ner. Но хорошо, что grannar были там. Они позвонили в brandkåren и они приехали и släckte ljuset. ‘They forgot to (Rus) blow out the candle (Sw) and everything (Rus) burned down (Sw). But it was good that (Rus) the neighbours (Sw) were there (Rus). They called the (Rus) fire department (Sw) and they came and (Rus) put the fire out (Sw). (6;9)

(70) 8;5
Это elfte på alfabetet ‘It is (Rus) the eleventh letter in the alphabet (Sw)’.

The reason for these multiple word mixings is no doubt that Julia did not know the Russian equivalent. As far as quotations are concerned, the child would often quote in the original language: Папа говорит «det finns inga spöken! ‘Dad says “there are no ghosts”’ (4;6). Saunders (1982) also reported that children usually quote a person or a section of a story in the language the utterance was made.

172 The underlined words can just as well belong to the category of mixing or even borrowing (since it is not certain that Julia was familiar with the Russian equivalent of some of these very specific words, which were acquired in a Swedish context).
7.3.5. Borrowings vs. code-switching

Muysken (2000:1) argued for the need to separate cases of code-mixing (according to him, the cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence) from lexical borrowing. Distinguishing code-switching and borrowing may not always be easy. Yet single-word incorporations are still often viewed as prototypical borrowings by many researchers (Andersson 1993, Clyne 1987, Gumperz 1982b). Dimmendaal (2011:200) suggested saving the word “borrowing” for monolingual speakers and use code-switching for bilinguals. Dimmendaal (2011:200) also proposed treating foreign words that are used across a community as borrowings, but he also admits that some words may actually start as code-switches and then become fully integrated in the language. Gumperz defined borrowings as items that are incorporated in the borrowing language and treated as a part of its lexicon (Gumperz 1982b). I will use Gumperz’s definition of borrowing as the introduction of single words or short idiomatic phrases from Swedish into Russian: ‘Mom, look! Snow and sun! Why doesn’t it build a rainbow?’ (5;0); ‘The dog’s (Sw) owner (Rus) had a chain (Sw)’ (5;0); Dimmendaal (2011:200) also suggests that applying a phonological criterion may make the distinction easier. Thus, phonologically and morphologically integrated single-word incorporations will be treated as borrowings here. Borrowings may be further distinguished as “core borrowings” – the words for which the borrowing language has equivalents (Myers-Scotton 1993b) – and “cultural borrowings” – culture-specific words that fill lexical gaps in the borrowing language (Myers-Scotton 1993). Borrowed words may also be adopted in the lexicon with whatever transformations are necessary for the particular grammatical category that fits the word. Such words are usually called “loan blends” (using Lindholm & Padilla’s terminology 1978b). Russian-Swedish creations, where one part of a word is borrowed and the other belongs to the original language (cf. Romaine 1998), were very frequent in Julia’s data earlier in her developmental periods (two to four years old): Nalle Puhuka ‘little Winnie the Pooh’; вски (Sw bi +Rus plural съки); тосики (Sw: toffs + Rus suffix –ик + plural inflection и) ‘cotton swabs’; стеночки (Sw sten + Rus suffix -очк + plural inflection -и); я хочу hallonинку ‘I want raspberry’; я щас 174 ramlana ‘I am going to fall down now’ (3;7) etc., where a Russian suffix is added to the Swedish noun root. 175 A similar tendency was also observed in verb formation: Sw bada + Rus мь

---

173 It is also interesting to note the placement of the negative particle не before the noun rainbow. The negative particle should negate the verb, not the noun. The phrase should have been constructed: почему regnbåge не получается (probably with the imperfective aspect here).

174 Сейчас ‘now’.

175 Rus я and Sw jag är diamorphs: /ja(:)/ which makes code-switching much easier.
badat’ ‘bathe’ (Rus купаться; the verb was probably built in analogy with купать ‘to bathe someone’ rather than купаться ‘to bathe’); smittanуть ‘to infect’ (in Я могу её smittanуть если мы пойдём к ней в гости ‘I may infect (Sw smitta + Rus suffix nуть) her if we go visit her’ (Rus).

Another frequent type of borrowing consists of a word in the base language that extends its meaning so that it corresponds to that of a word in the other language. These instances are called “loan shifts” (and have also been called “semantic extension” (see Romaine 1998): Это было уже очень долго назад… ‘long time ago’ (6;4).

Sometimes the meaning of a word may be extended even beyond the borders of the two languages (as in не могу, discussed in chapter 6), often in words which already have very broad semantics in both languages, like the word делать in the following case:

(71) 7;5

JUL: Почему никак помнить прошлую жизнь?
‘Why can’t we remember our past life?’
MOM: Чтобы можно было жить этой.
‘In order to be able to live this one’.
JUL: Мы можем же делать новую жизнь, но только знать, что другая жизнь была? А как мы будем жить другой жизнь, ты думаешь?
‘But we can do (make) a new life but know that the other life has been?
And how will we live another life (the life after this one) do you think?’

The construction жить другой жизнь (другой жизнью) ‘different life’ is a very interesting one, since the form of the adjective is correct, but the feminine noun жизнь is in ACC instead of INSTR. Perhaps the child intended to say в другой жизни ‘another life’ (the life after death) and the noun then needs to stand in LOC: в другой жизни or alternatively другой is an adaptation to этой in the mother’s turn (= input effect). Otherwise the child would simply calque Swedish idioms as in the following examples (cf. also твоя свинья (Sw din gris) ‘you pig’ above): Она ругала его за ничего (Sw för ingenthing) ‘She was angry with him for nothing’ (5;6); Я прихожу из Швеции (Sw Jag kommer från) ‘I come from Sweden’ (5;5); Какой автобус мы сегодня будем брать? (Sw ta buss). ‘What bus shall we take today?’ (5;8). Another phrase that was used with prepositions and was so frequent that after a while it was even not seen as being marked anymore was the calque of the Swedish construction att vara dum mot någon ‘to be bad to someone’. Prepositions were calqued particularly often in Julia’s speech at different periods of time: Ты была плохая на меня (= ‘du är dum mot mig’; sc. ‘you were bad to me’) (5;2); Она была плохая на меня ‘She was bad to me’(4;3); Он был плохой на меня ‘He was bad to me’(6;4); Вы все были плохие на меня ‘All of you were bad to me’ (5;8). This construc-
tion has no direct equivalent in Russian, and a paraphrase should be used instead. However, as is shown in the examples above, this construction was fully introduced into Russian and used with different prepositions, which were also mostly used in the correct form. This can also be seen as proof of simplification processes, which will be discussed below. This special type of borrowing, the Swedish dum mot ‘stupid to’, is also known as loan translation (see Crystal 1997), when parts of the word or expression are translated separately, so a new word or expression is formed.

Nevertheless, the concepts of code-switching and borrowing are often used interchangeably because it is very difficult if not impossible to distinguish between the two since they often take similar forms. Phonological integration, which has often been suggested, is not always a reliable criterion, especially when the phonological systems of the languages are similar (Haugen 1972, Poplack & Vanniarajan 1991). The morphological criterion is also useless if single words are morphologically marked or unmarked in both languages: Осторожно, spindel! (3;5) ‘be careful (Rus), a spider! (Sw)’; Это мой språk ‘It is my (Rus) language (Sw)’ (7;5) mentioned above. Essentially, no single criterion is always reliable, which allows us to conclude that none of them has universal validity. Sometimes the adapted incorporations are not really Swedish either, as in the following example: Мы atchooade (cf. Sw: vi nös), but are Swedish innovations created by the child.

7.4. Innovations that change the structure of Russian

As we saw in 7.3, it seems difficult (if not possible) to distinguish between language contact phenomena such as code-switching, mixing and borrowing. However, the discussion of various language contact phenomena becomes even more complicated when we have not only instances of “switching” but also of a language structure that is changed because of the switch, for instance as in 176 med грязные ножки177 (chunk: ‘with dirty feet’) (4;0). In Russian, the construction ‘with dirty feet’ would be с грязными ножками, which demands the Instrumental case after the preposition ‘with’. The child not only chooses to borrow the Swedish preposition but, as a result, the following Russian construction simply becomes impossible with the Instrumental case. Thus, the question is: how does the child know these rules? And what lies behind this construction? Is it an attempt at simplification or is it perhaps only sticking to the syntactic rules of Swedish, triggered by med ‘with’? In this case it would be understandable. Could she borrow a Swedish preposition because it is easier to use? This seems unlikely since it is not easier. Could she have momentarily forgotten the Russian preposition

176 Consider also the following example: …. Что я буду есть с? (5;6) (Sw vad ska jag äta med? ‘What shall I eat with?’). Julia also said: Что я буду äta med.
177 Even in Crimea.
and replaced it with the Swedish one instead? Of course, this could also have been the case – unless she chose not to do it as regularly as she did. The child knew the Russian preposition since she would always say с тобой ‘with you’ (a chunk?); but as soon as the construction required a change in case, Julia would choose a Swedish preposition: она была там med prins ‘she was there (Rus) with a prince (Sw)’. Med принцем also sounds just as impossible as med грязными ножками ‘with dirty feet’. One possible reason could be that, since Swedish was her dominant language and, as we know, does not have rich noun morphology, the child was not used to having cases and thus was not even looking for them in the input.

Cases are not seen as important in Swedish, whereas Russian children know from an early age that cases carry meaning (cf. also the discussion in Lepskaja 1997, Cejtlin 2009). Julia thinks that, since the phrase med smutsiga fötter is possible in Swedish, its equivalent med грязные ножки is just as possible in Russian. Julia would often use combinations of a preposition and a case that would be totally impossible for a Russian monolingual child, for instance смотри мне (смотреть на меня) (3;6) ‘look at me’. 178 On the other hand, we know that the connection between a particular case and a preposition is rather fixed in the consciousness of a Russian child (cf. Cejtlin 2009:275), while that was far from the case for Julia. For her, the main function of language is communication, so she does not pay much attention to the form and even feels it is unnecessary to correct her if we still understand what she says.

The construction with Swedish med will be treated as an instance of simplification here, as is the following construction with the adverb nästan ‘almost’: Я nästan padala (я чуть не упала) ‘I almost (I did not) fall down’ (3;8). The adverb nästan is also easier in a way, since one can simply use the verb padala ‘fall’ after it – just like in Swedish: jag nästan ramlade. In Russian the corresponding construction with чуть demands negation before the verb: я чуть не упала ‘I almost (I did not) fall down’. It was also observed that constructions with nouns and pronouns were acquired in a slightly different way by Julia. Pronominal constructions were remembered the way they were and often represented as a whole in Julia’s language (in Russian such constructions are called гештальтные конструкции), while constructions containing a preposition and a noun have to be created anew, which meant that Julia had to construct them on her own every time she wanted to use them. This can be another difference with monolingual Russian children, who do not usually create PREP + NOUN constructions anew every time they use them; rather, they comprehend the morphological frame (structure) of the syntactic construction as a whole.

178 When I corrected the child, she repeated смотри мнема (на меня).

179 However, that may very well be simple borrowing because she does not know the Russian equivalent.
Julia often used NOM in such situations or some other case that was not correct. Very often the Prepositional case was substituted by the Accusative or vice versa: Она села на моя маленькая цветок ‘She was sitting on my little flower’ (7;6); Она сидела на моя голова (на моей голове) ‘She was sitting on my head’ (7;6); Ты сидела на вот эту семечку! ‘You were sitting on this sunflower seed’ (7;6). Use of the accusative instead of the prepositional case as in Ты сидела на вот эту семечку ‘You were sitting to my sunflower seed’ instead of на вот этой семечке ‘on my sunflower seed’) was a very common feature of Julia’s speech, and even at the age of 8 the child had not mastered this distinction. The forms seemed to be in free distribution. Monolingual Russian children master this dynamic-static relationship between an accusative and a prepositional phrase rather early, while Julia – like many second-language learners – often used the cases interchangeably. While I still find some such mistakes in her data at the age of eight, I find many instances of correct case use, which means that the wrong and correct forms exist in free distribution. It is their very presence that is important here, since they would not be noticed in non-pathological L1 acquisition of Russian at this age. The influence of på has also been observed in Julia’s data as in the following example:

(72)  6:3
MOM: Где хомячиха?
‘Where is the hamster?’ (fem.)
JUL: Она на моей комнате!
‘She is at my room’

There were also many cases where the preposition was unnecessary: Я кусала на него (я кусала его Sw ‘jag bet på den’) ‘I was biting on it (apple)’, which can also be traced back to Swedish: jag bet på det. The preposition was often also omitted in Julia’s speech (в моей тарелке ‘(in) my plate’; (в) моей комнате ‘(in) my room’ (6;0); Что тут (в) моей комнате? ‘What is here (in) my room?’ (6;0); Я не хочу это играть ‘I do not want to play this’ (Rus ‘in this’) (6;2); мы сидели наверху и играли (в) карты ‘we were sitting upstairs and playing (in) cards’ (7;0).

During Julia’s earliest stages, the preposition was also omitted or filler was used instead. While it is known that monolingual Russian children would basically never use the wrong preposition with the wrong case (Cejtlin 2009:15), Julia’s material was full of such forms. Missing prepositions can sometimes be explained by the Swedish influence: почему (в) это играть? ‘Why play this?’ (Rus ‘in this’) (6;1); (Sw: varför spelar det? Jag vill inte spela det ‘Why play this? I will not play this’). In other cases there is a different reason since Swedish would also need a preposition: i mitt rum, på mitt rum ‘in/at my room’.
Beyond these innovations there are also fairly frequent cases of omitting an unknown word. In such cases, the word would usually take a masculine form: Почему ты рисуешь на мой... (на моём стеклянном шарике) ‘Why are you painting on mine... (sc. my glass ball)’ (7;6); Как много надо вот этот? = как долго надо держать градусник? ‘How long shall I this’? (‘how long am I supposed to hold a thermometer?’) (4;7).

Such constructions are often understandable for the interlocutor and are therefore not corrected since they do not disturb communication: for instance, using a “frozen” nominative in nouns or “frozen” adjectives: красивый бумажка ‘beautiful paper’. We still understand that the paper is beautiful. When such constructions are tolerated by the interlocutors and do not lead to correction, there is a certain risk that they will sooner or later fossilize in the speech of the child and that she will become accustomed to using them later in life. However, when corrected, the child protests, which has been shown by numerous examples. Moreover, Julia would often reject the appropriate forms when she was corrected, arguing that she had all the right to speak the way she did:

(73) 7;5
JUL: Мама, ты не можешь меня кремануть?
‘Mom, can you lotion me?’
MOM: Намазать кремом
‘Not lotion but put some lotion on me’
JUL: Нет, кремануть. Я хочу говорить кремануть.
‘No, lotion. I want to say to lotion’.

(74) 8;0
JUL: Мама, я ещё одну книгу прочитала! У меня два остались!
‘Mom, I read one more book! I now have two (masc) left’
MOM: Две.
‘Two’ (fem)

I felt that if I constantly corrected the child, she might lose her desire to communicate at all. There should always be a balance here. Recasts of the child’s utterances are a very effective, but not always possible, way of correction since one cannot insert the correct way of saying something every time the child makes a “mistake”. Perhaps exposure to monolingual Russian for a much longer time than this child was exposed to would be the only “remedy”. But because of various practical (mostly time-related) reasons, it was not always possible to provide more input of Russian in Sweden. However, after a visit to Crimea, Julia’s language became noticeably better after only two and a half weeks. Several innovations found in Julia’s output in April-June 2011 before her visit to Crimea at the age of seven disappeared by the end of that visit (August 2011). Julia also noted (when she was old enough to verbalize about language) that she even felt more Russian after these visits and that Russian was more natural to her. Again, had the child stayed for another couple of months, she might have received sufficient input not only for her to feel at home in Russian, but also to develop a native speaker proficiency in it.
JUL: Но ведь я это и сказала!
‘But that’s what I said!’
MOM: Ты сказала два!
‘No, you said “two”’ (masc)
JUL: Ах! Какая разница!
‘Oh well, does it matter?!’

There is apparently no endpoint in the acquisition of a more target-like language system: while we find forms typical of SLA я считаю для тридцать ‘I count for thirty’ (sc. ‘I count up to thirty’) (7;6); сколько у тебя зубных щёток? ‘How many toothbrushes do you have?’ etc. (7;6) etc., many correct phrases are found in Julia’s speech as well: Какие дела могут быть сейчас? Это же отпуск! ‘What kind of business are you talking about? It is a vocation!’ (7;7).

(75) 7;7
SUS: Помочь тебе?
‘Shall I help you’?
JUL: Я не хочу твоей помощи!
‘I do not want your help!’

(76) 7;7
COM: Julia to her cousin Stas:
JUL: Сороконожка может укусить тебя очень сильно и ты будешь плакать и даже можешь умереть!
‘The centipede can bite you really hard and you will cry and perhaps even can die!’

7.5. Discussion and conclusion

The innovations that we observed in Julia’s speech seem to be of two kinds: (a) those found in monolingual children as well (почему ты пишешь? = пишешь; смотри, я могу! (могу); можешь ты застегнуть? (застегнуть); он мой подруга and (b) those not found in monolingual children – i.e. unique bilingual innovations that are either a direct result of language contact (due to transfer, borrowing or code-switching) or not a direct result of a language contact (tendency towards analytic construc-

---

181 The words for different insects were very common in Julia’s speech from her earliest childhood since those insects were highly present in Crimea, and one had to see the difference between them (some bite while others do not; some are dangerous while others are not) and be able to name them.

182 All at the age of 3;7.

183 Although code-switching, if compared to the other features mentioned, may be on a completely different level.
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simplification, i.e. ignoring difficult morphological categories, semantic constructions etc.). Moreover, some delay was also noted in the acquisition of Russian morphology (or rather, Julia had not fully acquired some aspects of it).

While simplification is also characteristic of Russian children acquiring their mother tongue, simplification is stronger and more prolonged when Russian is acquired as a second language (Cejtlin 2009:23). Julia’s speech contains features that are more characteristic of foreigners who acquire Russian as a foreign language, since constructions such as the choice of aspect, assigning correct gender to a noun, case formation and choosing the correct preposition seem to be fairly easy for monolingual Russian children (Cejtlin 2009:1).

Cejtlin did not see the reason for simplification as involving in-

---

184 However, we also had instances of dropping prepositions, which is rather the opposite tendency.

185 Since the distinction between incomplete acquisition and delayed acquisition seems to be a crucial one, some clarification may be in order here. I believe it is possible to talk about incomplete acquisition not only in the case of heritage speakers, as discussed by Polinsky (when children who acquire Russian as an L1 move to another country and adopt the language of that country as their preferred language), but also in the case where the child has not acquired different morphological categories before the end of a sensitive (or critical) period. In this case, acquisition of certain features on the same level as in L1 acquisition becomes difficult (if not possible). Perhaps, in order for the parameters to be set – seen here from a generative perspective – or in order for the morphological features to be constructed, the child needs abundant input since there should be enough building material to acquire a feature completely. In either case, it may make sense to talk about a frequency threshold that is necessary for the parameters to be set, or the feature to be constructed. That is not all. In order for the feature to be sustained and not attrit, the amount of input should be constant and not below a certain level.

186 In the majority of cases, it is next to impossible to define the meaning of a particular case without a preposition since "on the level of syntactic semantics, the form preposition + case is seen as an inseparable unit (на уровне синтаксической семантики предложно-падежная форма нечленима)" (Russian Grammar part 1 2005:712, my translation).
fluence from the other language but rather acquisition of the second language system as such (ibid:5).

Obviously, it would be highly unscientific to draw any universal conclusions on the basis of only one child and her specific strategies and constructions. However, some tendencies noted earlier, for instance a relief strategy, i.e. drawing on resources from both languages (see Müller 1989) are certainly quite relevant for this child since I noted a general tendency towards simplification and reduction and a drift to analyticity in “constructing” Russian that often resulted in changing the Russian grammar. This loss of complexity is impossible in the natural state of Russian language development. However, this may not necessarily only be because of the influence of Swedish, in this case. Rather, the bilingual environment and lack of input could lead to decreased structural complexity of one language (here: Russian) – but not two. Thus, two reasons should be distinguished: (1) the influence of one language system on the other and (2) the impact of bilingualism as such. On the other hand, there are clear cases of innovations that emerge as a result of language contact.187 The idea that language contact in simultaneous bilingual acquisition can lead to grammatical change is a rather new one in the literature and has been put forward by, among others, Thomason (2001) and Yip & Matthews (2007, 2000).188 As we also know, there are two parallel processes in language acquisition: the formation of the language inventory (the formation of lexicon) and the acquisition of grammar (i.e. the rules of choice and, where necessary, constructing linguistic forms as well (cf. Cejtin 2011:2). According to Cejtin (ibid.), children form their own linguistic constructions only when they cannot find a ready-made construction in their mental lexicon or when access to it is for some reason difficult (or, I would emphasize, because input has not been sufficient), which could be another argument for the one-system hypothesis.

187 Yet, it should not be forgotten that choosing the wrong preposition or assigning the wrong gender may also be a result of language contact.

