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Abstract

The paper, which is a part of a longitudinal study, deals with my own child’s, Sarah’s second language acquisition (SLA) with the special focus on how the child benefits from the strategic use of language in a dual (Hungarian-English) linguistic environment. The recorded data shed light on the interaction between her two languages focusing on communicative intentions and her identity transformations in the dual language acquisition process. The recorded discourse pieces reveal the evolution of her acceptance of the shared interpretation of language separation. I apply a functional analysis of her oral language production, drawing on the data retrieved from the structured retrospective interviews I conducted with her to find evidence of her motives in appeals to second language (L2). While analysing my dataset I identify patterns in her using L2 as a complementary set of linguistic forms to differentiate shades of meanings and negotiate her identity.
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1 Introduction
1.1 The aim of the study

My research aims at understanding my daughter’s, Sarah’s identity development focusing on the role of L2 in negotiating emotional stances and identity changes. I analyse the data in order to reveal the motives of her language choice and the manifestations of her dynamic personality. I attempt to identify patterns in the data regarding emotionality and self-perception behind her language separation process in order to generate categories of them. In my category system I rely on the categorization and typology of scholarly research into communication strategies (Cohen, 1999; Dörnyei, 2005; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Oxford, 1990) and also on Baker’s (2006), Hamers’ (2004), Norton’s (2000) Pavlenko’s (2006) research findings. The authors listed above have come to the conclusion that the multilingual speakers appeal to their second language as a strategic linguistic tool to shade meanings and convey different affective stances. I have compiled and analysed a dataset taken from Sarah’s discourses and commentary to examine whether her language preference shows any similarities with the patterns the reviewed scholarly literature has identified. I investigate what role L2 plays in Sarah’s mediating and interpreting
communicative intentions and bilingualism modifies her sense of self in a particular communicative event.

1.2 Justification of the study

English is a prerequisite of academic and career success nowadays as international communication has become an integral part of our everyday life. Although multiculturalism and multilingualism are not new phenomena, it is still very difficult for people living in a monolingual country to cope with the new communicational challenges of the multicultural environment. The booming demand for speaking foreign languages imposes new tasks and responsibilities on parents and educators when it comes to socializing children to use two or more languages besides their mother tongue. As a consequence of globalization and job migration the value of foreign language knowledge has increased. This situation has generated a demand for teaching foreign languages to children as early as possible and has turned attention towards second language acquisition in natural settings. These circumstances justify further research into teaching English to young learners and encourage parents to raise their children in two languages at a time even in countries where monolingualism used to be the norm. The fact that the contexts and purposes of foreign language learning are so versatile and also the language learners’ attitudes show distinctness encourages research into the role and impact of individual differences in the learning process. My study gives an in-depth analysis of a particular case which can provide further data for the scientific research conducted on the topic of individual differences in second language acquisition. Due to its uniqueness it illuminates a special aspect of second language acquisition and commences a naturalistic and as well as rare language learning context. Due to its unusual character it also sheds light on new aspects, which so far have been out of sight or overlooked; nevertheless, they are worth consideration. When analysing my data I found that recurring patterns and categories became evident in Sarah’s L2 use.

1.4 An introduction of Sarah’s case

My paper is based on qualitative research into my child’s language development. The study spans over ten years. The child is now fourteen years old. Sarah has been raised in a dual language environment (Hungarian and English) since birth, the second language (further on L2) is integrated in the first socialization. Further on in my paper I refer to the established dual language environment as ‘bilingualism’ and call my participant ‘bilingual’. The reason for including English in child raise is that in our neighbourhood there is a family of mixed nationality, the husband is American, the wife is Hungarian. Their youngest son, Brendon is of the same age as Sarah. Due to our frequent encounters, mutual sympathy, shared background and family responsibilities even before our youngest children’s birth we had developed a very good relationship with the family, especially with the wife, Kati. Later our children were in the same group in the kindergarten and now they go to the same school in the same year but not in the same class. These coincidences led us to the decision of including English as a second language in child raise. During the years the circle of our friends has expanded with other English-speaking families and foreign people who also speak English as a second language. Some of those foreign people are associates at one of the multinational companies in Székesfehérvár or in the region. In addition, being an English teacher I also have a chance to teach at some of those
companies, and my and my husband’s interpersonal contacts with foreign people and also our experiences in multicultural settings encouraged us to take advantage of the situation and integrate a second language in Sarah’s raise. The fact that my husband and my older daughters (aged 21 and 26 in 2013) have a good language proficiency in English has created a favourable prerequisite. Also, this situation encouraged me to do my research in child second language acquisition. Although we have a number of friends who speak English, we have realised that our occasional encounters with them do not provide sufficient language input for my child to acquire the language. Therefore, in order to maintain a dual language environment, we had to establish a sort of ‘labour division’. According to the household rule for language separation Hungarian is dominant as it is our mother tongue, English is used only in home or informal settings, mostly in child-mother interactions during daily joint activities or freetime activities (e.g., joint reading and playing). Also, we speak English in the presence of certain friends and foreigners. We try to keep up the established language use patterns to make Sarah feel comfortable in L2 settings. Being aware of the drawbacks, constraints and limitations of L2 input we can provide for her second language acquisition, we anticipated at the outset that she would not be equally proficient in her both languages. It was obvious that with little community support in terms of L2 her dominant language will be Hungarian, which is her mother language. Supporting the most inclusive definition of bilingualism we stand firm in our conviction that for Sarah acquiring a good level of listening comprehension and developing a good competence in any of the four language skills, and also feeling comfortable in a context where a second language is involved can be considered as success. We sustain that raising our child in a dual linguistic environment is a wonderful gift to her and being able to persue the level of language proficiency we have defined is the right thing to do. In addition, we thought it would enrich both her life and that of the family.