188 See also 1:3
8 Language separation in early childhood: one system or two

(77) 2;3

MOM: Jag älskar dig!
‘I love you’ (Sw)

JUL: Mamma…du får inte…får inte…älska mig по-шведски!
‘Mom… you cannot/must not...love me in Swedish’

8.1. Introduction

As we argued earlier, there are still two points of disagreement about the way simultaneous bilingual children acquire their two languages: (a) whether they are able to separate them from the onset of acquisition or (b) whether a one-language phase precedes the acquisition of both languages as separate systems. Recently, however, the focus has shifted somewhat towards looking at the nature of interaction between the languages (see chapter 7), and the question whether the one/two-system discussion is a relevant issue at all has been asked (Genesee 2003). Indeed, these two concepts need not be regarded as completely opposite. Following Deuchar & Quay (2000), I would suggest looking at the process of differentiation, which basically automatically discards the two-system theory. However, in order to be able to look at the process of separation, one should at least allow the possibility that such a process exists.

This chapter will concentrate on how and when differentiation occurred in this child’s language. It be will argued that a simple association (between a word and a person), imitation and autonomous speech work together in the child’s development until the two language systems are differentiated. However, Julia understanding that there are two languages in her linguistic environment does not mean that the two languages developed totally independently of each other. Unfortunately, to date, the process of differentiation has not been given enough attention in the literature, so it is hoped that Julia’s material can make a helpful contribution to the debate. According to Deuchar & Quay (2000), there is no reason to argue that there is any system
at all before the bilingual child has acquired translation equivalents\textsuperscript{189} and can respond differently to his/her interlocutors. Lexical differentiation is often believed to take place before pragmatic differentiation (that is, using the appropriate language according to the interlocutor; in our case, using more Russian with the mother and more Swedish with the father). However, researchers do not always use measures of pragmatic differentiation that are independent of translation equivalents (see discussion in Nicoladis 1998). Nicoladis' subject showed evidence of pragmatic differentiation before lexical differentiation took place, which suggests that the child’s ability of pragmatic differentiation may lead to the beginning of the creation of two lexicons.

Arnberg (1992) doubted that language mixing on different levels (lexical and grammatical) has different reasons. She believes that two mechanisms are involved in the process of language separation: one includes what is called the elementary mental function (see Vygotsky 1978) and the other the higher mental function. If the mother speaks Russian and the father Swedish, the child will learn to associate these languages with these contexts. Arnberg described a situation where the child switched to English upon seeing his mother’s car near the kindergarten. Similar findings were characteristic of Julia and her siblings when they spoke Swedish to each other. Often they would switch to Russian when their mother entered the room. When the higher mental function is involved, it is not the situation, but rather the child that controls the situation. The stimulation comes from the individual him/herself. Thus, the child is conscious of what is going on around him/her. When the elementary mental function is involved, the child receives stimulation from the environment.

Applying Vygotsky’s higher and elementary mental functioning to the bilingual child, Arnberg (1992:479) argued that a child not only reacts to stimulation from the environment but is also conscious of the language presentation and is able to reflect on the languages and even control his/her language production. Already at the age of 2;3–2;5, Julia was able to consciously correct herself when the “wrong” language had been used. However, the process itself started before that age, and Julia – to be understood properly – applied various strategies available to her, both linguistic and paralinguistic ones. Nicoladis (1998) appealed for further research on how bilingual children use various clues in order to understand that there are two different languages in their surroundings. As far as Julia is concerned, I argue that she learned to separate the two languages gradually, in the process of communication, according to the patterns and feedback signals she found in the input (see also chapter 9).

However, the child is not just a passive receiver of information; she also plays an active role in the process of separation as well. She learns to distin-

\textsuperscript{189} Words denoting the same meaning but in a different language.
guish between the linguistic varieties by associating words with different people and by repeating them after her caregivers, both occasionally and on purpose, just as she repeated everything else (like the actions of the parent: putting her diaper in the washing machine when she saw her mother putting clothes there (1;6) or collecting the food left on plates when she saw her father doing it; see discussion in 8.5).

Two kinds of strategies will thus be looked at in order to determine how the child learns to understand that she is dealing with two different linguistic varieties:

(1) those that focus on the active role of the child and
(2) those that focus on the active role of the adult.

First I will cover strategies that the child uses to address the problem of communication and then in chapter 9 discuss the strategies that adults exhibit through their child-directed speech (CDS).

8.2. At what age do children distinguish between the two languages?

Already at the age of two months, infants are able to discern syllable-like stimuli better than non-syllable-like stimuli (Bertoncini et al. 1981). Young children are also said to be able to distinguish between two languages from very early on in their development (Nicoladis 1998; Genesee et al. 1996; Bosch & Sebastian-Gallés 2001; Hammes & Blanc 2000). As early as ten to fourteen months old, bilingual babies have shown that they can babble in different patterns with their English-speaking mother and French-speaking father (Maneva & Genesee 2002). However, this may be due to children adapting to the language of their interlocutor from an early age (cf. Arnberg 1990), not necessarily because they have developed two completely separate linguistic systems, as has often been claimed.

I believe that the child may be able to distinguish between different varieties from very early on, but only when they are spoken with native-like or natural proficiency. Since the form of the word is arbitrary, it is almost impossible for the child to know what word belongs to which language when pronunciation is almost the same. Deuchar & Quay (1999) investigated how early a bilingual child simultaneously exposed to English and Spanish could make appropriate choices and what appeared to be the factors determining his or her choice. They found a strong tendency for the language of the child’s utterance to match that of the context at the age of 1;7–1;8.

Julia’s data from this period (1;7–1;8) are also full of examples where she seemed to use the right language with the right person; a general examina-
tion of this evidence may be enough to prove that the child could distinguish between the spheres of use of the two languages:

(78) 1:7
GRANDMA: ты хочешь бутерброд?
‘Do you want [a] sandwich?’
JUL: нет!
‘No!’

However, this “separation” of the earliest period (1;6—1;8) may be because the child (1) acquired particular words in a particular context and (2) associated them with a particular interlocutor. It may also very well be that the child has no way of knowing that the varieties she is exposed to actually represent two completely different languages and not two closely related dialects of the same language. If we base this thesis on the child’s perspective and not that of a linguist, who is perfectly aware, for example, that English and Dutch are two different languages and not two different dialects of the same European language or that the dialects of Dalarna and Skåne are not two different languages related to Central/Stockholm Swedish but rather different dialects of the same language (sc. Swedish), then how can we really be sure that the child actually knows that Russian and Swedish are two totally different languages and not two remote varieties/dialects within the same diatopic system/of the same language? Various instances of language contact phenomena discussed in chapter 7 and chapter 9 pertaining to caretaker speech do not make the situation easier for the child.

When Julia talked to a Russian speaker she had never met before or met very rarely, she was not really sure which language to choose:

(79) 1:7
ZHANNA: Хочешь писать?
‘Do you want to write?’
JUL: Nej! (Sw)
‘No’

When speaking with “unknown” interlocutors, the child paid a great deal of attention to their body movements and listened to their speech especially carefully. Sometimes Julia would deny a proposition because she thought something else was meant:

(80) 1:7
ZHANNA: ЧТО это? Киса?
‘What is it? [A] cat?’
The same phenomenon was observed when Zhanna said *так* (which means ‘well’ in Russian but ‘thank you’ in Swedish; cf. Sw. *tack* ‘thank you’) when she turned the page. Julia looked a bit surprised since she could not understand what she was being thanked for (or was she surprised that monolingual Zhanna was using “Swedish”?). Julia also preferred to say some words in Swedish, even with her mother, like *так* ‘thank you’ instead of Russian *спасибо* (cf. the discussion about pronunciation difficulty in 8.5):

(81) 1;6

JUL: Мама, на на 192! (giving me a bottle of formula)
‘Mom, take, take’ (Rus)
COM: the mother takes it
JUL: Tack!
‘Thank you’ (Sw)

At 1;10 – 1;11 (October 2005) the child started substituting many overgeneralized forms for more specific ones: whereas before she would call many drinks *пить* (‘drink’; by its main function), now she started using more specific words: чай ‘tea’; сок ‘juice’; вода ‘water’. Appendix 3 presents other words that were over/underextended during this period. However, Julia would still call the objects she did not have a name for by their functions, for instance the pacifier top of her bottle was also called *пить* ‘drink’ (when the child was helping her mother in the kitchen), while all the other tops were called *ка* (sc. крышка) ‘lid’ and put in a separate box with the rest of the lids. When the child would find another lid (while sorting out the mess in the kitchen drawers), she would give it to her mother saying: *Та! Пить! Та! ‘take’* (Sw), *‘drink’* (Rus) *‘take!’* (Sw), while the regular bottle top was given using the words: *Та! Кад!* The child’s reaction to the mother’s words *она сломанная уже* ‘it [sc. the lid; fem.] is already broken’ (when Julia gave her a broken lid) was *ох! Убили!* ‘oh, it is killed!’ (Rus). This word was obviously remembered from a trip to Crimea, when the child heard it many times about killed insects. The word *убили* ‘they killed it’ was over-extended in many other cases and meant that something was ‘over, broken, dead’; i.e. it was the end of something.

---

190 Perhaps Julia thought that the word meant ‘to pee’ like in Swedish (*kissa*), since I usually used this word in its masculine form (*ko*tik) because of the ambiguity.
191 This word is acquired very late in monolingual Russian children as well; see discussion in Eliseeva (2008).
192 *На* meant ‘дай’
Many forms were learned in a context and were thus always used correctly from the very beginning: упало! ‘fell down’. Julia was used to saying the Russian words пить (‘drink’) and дай (‘give’) even to her father, and he seemed to understand her and never protested or forced her to say dricka (‘drink’ in Sw) or ge den (‘give it’ in Sw) to him. Thus, it was not easy for Julia to understand which language went with which person since everyone seemed to understand everything.

However, in that period Julia started to become increasingly aware that there were two different linguistic varieties, and, as I have mentioned earlier, at 1;9, Julia’s preschool teachers noted in a regular parent-teacher conversation that she had stopped using Russian words like на ‘take’, нельзя ‘not allowed’, никак ‘doesn’t work’, не могу ‘I can’t’, пить ‘to drink’ etc. in a Swedish context (which she occasionally did before, even in preschool).

Thus, by the age of 1;9 Julia was capable of carrying a conversation at least with Swedish speakers without using any Russian elements. In the mother’s diary too, there is a special note indicating that at the age of 1;10 – 1;11 a clear language separation was seen in Julia’s speech, since she was now adjusting her linguistic behavior to strangers as well, which had not been observed before. However, having separated the languages does not mean that a child has stopped mixing them. On the contrary, (conscious or) real mixing – by definition – begins with language separation. In addition, some instances of interference were noted, and they were most likely not conscious. As we saw in chapter 7, Julia’s Russian output still contained non-target-like features, but in Swedish contexts (at least in her monolingual Swedish preschool) the child’s speech was completely free of Russian by that age. At home Julia would still occasionally use Russian words with her monolingual father and with her sisters as well as many Swedish words with her mother and Russian-speaking relatives and friends when they came to visit.

The first instance of language interference was noted at the age of 1;9 – approximately at the time when the two systems were ‘differentiated’: the use of the word oïc (Rus oj + Sw s = ojg) in a Russian context, which could be the Swedish equivalent of ‘ouch’. Yet, as we have already argued, separation happens gradually (just like learning to “separate” over/underextended utterances) throughout infancy, since from the earliest stages Julia was able to associate Russian with Russian speakers who spoke Russian with her (her mother and Russian grandmother Lidia) and Swedish with her father, sisters and Swedish relatives.

Perhaps some parallels can be drawn between separating Russian and Swedish and using the words дай ‘give me’ and на ‘take it’ in Russian. In October 2005 (when she was about 1;10), Julia finally started to distinguish between дай and на, which was an important step in her development. Not only did she learn to distinguish between these two words; she also started using на only in a Russian context. Still, it was not an easy road, and before
Julia finally learned to differentiate between words, she would often use them together or try to correct herself when she heard that she had made a mistake. Also at around 1;9, Julia showed signs of awareness about the two linguistic systems in production. Nevertheless, there is some indication that this happened in comprehension three months earlier, at around 1;6.

(82) 1;6

Julia is trying to reach for Susie’s telephone:
JUL: Дай, дай, дай!
‘Give, give, give!’
SUS: Man får inte leka med telefonen!
‘You must not play with the telephone’
COM: Julia accepts it but looks at Victoria, then at her father.
JUL: Дай э!
DAD: (repeating after the child) Дай э!
JUL: /pause/ Dad? (surprised that her father was speaking Russian to her?)
DAD: А? (not understanding the child’s reaction)

Julia’s surprise may well have been because her father repeated the Russian utterance after her, thus using the “wrong” language. The following examples, which show Julia’s ability to “translate,” may also indicate that the child was aware of the two different languages:

(83) 1;7
MOM: Юля, скажи: купаться!
‘Julia, say: bathe!’ (Rus)
JUL: bada!
‘bathe’ (Sw)

Perhaps Julia understood the task скажи: купаться ‘say: bathe’ as ‘say купаться “bathe” in Swedish, since during the period from 1;7 to 1;10 – when a child learns to “separate” her languages – all her energy seemed to go to solving the problem of language separation. She was eager to demonstrate this ability or it may be that she simply did not want to say the Russian word купаться ‘bathe’ because it was more difficult to pronounce (the child definitely knew what the word meant).

When she spoke Russian, Julia was still dependent on visual aids such as pointing and gestures. Thus, she had difficulty talking on the phone, especially with her Russian grandmother, whom the child talked to frequently:

(84) 1;9

COM: Julia talks to her grandmother over the phone
GRANDMA: А что Юленька сегодня кушала?
‘What did Julia eat today?’
JUL: (pointing at the plate with her food)
GRANDMA: Что Юленька кушала?
‘What did Julia eat?’
COM: obviously not hearing the answer
JUL: pointing at the plate again
MOM: котлетку. Скажи «котлетку».
‘A meatball. Say “meatball”’.
JUL: Ky
‘Ball’
GRANDMA: Котлетку, Ласточка! Котлетку.
‘Meatball, sweetheart. Meatball’
COM: hearing what the mother says in the background.

Sometimes Julia used Swedish when she talked to her mother even after
the age of 1;9, perhaps to achieve a special pragmatic effect (to emphasize
her point) or simply because she had a unified system of negation elements
for both languages. However, in the example below, it appears that the child
had to use Swedish to make her mother understand that she did not want to
take off her pants simply because she did not want to pee. This was a co-
mon strategy for Julia: to use all possible means available to her in order to
be understood:

(85) 1;9

Julia is sitting on her pot wearing pants.
MOM: А трусики снимать будем?
‘Shall we take off your pants?’
JUL: Но
‘No’
MOM: А почему не будем?
‘And why not?’
JUL: Нет! О байс!
‘No! Poop!’
MOM: Юля, а трусики будем снимать?
‘Julia, shall we take off your pants?’
JUL: Неее!
Nooo
MOM: Сними трусики и сядь на горшок!
‘Take off your pants and sit on the pot!’
JUL: Нээээ….. питя-пень….Нээээээ…..
Näääää pita-penj-näääää
MOM: Давай, сними трусики и сядь на горшок!
‘Let’s take off your pants and sit down.’
JUL: Нэээээээээ!
Näää! (a loud scream)
MOM: Юля, пойдём на горшок!
‘Julia, let’s sit on the pot!’
JUL: NEJ!
Perhaps after having used all the alternatives she knew in Russian, she resorted to the last one she knew in order for her mother to understand her. Julia would often use any means available to her to get what she wanted. The language switch above had a purely pragmatic function. At times, the child may perhaps simply have felt like using a Swedish word, without attaching any deeper meaning into it:

(86) 1:8
MOM: Пойдём гулять, Юленька!
‘Let’s go for a walk, Julia’ (Rus)
JUL: Neja!
No (Sw)

8.3. The importance of the child’s motivation

Successful bilingual development means that the child has to learn both languages and use them in interaction with different people. Bilingual children must somehow learn to interpret bilingual input and use the appropriate language in the right context. Still, children have to be motivated to separate the languages; in other words, they have to need it in their life. Motivation as a factor has not yet been seriously investigated in bilingual acquisition, as has been noted by some researchers (Rontu 2005), but it has been examined much more carefully in psychology (see Bloom & Tinker’s 2001 monograph, for instance). When the child has no need for one of the languages, he/she will probably not be motivated to do use it and will instead have a preference for one over the other. If the mother understands when the child speaks Swedish to her, it will take much longer for language separation to occur, and even then the chances are rather limited that the child will actually speak the other language. At home her “monolingual” father also reacted to her Russian speech and understood it to the extent that it was possible. At 1;10–1;11, Julia would often say пить ‘drink’ (Rus) and дай ‘give’ (Rus) even to her father, and he understood her and never protested or forced the child to say dricka ‘drink’ (Sw) or ge den/det ‘give it to me’ (Sw). 193

The first “real” need for Julia to speak Swedish was perhaps in kindergarten, where no one understood Russian. At the age of 1;9–1;10 she seemed to realize that words such as обувь ‘shoes’; пить ‘drink’; одеть ‘put on clothes’ etc. were simply not used in preschool; if they were used, they were not understood by anyone. Before 1;9 the child might use not only Swedish words with monolingual Russian speakers, but also Russian words with

---

193 At the same time Julia would always insist on using the word jacka (Sw ‘jacket’), even with her mother.
monolingual Swedish speakers, for instance in kindergarten. Even words the child knew in Swedish might be said in Russian, such as обувь ‘shoes’, одеть ‘to put on clothes’, писать ‘pee’, какать ‘to poop’ etc.

8.4. Associating words with different people

When a child acquires a language, he/she tries to combine the world of things around him/her with the world of words (Cejtlin 1997:23). I would add that the child tries to combine the world of people with the names they use for the things around them. Just as the child discovers that different words can be used for the same object (e.g. Limon (the name of Julia’s bird), птичка ‘little bird’ (Rus), fågel ‘bird’ (Sw), попугайчик ‘budgie’ (Rus), pippi ‘birdie’ (Sw),194 черепашка ‘tortoise’ (Rus) and Sköldis,195 the child had to understand that some of these Russian words were only used by certain people, while others were not used (or understood) by them. Julia definitely associated different words with different people. The video camera was called mamma, and Hammarby (a Swedish football club) was called pappa. The child, for instance, was quite surprised when she saw me wearing her father’s green Hammarby T-shirt or other clothes she associated with him; she was similarly surprised with some of us spoke the “wrong” language (see table 3).

The violin that Julia’s older sister, Victoria, played was called “Victoria.” Julia also associated different objects with their function (the video camera was used to make recordings of her: as soon as the child saw the camera she said: Julia!196). She also knew her back would be scratched when she got on her pot – and demanded it. A little later (when Victoria started playing the piano and guitar), Julia associated other musical instruments with her as well, and as soon as she saw an instrument or heard it she cried Victoria!

Julia also knew that certain special words belonged to specific people. Julia’s mother, for instance, always said the word ‘folder’ in Russian (papka197) and Julia never heard it from her father, so she only knew the Russian term and used it even when she talked to Swedish-speaking interlocutors simply because she was not familiar with the Swedish equivalent. By the same principle, Julia associated two different linguistic varieties spoken around her with different people; still, understanding what it was all about was a gradual process. Some gestures were also associated with certain people. She was brought up in a world where her mother said спать ‘sleep’ and

194 These words are synonyms of some existent words/notions/references out in the world.
195 The name of the family’s pet tortoise.
196 Later on Julia of course learned to say ‘camera’ as well.
197 This word was very important since papka contained Julia’s portfolio – her earliest paintings, information from the doctor and other activities. The child was very fond of it.
her father sova, her mother said чистим зубки and her father borsta tänder-na ‘brush (your) teeth’. The question will remain unanswered whether the child saw differences in the process of brushing one’s teeth given by the two different labels and adjusted to them. However, it is also possible that Julia not only associated the two words/phrases with different people but reflected on the differences between them, for instance that the process of brushing one’s teeth or being put to bed was slightly different when done by different parents (cf. the discussion in De Houwer 2009). The child seemed to learn different words in a specific context. They were context bound, and she separated them by function, not linguistically; still, what exactly happened in her brain will remain a mystery.

Julia was so context-sensitive that she even used the few English words she knew in what were in her view their appropriate contexts: she said bye bye and hi only to the people her grandmother said these words to (neighbors who often visited the family during the daytime).198 In July 2005 (1;6), Julia was reported to use the word пока ‘bye bye’ (Rus) with Swedish people as well but only with close relatives; however, she chose English words with neighbors who came to visit.199 Since the words were context-bound, one could easily get the impression that the child was able to separate the languages (cf. 8.2):

(87) 1:8

JUL: Mamma, mas! (maslo)
‘Mom, butter’ (Rus)

COM: the child usually says this word pointing to the green package with margarine when she has breakfast with her mother.

However, when the Russian word was unknown, the child would say the one she knew, without reflecting much on adjusting the language to her interlocutor: Julia said Hämta! ‘Fetch it’ (Sw) to herself and sighed when she discovered that her toothpaste was not upstairs and that she would need to go downstairs to get it (1;8).

As Julia started to spend more time in a Swedish-speaking environment she became even more dominant in Swedish. When the child was 1;10, the mother made a note in the diary that Julia had a very intensive period of Swedish and used very few Russian words:

Julia has a very intensive period of Swedish now. There are very few Russian words, and only Swedish comes from her mouth, Swedish and again Swedish!

198 A diary note from June 2005.
199 Julia was so fond of using the few English words she knew that her Russian grandmother even made a note in the diary: “We taught the child Russian and Swedish and she started to speak English!” (May 2005).
During this period it is very important “not to understand.” Yet I observed that, despite all of Julia’s Swedishness, when she is with me, she switches to Russian. And then I try to develop her Russian. (diary note)

In this period, it was crucial not to give up but to continue speaking Russian to the child. Perhaps, after having separated the languages, the child wanted to choose one of them. At the age of two, for instance, there was a period when it was basically impossible to find any Russian material in Julia’s corpus. In all, there were no more than ten phrases in Russian; the rest were mixed or in Swedish.

In many situations, Julia saw that Swedish worked just fine. However, despite Julia’s strong preference for Swedish, when she was alone with her mother, she would always switch to Russian (as much as as possible, since Swedish dominance was so strong that most new words came entirely in Swedish). That was perhaps the only domain where she remained consistent. However, the time spent alone with her mother was not enough to sustain a good command of Russian. However, by the time Julia was 1;11 she was so good at associating different words with different people that she was also able to reflect on it:

(88) 1;11
Julia packed her bag and said: Hej då, pappa! ‘Bye, Dad’ (Sw). Пока, мама ‘Bye, Mom’ (Rus).

As the child grew older (by around 2;1–2;2), she would simply pick the words from her lexicon that fit best in a given situation (a strategy that resembles code-switching; see chapter 7). However, she still associated some phrases with certain situations. A diary note from January 16, 2006 (2;0), indicates that Julia’s mother gave her father instructions about one task he needed to do and at the end added: ring mig om det är nåt ‘call me if something comes up’. Julia repeated the words after her with the same intonation, waved to her father the way her mother did and after that would often say to her father when he went to work: 200 ring mig om det är nåt.

8.5. Learning by imitation and repetition

Naturally, learning by imitation plays a substantial role in learning any language (see Bandura 1977, Cejtlin 2000, Eliseeva 2008:49). Bandura (1977)

---

200 The pronunciation was, of course, simplified ring/å nä nåt, and the child did not understand what she was saying (except perhaps the word ring ‘call me’ (Sw)).
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argued that it is always important to take into consideration the child’s ability and desire to imitate adults – as well as his/her desire to carefully observe what is going on. Still, language acquisition is more a matter of maturation than imitation. Jakobsson (as cited in Eliseeva 2008:49) emphasized the creative nature of language acquisition: “the main task of the child is to discover linguistic rules in order to be able to create the words and the sentences that the child never heard before and imitation cannot explain it” (my translation).

However, imitation is a very important strategy in the language acquisition process, especially during the earliest stages; and even linguists who do not account for language acquisition in behavioristic terms must admit that a young child often wants to adjust to the language spoken by the interlocutor. Adults and siblings engage the child in different activities to develop his/her ability to imitate, which is also believed to be one of the main pre-conditions for developing speech (Cejtlin 2000). There are two different types of imitation found in the literature, echocholalia (ЭХОЛАЛИЯ) and autoechocholalia (АУТОЭХОЛАЛИЯ). Since the topic of this chapter is language separation and not imitation per se, I recommend that readers take a look at e.g. Eliseeva (2008:49-57), Bazžina (1985), Piage (1997) or Cejtlin (2000) for a further discussion of imitation; I will only mention such points that have a special relevance to my topic. Thus, in this discussion by imitation I only mean “echolalia” (the second and final step in the imitation process, in which echolalia is imitation that originates from outside stimuli, a model taken over from some other individual), while “autoecholalia” is repetition, an act that is made following the child’s own model (Bazžina 1985a:17-18). Autoechocholalia needs to be sufficiently developed for echolalia to appear (see Eliseeva 2008).

Julia loved to imitate both the words and actions of her caregivers. She started consciously repeating words after her caregivers from approximately 1;9–1;10:

(90)  **1:9**

COM: Julia and Victoria are sitting in the kitchen
VIC: Печенье!  
‘Cookie’
JUL: Сенье!  
‘Ookie’
VIC: Печенье!  
‘Cookie’
JUL: Сенне  
‘Ookie’
VIC: Кака

---

201 The automatic repetition of vocalizations made by another person.
202 Eliseeva (2008:49), following Bazžina (1985:17-18), argued that this distinction should be made.
The child obviously showed a clear preference for shorter and simpler words with respect to phonotactics:

(91) **1;10**

Julia said the word *plan* (Sw: *flygplan*) ‘plane’. I tried to teach her to say *самолёт*. The child repeated “BLU-BLÖ-TIK” (Diary note)

(92) **1;11**

I tried to make Julia say *яблоко* (‘apple’) but she insists on saying *äpple*. Then I gave up and asked her to say *ябло*. She repeated it (Diary note).

It is not a new idea that the level of pronunciation difficulty plays a role in the order of acquisition in children acquiring two languages simultaneously, and it has been supported by a number of researchers (Dieser 2007, 2009; Gagarina 2005 among others). Lisa Eliseeva, a monolingual Russian child, showed a similar tendency (see Eliseeva 2008). However, it is not supported by everyone (see Protassova & Rodina 2005).

However, by the end of 1;11, Julia had learned to pronounce even difficult words in Russian, but she often made a recast of the syllables, as in: *тависебра* = *‘awathro* = *throw away*. She repeated all the words with great pleasure, both in Russian and Swedish, no matter how difficult they were (which is also consistent with previous research; at the time of his/her vocabulary spurt, the child stops paying attention to pronunciation difficulties).

Julia loved to repeat especially after her mother. She was also given a toy parrot that could record human speech and repeat it afterwards; that toy remained one of Julia’s favorite possessions for a long time. By two years old, the child had also learned to closely imitate intonation (especially that of her mother and grandmother). She was taught not only to repeat different words, but also in what situations these words should be used (and by whom). As the child grew older, she was often asked to repeat the word after her mother or – if the wrong form was used – to repeat the correct one, at times with the help of a recast of the child’s utterance. However, there were some words that Julia did not want to repeat since she could not associate them with the

---

203 It may be hypothesized that these early repetitions also help the child acquire her first syntax and morphology. Thus, the quality of input and parental strategies are crucial.

204 Usually, pronunciation difficulties no longer play a role after the vocabulary spurt (cf. also Eliseeva 2008:92).

205 The child starts to use various strategies to make pronunciation of the words easier: assimilation, elision of syllables, sound substitution, cluster reduction (Eliseeva 2008:48).
objects she was used to. One of these words was *te* (Sw) ‘tea’, which Julia neither used nor wanted to repeat.\(^{206}\)

\[(93)\]

\[1:9\]

JUL: чай
‘Tea’

DAD: Te. Säg te!
‘Tea. Say tea!’

JUL: Неее! Чай!
‘Nooo! Tea!’ (Rus)

COM: The sound of protest. The child does not want to repeat the word *te* ‘tea’

When the child understood that the two words meaning the same thing belonged to two different people, she used this newly acquired knowledge all the time (as she did with all her newly acquired knowledge; for instance when she learned to open a bottle, she started opening every bottle, or when she learned to close them, she closed them all). As I mentioned earlier, at the time Julia started repeating words and phrases after her caregivers, she also started to repeat everything else they were doing. The following example shows how quick the child was to repeat, after her mother, the act of closing a bottle:

\[(94)\]

\[1:8\]

COM: The mother is sorting things in the kitchen, trying to find bottle tops that match the bottles

MOM: Смотри, что мама нашла?
‘Look what mommy has found’

JUL: Да
‘Yeah’

MOM: Крышку для бутылочки!
‘A bottle top’

JUL: Ай ай ай! Ой ой!
‘ay ay ay! Oy oy!’

COM: Julia looks at her mother, who was making a hole in the nipple, probably imagining that the bottle is being hurt. The mother tries to adjust the two parts of the bottle that she has just found. Julia also takes two similar parts and tries to do the same. Of course she does not succeed since the task is too complicated for her.

JUL: гån-gå! (‘det går inte’ Sw)
‘It does not work/it is not possible’

\(^{206}\) Julia was not very willing to repeat words like ‘cardiology’, ‘biology’ etc. either, since those words had no content for the child.
Looking at the video tapes when the child and her mother are working together, one can clearly see that Julia is doing everything the same way her mother does. When the child sees her mother putting two Tupperware parts that fit together, she then takes two other parts and tries to put them together and close the container (cf. or throws her diaper in the washing machine, as discussed above). All these activities are accompanied by rich interaction in Russian, so Julia could learn specific words in the context. She also received immediate feedback to her own utterances. It is not surprising that during such activities the child learned to use the right words in the right context and had the opportunity to use Russian quite a lot.

When it comes to imitation, it is important to have someone the child would like to imitate (cf. Tomasello 2003). Strong emotional bonds are necessary here (see Pavlenko 2004 for a further discussion on emotions in bilingualism). By repeating the words after her parents, the child learns to associate the words with specific caregivers even more strongly:

(95)  1:9

MOM: Чего это? Мамин чай, да? Скажи: мамины чай!
‘What is it? Mommy’s tea, yeah?’
JUL: Мама
‘Mommy’
MOM: Мамин чай!
‘Mommy’s tea’
JUL: Мама сий!
‘Mommy tea’
COM: with a tender voice, praising the child
MOM: Маленькая…
‘Sweetheart….’
JUL: Мама сий!
COM: repeating once again to make her mother happy
‘Mommy tea!’

This desire to make her mother happy was very important to Julia, which was especially apparent in the child’s desire to repeat the correct form “for her.” These early repetitions also helped the child form her first syntax and morphology since they made her aware of the formation of (in this case) possessive forms. In the majority of cases, the child also received feedback for having repeated the “correct” word, which illustrates the importance of caregivers in bilingual development:

207 These bonds vary in different cultures (and even in families) and can be built in various ways, with interaction only being one of them. In order to build strong bonds between the child and the parent, the latter should adapt his/her speech to the child’s cognitive development at a certain age in order for real interaction and understanding to take place.
8.6. Repair strategies and translation

I operate from the assumption that the main communicative intention of the child is to be understood (cf. Bloom & Tinker 2001). When the child wants something, she can express herself very clearly. If understood, she makes no attempt to change her linguistic behavior. If not, she applies all the strategies available to her (even para- or non-linguistic ones) to get satisfactory feedback from her caregivers.

When children use a language (or variety) that their interlocutors obviously do not understand, they may respond in a variety of ways indicating that a repair or a reformulation of the utterance is needed (Genesee et. al. 1995:624). These ways may be either linguistic or non-linguistic (such as gestures, pointing or crying) and more or less successful. Most often Julia used a combination of strategies, for instance translating the word and pointing or repeating the word in the same language and pointing (which was more common). The child often tried out what might work in the situation:

COM: Julia is sitting at the table eating. Her father is sitting beside her. Julia’s sock falls off her foot
JUL: паль!
‘fell’ (Rus; fell down 3p.sg.)
COM: Dad goes on reading his paper without paying attention to what the child said.
JUL: Упала!
‘fell down’ (Rus; fell down 3p.sg.)
COM: but Dad does not react anyway.
JUL: Упала!
‘It fell down’ (fem, Rus; fell down 3p.sg. FEM.)

The child was praised for being able to repeat the word correctly. That is why many parents may feel they should pretend they do not understand when the child speaks the “wrong” language (cf. Döpke 1992).
COM: Dad just looks at her and does nothing. Julia starts to cry and uses the last alternative she can think of.

JUL: ramla! (sc. ramlade)
‘fell down’ (Sw)

COM: Dad finally reacts and helps her.

(JUL) 1;11

COM: Julia goes to the refrigerator:
JUL: lass! (glass)
‘Ice cream’

COM: Mom does not react.
JUL: klass! (sc. glass)
COM: Mom does not “hear”
JUL: аоее (мороженое)
(Something that might be “ice cream” in Russian)

COM: Mom goes to the refrigerator and gives Julia some ice cream:
MOM: Мороженое. Юленька хочет мороженое, да?
‘Ice cream. Julia wants some ice cream, right?’

After a while the child stopped saying glass to her mother (cf. Imedadze 1960 about not just using a word from another language but reflecting on it as well). Communication was always purpose-oriented. Thus, Julia applied all the methods available to her in order to be understood. The strategy of “translation” (or rather speaking both languages simultaneously usually in order to emphasize or clarify something), was used by the entire family, and the child most likely simply picked it up from them. Translation was used both for emphasis and to ensure that the child would understand, sometimes for both purposes at the same time (see chapter 9 for a further discussion):

(99) 1;6

DAD: Vill du ha mjölk? (Sw)
‘Do you want [some] milk?’
COM: no reaction
COM: Father asks the same question again.
COM: No reaction
DAD: хочет? (Rus 3.p.sg.)
‘She wants?’ (wrong grammar but the meaning is clear; Dad has also learned this form)
COM: Julia reacts. She does want some milk.

210 These strategies will be discussed in more detail in chapter 10.
COM: Julia is sitting and talking to herself in some unintelligible language
COM: Victoria comes in with a drink in a glass
COM: Julia takes the glass very quickly from Victoria’s hand
COM: afraid that she will spill it
VIC: Nej! Her! Her! Her! Sitt! Sitta!
   ‘No (Sw). No (Rus). No (Rus). No (Rus). Sit down. (To) sit!’

It is scarcely possible for the child to distinguish what is right and what is wrong in speaking since there is nothing right and nothing wrong for her when it comes to language choice, just the desire to make herself understood (cf. the father using the same strategy).

MOM: Nej, Julia! Так нельзя!
   ‘No, Julia! It is not allowed!’ (when she sees that Julia is painting in the wrong book). The child stops immediately.
VIC: Юля! Нет!
   ‘Julia! (Rus). No! (Rus). No (Sw).

At 2;1 the child had so much linguistic awareness that she was also able to translate from one language to another. One of the first examples of translation was noted on February 13, 2006 (2;1): Julia was going around singing Blinka lilla stjärna där ‘Twinkle twinkle little star’. When her mother asked her: what are you singing? The child answered: Blinka звёздочкапа- ленькая! (‘Twinkle (Sw.) little star (Rus.).’ This also shows that Julia was not only able to use the right language in the right circumstances but also understood that she was using two different linguistic varieties. After 2;0 such examples became very frequent in the data:

DAD: Vad har Julia ätit?
   ‘What did Julia eat?’
JUL: Gröt
   ‘Porridge’
GRANDMA: Что Юля ела?
   ‘What did Julia eat? (Rus)’
JUL: Кауя!
   ‘Porridge (Rus)’

Julia had no way of knowing the word “twinkle” in Russian, but it is sufficient to note that she was trying to help her mother understand what she was singing in Swedish by translating it into Russian as well as she could.

However, even here we cannot be really sure that the child realized that the grammar underlying them was different, i.e. that Russian and Swedish were actually two different languages.

211 Julia had no way of knowing the word “twinkle” in Russian, but it is sufficient to note that she was trying to help her mother understand what she was singing in Swedish by translating it into Russian as well as she could.

212 However, even here we cannot be really sure that the child realized that the grammar underlying them was different, i.e. that Russian and Swedish were actually two different languages.
COM: Julia wants her mother to read a book, she takes it and brings it to her:
JUL: *Max ball*! Макс Мячик!
‘Max’s ball (Sw) Max’s ball (Rus)’
COM: The child translates the utterance for her mother.

When not heard or understood, the child would easily switch between the two varieties. She would also translate easily when asked to (a habit that improved with time):

(104) 2;6

JUL: Victoria är dum!
‘Victoria is stupid'
MOM: Что?
‘What?’
JUL: Вика плохая!
‘Vica bad’
MOM: Как Вика плохая по-шведски?
‘How would you say that in Swedish?’
JUL: Vica dum!
‘Vica bad [lit. stupid]’
MOM: Как носик по-шведски?
‘[And] how do you say nose in Swedish?’
JUL: Näsa!
‘Nose’
MOM: A глазик?
‘And eye?’
JUL: Глазен!
‘Eyes!’

Repair strategies, like the child’s ability to translate, were the main indicators of her awareness of the presence of the two varieties in her environment. The strategy of translation may just as well have been borrowed from the input, but in order to use it, the child needs to have developed a great deal of language awareness and bilingual competence.

The first signs of language awareness in comprehension were noted at the age of 1;6 when Julia reacted to her father’s comment in Russian (see example 82). By 2;5 however, the child has become somewhat of a language purist who would not allow any “wrong” person to use the “wrong” language variety anymore. This was especially apparent with her Russian grandmother, who was trying to learn some Swedish and was looking for an opportunity to practice it:
8.7. Autonomous speech

There is a special period in the child’s development called autonomous speech (see Vygotsky 2004:123, Eliasberg 1928 cited in Vygotsky 2004). The notion of autonomous speech is closely connected with the notion of elementary and higher mental functions discussed above (cf. Arnberg 1992). Yet autonomous speech is almost forgotten by researchers nowadays and to my knowledge has never been discussed in relation to language separation.213 Thus, I find it important to explain the notion of autonomous speech here and describe it in more detail since it may be directly related to this issue by working together with simple association and repetition in development.

The period of autonomous speech characterizes the child’s development at the end of the first year and in the second year – the very period that is the focus of language separation studies. According to Vygotsky, autonomous speech (AS) is characteristic of all children at this age; it is a law rather than the exception and is a necessary period in every child’s linguistic development. Thus, the notion of autonomous speech is highly relevant to bilingual children since the process of bilingual and monolingual acquisition seem to be very similar.

During the period of autonomous speech, it is the child who digests the information and actively produces his/her own speech. AS has its own rules and is thus called AUTONOMOUS. Yet “the language of a child is always the result of cooperation with the people around him” (Vygotsky 2004:131, my translation). Many words of autonomous speech are understood only from the context since communication without a context is impossible with a child who is just 1;5 years old. Words in autonomous speech are different from words of “real” speech and at the same time have a lot in common with it. These words are even different in meaning (cf. under- and overextension also found in Julia’s data): коляска гуляет ‘The pram is walking’; Бабочка

---

213 However, Dressler (1997) talked about the period of proto-morphology that all children go through. Isenina (1983; 1986) uses the term “pre-word period“ in the same sense. According to her, this period lasts until the age of around two years, i.e. before the first phrases start to occur.
The butterfly is walking’ (where ‘walking’ means на улице: ‘outside’; everything that was outside was ‘walking’).

During this period of development, the child simply cannot grasp the meanings of words and their meanings (ibid.). Vygotsky emphasized that communication in a certain period of development is only possible between the child and the people s/he knows very well since only these people can understand the child (Vygotsky 2004:125).

AS is not to be confused with CDS (see chapter 9), although many words in AS have a lot in common with CDS. This may be due to these words actually being words the child is able to understand at some particular period of development (ibid.). Still, autonomous speech is the speech constructed by the child him- or herself with the help of information received from input – in line with the child’s cognitive development at some particular point. The meanings of these words are also constructed by the child. The child is even capable of creating phrases with the help of autonomous speech, but these sentences do not have any syntax; the words in these sentences just follow each other (cf. pivot grammar or telegraphic speech). The words are used only in order to express what the child feels (or sees) at that particular moment: Kisse komma! (sc. Kissen kommer ‘The cat is coming’). One of the main peculiarities of autonomous speech is its agrammaticity, which means that the child does not combine the words with each other using syntax, but according to completely different laws:

\[106\] 1:9

JUL: Мама, сumpa (= strumpa) дать!
‘Mom, [fetch/give me …] [the] stockings!’ (stockings)
Sw Rus

Often these are interjections that simply follow each other, exclamations that do not seem to have any sense to us: a ve bā te unga! (untranslatable). On the other hand, parents tend to hear the words that remind them of their own speech, like in this case the word unga, which is reminiscent of the Swedish word gunga ‘swing’ that the father immediately heard and distinguished from the whole flow (it could of course also be the Swedish word unga ‘young people,’ but it is very unlikely that word would be used by Julia at 1;9). Thus, the parent hears the words that he/she wants to hear and attracts the child’s attention to these very words, in this situation, and – which is relevant to us here – with this particular person.

Since the words in autonomous speech can only be used in a particular situation, the same word can mean different things, depending on the context. Nor are the meanings constant. In general, vocalizations with permanent meaning are very salient in the speech of young children. For instance, Julia
used the word *akn* pointing at the balloon that she wanted her mother to buy on the way to the zoo. Whether the child meant the whole bundle of balloons (any of the balloons that were sold) or a specific one was not certain. Perhaps the word even meant the verb ‘I want to have it.’ However, in that particular situation *akn*+pointing meant that she wanted a balloon. Akn, to my knowledge, has no relation to any Russian word.214

Words in autonomous speech have indicative and nominative functions and do not have a significational function (Vygotsky 2004:133). With the help of autonomous speech, the child is capable of talking only about the things he/she sees right now (cf. the balloon discussion above). The main function of autonomous speech is to highlight some single fact in the situation, to point at something, which can be compared with a pointing gesture: *мама идёт* (идёт) ‘mommy go (goes)’. During the period of autonomous speech, the child is not capable of noticing what different words have in common and cannot make generalizations about the difference between the mother’s (Russian) and the father’s (Swedish) speech. Perhaps at the very moment the child understands that a blouse, skirt and coat are clothes, she will also understand that *книга* ‘book’ is a Russian word and *бок* ‘book’ is a Swedish one, and both words refer to the same thing (cf. using Bella for all black animals at the age of 1;10, for all black dogs at the age of 2;0 and only for one particular dog called Bella at 2;2 215). Yet, at the time the period of autonomous speech is considered to have ended in monolingual children, Julia showed an awareness of the two languages that are present in her surroundings (viz. at 1;9). Perhaps this period is necessary for the child to develop cognitively and linguistically in order to understand what is going on around him/her – not only when it comes to understanding what linguistic variety should be used in what situation but also that the words might have a narrower (or broader) sense than the child assumed. The end of the second year is full of changes in the child’s cognition and linguistic development (see appendix 1). However, all of these changes are interrelated, and the child’s awareness of there being two linguistic varieties present in his/her environment is just one part in this process.