The clear definition of reasons and goals at the outset made easier to be consistent and take on our role as language coaches and promoted us to set up a workable plan to turn our goals into reality. We tried to identify the reasons for wanting to raise our child with a second language and define short-term plans, so called weekly schedules. This way we could easier adopt to a concrete situation and to our child’s actual needs.

2. Theoretical background

In my study I analyse the same element, which is the role of L2 in my participant’s identity development and in her affective communication, from three different approaches: (1) sociolinguistic, (2) strategic and (3) linguistic perspectives. Since communication is unseparable from the social environment where it takes place, my research has sociolinguistic aspects and societal concerns. I focus on the specific context in which my participant lives and learns her two languages and I reveal the background that shapes her interpretation and her positioning herself in that background. To make my findings valid I give a sufficient number of details and contextualization of the data. The study has its origin in linguistics as I use my dataset for linguistic analysis. The theoretical frame of my linguistic investigation is pragmatics. It looks into the social aspect of language use and the linguistic behaviour of language users. Therefore, I am concerned with the functional rather than the structural nature of language. I investigate how my participant’s language behaviour reflects the interplay between her two languages. I use a
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sample set of discourse and interlanguage examples taken from my child’s talks to give evidence that there are recurring patterns and categories in her L2 use. My research also applies to psychology and individual difference research, since it reveals individual learning process. My case represents a possible context in the wide range of language learning profiles. Analysing the naturally occurring talk of my child I intend to emphasize the creativity of the individual language user and reveal that my participant, Sarah, as a strategic language user and a dynamic actor benefits from the dual linguistic system. As my study puts emphasis on one person’s language acquisition in a bilingual context, it is important to state that the data presented in it are not suitable for generalizations, they should be handled as manifestations of individual language use. I emphasize that the terms used in bilingualism research for a concrete feature of the phenomenon are not wholly applicable in my case. This single-subject case is supposed to rouse attention to individual differences and to show how the outcome of the language learning process reflects the learner’s personal interpretation of the sense of self and that of her learning environment. The present study is aimed at examining the attitudinal and affective aspects of L2 acquisition, which justifies investigating the same phenomenon from different perspectives.

3. Research design
3.1 Research questions
In my study the following central research questions are addressed:
1. What communicative intentions are manifested in Sarah’s code-switches and appeals to L2?
2. How does Sarah’s identity change and develop in the dual language environment?
3.2 Research methodology
In the 90’s new qualitative approaches started to complement quantitative research and provide alternatives to traditional approaches. Since then qualitative research has witnessed an expansion and become popular with the growing interest in ecological validity. Qualitative research as a complementary paradigm beside quantitative meets the requirement of ecological validity by representing genuine contexts and cases. Personal accounts of experiences, subjective interpretations of phenomena across a broader span of time have become a major focus in qualitative research. My research falls into the category of qualitative research and involves one person, my own child. It is a case study conducted longitudinally with a time-span of nine years. It is aimed at understanding a bounded phenomenon, as I try to reveal the characteristics of the case that is my informant’s language development in a marginalized linguistic environment. According to Duff’s (2002) conceptualization marginalized cases are considered to be rare or unusual and show a kind of divergence and alteration from general cases. I label my case a marginalized one for the simple reason that L2 acquisition takes place in a non-native language environment and it is primarily supported by non-native speakers of that language. My case is an extreme, atypical and convenience case. It is extreme and atypical since L2 acquisition takes place in a marginalized context with the parents being non-native speakers of English having limited community support regarding L2. Convenience comes from the fact that the participant is my own child, which situation is advantageous in terms of data collection and makes it possible to examine the phenomenon in a holistic fashion and in a context-sensitive way. Emotional bonding and cohabitation gives a great opportunity to look into
private interactions. I investigate my child's language development and her language behaviour in the context of her natural environment. Ethnographic research EC (Hymes, 1974) is a relevant framework to analyse micro-level analyses like discourse samples and to examine patterns and functions of communication. I consider my research an ethnographic single case study as I strive for the complete understanding of (individual) language behaviour of one particular person. Ethnographic single case study seems to be a relevant method for giving an exploratory, interpretive and in-depth description (Duff, 2002) of my single subject’s, Sarah’s linguistic development. I do not set out for providing statistical analyses of discrete linguistic elements. There is less emphasis on the numerical accounts (e.g. frequency calculations) of a particular linguistic phenomenon, rather I attempt to reveal why and how things happen in a particular way. Besides identifying and discussing the main foci, (my participant’s communicative intentions, identity development) of the research I am determined to find patterns in the data and make them salient for the reader. I am aware of the fact that my single-subject case is not suitable for generalizations but strongly believe that it provides valuable data to extend our knowledge about what can happen in dual language acquisition. In order to make it as valid as possible I tried to avoid biased statements by triangulating the data, which means I attempted to describe my participant’s own subjective interpretations of the events as well as my and all involved interlocutors’ opinions and conclusions. I use the term dataset instead of the term corpus when I refer to the material I use for linguistic analysis in my paper. The term dataset is more appropriate as the analysed material is made up of the written version of isolated speech events recorded in different periods of time. My material is a collection of selected discourse samples taken from authentic interactions. I approached my data from a purely qualitative perspective, and analysed them with the help of qualitative methods. Doing an interpretive research, I wanted (1) to uncover recurring patterns in the way my participant uses her two languages naturally, and (2) to categorize my data accordingly.