8.7. Discussion

When it comes to acquiring two mother tongues, the process of separation still seems to be intensely debated. The question itself may seem unnecessary if we assume that children do not even have such a process but develop

---

214 Such words may also come from CDS, but are changed by the child to the extent that they become unrecognizable.

215 See appendix 3.
two linguistic systems in parallel, independently of each other, which is known as the two-system model.

Arnberg (1981, 1987) had an interesting theory about the ways the child adjusts his/her speech to the surroundings (i.e. to the interlocutor, the topic of the conversation and, of course, the interlocutor). She took a different approach in discussing language separation, arguing that children separate the languages because they strictly associate each of them with a specific person, i.e. they use elementary mental functioning (Arnberg 1992). Thus, the strategy at home for raising bilingual children may increase their attention to dual language presentation in their environment and thus make the separation process easier and quicker. Strategies where the languages are connected with a specific person seem to be more helpful than those where parents use the two languages interchangeably (Arnberg 1992). We know from the literature that children who appear to mix languages minimally or not at all have nearly always been raised based on a one-person-one-language strategy. Thus, speaking the “right” language to the “right” person implies early language differentiation, according to Arnberg. She considered language awareness to be the main factor in early language separation. In her different approach to investigating language separation, she suggested that two types of learning processes were involved: elementary and higher mental functioning (Arnberg 1992).^{216}

Nor should one forget that there are other factors as well that may be considered important in the issue of language separation, for instance imitation and observational learning (see Bandura 1977). De Houwer has emphasized that the Separate Development Hypothesis she proposed (De Houwer 1990) is only valid when children were brought up according to the one-person-one-language system, which brings us back to Arnberg’s argument about elementary and higher mental functions. Still, the relevant question to ask is what happens when the parents mix their languages? Will this be fatal for De Houwer’s theory? I believe this dilemma can only be avoided when the data rule the theory and not vice versa. Besides, how can we, as noted above, actually know that the child knows that Russian and Swedish are two different languages? How can Julia know then that Russian marks for case and Swedish does not? Why would she even be looking for a case in Russian then, especially after 1;10, when Swedish clearly becomes her dominant language?

Julia started to use the right language with the right interlocutor at 1;9 and give correct answers, at least in Swedish. Thus, it can be said that by 1;9 the child developed an ability to adapt her language to the situation and the interlocutor.^{217} Mixing still occurred in communication in the family and in

---

^{216} For a further description of these approaches, see Vygotsky (1978).

^{217} As was shown in the previous chapter, this does not mean that the child had appropriate (sc. age-adequate) linguistic skills in each language.
situations where Julia had to communicate in Russian. Before 1;9 the “separation” was perhaps due to Julia acquiring different words in a specific context and associating them with a particular person. In her very first months, the child learned to associate Russian with Russian speakers and Swedish with Swedish ones. As noted, she also associated particular gestures with a particular speaker (like making a sign of the cross in the air with her Russian grandmother). Thus, it seems possible that a simple association between a word and a person, imitation and autonomous speech work together in development. Language differentiation is clearly more than a simple association; however, children may start with a simple association, then imitation, then autonomous speech until the “real” language systems have been differentiated as a result of exposure to two different varieties.

The child’s motivation is another factor that has proved to be important in language separation. However, no matter how motivated the child is, it is still the parents’ responsibility to provide equal development opportunities and more or less equal input in both languages before the critical period is over. The circumstances may change, and the child may later want to make more use of his/her weaker language in everyday communication, but the clear dominance of one language in his/her early childhood may have negative consequences for the development of the weaker language later on and require additional input and time to develop proficiency in that language. Parents should create meaningful situations so that the child wants to use both languages; it is important for them to create situations that will motivate the child to speak the language that does not develop according to age-relevant norms. The best motivation is a real need to talk, to express one’s wishes and desires. Nonetheless, more case studies are needed that are focused on the process of separation per se to understand this very intriguing issue.
9 Language input: The importance of child-directed speech and parental strategies

Children acquire language from the speech they hear. There is no other way of acquiring a language.

Stella Cejtlin (1997:10)

9.1. Introduction

In constructivist approaches to language acquisition, a great deal of attention is paid to the linguistic input that children receive and analyze since input provides the main building material for constructing their own linguistic system.

In this chapter I will try to find connections between language input and the bilingual development of this child in the given circumstances. In order to do this, I will analyze the linguistic input Julia heard around her as a context for her language acquisition, which resulted in her acquiring a stronger language (L1\text{strong}) and a weaker one (L1\text{weak}).

According to Pennfield et al. (1959), bilingual children learn two languages as easily as they learn one. However, the analyses provided in chapter 7 have clearly shown that, while Julia seems to follow the same linguistic milestones as monolingual children, some delay was noted in her acquisition of Russian morphology (or rather, Julia had not fully acquired some aspects of it). Whereas by the age of 3;5 a Russian child with typical development is expected to have understood the main morphological rules, Julia’s data show different examples of a reduced case system, the wrong gender assignment, violation of agreement etc., thus showing more characteristics of Russian as a second language, an L2, rather than an L1. \footnote{The child’s Swedish, on the other hand, compared perfectly with that of her monolingual Swedish peers.}

One can only wonder where these differences in her ultimate attainment originate. Are there connections between delayed language acquisition and the input that the child was exposed to? The answer to this question may have important consequences not only for BFLA but for the theory of lan-
language development in general. Input factors are sometimes thought to play a relatively small role in language acquisition (Chomsky 1975). In the Principles and Parameters Framework (Chomsky 1981), learners depend on input only as a trigger to learn how specific grammatical parameters are set in the language they are acquiring and for as long as the amount of input is not reduced to zero, the quantity of input is not really relevant in the generative approach (Pinker 1994). In my view, this idea can only be supported (to a certain extent) when it comes to the acquisition of phonetics and phonology – at least as far as this child is concerned. However, that has not really been the case with morphology. Another highly relevant question is what role input plays in the process of language separation.

Below I will argue for the importance of the quality and quantity of input for balanced bilingual development and show that Julia’s acquisition patterns may be partly related to the patterns she was exposed to. On the other hand, the quality of input cannot explain most of the qualitative changes observed in the child’s grammar. The lack of Russian input as such may have led to development that diverged more from what has to be considered typical with the monolingual acquisition of Russian. As we saw in chapter 6, impersonal constructions were actually acquired by the child by 8;7, after she had spent almost two months in Crimea in a Russian-speaking environment. Another issue that we should bear in mind is that it is not just input but also the limited number of people the child could talk to in Russian (output factor) that is important here. While in Crimea, she was exposed not just to her grandmother, but also to her uncle, cousins and friends she met everyday on the beach. The child was placed in a totally monolingual Russian environment where basically no Swedish was spoken (at least after the age of five), except some phone conversations with her father.

On one hand, by having very few Russian people around her in Sweden, Julia did not get the linguistic variety she could have had if she had been brought up in Russia. The limited number of people to talk to meant not only that she was not exposed to a variety of speakers and variety of constructions but also that she did not have a fair chance to practice enough either. Still, the amount of input she received was sufficient for her to understand that she was dealing with two linguistic varieties and learn to separate the two systems, as I showed in chapter 8. Although phonology lies beyond the scope of this investigation, it should be noted that the input received was also enough for her to acquire Russian phonology on a native speaker level. Julia’s pronunciation has never been marked – either in Swedish nor Russian. Perhaps that is because phonological patterns are acquired very early in life, and Julia was exposed to enough input in that developmental period to master it. It is hoped that the discussion in this chapter will also give some clarification as to how this was possible.
9.1.1. The conditions for language learning

The basic conditions for learning a language are (1) direct exposure to it and (2) the need to interact in the language (languages): the more a child interacts with speakers of a language, the more of the language she will learn\textsuperscript{219} (this is rather obvious; see Ervin-Tripp 1971, Pearson et al. 1997). Hyltenstam & Abrahamson (2003) argued that the language learning mechanism needs to be continuously stimulated from birth to develop properly. This is especially important during the so-called critical period of language acquisition (i.e. between the age of zero to four years, according to Meisel 2007). Keeping this in mind, I will mostly concentrate on the earliest stages of Julia’s linguistic development and try to understand how the patterns of exposure at that time were related to her proficiency later on.

But the relevant questions are rather (a) how to stimulate this mechanism and (b) how much stimulation is needed for it to function. Montrul (2008) suggested considering the following dimensions of input: (a) timing – when exposure to input began; (b) setting – the context in which input is received; (c) mode – how input is received; (d) amount – how much input the learner is exposed to; (e) quality – the contextual and structural variety and accuracy of the input. Other dimensions have also been suggested; for instance, the input should be presented in a way that is comprehensible to the child, which makes the role of the caregivers especially important.

Thus, I find the following issues relevant for the evaluation of input, and in this chapter I will attempt to describe its multifaceted nature:

- Is the input in both languages balanced or not?
- Is one of the languages dominant with respect to the environment the child lives in?
- How many people give input to the child, especially in the case of the weaker language?
- Do the parents use a simplified language or not?
- Are there other languages the child is faced with?
- Does language mixing occur, how do the caregivers react to language mixing and do they mix languages themselves (with consequences for the quality of input)?

9.1.2. Input defined

Generally input is seen as the sum of all linguistic production aimed at the child (see Cejtlín 2000). However, not all of this production can be comprehended by the child. In addition, the language not spoken directly to the

\textsuperscript{219} Although it is not obvious how close the association between exposure and learning will be (Pearson et al. 1997).
child may also have an influence on production (for a further discussion, see De Houwer 2009).

In this chapter it will be argued that
(1) The quantity of input that Julia received was not enough to fully construct a Russian mother tongue. The lack of Russian input in Julia’s surroundings inevitably led to development that diverged from what is typical of monolingual acquisition of Russian, since the child had to build her own constructions on the basis of the limited material available for her.

(2) The linguistic behavior of the caregivers is mirrored in the linguistic behavior of the child. Thus, Julia’s acquisition patterns can be partly related to the patterns she was exposed to.

(3) The role of the caregivers is crucial in language acquisition since they engage the child in conversations and accommodate their own talk in various ways. Given the positive emotions transmitted from the very first phrases the child heard in her CDS, Julia developed a positive attitude towards Russian and a desire to speak it. That continued throughout her childhood and even became stronger with time.

Since this study adopts a developmental perspective, it is hoped that with time Julia will be able to acquire the necessary structures. Yet it is important for now to remember that the input Julia received was not static but rather varied over time. Julia’s surroundings adapted to her linguistic and cognitive development. And on the contrary, Julia also perceived her input differently, depending on her current developmental level.

9.2. Methods of measuring input

There are two methods of studying the relationship between parental input and children’s linguistic competence. These methods are based on either questionnaires or the analysis of the spontaneous interaction between the children and their parents. Some methods use both techniques (for a further methodological discussion, see La Morgia 2011).

Parental input can be measured by the number of utterances produced when they address the child, and vocabulary can be calculated by counting words or word roots. However, it is rather questionable whether input and output are best measured by factors that are numerically quantifiable. The complexity of the child’s utterances is usually measured by counting the mean length of utterance (MLU) in words and morphemes. However, MLU

---

220 Russian was also chosen (considerably) later as the preferred language of communication among the three siblings (see chapter 1).
is not a reliable measure in dealing with languages with rich morphology such as Russian, since using (inflected) words as units of measurement is not an acceptable way of finding the MLU in a language like Russian, where syntactic relations are expressed in morphology as well (e.g. the locative relation). Moreover, in an investigation that focuses on innovations in Russian and that does not make direct comparisons with Swedish, using these quantitative measures makes little or no sense. What do the MLU in phrases like the following actually tell us? Что она spelade? (на чем она играла?) ‘What did she play’? надо быть с детьми (с детьми) ‘One has to be with her kids’; я взяла много вещи (вещей для шитья) ‘I took the sewing things’; он от одиннадцать лет (от одиннадцати) ‘it is at 11 years old (from)’; никак положить в rapperskorg – видишь какой он полный ‘can not put in this garbage can’ (Sw), you see how full [he] it is’. Should we count words or morphemes in a phrase like: мы много вещи (вещей) делали ‘we did many things’; У никого так много нету (ни у кого нет так много) ‘at no one has so much’ (no one has so much) or in this one: это онс221 кваркирами (это его аквариум, аквариум для головастика) ‘it is his aquarium (aquarium for a tadpole’)?

Therefore, the MLU of Julia’s utterances will be not taken into consideration in this investigation. However, in this study, I also estimated time of exposure and gave a detailed description of the people the child usually communicated with. Instead, samples of conversation between the child and her parents from Julia’s earliest developmental periods should provide the best material for analyzing this kind of input.

A detailed qualitative description of the speech the child was exposed to will provide a much better picture of whether Julia’s caregivers provided her with morphologically and syntactically complex utterances and a varied vocabulary. It will also give an idea of the caregivers’ attitude to language mixing and to helping the child use the two languages in different sociolinguistic circumstances.

9.3. Factors contributing to the development of early language skills

Different factors have been said to contribute to the development of early language skills. Hart & Risley (1995) found that output, vocabulary and complexity of utterances in parental input were some of the contributing factors. Frequency in input has also been shown to have implications for vocabulary acquisition (Huttenlocher et al. 1991) and for grammar as well.

---

221 Rus pron on + Sw possessive s.
Pearson et al.’s study (1993) suggested that a reduced productive vocabulary was the result of reduced input. Four years later, Pearson et al. (1997) proved the relation between quantity of input and vocabulary learning during the second year of life. The researchers investigated the relationship between input received and vocabulary learning in Spanish-English bilingual children; using data from CDIs, they were able to show that the number of words learned in each language was proportional to the amount of time spent with speakers of that language. The child seems to need several hundred exposures to different forms before the transformation is complete (O’Grady 2005:195).\footnote{Seen from an historical point of view, this may also result in language change: if the word is not frequent enough, the child’s (deviant) form will become permanent (see Naigles 1990, O’Grady 2005 for a further discussion).} If this does not happen because the word is not frequent enough, the child’s form may become permanent and lead to language change (see Naigles 1990, O’Grady 2005 for a further discussion on language change and examples).

This also corresponds to what Smith & Cormack (2002) call “frequency threshold.” Thus, if the amount (critical mass) is insufficient, the child will build his/her knowledge based on the resources available to him/her. It is thus crucial to discuss the importance of input in conditions where access to input has not been optimal, since as a consequence language learning patterns may develop differently from those that develop under optimal conditions. The “recasts” of the child’s utterances are another important factor in the acquisition of grammatical morphemes (Farrar 1990). However, the cognitive capabilities of children that heighten their ability to assimilate input should not be forgotten either (Gopnik & Meltzoff 1987).

The bilingual situation brings its own challenges, and the quality of the mother’s language becomes especially important here since she is often the main source (and sometimes the only source) of linguistic input for the child. Given that the mother has spent more than sixteen years in Sweden, it is not surprising that her language may show some signs of attrition\footnote{Although not many, since she teaches Russian at the university and has the opportunity to speak Russian.} and may contain features that are not typical of monolingual Russian speakers. As was mentioned earlier, it is thus mostly the mother’s variant of language that is further transmitted to the child and used by Julia as material for her language construction. Furthermore, as was seen in chapter 8, Julia tried to repeat everything after her mother and basically tried to do everything the way her mother did it.

Another closely related issue is the role of the siblings. According to Qi (2004), the overemphasis on parental input has underestimated the capacity of bilingual children to take in other sources of input such as siblings, neighbors and other people the child often hears in his/her everyday life. Julia’s case is particularly interesting since her siblings were born and raised in
Sweden as well and their language differed significantly from that of their Russian peers (for more details, see Ringblom 2003, 2004, 2010). Even though they mostly spoke Swedish to Julia between the age of zero and five, some Russian was still used (at least in Crimea), and Russian was always spoken by them to their mother, Russian grandmother and other Russian relatives, so Julia could overhear some of their innovations. The question is whether (and how) these forms influenced her acquisition of Russian. While Julia grew up almost isolated from other children speaking Russian (except when visiting Crimea or when her Russian-speaking relatives visited), she was constantly exposed to the language use of her siblings.224 Below are some examples of language patterns that Julia was exposed to.225 SUS: давай оденем горячую (meaning тёплую) обувь. Сегодня холодно. ‘Let’s put on hot (warm) shoes. It’s cold today’; VIC: Что это за fancy печенюшки, такие все из себя?! ‘What kind of fancy cakes are those? Real sweets!’

(107) 7;2

SUS: У тебя семь подарок! NOM form instead of GEN
‘You have seven present’
JUL: Не семь подарок! Семь подарки226!
‘Not seven present. Seven presents’ (NOM plural)
MOM: Подароков!
‘Presents’ (GEN plural)
JUL: Подароков...
‘Presents’ (GEN plural)

(108) 7;2

SUS: В алфавите только 31 буква!
‘There are only 31 letters in the alphabet’227
MOM: Буква
‘letter’
VIC: Да? А я тоже думала буквы228...
‘Really? I also thought letters.’

---

224 Even though Susie and Victoria switched to speaking Russian with Julia when she was five, she was passively exposed to their variety before that.
225 However, the siblings started to speak Russian to Julia only when she turned five.
226 Julia built the word подарки in NOM Plural. The child noticed that something was wrong in Susie’s utterance and came up with a better suggestion (in her view).
227 This is either Gen PL fem. (because of the number before it, Julia may think that, after numbers higher than four, the GEN PL must be used, such as 5 букв) or NOM Sing Masc (as Julia seems to think).
228 Since Julia pronounced 31 as тридцать один (in masc); perhaps that is why she also said буквы.
The irregularities in the Russian input of Julia’s siblings meant that the child was exposed to what was in a way a simplified variant of Russian that could also account for Julia not receiving sufficient correct input for a correct linguistic analysis or to sustain the correct form. This, together with the fact that she did not receive sufficient input simply because there was no opportunity for the mother to speak Russian to Julia more than a few hours a day in some developmental periods (when Julia was at preschool from 8:00 to 4:00 or when the mother had to work late at night) may have had an impact on her acquisition of Russian morphology. However, it is very important to look at what was happening before the age of five, when Russian was almost never spoken directly to Julia by her siblings. Thus, as for the language that is not spoken directly to a child, Julia’s case may be of particular interest, not only because of the variant of Russian she was exposed to by her siblings but also since there are numerous examples in her data when she used an English word in an appropriate situation even though English was never spoken to the child except among relatives/friends. When Julia’s Russian grandmother went to Crimea, the child no longer heard English input everyday and stopped using English words in her speech,229 except perhaps the word ‘scratch’ (for a further discussion on overheard language, see De Houwer 2009, Döpke 1992).

The role and impact of the speech of parents and siblings cannot be neglected, since they are the child’s “teachers,” and the attitudes they attach to the language(s) can also be crucial for the child’s bilingualism. It is therefore important to show how the linguistic behavior of the caregivers is mirrored in that of the child. All these factors must be taken into consideration when describing the complicated phenomenon called “input.”

Key theoretical questions in this respect are (a) how much input and (b) what kind of input does a child need to acquire two languages simultaneously in a native-like manner. Unfortunately, because Julia’s parents separated at 4;5, I cannot address that issue in the present study. Certainly, it is possible that, if the child had had regular exposure to Russian even after the age of 4;5 (and not just every other week, which was the case here), the results would have been different. As Arnberg (1981) argued, raising a child bilingually in a situation where the only source of language input is from the child’s family requires greater efforts from the parents than is often recognized. Moreover, the multiple stressors that Julia was exposed to during that time also had a negative impact on her linguistic development as well.

Recalling Pinker’s words, the ability to use a language is sometimes referred to as something that “comes so naturally that we are apt to forget what a miracle it is” (Pinker 1994:7). Nonetheless, the situation in acquiring two first languages simultaneously may not be quite the same. The role of the

---

229 Since only Russian is spoken in the part of Crimea Julia visited, it is not relevant to talk about influence from Ukrainian.
quantity and quality of exposure becomes even more crucial in BFLA simply because of the time aspect (it is scarcely impossible to speak to the child twelve hours a day in both languages) but the question is: do we actually need to? Monolingual children are not exposed to their mother tongue twenty-four hours a day either, and they still learn to speak. The crucial question in this respect will be whether Julia’s divergent development in Russian was due to her limited exposure to the language or to the contact situation per se, where the influence of Swedish could have played a major role.

Even in monolingual situations we are familiar with cases of so-called language deprivation. Cejtkin (2000) also describes cases where children (at times from very rich families, where the parents are more preoccupied with giving them expensive toys rather than time) speak very poorly, almost exhibiting signs of SLI. This can just as well be the case in bilingual families where the mother does not have a chance (or desire) to stay at home with the child for the first three years since she often has a full time job to return to. Lanza has also pointed out that “input is more than amount of exposure to each language” (Lanza 2004:250; emphasis in the original). Thus, not just the quantity of input (or the time of exposure) is important here and may have consequences for the child’s bilingual development; so is the quality of input (including child-directed utterances, the child-directed speech (CDS) the child was exposed to). However, it is interesting to shift the discussion from quality and quantity of input to the process that children go through when they analyze it.

9.4. Input and output: where does intake come in?

“Our experience has been that what our children heard (input), our children spoke (output). While my project has convinced me of the truth of this axiom, not all researchers seem to agree – and I’m not really sure why”.