3.3 Data collection instrument

Data for the research were drawn from multiple sources, they were collected with the help of (1) participant observation and field notes, (2) structured retrospective interviews conducted with the child and (3) other documents such as the child’s writings and drawings. The interactions were tape-recorded at home and some other informal settings where Sarah felt comfortable with the presence of her friends and family members. The selected discourse pieces are presented as excerpts in my paper and they are numbered in an ongoing fashion. I added the child’s age after each excerpt in brackets with the first number indicating the year, with the second number indicating the month. For example: (3;6). Adding her interpretations of a particular situation to those of mine contributed to triangulation and has made the findings more valid.

3.4 The participant

The case study is restricted to one person, Sarah, who is the researcher’s (myself) own child. However, as the focus of the investigation is on child’s second language acquisition, a number of other participants, related individuals are also included. They are considered as interlocutors in the child’s interpersonal communication. In most cases it is the mother (the researcher) and the child’s siblings and peers whose discourse is observed and taped by the researcher. The study was conducted at the child’s home and in other
informal settings, in the circle of close friends and family members where the child felt comfortable and had an open rapport with interlocutors. These circumstances provide a naturalistic context, which is a fruitful arena for data collection. Data for the research covered ten years, from the age of one to eleven.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Bilingualism – emotions - identity

Researchers (Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 2006; Ricento, 2005) revisiting SLA research in the 90s recommend considerations of identity in SLA. In the 90s a great deal of attention was turned to the sociocultural dimension of bilingualism and second language learning. Since then ethnographic studies have mushroomed to reveal how identity formulates and transforms in the varied contexts of second language learning. Earlier studies had dichotomic oppositional categories like native-non-native, motivated-unmotivated language learner to suggest that the ultimate goal of learning is nativelike proficiency and the desire to become an indistinguishable member of the target speech community. Such studies approached identity as someone whose main goal is to be accepted in the target culture group and described the language learner with fixed, invariant/constant attributes. (Ricento, 2005) These studies placed the individual learner in a bipolar system distinguishing between the good vs. successful language learner, the motivated vs. unmotivated learner, the instrumentally motivated vs. integratively motivated (Gardner, 2001) language learner. This approach considers the learner as static and implies that learners can be described with permanent, unchanged attributes. This view seems to ignore that learners undergo multiple changes during the learning process and show a dynamic picture of identity transformations. They consider the individual as a social attribute and examine them exclusively according to their success or failure regarding their integration effort and success into the target community. These researchers underscore learners’ desire and ability to integrate in the target language community. Recent approaches (Norton, 2000; Ricento, 2005) put more emphasis on the interaction of the individual’s multiple membership and illuminate how these memberships are understood by the learner and by the learner’s environment and also how different subject positions unfold in different contexts (Ricento, 2005, p.898). The authors of first-person, single-subject accounts provide a wealth of examples taken from socially-constructed naturally-occurring authentic interactions to give a complex picture of what is going on in the individual during the learning process. It turns out that the degree of motivation and attitudes displayed by the individual learner is not static. The dynamic character of the individual is emphasized by Norton (2000) and Ricento (2005). They claim that individuals’sense of self shows a diverse picture at different points of time and in different contexts during the learning process. Norton’s microlevel social encounters with her participants underpin that learners get a range of opportunities to speak, and are placed in different situations. Based on the interviewees’ accounts she concludes that individuals take different subject positions from the disregard to the fully accepted language user. Research into the relationship between identity and SLA is expected to provide further empirical data to know more about individual learners’ behaviour and attitudes to learning. The significance of microlevel analyses is that those accounts greatly contribute to awareness and are of high importance in eliminating dogmas and biases and allow seeing things from multiple perspectives.
4.2 Communicative intentions conveyed via L2 in Sarah’s language use

My aim is to give insights in Sarah’s L2 development, as indicated in the title. In my inquiry I do not investigate my participant’s L1 development for the simple reason that space limitations preclude an in-depth analysis of her development in both of her languages. Yet, in studying my participant’s second language development, the acquisition of L1 is always taken into account, as L2 learning is often influenced by transfers from L1. A number of L1 utterances and references to L1 are included in the selected excerpts of talk to provide information and underpin my interpretations and conclusions. The massive and continuous reliance on L1 is justified because a significant part of the structured retrospective interviews was conducted in L1. I expected that talking about feelings and reporting on subjective interpretations of learning and language use in Hungarian, in her mother tongue, was easier for Sarah. As the majority of her personal accounts has been documented in Hungarian I present them in Hungarian in order to fulfill the validity requirements of the qualitative research and add English translations for those who might not know Hungarian.

In this part I present how Sarah uses L2 as a complementary set to shade and clarify communicative intentions in interpersonal interactions. I present situations to reveal that she has definite expectations and knowledge on who, where, when speaks Hungarian or English. In this section I categorized the samples according to the different communicative intentions. In my category system I relied on Pavlenko’s (2006) research findings who has come to a conclusion that the multilingual speakers she interviewed appealed to code-switching to convey different affective stances. Sarah’s language behaviour reveals that language shift signals affect and it is meant to manipulate the situation and the interlocutors. Language choice indicates emotional attachment. My findings in this respect underpin Pavlenko’s (2006) results she collected from her multilingual interviewees’ language performance.