Stephen Caldas (2006:196)

The truth, however, is more complicated than described in this quotation. In order for input to become “output,” it must be first “digested” by the child in some way or another. The material the child gets from speech must be sys-

230 Sweden has vårdnadsbidrag ‘child allowance’, which allows one of the parents to stay home with the child and receive over €300 a month for this, but many parents still prefer daycare since they usually have a full-time job to return to once the child is 1;0–1;5 years old. Daycare in Sweden is usually so good that parents who have the option of staying home longer still prefer to send their children there because they believe in the importance of social development and interaction with other peers.

231 By quality of input I mean not just the amount of mixings in the caregivers’ speech but also the overall language quality of their speech, including possible instances of language attrition.
tematized. As Ščerba (1974:35) put it, the speech organization of a person cannot simply be the sum of his/her experience of speaking and understanding but rather a digestion of this experience. This “digestion” will be the main focus of this section. If the amount (the critical mass) of input is insufficient, the child will analyze it according to the resources available to him or her. Thus, I find it important to discuss the importance of input in conditions, when access to it has not been optimal and as a consequence language learning patterns may develop differently from those that develop under optimal conditions.

Montrul (2008) also noted that input is much more than simply listening to the language. It is more than something entirely external, that is out there in the environment, as many researchers are inclined to assume. It is also the child’s attempt to process what he/she hears, i.e. the input must be converted into an intake, the part of input that is completely and successfully processed (see Montrul 2008, Hatch 1983 and Carroll 2001 for a further discussion about input and intake). However, there is still no agreement among researchers whether intake is a process or a product or a combination of the two (Wong & Simard 2000, cited in Rast 2010:99).

Following discussion in Montrul (2008), I consider intake to be the result of language processing the child is engaged in with the help of the feedback he/she gets from his/her caregivers, not just the linguistic environment that he/she is exposed to: “raw linguistic data out there in the environment is useless for the language faculty in the absence of mental mechanisms that convert these physical data into intake” (Montrul 2008). Input as such is not very effective without the caregivers’ feedback. As was mentioned (see chapter 8), recasts of the child’s utterances are an important factor in language acquisition (Farrar 1990).

Another relevant issue is the initial introduction to the two languages and the way the caregivers speak to the child during the earliest stages, their CDS.232 The way linguistic data are presented, the entire interaction between the child and the parents can be sufficient for his/her desire to speak the two languages. Thus, it is important to discuss what is happening in the child’s home during the earliest stages (when everything actually starts), and what the interaction styles are between the child’s caregivers.

---

232 I will use the term CDS or “caretaker speech” instead of the more widely used term “motherese” (Ferguson 1977) since the speech of Julia’s father and other relatives definitely played a vital role in her language development as well. They made adaptations in their speech when talking to the child and exhibited several characteristic features of the mother’s speech. These adaptations will only be mentioned and exemplified briefly here. Julia’s siblings also exhibited the same behavior.
9.5. Child-directed speech (CDS)

According to Ferguson (1977), most parents adapt their language to children (or simplify it) in order to give them a better opportunity to interact with their caregivers and learn their mother tongue. This phenomenon has been called child-directed speech (CDS) and has been widely described across different languages (see Nordqvist 2001 for an overview; cf. also Snow & Ferguson 1977, Furrow & Nelson 1986, Voejkova 2004). However, not much has been written about the CDS of bilingual homes. It is therefore important to consider this issue in more detail, especially given that CDS is believed to influence the entire language development.

The question that is especially relevant here is how CDS facilitates the acquisition of Russian. Since CDS is perhaps the most important input, it is hoped that we will be able to evaluate this linguistic material and also understand how it is related to the child’s linguistic proficiency later on. Thus, it is mostly the linguistic material of the adults around Julia that I will focus on here. My focus will therefore not be on the different ways adults initiate communication with the child.233

There are studies indicating a direct relationship between CDS and the acquisition of certain linguistic aspects (see Nelson et al. 1973 for English). Although there are no serious investigations so far about the influence of CDS on the acquisition of Russian, it has nonetheless been noted that children who hear speech with such adjustments, for instance onomatopoetic words like bee-bee for car or av-av for dog in their CDS, learn to talk faster (Cejtlin 2000); if they are not exposed to simplified speech (“motherese”), they may even lag behind in their language development.

However, the relationship between CDS and language acquisition is far from clear. While many features of CDS seem to be designed to enhance the comprehensibility of the mother’s speech, it does not mean that these adaptations are really necessary for language acquisition to occur (Lieven 1994, O’Grady 2005). Lieven (1994) concluded that, despite the attitudes towards the structure of CDS in different countries, most children solve the problem of relating the content of speech to its form. Thus, one cannot really be certain whether all the speech adjustments adults make when they talk to children are really necessary. There are cultures where infants are not even spoken to directly, but they too learn to speak (see Foley 1988, Lieven 1994, Déprez & Pierce 1993 for an overview). Still, in most Western countries parents are inclined to adjust their speech to infants (non-speaking persons). Many adults find themselves talking to children in a way that would sound strange in any other context. Voejkova (2004:51) also noted that the speech

---

233 For a discussion of the ways adults solve the problem of communication with very young children as well as different types of these registers, see Gavrilova (2007).
of a mother to her child has various peculiarities compared to the speech between adults.

The interaction aspect is perhaps the most crucial one in CDS. It is only natural since interactive communication may well be the main factor in language development (Vygotsky 1962). Matychuk (2005) also argued that the negotiation between the caregiver and the child lies at the heart of CDS, even if the infant does not respond in an adult-like way. However, after a few years, as the infant starts to produce more adult-like utterances, the interaction between the adult and the child becomes more balanced (ibid.), and most parents stop using this speech register when they talk to older children. Perhaps the main point here is that caregivers subconsciously want the interaction to happen on the child’s level of cognitive development. Various adaptations in CDS make it easier for the child to comprehend what the adult is saying and therefore make it easier to imitate them.

9.5.1. The characteristics of CDS

CDS (also called “caretaker speech” and “motherese”) has been identified as having several characteristics (at least in studies of Western middle-class families): (a) slower in tempo than speech between adults, (b) higher in pitch, (c) more exaggerated in intonation, (d) with shorter utterances and (e) with fewer complex sentences and subordinate clauses (for a more detailed description of CDS, see Snow & Ferguson 1977). With its repetitions and expansions of child utterances, CDS tries to engage the child in conversation, which is also considered to be its main function. Frequency of elements in CDS may play a key role as well, especially for the order of acquisition of inflectional categories and the prevalence of certain forms over others in children’s speech (Lustigman 2007). Some forms may be favored in CDS, for instance the more neutral or unmarked ones. It is also a general tendency in many languages that caretakers choose morphologically simpler nouns or more regular plural nouns rather than irregular plural forms (Brown & Bellugi 1964, Snow 1977, Cazden 1979, Lustigman 2007).

The main features of “caretaker speech” can be summarized as follows:

- the meanings of sentences are concrete and situation-bound (a “here and now” timeframe is used)
- utterances are simplified, with a more restricted range of sentence patterns and shorter sentence length
- extra information, most often for clarification (not needed when talking to adults)
- sentences contain expressive elements (diminutives, reduplicative words, special words and sounds)
- new or different words are used
- words have a different meaning in the “child context”
- frequent question forms
- sentences with high rising intonation.

All the characteristics of CDS noted above are also found in the input that Julia received from her caregivers, as will be shown below. These modifications in input are adapted to the needs of the child and seem to be important in order to communicate with him/her. In Russian CDS, some authors also mention typical Russian features such as threats like Будешь себя так вести, отдам милиционеру! ('If you behave like this, I will give you to the policeman!'); Сиди тихо, не позорь меня перед людьми ('Sit quiet and don’t make me ashamed of you in front of people'). Such phrases originate in adults wanting the children obey them in everything (see Bazžina 2009, which provides the examples above). Bazžina (ibid.) also emphasizes that the Russian communicative field is highly didactic. People try to teach what may appear to be strange to foreigners visiting Russia. None of these features was noted in the recorded material. I would venture to say that this may be due to my accommodation to the Swedish culture, since threats like these sound strange to me now. However, they were noted in the Russian grandmother’s speech to Julia: если ты не будешь спать, то придёт из леса серый волк и заберёт тебя ('If you don’t fall asleep, a gray wolf will come from the forest and take you away'). The grandmother made these threats very visual by showing Julia the forest outside the window. Such threats – surprisingly enough – did not result in any fear when Julia later went into the forest because a wolf was there. Yet every time her grandmother went to the window holding Julia in her arms, the child would point to the forest and say серый волк ('gray wolf').

A critical question here too is what is the appropriate age at which we can speak of using CDS. While Ferguson (1978) notes that adults who are in love with each other may also use this register, it is still reasonable to determine a borderline for using CDS in childhood. Gavrilova (2007) suggests an age boundary of two years since the main features of CDS are highlighted to a greater extent in this period of time. Casagrande (1964), on the other hand, draws the line at four years and Dil (1976) at six years. The question of age is not so important in itself, but rather in relation to another issue – the reason for using CDS. While I agree with Gavrilova (2007:389), who claimed that the characteristics of CDS are mostly visible before that age, following Casagrande, I draw the line at four years old, since after two years old, Julia’s parents had not stopped using CDS, but simply added new characteristics to it.234

---

234 Besides, at around four years of age, the communicative initiative shifts to the child, and the adult becomes more like a hearer (see Kazakovskaja 2006).
Bearing that in mind, it will be interesting to shift the discussion from the descriptions of CDS to its functions. According to Pine (1994), the main function of speech adjustments made in CDS is motivated by the desire to communicate rather than to teach the language. Uspenskij (2007), on the other hand, argued that parents also teach the child to speak. This opinion is shared by many users of this register (see Gavrilova 2007, who suggested putting the age boundary somewhat higher if we see CDS as a way of teaching language as well).

Gavrilova (2007) also talked about two different types of caretaker speech: the first is used with a child who has not started to talk on his/her own yet (before 1;6); the second is used with a child who has already started to talk (after 1;6). The borderline between these two periods is clearly arbitrary, but the main point in this division is to mark that adults use two different ways of talking to children at different ages and change them as the child becomes older. Cejtin (2001) suggested adding another important aspect – a didactic one. This aspect has turned out to be especially important in this bilingual family, since a key function of CDS here was not just communicating with the child, but also teaching her the language.

9.5.2. CDS in Julia’s home

De Houwer (1990, 2005) emphasized that, in order to be able to make comparisons between different case studies, researchers should describe the input conditions of their subjects in as much detail as possible. Thus, in this section I will describe the CDS that Julia received from her caregivers, concentrating on the Russian input and try to show how it influenced her acquisition of Russian. My main purpose is to highlight how input is related to the linguistic knowledge that the child developed in her weaker language later on. Generally, Julia’s parents tried to adopt the child perspective when they talked to her, and the topics of the conversation were connected to the immediate context with joint attentional focus. Thus, the focus here is mostly on the production of the caregivers.

The analysis will start with the very first months of Julia’s life, using some of the first mini-disc recordings of mother-child dyads available. Even at a time when Julia was able to produce only her earliest vocalizations, her mother tried to interpret them and give them meaning. Uspenskij (2007) argued that parents teach their child to speak by trying to find some meaning in their earliest vocalizations. Foley (1988) saw interpreting the earliest vocalizations as a way of seeing a small child as a personality. From the very first days of Julia’s life, her parents tried to promote her language development by talking to her in every situation, engaging her in conversation and interpreting her earliest vocalizations, trying to give them some meaning (see also Brown & Bellugi 1964, Snow 1977, 1983 and Cazden 1979).
Julia is lying on the changing table talking:

JUL: Lä…m…ä…ä…ä…ä

MOM: A кому скоро 3 meses будет?
    ‘And who is going to be three months soon?’

JUL: Aaaa

MOM: App! Скажи PPP!
    ‘Ar! Say RRR!

MOM: Где носик у нас?
    ‘Where is our nose?’

MOM: Вот он, носик! (answering her own question)
    ‘Here is our nose…’

JUL: арroy!

MOM: Arroy!

MOM: Tи маленькая, ти ласточка! Любимая! A кто любимый? Кто хороший?
    ‘My little and sweet one! My favorite! And who is my favorite? Who is beloved? Who is little Julia? Who is peeing with such a serious face?’

JUL: äääää

235 The so-called “doctor we” (as it is called in Russian). It is considered a common way of talking to patients (and small children).

236 Such repetitions were extremely common.

The main purpose of such conversations was to hold the child’s attention by asking various questions with rising intonation, commenting on everything the child was doing. These “dialogues” usually occurred in routine daily activities, and the mother and the child could have close eye contact with each other:
Examples like the one above are prevalent in Julia’s data in the earliest months. Such interactions comment on Julia’s activities (peeing with a serious face) and contain questions for which no answer from the child is expected, their function instead being social or phatic: “And who is six months old?”, “Who is beloved?”, “Who is Julia?” The pronunciation *my* [ti] instead of *my* [ty] shows that the mother adapts (here: simplifies) her pronunciation to the child, making it sound more child-like. The form [ti] is very common in Russian registers of CDS. The main function of speech is communication as such; caregivers need to be sure that the child understands them so they make these adjustments. Many expressive elements are also present in this dialogue. The word ласточка literally means ‘swallow’, but in this context its meaning is extended to ‘beloved, sweetheart’. The mother seems to comment on every action of the child and verbalize it: *А кто ножку кладёт в ротик и аже давится?* And who is putting her foot in her little mouth and almost stifling it? 0;6. Yet she also comments on everything she does as well:

(113)  **06;5**

MOM: Давай будем тебе прочищать носик. Ты хоть знаешь, что это так кое? Вот… и вторую носиньку… вторую носиньку…
‘Let’s clean your little nose. Do you even know what it is? So… and the second nostril… the second nostril…’

JUL: Aarroe…rrrr
MOM: Не вкусно?
‘Not tasty?’

JUL: Bäää buuu arrrr
MOM: Ну что, почистили носик?
‘Well, are we done cleaning your nose?’

JUL: rrrrr…mmm…abova…bu…bääää…aru…bla

Diminutives, reduplications and other expressive elements are very frequent in Russian CDS. We see many diminutives for names (especially for Julia – Юлечка, Юленька). The word носинька (‘little sweet nostril’) is an occasionalism and not normally used in Russian. Such occasionalisms were very frequent in the CDS Julia was exposed to (ротинька ‘little moth’; ко-тинька ‘pussy cat’ etc). The Russian adults around the child constructed

---

237 The same tendency (words getting a different meaning in the child context) was also noted in Swedish CDS.

DAD: Har du börjat med tutte? (napp) (surprised)
‘Have you started with a passifier?’

COM: when he sees Julia has put a pacifier in her mouth, which she never did before (1;9).

238 Aside from these early vocalizations, there were numerous examples of sounds that sounded “Russian” or “Swedish”. The parents typically separated those sounds from the flow of speech and emphasized them. The parents believed that this was the main way for them to mark “their own” language.
new words based on standard Russian and exposed Julia to them on a regular basis. This phatic function of CDS has a primary position until it gives place to the informative function as the child grows older and adults increasingly socialize with him/her to teach him/her information about the world. When Julia’s mother and grandmother asked her the following questions at the age of six months, they were definitely not expecting the answer “I did or I had” from the child: Кто почистил носик? (‘Who has had her nose cleaned?’). Even when the child grew older, the dialogues were still often held in the “we form.” The mother still commented on every action when she spoke Russian to Julia, not just in the present but in the near future as well. Like during the earliest stages, one striking characteristic of the dialogues is the very frequent use of the child’s name in various forms as well as repetition of the same phrase with different word order:

(114) 3;10

MOM: Садись, Юленька, садись масик мой!
   ‘Sit down, Julia, sit down, sweetheart’
MOM: Потом нам надо с тобой рыбок покормить, да, Юленька? Покорми- мь рыбок?
   ‘Later we need to feed the fish, yeah, Julia? Will we feed the fish?’
MOM: Садись, чтобы ничего не упало. Потом нам надо с тобой рыбок покормить.
   ‘Sit down so that nothing falls down. Then we need to feed the fish’

Julia’s siblings also adapted their language when they talked to her. Victoria, for example, had a strong tendency to speak Julia’s language:

(115) 2;6

VIC: Inte bita Toja (sc. Victoria). Inte, ont!
   ‘Not bite Toja (Victoria). Not, pain’
JUL: Это не по-русски!
   ‘That’s not in Russian’
COM: Julia corrects Victoria

As the child grew older (approximately from the age of 2;5), it was possible to have “real” conversations with her, to ask her questions and later to make Julia ask questions and answer them.
9.6. Communication versus teaching language through CDS

As was noted above, the main function of speech adjustments made in CDS is motivated by the desire to communicate rather than to teach language (Pine 1994). However, in Julia’s case it was also true that at least in the case of Russian, her mother was also trying to teach her the language, to adjust it to the child’s level and interpret her utterances. I felt that without those adjustments, Julia would not be able to understand me. It seemed that Russian was introduced from the very beginning as a second L1, and the mother also used translations from Swedish.

The parents often repeated the same sentence (question) several times in order for the child to grasp the meaning better (see examples 110, 111, 113, 114). Perhaps that was also a subconscious way of increasing the quantity of input.

The mother’s Киви! Скажи: киви! ‘Kiwi. Say kiwi’ (example 70) clearly shows her desire to teach Julia Russian, not just to communicate with her. The child was usually praised not just for being able to give a correct label for something but also for correct language usage: МОМ: Что это? ‘What is it?’ JUL: О-буфь! ‘ sho-es’! МОМ: Умничка! Обувь. Юлина обувь. Босожки Юлины. Красивые красные босоножки. ‘Good girl! Shoes. Julia’s shoes. Julia’s sandals. Beautiful red sandals.’

The didactic aspect is a very characteristic feature of Russian CDS, which was noted in earlier investigations as well (see Cejtlin 2009). When Julia repeated a certain sound more or less correctly (as adults expected), she always got very positive feedback from them. Below we see an example of her mother changing the word order to facilitate understanding when she saw that Julia did not respond to her question. It was often observed that Julia understood the question better when “the main word” came early in the sentence, what may be called focus placement:

(116) 2:5

MOM: Ты хочешь купаться?
‘Do you want to bathe?’
JUL: (silence)
MOM: Ты купаться хочешь?
‘To bathe – do you want to bathe?’
JUL: Да
‘Yes’

---

239 Julia’s sisters also applied a pedagogical strategy to “teach” Julia.
Julia’s favorite sounds at around six months were *aroj, dadadadada, ej, jajajaja; nja-nja, iii, ar, agu, ajaj, bäää, bum* and *avvv*. She loved to repeat different sounds after her mother, and her mother loved to repeat them after the child; this linguistic play was one of Julia’s favorite activities. These sounds are rather typical of early babbling, which usually consists of either a single syllable repeated several times (*dadadadada*) or varying syllables in a babble sequence (*babadada*). These sounds are not language-specific yet.\(^{240}\)

Below is an example of Julia’s Russian grandmother interpreting the child’s vocalizations (which was often very successful):

\[(117) \ 1;4\]

**JUL:** а́дя! Дя! (дай)
‘A gi! G[í]!’
**COM:** stretching her hand to get some bread.
**MOM:** Она говорит «дай!»
‘She says “give me”!’
**GRANDMA:** Сюзинька, дай ей хлебушка! На!
**COM:** Grandma gives Julia a piece of bread
**JUL:** ва ва ва
**COM:** chews and spits out the cucumber
**JUL:** A mam!
**COM:** in a demanding tone, at the same time trying to take off her bib and get down from her chair
**MOM:** А?
**JUL:** ÅÅÅ nj nj nj
**GRANDMA:** Finish…
**COM:** Grandma uses English since Julia’s father is present
**MOM:** Никакой не финиш, Юленька, потому что мама ещё не наелась. А раз мама не наелась, значит, никто не наелся.
‘No, Julia, it is not ‘finish’, since your mom is still hungry. And if your mother is hungry – everybody is hungry’.
**COM:** Julia silently tries to get down from her chair.
**GRANDMA:** It means I am full (and helps the child get down).
**JUL:** Hm! Hm! (happily)
**GRANDMA:** It means she is happy that we understood!
**JUL:** Дааааа\(^{241}\)!

Julia’s Russian grandmother often taught her what things were called in Russian, and she asked me and Julia’s siblings to do the same:

\[(118) \ 1;4\]

**VIC:** Titta, pappa!
‘Look, daddy!’
**COM:** grandma interrupts Victoria

\(^{240}\) Babbling sequences become language-specific only at around ten or twelve months (see Vihman 1996 or Clark 2009).

\(^{241}\) It is unlikely, though, at this age that Julia could understand her grandmother’s comment in English. So the child’s reply was rather an expression of happiness that she was understood.
The grandmother is either sure that the child understands Swedish better and thus wants explanations to be given in Swedish or she is afraid that Julia is socialized with too much Russian and is calling for more Swedish input. As noted earlier, the Russian didactic tradition is very clear here. The child has to learn. Julia was taught not only to say different words, but also in what situations those words were to be used (and by whom). As the child grew older, she was often asked to repeat the word after her mother or – if the wrong form was used – to repeat the correct one, often with the help of a recast of the child’s utterance.