The excerpts reveal what sort of communicative intentions are mediated and interpreted through L2 in concrete communicative events by my participant. Also I show how the integration of L2 indicates a variety of emotional stances both on the part of the speaker and her interlocutors’. In the analysis of my child’s discourse and commentary I categorize the samples according to different communicative intentions and affective meanings and attempt to find patterns in those functions. In my inquiry I apply utterance-level/intra-utterantial and above utterance level/inter-utterantial analyses (Schiffrin, 1994). In all cases I consider one excerpt as a basic unit of linguistic analysis. The communicative intentions I focus on in this section are: (1) accommodating to the established language separation rules, (2) expressing emotional attachment, (3) conciliating the interlocutor, (4) identifying the situation and the interlocutor’s mood by language use, (5) topic abandonment and tricking, (6) easing tension - injecting humour

(1) Accommodating to the established local rules in language separation

Excerpt 1

1. Sarah: Mummy, Brendon speaks English at nursery too.
2. Mother: With whom? With you?
3. Sarah: No, with his mother.
4. Mother: Yes, but his father is American, so they speak English more often than we do. At home in the street, in the shop, everywhere. Perhaps it was easier for him to speak English.

5. Sarah: Yes, but I never speak English with you in the kindergarten.

6. Mother: They do it in their way, we do it in our way. (3;4)

Coming back home from the nursery Sarah made a statement about Brendy’s using English in the kindergarten as in the utterance above. Brendon was her groupmate at nursery, he is an American-Hungarian bilingual, whose first language is English. The reason for her astonishment was the boy’s using English at nursery, which is for her was an unexpected domain for using that language. For her it was strange that someone uses English outside home without mother’s presence, since it was very different from the household language use pattern she was raised in. Brendon’s language behaviour represented a deviation from Sarah’s local cultural norms, as a matter of fact for Brendy English is the most frequently used language. To clarify the situation I told her that bilingual families use their languages in different ways arguing that the rule of language choice we established in our family is only one in the multitude of language share patterns that bilingual families depict. She seemed to be satisfied with my argumentation and my explanation of the event must have made her redefine her conception about language and language use, because she nodded off my answer. The evidence of the change in her views is that later she herself gave accounts of several examples of different language boundary patterns in the bilingual families we have relationships with.

(2) Expressing emotional attachment

Excerpt 2

1. Sarah: Mummy, when I am as big as Dodó (her older sister), I also say 'anya' ('mother') to you?

2. Mother: I don't know. What do you think?

3. Sarah: No, you are my mummy. (She intersects hurriedly.)

4. Mother: So you like calling me mummy?

5. Sarah: Yes. And I always say it. (5,2)

Sarah raised the question in line 1 one evening while we were having dinner together in the kitchen in narrow family circle. Her inquiry surprised me because it was an old established rule in the family that my older daughters address me 'anya' (mother in Hungarian) as opposed to 'mummy' so she must have perceived the difference in use many times before. Until that time Sarah had not given voice to her astonishment noticing the difference between her and her siblings’ language use. Her inquiry obviously exemplified a case of directing attention to language use differences in her social environment. The fact that she trasformed the situation into an object of analysis infers that she realizes that 'mummy' with English pronunciation sounds out of place in an L1 context and gives evidence of her metalinguistic awareness. Obviously she started to think about language. From line 4 it turns out that she has no aversion to her use of 'mummy', quite the contrary, she thinks the word 'mummy' is a better fit, it better expresses her intention, that is her assuring me about her overwhelming love towards me. The way she raises the question in line 1 suggests her perception of the dynamism of language use. She assumes that current language use norms can change with time. That’s why she wonders
whether her way of addressing me ‘mummy’ will remain in the future or will be replaced by ‘anya’ when she grows as old as her sisters. The difference between her sisters’ and her wording simply arouses her attention to a linguistic item, which she wished to discuss with me, although as implied in line 4 she did not attribute too much significance to the real reason. Her answer in line 4 to my question in line 3 gives evidence that whatever happens in the future she will always prefer using the word ‘mummy’, as it gives her inner satisfaction. From her last comment it turns out that she would not like to change ‘mummy’ for ‘anya’. Perhaps because she had been using ‘mummy’ from the very beginning of her language acquisition it signals stronger emotional attachment. She implies that time and experience has made that word more valid and lended credit to its use. On the one hand, her comment is suggestive of her metalinguistic awareness displaying her ability to interpret her and her interlocutors’ language use. She claims that she knows ‘mummy’ pronounced in English is odd in a Hungarian context, as we had earlier discussed it, and understands that the use of ‘anya’ is more typical and suitable in her language community. It is also an example of assimilating an L2 word in L1 as a manifestation of affective communication strategy by which she gets attention. The case shows that even if they sound odd, she clings to L2 elements and applies L1-L2 code-switches in natural talk, when those L2 elements better describe and express her communicative intentions. Her preference of the above mentioned L2 element is underpinned by the fact that she always addresses me as mummy with English pronunciation even in a Hungarian context with other Hungarians around. This must be a preferred element, which is fully assimilated in her first language. Her comment shows that although she is aware of the awkwardness of using the foreign-sounding word in a Hungarian context, and also she gives voice to her astonishment over it, she comforms herself to the use of this word. She calls my attention to the deviation from the rule but assures me that the L2 word is a better fit. By adding her last comment gives evidence that mummy represents conscious transfer (Taron, 1977) and infers that she would be reluctant to abandon that word with L2 pronunciation as it intensifies the content of her utterance and amplifies her emotional bonding to me. Her body positioning as she hugs me tight, illustrates that using this word gives her internal satisfaction, the word {mAmi} instead of ‘anya’ represents alliance, it means we-ness and intimacy, therefore she does not abandon it (Baker, 2005; Pavlenko, 2006). I have detected some other instances of L2 transfer which exhibit similar emotional attachment.

(3) Conciliating the interlocutor - Identifying the situation and the interlocutor’s mood by language use

Excerpt 3
1. Mother: Na mostmár mars aludni! (Now get in bed!) Ne mondjam többször! (Don’t let me say that any more.)
2. Sarah: Give me my diaper.
3. Sarah: It is not here.
4. Mother: Go and fetch it quickly.
5. Sarah: But we didn’t read! I want ’Make-believe’! (4:2)

It was around bedtime when as a response to my outburst in Hungarian in line 1 Sarah turned to me in English as in line 2 emorsefully. The diaper is a safety blanket for
her she has been using from babyhood up to the present day as a comforting object when
sleeping or feeling tired. The utterance in line 2 was purposeful and was meant to soften
me. Her using English together with her gestural and body performance, smile on her face,
outstretched arms, glimmering eyes was a linguistically performed social act and gave
evidence of her tactful behaviour. On the one hand, it seemed to be an effective tool to
reach my satisfaction. On the other hand, it served another goal: to get me to read a
bedtime story for her, and to be less strict about the bedtime agenda. She expected that via
code-switching she would better convey her intended meaning, so her request in English
served as an affective strategy to control the interlocutor and get inner satisfaction.

(4) Topic abandonment and tricking
Excerpt 4
1. Mother: Sarah: You haven’t opened the book today. You are lying, aren’t you?
(pressing Sarah’s nose gently)
2. Sarah: I am not lying, I am sitting.
3. Mother: (I can hardly hide laughter away) Really? Then tell me the poem now.
Sarah starts reciting the poem but stops many times not knowing the text fluently.
4. OK, learn it, I will come later and ask you. But next time you should think before
you cheat me. Promise,
Sarah: Yes. promise. (8;3)

This conversation occured in the evening, she was lying in bed, and I asked her if
she knew the Hungarian poem, Hajnal Anna: ’A náthás medve’ ‘The bear with a cold’, she
had promised to learn for school. She said yes, but it turned out to be a fib, as to my
request she could recite the poem only with a lot of mistakes. I told her I was disappointed
about her bad behaviour and I reproached her for not telling the truth shown in line 1.
Feeling ill-conscience she immediately bounced up in her bed and answered as in line 2.
This event shows that she understood the perlocutional act of my utterance in line 1, she
knew I was furious with her, therefore she tried to conciliate and soften me by playing on
humour using a homophone ’lie’as a linguistic resource. The utterance was an attempt to
get me to be more permissive and forget about her improper behaviour. By outwitting her
mother she created a chilling effect on the mother and could get her to forget about her
mischief. This example is suggestive of her employing topic abandonment as a type of
achievement strategy. At the same time it gives evidence that she is able to control her
language knowledge and to use that knowledge in a creative way. It is a typical case of
resource expansion and the realization of metacognitive and affective strategies.

(5) Easing tension - Injecting humour
Excerpt 5
1. Dori: Sarah, come. We’re baking ’Kacsa Nagyi’ chocolet cookies, which you like so
much. Prepare the flour, sugar, eggs and cocoa here on the table.
2. Sarah: Soon, soon, soon. (The girls are waiting, but Sarah does not move from the
sofa)
3. Dori: Are you sitting on your ears? Is it so difficult to lift your buttocks and get
the flour from the larder?
4. Sarah: No. Coming!
Sarah runs up to the table in the dining room and fidgets with the tulips, which are placed in the vase in the middle of the table. In the following moment she turns up in the kitchen with a tulip in her hand and says:

5. Sarah: Dodó, your flower is here.
6. Dori (laughing): Very clever! (8;7)

I became attentive to my daughters’ conversation presented in the excerpt above because it was a typical case when the bigger ones’ disciplined Sarah and tried to get her to assist them with housework in English. It was so as they learnt that Sarah was more cooperative when they asked her in English perhaps because talking in English gave her the impression that the girls’ request is less direct and imperative or simply she loved when she was talking in that language to her siblings. This time my bigger daughters, Dóri and Nani were busy baking a cake in the kitchen. They wanted to involve Sarah in the activity so they asked her in English to collect the necessary ingredients. Sarah was too lazy to react immediately to Dori’s request so she stayed lying on the sofa and pretended as if she had not heard what the girls had said. As a response, Dóri made a remark in a high voice about her laziness and made another attempt to persuade her so asked her again as in line 3. As a sign of apology Sarah suddenly bounced up from the sofa, went to the dining table where there were red and yellow tulips in a vase. She made sure that big girls were watching her, so reached for a flower in the vase, picked it out and went with it to the kitchen. Reaching the kitchen table she imitated as if she had wanted to put the flower in the bowl which was prepared for the ingredients of the apple pie the girls planned to bake. Certainly the pun was a tool to counterbalance her sisters’ teasing. Sarah realized her inequitable position, and wanted to change her siblings’ attitude. Her gestural performance, the smile on her face, accompanying the utterance in line 2 indicated that the pun was applied not only because she wanted to sound funny. Her aim was undoubtedly to win her sisters’ conciliation, which she finally could achieve as shown in line 6. Inserting humour proved to be an effective strategic tool to defend herself and to win attention. The siblings’ reaction and the smile on their faces signalled for Sarah that her pun hit the target. From the way the siblings’ reacted she realized that she could redefine her position in the circle of siblings. Hearing her well-placed pun her sisters admitted that she was clever enough to speak for herself and gave her the opportunity to control the situation.