(119) 1;11

JUL: Сётка
‘comb’
MOM: расчёска
‘comb’

Real corrections were used as well (although less often). In the example below, we see both the recast of the child’s utterance and the request to repeat it:

(120) 3;10

MOM: Ты уже не болеешь?
‘Are you not sick anymore?’
JUL: Болит
‘It is sick’
MOM: Я болею. Скажи: я болею
‘I am sick. Say: I am sick’

(121) 3;10

MOM: Какая у Юленьки болезнь? Что у Юленьки такое?
‘What kind of sickness does Julia have?’
JUL: Host
‘A cough’ (Sw)
MOM: Host? Кашель скажи...
‘Host? (Sw ‘cough’). Say кашель (Rus ‘cough’)
JUL: Нее. Хе хе.
‘Nope! Ha ha’ (laughing)
MOM: Садись, чтобы ничего не упало.
‘Sit down so that nothing falls down’

While the word ласточка (‘swallow’) is often used in the sense of ‘beloved’ in other contexts and by other speakers of Russian as well, the word kiwi is usually not used in any sense other than denoting the fruit (see above). Examples of using a word with a completely different meaning in an immediate context are very frequent in the Russian CDS that Julia was exposed to and are used not only by the mother but by the grandmother as well, who used the words котик (‘kitten’) and маленький ротик (‘little mouth’) to address the child:

(122) 1:4

COM: Julia is eating. She takes the whole plate and puts her face in it. The grandmother is terrified, runs to the child and starts feeding her with a spoon:

GRANDMA: На, котик!
‘Here you are, kitten’ (meaning ‘sweetheart’)

JUL: На на на!

COM: Julia shakes her head
‘Take take take’ (Rus, at this period of time also meaning ‘give give give’, but in this context also ‘do not give’ since the child also shakes her head when she says it)

GRANDMA: Ну как же так? Ам, маленький ротик, ам!
‘Why?’ (sc. ‘Why don’t you want to eat anymore?’) ‘Am, little mouth, am’!

JUL: Ай а! (said with a Swedish intonation)

DAD: Ай а!

COM: The father immediately repeats it after the child

JUL: Тень те тень

COM: holding a tomato
‘Tenj te tenj’ (just a combination of sounds, perhaps trying to say to mato)

GRANDMA: Она очень хорошая, маленький ротик. Спать… очень хочет спать…
‘It (lit. she) is so nice, this little mouth. Sleep… she wants to sleep…’

However, the child was not able to repeat all the words and phrases she was asked to because cognitively she was not ready for it (мамин чай was repeated as мама сяй).
9.7. Teaching language awareness through CDS

Julia was taught not only to say different words but also in what situations these words should be used (and by whom). From the child’s earliest age, her caregivers (especially her father) always repeated after the child what the word basically sounded like in their language, separating it from the rest of the “flow.” Although such utterances were often incomprehensible and by no means language-specific, the parents’ responses to them were very different, depending on whether they thought the utterance was said in their own language or not. When the father “heard” a word that sounded Swedish, he always emphasized Julia’s correct language use and gave her immediate feedback for using the “right” language:

(123) 1;4

COM: Julia stretches her hand, reaching for a fork. She takes it from her father’s hand:
JUL: Да да да!!! (дай дай дай!)
‘Gi gi gi (give)!!!’
JUL: вääää...uuu...äää...
COM: the child talks to herself and at the same time picks up food bits from the table and puts them back on her plate:
COM: no reaction from the father
JUL: O, nej! (all of a sudden, with Swedish intonation)
DAD: O, nej!? (repeating after the child)
JUL: Dej!
‘You’ [oblique case: dig] (Sw)
DAD: Här...
‘Here’
COM: The father gives Julia more food and kisses her
‘Here [you go]’
DAD: Gott. Så gott.
‘Tasty. So tasty.’

(124) 1;4

MOM: А Юля хочет колбаску? Юля… хочешь?
‘And does Julia want some sausage? Julia, do you want some?’
COM: The mother gives Julia a plate of sausage
COM: Julia picks up a piece and puts it in her mouth
MOM: Спасибо надо сказать. Спасибо.
‘One has to say “thank you." Thank you.’
COM: In the background one can clearly hear how everyone is trying to teach Julia to say tack (Sw ‘thank you’) at the same time.

The child’s desire to be understood is seen in her father’s speech as well (to say nothing of her mother, who switches to Swedish for exactly the same
reason). But even her monolingual father uses all the methods available to him. Julia’s caregivers used many different techniques to facilitate understanding, with changing the word order being one of the most frequent ones. The mother would often change the word order when she saw that Julia did not respond to her question. Gavrilova (2007) found that in mother-child dyads the same name is often used both as a subject and as an object. Such examples were very frequent in Julia’s CDS too: Пойдём купать Юленьку? Юленька будет купаться? ‘ Shall we bathe Julia? Will Julia bathe?’ The mother would often change the word order to express the same idea: Помоем головку? Будет Юлечка мыть головку? Головку мыть будем? These “techniques” have to be seen as a subconscious strategy to teach Julia the language. The mother always talks about herself in the 3rd person singular and often in the plural when she addresses the child:

(125) 3;10

MOM: Давай мама тебя щас научит бабушке звонить!
А давай бабушке позвоним.
‘Let mom teach you how to call grandmother. Let’s call grandmother’.
MOM: Пойдём выбрасывать бумаги.
‘Let’s go throw away the papers’
JUL: Бумажки
‘The papers’

As Julia grew older, the strategy of translation was added to those mentioned above, in order to be certain the child understood the utterance. That was also done to ensure that nothing important was missed in communication with the child. In this family, CDS was often characterized by simultaneous bilingual input when new words were introduced. This tendency was observed when the child had already begun to pronounce her first words (around 1;5, cf. with the second stage according to Gavrilova 2007) and increased with age. The more dominant Swedish became for Julia, the more inclined the mother was to translate a new word for her when she introduced it. Perhaps it was done for further clarification or to be sure that the child really understood her.

As Julia grew older, her mother’s intention was not only to engage her in conversation, but also to teach her information about the world. As noted above, these features of input are adjusted to the needs of the child (in this case, in order for her to understand the new concept) and are vital for communicating with her. Communication can only take place when both partners share common knowledge:
COM: Mother holds Julia’s foot after her bath
MOM: Смотря как кожица у нас съёжилась от водички, да? Долго Юленька купалась. Долго, да купалась? Купалась Юленька… Тогда кожица вот так сморщивается, видишь? ‘Look how our skin shrank because of the water, hasn’t it? Julia has bathed for far too long. She has bathed long. Julia has bathed… Then skin shrinks like this…. do you see?’
JUL: Пасики Юля. Пасики тоже.
COM: looking at her fingers
‘Fingers Julia. Fingers too’

Often, in order to be sure the child had the necessary cognitive base for learning a new word, the mother would translate the word or explain the new concept in Swedish:

COM: mother answers her own question
‘And what is this? Cucumber (Rus). Cucumber (Sw). Say “cucumber.”’
JUL: Бана..! Den!
‘Бана…’
COM: the child wants to say banana
‘That one!’
MOM: Ha ha!
COM: Julia calls the cucumber banana

In order to be sure that the child understood the word, the mother would often introduce it in two languages:

MOM: А это что?
‘And what is that?’
JUL: Туда!
COM: Julia points to her chest where she usually places the bib

Perhaps that strategy originates from the mother communicating with her older daughters, who often did not react when her mother used a Russian word. She had the feeling the word did not really mean anything to the child. When the mother told Victoria (who is fluent in Swedish and Russian and highly proficient in English), the mother had to search for the alternative in three languages until she got a reply from the child: “Aha, now I understand!”. A word like ulcer, for instance, needed to be introduced in several languages. When nothing worked, the mother explained what the word meant.

An instance of overextension (the child called all long fruits and vegetables banana).
'There!'  
MOM: Передник, да? Haklapp!  
‘A bib (Rus), yes? Bib (Sw)!’ (here, the mother introduces the same notion in both languages).

(129)  1;5

MOM: Эта соска тоже грязная. Она уфф! Она smutsig!  
‘This pacifier is also dirty. It is icky! It is dirty! (Sw)’

Translation is used for greater emphasis, as in uff ‘icky’, an onomatopoeia. As noted above, these features in the input are adjusted to the needs of the child (in this case, in order for her to understand the new concept) and are vital for communication with the child. Translation was also used in the siblings’ speech as well:

(130)  1;9

COM: Victoria brings a glass of water and wants to hold it for Julia while she is drinking (since Julia is too little to hold it on her own):  
Julia grabs the glass immediately:  
VIC: Nej! Her! Her! Beê! Sitt! Sitta!  
‘No (Sw). No! No! (Rus). Enough! (Rus). Sit! (Sw). Sit! (Sw).’

Victoria thus uses translation as well for emphasis and clarification, which is also clear from the example below:

(131)  1;9

VIC: Ska vi byta? Byta? Меняться?  
‘Shall we change? Change? (Sw)? Change? (Rus)’
JUL: Niiii!  
JUL: Mina mamma!  
COM: about Victoria  
‘My (pl.) mother!’
COM: Victoria gives a spoon to Julia  
JUL: Дай!  
‘Give [me]!’
VIC: Tack!  
‘Thanks!’
COM: Victoria answers in Swedish even though Julia’s utterance is in Russian.
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The siblings – like the parents – were teaching Julia to speak, not just trying to engage her in the conversation. This strategy naturally resulted in the same behavior in Julia:

(132)  2;5

COM: Julia is looking for her grandmother:
JUL: Бабушка!
   ‘Grandmother! (Rus)’
COM: Silence
JUL: Mormor!
   ‘Grandmother! (Sw, lit. mother’s mother; sc. the same person)’

It is not surprising that the child would later also initiate conversations in Swedish. Such attempts were often corrected with an appeal to use the “right” language:

(133)  4;2

JUL: Mam, jag behöver faktiskt tejp!
   ‘Mom, I actually need some tape!’
MOM: Скажи по-русски!
   ‘Say it in Russian’
JUL: Мама, дай мне tejp!
   ‘Mom, give me some tape!’

However, Julia could not say every word and utterance in Russian, no matter how much she wanted to:

(134)  4;4

JUL: Скорее, мам! У нас есть bråttom!
   ‘Mom, hurry! We are in a hurry!’
COM: borrowing from Swedish

Although at times when the child understood that the wrong language was used and she corrected herself, such “corrections” could make the situation even worse:

(135)  4;2

JUL: Мама, почему ты ser ut så här?
   ‘Mom, why do you (Rus) look like that?’ (Sw)
COM: The mother does not react since she is very tired that morning
COM: The child asks again in a “more Russian” way:
JUL: Мама, почему ты серёшь så här?
COM: a mixture of Swedish ser ut and Russian выглядишь: выглядишь = serёшь

That was not because she wanted to mix but because of language dominance. By 8;7 Julia had learned to express basically everything by means of Russian. She became very creative and invented new words for missing items ad hoc.

9.8 Parental strategies and language separation

The parents and other caregivers play the most important role in helping the child understand the world around him/her and the laws of this world, including linguistic ones (see Arnberg 1992). Arnberg (1987, 1992) repeatedly talked about the importance of making the child understand that he/she is dealing with two linguistic systems. This task will be much easier when the parents use the one person one language (OPOL) principle. However, the OPOL principle is not enough. It has been shown that the ways parents react to the child’s production are crucial for the child’s ability to use the right language in the right situation (see Lanza 1997).

If the mother constantly uses the English word ‘scratch’ in Russian (often with an adapted Russian pronunciation), there is simply no way for the child to learn that the word is not Russian. It is only much later, talking to other Russians, that the child will eventually learn that the word is not used by every native speaker. Julia continued to use the word ‘scratch’ even during her summer vacation in Ukraine, when she wanted her back scratched. When that was not understood, she had to learn the Russian expression почеши мне спинку ‘scratch my back’; from then on, she used them both. The word ‘scratch,’ however, has remained her preferred choice to the present.

This section will focus on the dynamics of interaction between family members during the early stages of Julia’s linguistic development (with a focus on language separation) and argue that what happens there has an effect on the child later on. As mentioned in chapter 8, even after Julia “separated” her linguistic systems, there was a short period of time (until around 2;3) when she occasionally used some Russian words even with her father and her sisters (with whom she spoke Swedish at the time). By the age of 2;0 the child was perfectly monolingual with her Swedish grandparents, aunt and uncle as well as in kindergarten and with her Swedish friends. Nor were there any Russian words in the video recordings from kindergarten after the age of 2;0. Thus, it can be said that by the age of 2;0 this child had developed true bilingual communicative competence and the ability to adapt
her language to the situation and the interlocutor. However, this did not happen overnight; the child had been moving in this direction from the first months of her life – together with her parents.

An analysis of the dialogues between Julia and her parents shows that the parents use various linguistic strategies to help the child distinguish between the spheres of use of the two varieties (although this is never really done explicitly, only implicitly by the parents’ own language choice) as in the example below, where the mother actively helps Julia with her language choice:

(136) 1;7

JUL: Mamma, kom!  
‘Mom, come! (Sw) ’
MOM: Куда пойдём?  
‘Where shall we go? (Rus) ’
JUL: Туда!  
‘There (Rus) ’
COM: the child points downstairs

As mentioned earlier, a key aspect – the linguo-didactic one – is present when parents communicate with their children. Thus, caregivers not only communicate with their children; they also teach them the language, including which language should be spoken to whom. The main focus should therefore be on the parents’ reactions to the child’s early utterances and her responses to them:

(137) 1;6

MOM: Ну что ты делаешь, Юля? Вот так надо держать ложку.  
‘What are you doing, Julia? That’s not the right way to hold a spoon’
COM: mother shows the child how to hold a spoon
MOM: Вот умничка (petting the child). Кушай нормально.
‘Good girl. Eat properly’
JUL: (reaching out for milk) Ma...tu tu u m...  
‘Ma...tu tu u m...’
MOM: Что, Юлечка, хочешь молоко?  
‘What is it, Julia? Do you want some milk?’
JUL: Мх (satisfied)  
‘Mh’
MOM: Молоко? Налить тебе в бутылочку его? Хочешь сюда молочко?  
‘Shall I put some milk in your bottle?’
COM: the mother shows the child her cup

244 As was shown in the previous chapter, this does not at all mean that the child had appropriate (i.e. age-adequate) linguistic skills in each of the languages.
9.8.1. Interpreting the child’s utterances

Before a child learns realizations for each case, he/she gets to know the whole range of possibilities (cf. Coseriu 1963:237) by being exposed to them through interaction (cf. Tomasello 2003). In bilingual contexts, this “range of possibilities” is naturally much wider, and the child has to learn to distinguish between what goes with whom. That is where adults come in; together with the child’s own strategies, their role is crucial in helping the child along.

However, since most of Julia’s utterances before 1;8 were said in “autonomous speech” (i.e. both Russian and Swedish, but mostly Julia’s own; see chapter 8), only close relatives could interpret them. The adults were able to interpret not only Julia’s speech but also her gestures and intentions (see example 94 above, when the grandmother interprets Julia’s movements: Julia (silently trying to get down from her chair). GRANDMA: ‘It means I am full’ (helping the child get down). Julia: Hm! Hm! GRANDMA: ‘It means she is happy that we understood!’).

Julia’s material shows that the parents are also able to discern from her linguistic flow what they believe to be the right language and make the child aware of it (see example Ha, котик!).

(138) 1;4

COM: Grandmother Lidia feeds Julia. The father is present as well.
GRANDMA: Ha, котик!
‘Here you go, kitten!’
JUL: Ha ua na! (negatively shakes her head)245
‘Here you go!’ (‘take take take’)
JUL: Аj-a! (Swedish interjection pronounced by Julia with Swedish intonation)
COM: The father momentarily distinguishes it from the flow of “Russian” speech and repeats it after the child.
DAD: Аj - a!
‘Aj - a!’ (repeating after Julia)

Sometimes the mother tried to help the child use the right language in the right context. In the example below, this was done with the help of the Russian word mym:

245 During this period Julia used на ‘take’ instead of дай ‘give’, which is why на accompanied with a negative shaking of the head, meaning не надо, не хочу ‘Don’t do it, I don’t want’.
When the child initiated a conversation in Swedish, her mother would usually try to "guide" her into using the correct language, like with Будем писать? ‘Will we pee?’ in the example below (cf. with туда ‘there’ (Rus) above):

(140) 1:10

JUL: A kissa?246
   ‘And what about peeing?’
MOM: Будем писать?
   ‘Shall we pee?’
JUL: Нэ нэ буду буду!
   ‘Oh, will not, will not!’

9.8.2. Parents’ responses to Julia

SPEAKING THEIR OWN LANGUAGE

At the earliest age, many of Julia’s words and especially utterances were incomprehensible. They could be either Russian or Swedish or both. However, the parents’ responses to them were very different, depending on whether they thought the utterance was said in their own language or not. The caregivers seemed to separate from the flow of the child’s speech what seems to be “the correct language use” in their view and concentrate the child’s attention on these sounds. When they thought that Julia was speaking their language, they gave her special attention. Thus, even though the utterances were often incomprehensible and by no means language-specific, the parents’ responses to them were very different, depending on whether they thought the utterance was said (or thought to be said) in their own language.

The child was very sensitive to her parents’ reactions; when the response was not what she had expected, Julia might change to a different way of expressing her thought. That was the case as well as the child grew older:

246 The construction A kissa? is impossible in Swedish and is thus interference from Russian.
COM: Julia goes to the toilet and sees that Susie is ready
JUL: Susie покакала!
   ‘Susie is ready’

COM: Julia sees her mother’s surprised look. The mother is surprised because of the child’s correct form, that she does not use the “wrong” language. Yet Julia keeps on trying again (perhaps thinking that she was not understood).
JUL: Сюзи какала… Сюзи какать… Susie duktig\textsuperscript{247} bajs pottan!
   ‘Susie pooped (Rus)… Susie is pooping (Rus)… Susie good poop on pot’ (Sw)

PARENTAL REACTIONS TO NON-TARGET-LIKE FORMS

The main issue here is what was tolerated by the interlocutors, what was corrected. Often, when the child used the “wrong” (e.g. the non-reciprocal) language, the mother tried to translate her utterance into the “right” language, the language that was more appropriate for the situation:

(142) 2;5
COM: Julia is trying to open a bottle but does not succeed:
JUL: Мама, кан inte den!\textsuperscript{248} (sc. ‘open’)
   ‘Mom, cannot that’…
MOM: Ну что? Не можешь открыть? Давай мама поможет
   ‘What is it now? You cannot open this? Let mommy help you!’

The example above clearly shows that the mother uses the strategy of translation (see Döpke 1992). She also helps with the necessary word (but in Russian): the all-purpose word den ‘that’ was translated into the word with the meaning the child was looking for, ‘open’. Developmental mistakes in grammar were usually never corrected, neither by her grandmother nor her mother:

(143) 2;6
GRANDMA: Мы сейчас обкупнём мою ласточку…
   ‘Now we shall bathe, my sweetheart…’
JUL: нету головку
   ‘Not my head’
GRANDMA: Нет, головку нет… я же обещала,…
   ‘No, not your head… I promised not to…’

The grandmother does not correct the child (the correct way to would be: нe головку\textsuperscript{249}). In this case we have an example of constituent negation. As

\textsuperscript{247} Duktig – first evaluation.
\textsuperscript{248} A frequent strategy was to substitute an unknown word for “that” or “this” or simply point at it.
noted earlier, at this stage ねも was used as an unspecified all-purpose negator in Russian. The negator ねも instead of ね is tolerated since the child’s intention was understood: ‘it is OK to bathe, but not to wash my head’. At this period, the comprehension function of speech was more important than language correction (which was also true in later stages). It was hoped that the “wrong” form would disappear by itself later on. Later, when ねも became a frequent negator and continued to function like ね, attempts were made to correct the child. However, at this age they did not lead to any immediate correction, but instead to protests from the child because her own constructions were not approved by her mother. Julia’s language was her own creation, and like every creator, she wanted other people to like her creation.

9.8.3. Discussion and conclusion

My main purpose here was to find connections between language input and bilingual development. I aimed to describe how Julia developed her language skills in Russian and her interaction strategies with primary caregivers. I assumed that the difference in Julia’s language skills in each language depends on the differences in the learning environment for each of the languages. The learning environment includes language use patterns in both Russian and Swedish and the quality and quantity of input for each language.

The CDS that Julia was exposed to in her earliest childhood seems to share the same features as the CDS described in the literature and found in monolingual families. Julia’s parents tried to adopt the child’s perspective when they talked to her and used topics that were connected to the immediate context, thus commenting on the child’s immediate activity. Their speech was full of diminutives and occasional formations that might sound strange in any other context. When the child was very young and basically did not speak, the mother spoke only Russian to her. As Julia grew older and started to understand more and pronounce her first words, the mother seemed to eventually use Swedish as a cognitive basis for teaching Julia Russian, perhaps subconsciously treating Russian as some sort of L2 that needed to be taught. The strategy of translating is thus a typical strategy in bilingual CDS, at least in this family. The strategy would be impossible in a monolingual home, where simplification, repetition or recast is used instead, since there is no need to use the resources of another language.

The analysis of parent-child dyads has shown that Julia’s Russian interlocutors were often inclined to interpret her communicative intention and to verbalize them aloud – for the child as well. From early on, her utterances – no matter how comprehensible they were – were interpreted and “translated”

249 The form ね てを く ‘not my head’ was used correctly before, when the child’s language was not being analyzed.
into the appropriate language, sometimes in both languages. Through her earliest communicative acts, the child tried to get a response from her caregivers and engage them in conversation and in doing so develop her language skills. The earliest communicative acts were parental imitations and the child’s response to them and the other way round. Parental feedback gave the child the opportunity to explore (and later master) the new forms on her own and make conclusions about which situations they were applicable in.

As Julia grew older, it was clear that, along with trying to interpret the child’s utterances, the mother applied other strategies. However, different ways of trying to engage Julia in a conversation were used from Julia’s first days up to the age of five. It was always the mother’s intention to elicit more output from the child, which brings us to the other important characteristic of CDS used in Julia’s home – that it was used not just for communication but to teach language. By translating the utterance into another language, the parents also signaled to the child that this was an acceptable strategy in communication. However, translation was not used instead of other strategies but rather as a complement to them. Repetition, paraphrase or changes in word order were other means of adapting their speech to the child. However, it was scarcely possible for the child to understand, at least at the very beginning, which words could be translated and for whom, and which words could not. When the father used the (few) Russian words he knew, he gave Julia the signal that she could do so as well. However, the child was not aware that only a very limited number of words could be translated since her father was not proficient in Russian.

It was found that the child’s communicative attempts were interpreted from the earliest stages of her linguistic development, even during the pre-verbal stage, when many utterances were unintelligible. During that stage, Julia’s parents were mostly pre-occupied with trying to interpret her utterances, deciding which language the child was speaking and assigning the properties of either Russian or Swedish to those unintelligible utterances. However, as time went by, the intelligibility of Julia’s utterances increased and she received more and more feedback on her language choice as well. It was clearly shown that the cultural and linguistic characteristics of Russian are embedded in mother-grandmother-Julia interactions. The child imitated not just her parents’ behavior in general but their linguistic behavior as well.

Julia’s mother tried to give her a positive attitude to Russian and used different strategies to promote its use in the family. There were always Russian books and films in the house, and various relatives and friends brought new ones. Yet, because of various social and emotional factors, the input was obviously insufficient for her to develop Russian as an L1.

An interesting question that remains unanswered in this study is whether the child would have exhibited the same kind of ‘errors’ if she had been brought up in a monolingual environment and exposed to the same
level of input; i.e. if she had been brought up in Russia. The cases of linguistic deprivation described earlier by Cejtlin indicate that it may well be the case that such children improve when they are exposed to more input in a monolingual Russian preschool and communicate with other speakers of Russian. In my view, it would be highly unethical to replicate a case like Julia’s, albeit in a monolingual environment, in order to answer this question. Therefore, I can only speculate as to which deviations are due to a lack of input as such and which are due to language contact.
10 Conclusion

10.1. General conclusion

The objective of this study was to provide an insight into the acquisition of Russian in a contact situation by examining a simultaneous Swedish-Russian bilingual child (BFLA), Julia, from birth until the age of 8;5. Observations were made of how the child’s languages developed and were influenced by different factors: (a) the languages involved, (b) the quality and (c) quantity of input as well as (d) the speech of her parents and (e) their reactions to the child’s utterances. A qualitative analysis of Julia’s data is provided, concentrating especially on the earliest stages (before the end of the critical period, at 4;5). However, occasional references were made as well to the child’s later development. In doing so, I have also concentrated on the issue of (f) early language separation and (g) the child-directed speech (CDS) Julia was exposed to as a context for her language acquisition. The purpose of this final chapter is to summarize some of the most important methodological, theoretical and educational implications of this dissertation.

The main finding of the work is that Julia developed one of her grammars, that of Russian, in a different way than do monolingual Russian children. Her Russian was not free of linguistic innovations that are very uncommon (if present at all) in monolingual speakers. Nevertheless, the child grew up to be a competent speaker of her own variety of Russian, which was created both as a result of language contact and reduced input. The child’s main intention has always been to communicate and in pursuing this, she applied every method available to her at the time, even if that meant using the other language. I noted that the child’s functional preferences were always stronger than her formal preferences (cf. Voejkova 2004:103). In Julia’s case, this was mostly manifested by her desire to communicate and express herself – no matter how limited her resources were at the time.

One assumption made in BFLA literature is that children undergo the same acquisitional stages as their monolingual peers. This view was corroborated by the present study: Julia’s linguistic development follows the same linguistic milestones found in monolingual children at the beginning of language acquisition, while later (with the emergence of morphology) the picture is different (but only as far as the weaker language is concerned), and a somewhat delayed development was noted. Julia’s interlanguage kept changing even to the present date, since the child continues to receive input in
Russian. However, that input is still qualitatively different from the target norm. In a language with such rich morphology, like Russian, it could make sense to talk about a morphology spurt, not just a vocabulary spurt (Gagarina 2008). A certain quantity of words may be needed in order for a morphological spurt to occur (cf. Smith & Cormack 2002: frequency threshold). It seems that before the critical period was over, Julia did not go through the process of a morphological spurt that is common for monolingual Russian children.

A key theory of bilingual acquisition that was explored in this dissertation concerns language separation. It has been a subject of considerable debate in the literature whether simultaneous bilingual children can separate their two languages. The general assumption in the past few decades has been that bilingual children develop separate linguistic systems from the onset of acquisition. But Julia’s data have shown that she started with a common language system that only later developed into more complex constructions and two separate grammatical systems.

Julia started using the correct language with the appropriate interlocutor at approximately the age of one year and nine months, at least in Swedish. Before 1:9 “separation” was due to Julia acquiring different words in a specific context and associating them with a particular person. However, language differentiation during the earliest stages is certainly something more than simple association, and more case studies are needed that will focus on the process of separation in order to understand this important issue.

Understanding that there are two separate languages in the environment does not mean that the bilingual child’s languages develop independently of each other. The two systems in this case, acquired simultaneously from birth (2L1), seem to develop in parallel but not autonomously. The two languages developed in permanent interaction, where especially the weaker language (L1\text{weak}), Russian, was influenced by a stronger one (L1\text{strong}), Swedish. The situation described in this study does not lead to the creation of a new contact language but rather a new individual language variety of Russian outside Russia. This finding remains to be substantiated by further investigation. If it is determined that different children with different cognitive development and linguistic environments produce similar forms, then we can argue for the occurrence of new linguistic varieties in asymmetric BFLA.

Julia’s Russian seemed to undergo structural modifications and replacements such as simplification (i.e. ignoring difficult morphological categories, semantic constructions etc.) and a drift to analyticity in “constructing” Russian, which often resulted in a change in Russian grammar. This change is scarcely possible in the natural state of language development for Russian. However, this may not be due simply to Swedish influence. Rather, the bilingual environment per se (which, among other things, involves a lack of input) may cause decreased structural complexity in one language – but not both. While simplification can also be considered a characteristic of Russian
children acquiring their mother tongue, it is more pronounced and prolonged when Russian has to be acquired as a second language (which was the case for Julia).

The development of Julia’s syntax was clearly ahead of her acquisition of morphology. At the age of three, a Russian child is expected to comprehend the main rules of morphology and is able to use them in her own sentences. However, that was not the case in this study. While Julia learned to use some prepositions, auxiliaries and past tense forms, she showed a delay in the acquisition of Russian morphology (or rather had not fully acquired some aspects of it by the age of eight). That could be observed in a reduced case system: the Nominative was used instead of the Prepositional case; there was not always differentiation between the Genitive and Dative or the accusative and locative cases; gender assignment was wrong, there was violation of agreement, proper names were not inflected; the future tense was not always constructed correctly; there were problems assigning gender to a noun, forming cases and choosing the correct preposition in the presence of so-called “verb holes”; the perfect/imperfect distinction in the choice of Russian aspect was not acquired and impersonal constructions were not produced.

Naturally, delayed acquisition differs significantly from incomplete acquisition, but I believe that one might talk of incomplete acquisition even in the cases of simultaneous bilingual acquisition, when the child does not receive the amount of input needed before the end of the critical period (cf. discussion in Montrul 2008). The acquisition of morphological categories is considered to be more or less complete in monolingual Russian children of this age. Thus, Julia’s speech contained features that are more characteristic of L2 learners than of native speakers of Russian. Constructions such as the choice of aspect, impersonal constructions, assigning gender to a noun, case formation and choosing the correct preposition seem to be fairly simple for monolingual Russian children.

Thus, the claim that BFLA children reach a grammatical competence in both languages that is qualitatively no different from that of monolingual children was not corroborated by this study. The innovations found in Julia’s speech seem to be of two kinds: (a) those that are found in monolingual children and (b) those that are classified as unique bilingual innovations. The latter emerged as a result of the cross-linguistic influence. Bilingual innovations may provide valuable information about the process of normal bilingual development since we are faced with developmental deviations/“mistakes” that occur as a result of contact between the two developing languages – direct or indirect. It is believed that these innovations may be more typical of BFLA children than previously assumed, although they do not all necessarily have to be found in developmental data.

Language dominance is viewed as a major determiner in cross-linguistic effects. While it was not always possible to determine the exact reason for a
particular form, there were clear cases of innovations that emerged as a result of language contact. The status of the weaker language has to be considered separately and investigated further, but it makes more sense to talk about a new dialectal variety of Russian (outside Russia) that emerges under the influence of Swedish (cf. e.g. the work of Maria Polinsky on American Russian) rather than talk about an L2 variety. It is believed that some of these peculiarities may be common for every child who acquires Russian in Sweden. All this, however, remains to be substantiated by further analyses.

Thus, even though exposure to L1 occurs before the critical period is over (from birth onwards), the ultimate attainment is different; Julia developed 2L1 (with the same milestones), but the weaker language behaved more like a delayed L1. Russian is still considered to be an L1 since it was acquired before the critical period, but it actually took on the status of an L2 (cf. Bernardini & Schlyter 2004). However, it has also been noted that the same developmental stages are characteristic of both L1 and second language acquisition (Cejtlin 2011). Child L1 learners usually overcome developmental errors without a need for instruction whereas Julia, who resembles L2 learners, continued to have many deviant forms. In terms of outcome, the acquisition of Russian as a weaker language may be variable and not universal like Russian L1 acquisition in monolingual Russian children living in Russia. It is variable since it depends on the linguistic environment the child was exposed to and a combination of different environmental factors: (1) cognitive abilities, (2) type of input and (3) socialization patterns.

One of the focuses of this study was to find connections between language input and bilingual development. The difference in Julia’s language skills seems to be due to the differences in the learning environment for each language. The learning environment involves language use patterns in both Russian and Swedish, the quality and quantity of input for each language and Julia’s interaction strategies with her primary caregivers. This dissertation has shown that differences in the learning environment can explain the variation between the child’s use of Russian and Swedish and her proficiency in the languages.

Adults would often fill in gaps in Julia’s language with correct verbs or nouns and would encourage the child to repeat the correct variant, which the child might resist. Furthermore, such constructions were often understandable for the interlocutor and were not corrected since they did not disturb communication, for instance using “frozen” nominatives in nouns or “frozen” adjectives. When such constructions are tolerated by the interlocutors and do not lead to correction, there is a certain risk that they will sooner or later become fossilized in the speech of the child and used later in life as well. Moreover, Julia would reject the appropriate forms when she was corrected, claiming that she had every right to speak the way she did.

It appears that, even though Julia had exposure to both languages from birth onwards, the amount of input in the weaker language received before
the end of the critical period (i.e. from zero to about 4;5) was not sufficient to allow her to develop full native command of Russian, especially of Russian morphology. The child exhibited structures that are more typical of L2 than L1 acquisition (even though both languages were L1).

Morphology in particular could be a vulnerable domain in this respect since the complex morphological rules in Russian cannot develop without ample input. As a consequence, one stronger language, Swedish (L1strong), was acquired along with another, weaker language, Russian (L1weak). Because of the limited Russian input and language contact, the child was not able to comprehend the transparency between the functions of Russian morphology and the forms for expressing those functions (cf. Voejkova 2004:88).

Since all children construct their own language with the help of the information they get from the input, it may be the case that, since the input was not sufficient and contained evidence of more than one linguistic analysis, this child developed one language as an L1 and the other as an L2 (or at least as a divergent variety of L1).

I do not deny that, given a sufficient amount of balanced input in the two languages, bilingual children can develop native-like proficiency in both; however, quantitative differences may lead to qualitative differences, which in turn may influence the ultimate attainment of the child, which is qualitatively different from that of a Russian monolingual child. Nevertheless, this has little to do with the child’s ability as such to become bilingual.

It seems likely that, in order to understand the morphological rules, the child needs to hear and comprehend a certain amount of words in different forms and contexts to make correct generalizations. Seen from another point of view, the lack of input could lead to language dominance, where the language that received more input (Swedish) becomes the dominant one in the given language combination, which could serve as some kind of developmental guide for Russian (cf. Bernardini & Schlyter 2004). The main reason for language dominance is a lack of input in the weaker language. If there is insufficient input, it may contain evidence for more than one linguistic analysis. However, the structures are not fossilized but are subject to improvement – but only given additional sufficient input (as happened during Julia’s visits to Crimea). Nevertheless, after such visits, the newly acquired constructions could be subject to language attrition – again because of the continuous lack of input in Russian when the child was back again in Sweden.

Complete native language acquisition needs considerably more input before the end of the critical period in order for the child to find all the relevant rules (and idiosyncracies) in the data; or, to put it differently, grammatical perfection needs considerably more input than the generalization of a certain rule by inducing it from the data perceived (cf. Boyd & Goldberg 2011). Thus, if the input in first language acquisition has not been sufficient because of a lack of time or for other reasons, the child may simply not have a
fair chance, compared to monolingual children, to fully develop a language with rich morphology (such as Russian) as his or her L1.

The CDS that Julia was exposed to in her earliest childhood seems to share the same features as the CDS described in the literature and found in monolingual families. From early on, Julia’s utterances – no matter how intelligible they were – were interpreted and “translated” into the appropriate language, sometimes into both languages. Different ways of trying to engage the child in conversation were used from the very first days of Julia’s life up to the age of five.

It has always been the mother’s (and author’s) intention to elicit more output from the child, which brings us to the other important characteristic of CDS used in Julia’s home – that is used not only for communication but for teaching language. Translation was used together with repetition, paraphrase and changes in word order. However, this assistance was not enough for her to construct a language, just as using the one-parent-one language method is not enough.

Constructing a language is very much a matter of quantity of input, which comes from a variety of sources. Despite many social and emotional factors present in Julia’s environment, the amount of input was obviously not enough for her to develop Russian as a (genuine) L1. It is thus my conviction that, without abundant input before a certain age, provided by loving caregivers, the successful and complete acquisition of two languages from birth is not possible. In order to acquire a language on a native-like level, three important conditions, what may be called “optimal conditions,” should be met:

- Varied continuous input before the critical period (up to the age of 4;5)
- Critical mass (to be investigated by further parallel research)
- Specific conditions that help input become intake (which include parental strategies and CDS)

10.2. Some implications for parents and educators

Educational policies are usually based on various considerations. This study focuses only on the qualitative aspect of the weaker language (Russian), based on the results of one child, so the findings from the present study should not be the sole basis of information for parents and educators. However, from the perspective of the rearing and development of a child, the following suggestions reflect the main implications of the findings from this study:

(1) The main finding may be summarized as follows: any lack of input has a certain impact on the acquisition of a morphologically rich
language (in this case, Russian). Morphological categories may be set randomly or not set at all. It is thus implied in the present work that the amount of input and its result, language proficiency, are intertwined. The input the child receives should contain different sources that are as varied as possible for the child to construct his/her language on his/her own.

(2) The child is fully capable of acquiring two languages simultaneously in an unconscious and natural way when the parents use one parent-one language (OPOL) mode. The innovations present in one language (here, the weaker one) should not be a cause for (serious) concern as long as they are present in only one of the languages. They are not signs of disorder but a manifestation of typical bilingual development. Such deviations from the norm will most likely disappear on their own, given sufficient input in the weaker language, preferably in a monolingual environment for longer periods of time, around two months.

(3) The stage of initial language mixing is a natural one and should not be a reason for concern either. The two languages seem to develop in permanent interaction since the child has no way of knowing whether the two varieties he/she is exposed to are actually two different languages and not simply two dialects of the same language.

(4) The parents should not give up speaking the weaker language simply because the child “prefers” to speak the stronger language. Instead, they should try to provide a nourishing, stimulating environment for language development, full of love and care.

(5) It may be considered best for the parents to avoid separating if possible. For any language development, the separation of the parents may have far-reaching consequences that could be difficult to repair.

(6) Implicit ways of correction are always preferable. Recasts of the child’s utterance may be one way to improve language proficiency.

(7) It should be remembered that the child must need the language in order to speak it. Thus, one of the ways to insure that the child actually needs to speak the language would be for the parents to pretend they do not understand when the child uses the “wrong” language (cf. Voterra-Taeschner’s (1983) *Wie bitte?* strategy).

10.3. Some perspectives for future research

It would be highly problematic to draw any universal conclusions on the basis of one child; however, some tendencies are highly relevant with this particular child. It is my intention that the present study will inspire future research on BFLA in general and on Swedish-Russian bilingual children in particular. Future work should focus on some of the issues dealt with in this
work: (a) the acquisition of morphological categories, including (b) the order of acquisition, (c) the importance of input for bilingual development and (d) the implications of using various parental strategies. Overall, (e) the factors influencing language acquisition should be looked at in more detail. Attempts should be made to verify the findings of this dissertation on different children and perhaps even on a larger number of children (experimental designs). It would also be valuable to look further into the notion of input in other Russian-Swedish bilingual families.

The need for more case studies that describe the situation from within cannot be overestimated. In addition, to get back to the subject of this study, examining Julia later in life would probably be an even more intriguing endeavour.

Some follow-up studies are suggested:

(1) In-depth studies about acquisition of morphology in general and each morphological category in particular in other Russian-Swedish bilingual children.
(2) Experimental studies that explore the generalizability of the present results. A collection of narratives by Russian-Swedish bilingual children may be one way of doing this.
(3) Some quantitative investigations using statistical methods of analysis (both of Julia’s data and the data of other Russian-Swedish bilingual children) can be in order.
(4) To learn more about the connection between parental strategies and language acquisition, it would be interesting to focus more specifically on how parents in different families react to their children’s language use.
(5) Lexical development deserves special attention. The results of Julia’s CDIs for both languages should be compared with the CDIs of other Russian-Swedish bilingual children of similar ages.
(6) The study of innovations is another area where much more work is still necessary. In describing the process of language construction, an analysis of innovations is especially important, both theoretically and practically, since it can give some guidelines to parents as to what to expect and give linguists a chance to see how languages are constructed when they are acquired in a contact situation. More research should be undertaken into the complex issue of language change in the Russian of bilingual children living in Sweden.
10.3. Methodological implications

The results of this study indicate the need for a review of the literature on BFLA, both in conceptual and applied contexts. We need to learn more about the connections between input and output in bilingual development along with the development of the language situation of a child over a longer period of time. The morphosyntax of a weaker language is often viewed as a key symptom of specific language impairment (SLI; cf. Gopnik & Crago 1991). This claim can also be misleading in a BFLA situation, since many morphological innovations in a weaker language may also show similarities/coincidences with non-target forms not only in SLA but in SLI as well.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Major achievements in Julia’s development during her first years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Cognitive/Linguistic</th>
<th>Social/personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mon</td>
<td>- lifts head when on belly</td>
<td>- opens mouth to communicate</td>
<td>- recognizes faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sees object at 25 cm</td>
<td>- turns in the direction of voice</td>
<td>- responds to name with smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mon</td>
<td>- holds up head when held</td>
<td>- reacts differently to various types of music</td>
<td>- smiles when talked to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tracks objects in movement, looks at hands/feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>- falls asleep easily when fed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when moving and tries to touch moving mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td>- reacts happily when she sees her mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tracks sounds; moves head in direction of a sound source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- loves bright colors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mon</td>
<td>- supports body with elbows when on belly</td>
<td>- babbles, echoes and waits for an answer</td>
<td>- responds differently to a smile and a voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- holds bottle when drinking</td>
<td>- talks back when talked to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reacts when the conversation with or around her is over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- babbles in syllables: &quot;mama, babababa&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 mon</td>
<td>- tries to get hold of a toy</td>
<td>- reacts to our intonation</td>
<td>- discovers her hands and plays a lot with her fingers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rolls from her back to her stomach</td>
<td>- 0:5: learns to understand easy questions</td>
<td>- recognizes her mother immediately among other adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- lifts her head</td>
<td>- sings: &quot;aaaaa&quot; when asked if she wants to sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sits on her own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tries to eat on her own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- has two teeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mon</td>
<td>- rests on her arm while lying on her stomach</td>
<td>- knows her name</td>
<td>- recognizes known people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trying to get hold of a toy with her other hand</td>
<td>- understands ‘no’</td>
<td>- plays frequently with her feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- holds a bottle</td>
<td>- babbles in syllables: &quot;mama, babababa&quot;</td>
<td>- responds suspiciously on occasion to unknown people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- moves toys from one hand to the other</td>
<td></td>
<td>- waves good-bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- discovers new things by putting them in her mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- crawls backwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- has four teeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- starts swimming in a lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 mon</td>
<td>- sits up after lying</td>
<td>- is able to hold a &quot;real&quot; dialogue, always answering</td>
<td>- 0;7: shows very little desire to go to unfamiliar people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- stretches after a toy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–11 mon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–15 mon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **crawls and moves backwards at 0:7**
- **enjoys holding and eating cakes and pastries**
- **touched her reflection in the mirror**
- **enjoys going to the sauna and swimming pool**
- **enjoys grabbing very small objects and starts playing with them**
- **insists on eating by herself and holding her own bottle**
- **stands by supporting herself on something**
- **crawls and moves forward**
- **distinguishes a question from a statement**
- **0:7: always understands her name**
- **0:8: turns in response to it**
- **points to a lamp when asked**
- **0:7: first word: *mama***
- **0:8: *pappa***
- **listens very attentively to adult conversations; takes an active part in their dialogues by trying to repeat what they said**
- **waves goodbye to everyone who is leaving**
- **becomes more social**