4.3 Sarah’s identity development

The excerpts in this chapter fall under the following categories: (1) social identity development in interaction, (2) handling negative feedback, experiences, (3) defining group boundaries - preserving alliance and privacy, (4) getting authority and wielding power via L2, (5) finding ways to enhance learning - reference to other language learners’ experience

1. Sarah: Brendy, we have coke, do you want?
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2. Brendy: It is not good for me. Mom says I mustn’t drink anything from the fridge. I’m ill with hörghurut, and taking medicine.


5. Kata: Mit mondott? (What did she say?)

6. Sarah: Azt, hogy nem ihat hideg vizet, mert hörghurutja van. (That he mustn’t drink cold water because he has bronchitis.)

7. Kata: Hogy van az, hogy hörghurut angolul? (How is 'hörghurut' in English?)

8. Sarah: Nem tudom, mi csak azt mondjuk, hogy 'ill'. (I don’t know, we say only 'ill'.)

9. Meg a Brendy is úgy mondja. (And Brendy says so.)

10. Kata: Jó, elhiszem. (Good, I believe it.) (5;5)

Prior to this conversation, lines 1-4 there was a short dialogue between Brendy and Sarah from which it turned out that Brendy was not allowed to drink cold water because he was ill. Brendy, Sarah’s groupmate in the kindergarten that time, is a balanced bilingual with an American father and a Hungarian mother. As Brendy spoke English, which Kata, Sarah’s best friend living next door did not understand, the girl asked Sarah to translate Brendy’s words for her as in line 5. Sarah did it without hesitation as in line 6 but Kata proved to be more inquisitive and wanted to know exactly how ‘hörghurut’ was in English. Sarah, not knowing the English word herself, explained that they do not use that word in English in the family and added they usually replaced it with the word ‘ill’. The same remark in line 6 also implies that this gap in her lexicon did not disturb her and seemingly she did not attribute much interest to Kata’s hair-splitting. To support and underpin her argument, in line 9 she mentioned that Brendy used the same word for that meaning. The reference to Brendy’s language use seemed to be a persuasive and powerful argument for Kata. Line 10 gives evidence of it where she acknowledges that Sarah’s explanation was satisfying. Apparently, Sarah’s tactful way to overcome a linguistic challenge was successful. Reference to Brendy helped her to escape from a situation which might have created a negative picture of her L2 proficiency. Sarah hoped that her argumentation in line 10 would make a positive impression about her knowledge. She assumed that the mere fact that Brendon and she use the same English word for the meaning in question would give credit to her explanation. She expected that Kata would consider Brendon as an authority of L2 knowledge, and looked up on him due to his proficiency in both Hungarian and English. Kata’s feedback in line 10 gives evidence that she behaved as it had been expected from her: she had no doubts about the credibility of Sarah’s answer. Sarah’s behaviour exhibits her sense of group-solidarity because she translates Brendy’s English talk into Hungarian not wanting to exclude Kata, her friend from the conversation. On the one hand, it represents her assimilation attempt into the community of friends. On the other hand, in line 6 the reference to ‘we’ as a group or community, which is distinct from that of Kata’s and identical with that of Brendy’s is suggestive of Sarah’s dynamic and transforming identity. The excerpt illustrates how Sarah regulates, identifies and redefines herself in the cultural group depending on her personal needs and interests. Directing attention to the similarities between Brendy’s and her own family’s language use as in line 9 seems to be a good idea to speak from a powerful position and
give the impression of a knowledgeable L2 speaker. It is also suggestive of her alignment with Brendon’s language community. The fact that identifying herself in the same group where Brendon belongs to authorizes her to be treated as a legitimate L2 speaker (Norton, 2000) who is knowledgeable enough to make valid statements about that language. Her inferences in lines 8-9 about her group affiliation betray that in the interaction she had developed a powerful subject position and appeared to be a respectful and legitimate L2 user. References to shared language use habits with fully authorized and undoubtedly legitimate L2 speakers like Brendy increases her self-esteem and self-confidence. We-ness, group belonging regarding L2 gives her power and authority (Pavlenko, 2006; Norton, 2000; Ricento, 2005).

(2) Handling negative feedback
Excerpt 2

1. Sarah: A Matyi azt mondta, ha nem tudok folyamatosan beszélni, akkor nem is tudok angolul. (Matyi says if I can’t speak fluently, I can’t speak English.)

2. Sarah: De azt a Matyi nem tudja, milyen az angolt használni az igazi beszédben. (But Matyi doesn’t know what it is like to use English in real speaking)

3. Sarah: Mondtam neki, ő lehet, hogy sok szót tud, de nem tudja összerakni. Én meg tudom, sőt még beszélgetni is tudok angolul. (I told him he might know a lot of words but can’t put them together. But I can and even can talk in English.) (9;8)

Sarah is very sensitive to critical remarks and the negative opinions about her English knowledge contributes to her perception that she is an incompetent speaker of English. With introducing the term ‘sensing the right to speak’ and that of the notion of incompetent or illegitimate speaker Norton (2000) makes an important point that inequitable power relations and culturally mediated bad experiences can deter individuals from communication. Between her ages of seven and eight Sarah often complained that some kids in her class kept challenging her. The sample above exemplifies one of them. As a reaction to Matyi’s remark Sarah positions herself as an ignorant, disregarded speaker of L2 whose right to speak is shaken, therefore she herself becomes hesitant and uncertain about her knowledge. Her imbalance and contradiction is reflected in line 3, where she seems to restore her self-esteem by claiming that she is able to express herself in complete sentences not only in isolated words as Matyi does. Her utterance in line 3 is a manifestation of self-defence. Feeling disappointed by Matyi’s degrading statement she feels being silenced would be the sign of admission, so decides to speak for herself. Some other cases give evidence that Sarah displays varied reactions to injustice and negative criticism: sometimes she is silenced, and copes with it by reporting on her experience at home, some other times she gives voice to her opinion on the site and is determined to disarm her opponent. Comments similar to this one abound in my dataset. They show that she is sensitive to the opinion of her social environment and her multiple perception of these opinions formulate her self-image. Just as well the discussions of her perceptions depict her permanent struggle of subjectivity/the individual learner in the process of self-identification. The fact that she recurrently initiates conversations to discuss her feelings about her L2 gives evidence of these individual struggles. At the same time her peers’ comments are of high importance in enhancing her learning. They encourage her to be more self-reflexive and responsible for her own learning process, and from time to time
fosters her to monitor her own language progress and to reconstruct her identity. It shows Sarah’s perception of the relative nature of language knowledge. Her conceptualization of language competence, her conception of herself in the language learning process are also reflected in her reporting on the classmates’ criticism. Her hesitation is clearly mediated in lines 1 and 2. Her utterances give evidence that it is difficult for her to decide whether she is a legitimate or an illegitimate speaker of L2. Rámi’s conception in line 1 reflects the typical lay person’s view of language competence inferring that real language knowledge means the ability of speaking about all topics in that language. Sarah supported by her own personal experience stands firm in her conviction that her language competence is justified and she considers herself as someone who has the right to speak the language. Line 3 shows that her self-evaluation of her own language proficiency reflects and echoes her social environment’s view of language competence.

(3) Defining group boundaries – preserving alliance and privacy
Excerpt 3
1. Sarah: ’Már megint angolul beszélsz!’ (Again, you speak English!)
2. Mother: Miért nem akarod, hogy angolul beszéljünk? (Why don’t you want us to speak English?) Katáék előtt mindig úgy beszélünk. (In the presence of Kata’s family we always speak English.)
3. Sarah: A Katáék meg a Kasia-ék az más, ők mindig itt vannak, olyan, mintha velünk laknának. (Kata’s family is different, they are always here as if they lived with us.)
4. Sarah: Meg másokkal nem szoktam angolul. (And with others I don’t speak English.)

Sarah reproached me as in line 1 in a low voice for talking to her in English as we were walking in the aisle of a busy shopping mall. She thought I displayed inappropriate behaviour and treated my using English as a rule offence, a deviation from our language use /household rules of language choice, and also she evaluated the situation as a betrayal of our alliance. Using a low voice is suggestive of her expectations regarding language choice and conforming to the norms. The fact that she does not accept using English in the presence of outsiders or uninitiated people shows how she identifies and regulates herself in the group.

Her utterance in line 1 is a clear request for my cooperation and preserving alliance and privacy. At the same time, not allowing speaking English with ‘others’ might mean two things: (1) ousting them from the circle of the allied members, (2) accommodating herself to the group. Her answer in line 4 to my question in line 2 is noteworthy. She gives a quick and simple explanation on why she refuses using English in that particular situation. Line 4 implies that the locally established rules regarding language boundary is an appropriate explanation, so she is unwilling to get involved and go deeper in further discussions.

(4) Getting authority – wielding power via L2
Excerpt 4
1. Dodó and Nani (Sarah’s elder sisters): Mi az ott Sára? (What is it here, Sarah?)
2. Sarah: Tigris. (Tiger)
3. Dodó: Mondd még egyszer! (Say it once again!) Dodó and Nani start laughing.
4. Sarah: Tíger. (victoriously)
In the example above the L2 code-switch falls into the category of both reduction and achievement strategies. The context behind this event was that Sarah’s elder sisters kept pulling her leg because she had difficulty in pronouncing the sound ‘s’ in Hungarian, which often raised a laugh among the bigger ones. On her siblings’ eliciting her to pronounce ‘tigris’ she used ‘tiger’ to avoid the embarrassing situation, since it did not contain the sound she had not mastered yet. On one hand the code-switch produced by her represents abandoning a message, signalling that she is unwilling to react to her siblings’ joking. In this consideration I treat the code-switch as reduction strategy. On the other hand, the L2 element seems to be a valuable linguistic resource to overcome an uncomfortable situation and solve a momentary problem. At the same time, due to her tactful and creative solution she won her sisters’ appreciation and thus she could also change power relationships in the circle of the siblings. The case shows that her L2 use lends her authority. This function of code-switching underpins Pavlenko’s (2006) and Baker’s (2005) findings.