- **enjoys looking after her toys, pressing buttons**
- **when in the hallway wants to go outside and ring the door bell**
- **takes the spoon when hungry**
- **tries to stand and walk**
- **enjoys picking up small objects**
- **throws things on the floor and watches them fall; enjoys when they get broken**
- **takes things out of boxes and drawers and puts them back**
- **rolls a ball and "reads" a book while bathing**
- **takes small objects with two fingers; eats rice one grain at a time**
- **disCOVERs different tools to write and draw with and can do it for a long time**
- **performs some actions when asked**
- **understands simple questions**
- **is able to produce very difficult vocalizations that are reminiscent of sentences**
- **Points at known objects**
- **creates her own names for different things (ex. at 0:9 says lampa ‘lamp’ (Sw/Rus), tilta ‘look’ (Sw); at 0:10 uses sound imitations like *av av* (for a dog) and *mjau mjau* for a cat, says ka (from Rus paka ‘bye bye’, na ‘take’ (Rus))**
- **mixes Russian and Swedish prosody in a way that makes her sound Swedish to Swedish speakers and Russian to Russian speakers**
- **listens to Max Potta (her favorite book) and knows what will happen on each page**
- **reacts if the reader misses a page while reading a book she is very familiar with**
- **follows easy commands**
- **points at most known objects and names some of them**
- **says mina ‘mine’ (Sw) at 1:0, pai ‘fell down’ (Rus) by 1:2; borta ‘all gone’ (Sw), bada ‘bathe’ (Sw) at 1:3; njam-njam ‘tastes good’ (Rus) at 1:4; ti (from Russian ptíčki ‘birds’ at 1:5; bol ‘ball’ (Sw) at 1:5**
- **has developed into a very social, calm, easy-going child**
- **usually obeys, but has a strong will; protests with loud crying.**
- **enjoys playing with her siblings and their friends**
- **always draws a picture for guests who come to the house**
- **insists on sleeping with her parents**
- **tries to help in household activities**

- **stands without support**
- **crawls upstairs, walks**
- **picks up small things with using her thumb and index finger, enjoys putting very small objects in very small boxes**
- **drags toys to her when she wants a particular toy**
- **holds several things in her hand**
- **drinks from a cup, yet prefers to drink from a bottle**
- **removes her own socks and mittens**
- **goes actively with her**

- **has a strong will; protests with loud crying.**
- **enjoys helping with her parents**
- **always draws a picture for guests who come to the house**
- **insists on sleeping with her parents**
- **tries to help in household activitieS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (months)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18          | Starts doing easy puzzles and building towers | - enjoys playing with telephones, especially real ones  
- enjoys playing on the beach, with toys in the sand  
- brings objects when asked for them  
- knows sounds of animals and imitates them well  
- is very Swedish dominant  
- insists on saying Swedish words even when asked to say the word in Russian: when asked "say mashina," she responds "bil, bil, bil!". Other words also appear frequently at this time both in Swedish: *bok* 'book', *mat* 'food', *kom* 'come', *tack* 'thank you', *bil* 'car' and in Russian: *pi* 'drink' (pit); *mu* 'fly' (muha); *mar* 'mosquito' (komar); *djadja* 'uncle'; *kaka* 'poop'; *pis* 'pee'; *čaj* 'tea'; *tufi* 'shoes' (tufl); *nak* (Rus = *take*) + Sw *tack*) 'take it please'; *baka* 'grandma', *niz* 'downstairs', *tuda* 'there', *maka* (morkovka) 'carrot' etc.  
- enjoy to draw, but does not accept help or suggestions  
- learns to play independently  
- does not want anyone to help her eat  
- understands why she needs to sit on the toilet and does so |
| 24 – 27 (2 yrs) |  | - enjoys looking at her reflection in the mirror  
- often asks adults to read to her  
- plays with lipstick when we are not watching and paints her nails  
- is able to hammer  
- makes puzzle with eight pieces  
- knows that the pet bird needs to be covered every night in order to sleep  
- can warn other people and herself in possible danger: *He ynađu! do not fall!* (when going downstairs) or *Bađyuxa! Onac-ri! 'Grandma! Danger!* – when she saw a lot of cars on the street  
- gets a melody right away  
- is very independent: *Julia själt* is a favorite phrase now; *Mama, jag kan!* 'mom, I can'  
- turns the pages on her own and remembers the content on each particular page when reading  
- knows the names of her parents and siblings  
- remembers the names of friends and relatives  
- knows several colors: red, green, yellow  
- knows different kinds of trees, car brands  
- uses adjectives to describe things she sees: beautiful, big etc.  
- can evaluate: *Julia duktig pâ ä gympa; Susie duktig pâ ä dansa!* 'Julia’s good at gymnastics'; *Susie’s good at dancing'  
- knows the words ‘upstairs’ and ‘downstairs’ and describes where an item is  
- recognizes a familiar object, place, activity by hearing two  
- loves playing hide-and-seek and understands that one has to be very quiet then  
- knows different kinds of clothes and tells people what to put on  
- knows well what she likes and does not like and expresses it: *Köpa mösjum klubniki!* 'Julia loves strawberries'.  
- asks people how they feel: *Mamma trött? ‘Mommy tired’?*  
- by 2:5 is able to react when she sees wrong behavior, for instance a boy crying loudly in a train  
- tries to show that she is able to do everything on her own and wants to demonstrate it  
- experiments with expressing different emotions: surprise, horror, fear and checks our reaction to it  
- imitates her siblings’ behav- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 yrs</th>
<th>3 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- walks for a long distance</td>
<td>- understands the content of books well in Russian and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- runs well</td>
<td>- knows the words of comparison in both languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- continues to enjoy doing puzzles and making towers</td>
<td>- retells events well, especially in Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dressing skills are well-developed</td>
<td>- enjoys poems and loves to create her own, but most often without rhyme: Я груша, Самуэль – яблоко! Я груша, Самуэль – ананасик!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- loves bowling with the whole family</td>
<td>- loves exploring new things and places, including talking to new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- takes initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- loves to sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- demands a lot of attention and wants others to share new experiences with her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- enjoys playing with all the children in the kindergarten, yet, still has &quot;best&quot; friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

first letters; ÖF— öppna för-skola (a place she loves to visit)
- understands what the number 2 is and that it involves two things
- knows the difference between many and few, between sports
- can express the size of the objects and animals with different intonation and voice timbre: Мишка маленький-маленький ‘The teddy is little’ (with a tender voice) and Мишка большой ‘The teddy is big’ with a rough voice.
- able to use the pronoun ‘I’ when talking about herself (2;3).
- no recast anymore when saying Axel (not Axles as before)
- starts correcting language in “Max lampa,” “Max potta” and other favorite Max books: ’Kommer mamma’ corrects to ’Mamma kommer’
- uses correct language for the purposes of emphasis (2;3): Mamma! Igen! Опять!
- Mom, again! (Sw/Rus).
- does not allow Russian people to speak Swedish to her (2;4)
- occasional mistakes noted in Julia’s Swedish; leka piano, leka kort (instead of spela); Julia grätte (grät) – irregular form of the past tense
- Эта книга – ‘book’ (probably from книга (Rus) – the sentence was said in a Russian context
- Машинка sänder – ‘the car is broken’

- runs immediately and puts on her overall when she sees one of us from the preschool window
- enjoys playing with her friends (has two best friends, Axel and Samuel, and can play with them for a very long time)
- understands what is good and what is bad, what is allowed and what is not allowed: seeing crumbs from a cake on the floor she would say: Inte äta där ‘not eat there’!
- by 2:5 has learned to pretend and do things in pretence
- goes to the computer in the evening and takes out the wire when she wants me to stop working and read to her
- knows many songs and sings often
- wants to be like her mother, repeats everything after her
- notices many details
| 4 yrs | -can walk over 5 km  
-attends ski school every winter | - remembers songs and rhymes in Swedish she learned in preschool  
-starts to understand different concepts because of the parents’ separation (at 4:5) and always asks questions when she does not understand something  
-understands long stories and asks relevant questions related to the story  
-has a very good memory; loves playing “Memory”  
-knows all parts of the body (including knees, cheeks and feet); however, does not know the words пирамида, матрешка ‘toy pyramid,’ matreshka doll’ which every Russian child her age knows  
-knows the difference between different kinds of objects in Swedish: it is not enough to say bil when it is a lastbil ‘truck’  
-wants to know exact difference between different words: «Что такое толстые?» Это жирные? Тюк(txt) ‘fat’? ‘What is fat? Is it thick? Is fat thick?’.  
-wants to know exact difference between different words: «Что такое толстые?» Это жирные? Это tjejer ‘fat’?  
-can write «Julia 4 years old» and simple words and names in both languages  
-repeats other people’s information and accent | - knows all the family members and closest friends very well by name and face  
-loves order, remembers to brush teeth every morning and evening  
-interested in her dreams and loves to retell them; wants total attention then  
-marks her identity by talking only in Russian to her mother, even among Swedish speakers, on the other hand sings songs in Swedish when in Crimea  

| 4 yrs | -elts elements of both languages when speaking Russian: птичка är zlaj ‘bird (Rus)’ is (Sw) angry (Rus); зайчик äter morrökvu ‘bunny (Rus) eats (Sw) a carrot (Rus); andra rövka ‘the other (Sw) hand (Rus).’ | - uses water for ‘soup’ and pins for ‘meatballs’ etc. when playing; ‘bakes’ cakes of sand as treats for her dolls  
-is concerned about her looks and looks at herself in a mirror and asks: Am I beautiful?  
-starts to understand what is beautiful and what is ugly  
-describes people and things with adjectives  
-very active, happy and easy-going child who enjoys many activities  
-interested in how to make food |
- can write numbers and well-shaped musical notes but does not know the difference between them yet
- loves to rhyme
- loves mixing colors to discover new ones

| 5 yrs | - rides a bike for a long time  
- knows the way to kindergarten when travelling by car or walking  
- explains directions; has her favorite routes when walking to her favorite places  
- knows the value of money and how much 5, 10, 20 kronor is and what can be bought with it  
- skies downhill  
- attends swimming school and can swim  
- knows her address and the telephone number for both her mother and father  
- can easily count in both languages  
- understands right and left hand but always forgets where her heart is | - understands what today, tomorrow and yesterday are; very organized: wants to have a clear schedule for what she will do tomorrow  
- associates Saturday morning with gymnastics  
- can do even very difficult puzzles  
- enjoys retelling what she has done during the day before going to bed  
- understands a sequence of events and follows directions  
- knows the names of the fingers in Swedish  
- starts using metaphors, calls fat people "cows"  
- adds many small details to her paintings: adding roots when drawing trees and a baby when painting pregnant women. When drawing fish, mushrooms etc. wants to distinguish between different kinds and is no longer satisfied with just drawing a fish  
- draws a picture well, cuts it out and adheres it either with tape or glue, signs her name and age | - helps a lot with household chores (loves helping in general and brings things we need)  
- knows well where things are and often helps her mother find them  
- is a calm child who loves playing both on her own and with her friends  
- has some new female friends, but is still devoted to the old ones (Samuel and Axel) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Skills and Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6 yrs     | - uses a knife and fork correctly, along with a napkin  
- swims well and takes part in swimming competitions  
- continues to take swimming lessons  
- can draw with greater precision now; especially loves drawing people, animals, princesses, houses  
- understands long directions in both Russian and Swedish  
- can read and write in Swedish and Russian  
- knows well right and left and the position of the heart  
- remembers even the smallest details of the places she visited and at what time  
- can draw all the basic geometrical figures  
- understands how old people are and who is older  
- is convinced that her friend will die one year earlier since she is one year older  
- gives directions in both languages  
- is good at translating and often practices this habit with various visitors and friends who stay at our house  
- is known as a helping and supportive child in the kindergarten as well  
- enjoys playing with family pets, starts to take care of them  
- always says thank you when leaving the table, takes her plate with her and usually puts it in the dishwasher  
- is very emotional and feels sorry for everyone and wants to help everyone  
- does well when left with friends and relatives even for longer time  
- has well developed habits of taking a shower and brushing her teeth  
- has good habits of dressing and undressing and putting dirty clothes in a special place  |
| 7 – 8 yrs | - takes gymnastic lessons 3 times a week  
- continues swimming lessons learning various techniques  
- plays piano and flute  
- takes basketball lessons once a week  
- reads books for a longer period of time  
- has no problems in school and achieves at her grade level  
- knows her schedule and does not forget any activities (even when not reminded)  
- retells very long, detailed stories in Russian  
- understands what is right and wrong and is able to tell adults about their wrong behavior.  
- has no problems telling other mothers about their mistakes from a child’s perspective  
- questions her own mother in a very polite way if she sees that she is not doing something correctly. |
Appendix 2

Bilingual child Julia, 7;5  Swedish and Russian

Linguistic judgement in language proficiency in Swedish.

Participational observation: scenario: Julia was playing with her playmate Amanda, same age, but monolingual in Swedish.

- General impression: both girls have the same command in their proficiency in spoken Swedish, there were no differences observed.

Phonology: the Swedish /sh/ allophone is in most cases according to the standard Swedish norm, but there may be occasional simplifications towards the /sh/ allophone in English or German. Sometimes, a more regional realization, (/tsh/), may occur as well.

Other typical features of Swedish phonetics (and phonology), e.g. the special /u/ phoneme or accent 2, are in place and realized according to the Swedish norm. The extreme opening of the /ä/-phoneme before /r/ can also be detected. But in very few instances can a vocalisation of /r/ be observed, such as in mor ‘mother’ /mu:a/.

Morphology: no grammatical feature was missing; everything seems to be in place, even gender.

Syntax: No deviations from the standard Swedish norm are found, V2 in main and subordinate clauses is always present, there are no simplifications towards V3 as e.g. in English.

However, it should be pointed out that both girls have, at least in some conversations, a rising intonation pattern (i.e. sentence final pitch raising) in some declarative sentences.

Pragmatics: back channel signals occur, they imitate other people’s behavior, e.g. when they exchange greetings.

Vocabulary: No significant differences from the vocabulary of other children of the same age are to be found; on the contrary, the terms are very up-to-date. They use e.g. hemtelefone and not the older unmarked and unspecified form telefon.
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## Appendix 3

**Semantic over/underextension in Julia’s early vocabulary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years/months)</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Bye-bye</td>
<td>Used only with neighbors, grandparents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Paka</td>
<td>‘Goodbye’ (Rus). Used only when the child says good-bye to her immediate family as well as her mother’s friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Hejdå</td>
<td>‘Good-bye’. Used in its regular sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10</td>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>All black animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;0</td>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>All black dogs (a friend’s dog, Bella, was black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2</td>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>One special dog, Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;2</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na = daj (‘take it’ ‘give me’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;6</td>
<td>zzz</td>
<td>About all small insects except flies and mosquitoes, which were known and distinguished from early on (mu - muha ‘fly’; mar - komar ‘mosquito’, all in Russian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10 - 2;5</td>
<td>Den</td>
<td>‘It’, ‘that’. For everything she cannot name yet (regardless of language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Nemogu</td>
<td>‘Do not want’, ‘cannot’, ‘will not’, ‘do not need to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Mu</td>
<td>All animals with fur (Rus: the sound of a cow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;7</td>
<td>Mu</td>
<td>All animals with fur (Rus: the sound of a cow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;8</td>
<td>Nin</td>
<td>Rabbit, all other soft animals that one can touch and hug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;8</td>
<td>Tisjka (ptička)</td>
<td>All birds, all big insects that can fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10- 2;5</td>
<td>Sabina</td>
<td>All black girls and women (because a friend of Julia’s sister called Sabina was black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;8</td>
<td>Macka</td>
<td>‘Sandwich’. For ‘sandwich’, ‘cheese’, ‘bread’, ‘butter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9</td>
<td>Bajsa</td>
<td>‘pee’, ‘poop’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9</td>
<td>Välling</td>
<td>‘Porridge’. For go to bed; formula; to drink (in general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10</td>
<td>Bebis</td>
<td>‘Baby’. Pacifier, pram, baby, everything that has to do with a baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10</td>
<td>Fiol</td>
<td>Violin, Victoria (the older sister who plays violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11</td>
<td>Hammarby</td>
<td>Hammarby (Swedish soccer team) logo; everything that was green and white, all of dad’s clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11</td>
<td>Pappa</td>
<td>Hammarby logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11</td>
<td>Pampers</td>
<td>Just one special kind of diapers (with a green line on the top)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4

**Julia's language environment (input that the child received)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years; months)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Caregivers</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Estimated frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth-0;01</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>two hours a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses and doctors at the hospital</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0;01 - 0;06</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>all the time when he was at home with Julia (4-5 hrs a day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2 -3 hrs every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0;05 (one week)</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants of the conference on Child Language</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally, 9 hrs a day during the whole conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0;07-1;5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>all the time when at home with the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>sometimes when on the bus or play school or when only monolingual speakers were present (occasionally ca 2 hrs a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Interaction Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 1.7 Ukraine (Crimea)</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>ca 3 hrs a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 - 2.0 Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.5 Sweden (2006)</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously (except some few phrases in Russian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>daily from ca. 8.00 - 16.00 (except weekends)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 - ca 2.7 Ukraine (2006)</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost always outside the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>mostly at home (by the ends of the visit only Russian was used in all the situations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>mostly at home (by the ends of the visit only Russian was used in all the situations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Speech Pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 2;7 - 3;1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (for 3 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncle Sasha</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (for 3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cousin Sonya</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (for 3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost always at home and sometimes in the nursery school when many monolingual Swedish speakers were present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandmother Lidia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (except a few words she knew in Swedish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>on weekdays from ca. 8.00 - 17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian friends of the mother's who came for a visit</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously during two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 2;10 (ca 3 weeks)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mothers' friend Anita (spoke very good Russian with a slight Hungarian accent)</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (Julia answers her only in Swedish). Basically no monolingual Russian utterances. Swedish words and constructions are used basically in all Russian sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>various friends of the siblings</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2-3 times a week 2-3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 3;1 - 3;5 (2007) (with the exception of three situations below)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost always at home and sometimes in the nursery school when many monolingual Swedish speakers were present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously (except some few phrases in Russian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandmother Mia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian friends of the mother's who came for a visit</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously during two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3;3 (1 week)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden grandmother Mia, aunts and uncles who stayed in the same house</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>when together with the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>almost all the other time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Contact Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4-3:5 (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>basically all day long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when they were home from school in the evening and during weekdays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously (in the evening and on weekends)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5 (10 days)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The rest as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5-3:6 (2007)</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almost always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6-3:7</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almost always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very often (because of the constant presence of Russian quests)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from ca 9:30 - 15:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:9-4:0</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost always (but the mother is seldom at home)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almost always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.3</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the father is seldom at home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents' separation</td>
<td>Russian - every other week only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 - 4.7</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>sometimes (and always when reading books)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncle Sasha</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (for two weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cousin Sonya</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously (for two weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 - 4.10</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Victoria</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Susie</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>on weekdays (8.00 - ca 17.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 - 4.11</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Susie</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week (when with the mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Victoria</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 5.5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Contact Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;0 - 6;5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Susie</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week (when with the moth-er)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Victoria</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;5 - 6;7</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;7 - 6;0</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>every other week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian friends who stayed over</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>almost daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncle Sasha</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>for 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cousin Sonya</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>for 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 At age 6;7 (in 2010) Julia started school. Similar input pattern as from age 6;0 (with visits from Julia’s Russian grandmother every winter/spring and Julia’s visits to Ukraine every summer and with siblings Susie and Victoria speaking Russian to Julia regardless of the time or context). In 2012, when the child was 8;5, Julia spent two months in Crimea during the summer.
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Mitt namn är Natasha Ringblom och jag är forskare på Stockholms universitet. Min doktorsavhandling handlar om simultant tvåspråkig utveckling hos svensk-ryska tvåspråkiga barn. Syftet med avhandlingen är att svara på frågan hur barnens två olika språk utvecklas samt vilka faktorer som påverkar utvecklingen.

Julia Ringblom som går på Minibussten är min viktigaste informant och videoinspelningar av henne tal görs regelbundet i olika sociolinguistiska situationer. För att säkerställa Julias språkspridning är anmärkande på förskolan jämfört med hemmet är det viktigt att kunna göra videoinspelningar även i förskolans miljö. Det blir dock omsorg att endast spela in Julia och helt exkludera alla andra barn som leker runt omkring. Dessutom kan det bli väldigt intressant att underlåta just sådana situationer där Julia umgö med andra barn, samt på vilka sätt/språk hon gör sig förstådd. Därför är det viktigt att fråga alla föräldrar om ni inte har någonting emot att er barn kan komma att vara med på inspelningen.

Alla inspelningar ska analyseras av mig själv och videobanden kommer inte att spridas vidare, säljas eller användas för några andra ändamål än denna studie. Personliga data behandlas konfidentiellt och sammanställningen sker så att enskilda barns uppgifter inte går att spåra.

Den förälder som inte vill att hans/hennes barn ska vara med under inspelningen kan meddela mig direkt eller via personalen. Om ni har några frågor kan ni ringa 08-7761065, 0705711065 eller skicka ett mejl till natasha.ringblom@english.su.se
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