(5) Finding ways to enhance learning – reference to other learner’s experience
Excerpt 5
1. Mondd el, mi volt ma a suliban! (Tell me what was at school.)
2. ‘Jó, de a dolgozatban nem azt kell tudni, hogy mit csináltam ma! (Good, but in the test I do not have to know what I did today.)
3. Ott azt kell tudni, ami az órai anyag! (There I have to know what is the lesson material.)
4. Amikor én megyek nyelvvizsgázni, akkor velem is leülsz tanulni, mint a Nanival? (When I go to take an exam will you sit down with me to learn like with Nani?)
5. Meg kéne tanítanod a nyelvtant! (You should teach me the grammar.)
6. Mer az úgy nem elég, hogy csak úgy beszélünk ebéd közben, meg ilyenek? (Cause it is not enough that we only talk during lunch and things like this.)
7. Sőt, amikor nyolcadikas leszek oroszul is elkezdhetünk tanulni, utána meg franciául és lengyelül is akarok. (What’s more, when I am in the eighth class, we can start to learn Russian, and then I want French and Polish too.)
8. Na jó. (Ok then.) (10;7)

One afternoon Sarah was upset because she got a four because she made grammatical mistakes in her test paper. She was disappointed and pushed the responsibility on me in line 2 pointing out that that learning for school requires instructed learning which is impossible to achieve during loose conversations. Her request in lines 4-5 she invites me to sit down with her and practise English to get prepared for school purposes. Her understanding of the characteristics of learning at school is reflected in her utterances. She claims practising and routinizing discrete elements of language is imperative to construct relevant knowledge for successful completion of school assignments and language exams. Her utterance in line 2 is suggestive of her awareness of the difference between learning language for academic purposes and learning it for communication. Her utterance in line 4 betrays how her personal experience influences her views about the function of language. In line 4 she draws on Nani’s, her elder sister’s example to underpin her argumentation. The way Nani prepared for her language exam and her own personal experience about using English at school and at home made her reconsider her thinking about language.
accordingly she concluded that learning at school is broken down to areas, skills and vocabulary. With her utterance in line 5 she refers to grammar as a clearly separable area in language learning. She perceives that successful fulfillment of lesson and language exam requirements demands a different type of preparation. Lines 6-7 give evidence of her perception that language is used for two distinct functions: the communicative and the cognitive function. In line 2-3 Sarah makes me understand that free conversations in English in informal settings greatly differ from what she is expected to know in the English lesson at school. Sarah’s argumentation implicitly reflects her linguistic awareness too. Sarah’s valorization of foreign language knowledge influenced by her social environment is reflected in the utterance in line 7. Foreign languages are highly valued and language learning has a high prestige in the family, therefore she has developed a positive attitude to language learning.

5. Conclusions
My aim was to analyze concrete examples on how language shift and reference to L2 modify and further shade meanings in the use of Hungarian and English of a girl in a dual language environment. The analysed data give evidence that cross-linguistic phenomena signal affect. Sarah mixes the languages to get the intended meanings across. Appeals to L2 express things like group-solidarity, attachment, conciliation, identifying the cospeaker’s mood, having fun with language, accommodating friends, tricking and preserving alliance and privacy. When defining my analytic categories I used Pavlenko’s (2006), Baker’s (2005) and Norton’s (2000) research conducted about their multilingual interviewees’ affective stances. The child’s language behaviour justifies that language use is unseparable from the social context and from the way the individual perceives that social context. The excerpts underpin how her discourse appropriates for the locally established family norms and agenda and how she interprets and relates to the communicative event in the dual linguistic system after her age of three. I described the ways Sarah applies influence on her social environment integrating L2 as a strategic tool to reach her goal. I concentrate on how the feedback she gets from her social environment influences her identity transformations. I focused on the multiple identities Sarah develops in bilingualism at different points of time in a variety of situations. The excerpts presented in the empirical part betray how she negotiates her identity and allows insights in her perception of self. I intended to show how the feedback she gets from her social environment influences her perception of self, her progress in L2, and the way she feels about her own language development. I draw on my data to show that this feedback mechanism generates myriad of effects in her learning process and makes her constantly reformulate her self-image. Depending on the numerous effects she develops versatile and sometimes contradictory identities and depicts various motivations and group affiliations. The social interactions presented in the excerpts underpin that she undergoes a number of identity transformations. Due to the dialectic relationship between her and her social environment she is forced to reconstruct her world, and revisit her place and position in the community she belongs to. Stretches of discourse bespeak how Sarah succeeds and fails to speak from powerful position with her peers. The excerpts are aimed to show the different degrees of her self-esteem, and with the help of them I intend to underpin that sometimes she positions herself as an
incompetent, disregarded individual, other times she develops a powerful, self-confident position. I want to show that her identity is not static moving between positive and negative identifications in the group and speech community where she finds herself in a particular discourse event. I display manifestations of her sensing her right to speak L2. The term ‘sensing the right to speak’ is introduced by Norton (2000) with reference to the speaker’s perception of their social position in a language community. With the term Norton raises awareness to situations where inequitable power relations and culturally mediated bad experiences can deter individuals from communication.

6. Limitations of research

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