

MIXED SPEECH OF AN EARLY BILINGUAL CHILD: A CASE STUDY ON JAVANESE-INDONESIAN BILINGUALISM

Endang Fauziati

English Department, FKIP-UMS

Jl. A. Yani Pabelan Kartasura Tromol Pos I Surakarta 57102

Email: efauziati@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The present study is concerned with mixed languages in the speech of a bilingual child, in Indonesian and Javanese. It is a cross-sectional study. The data of this study are in the form of sentences containing mixed languages. There are 50 sentences used as the data that are collected through observation and note taking. The collected data are then analyzed using descriptive method. The data analysis has revealed that the child's speech does contain elements from both languages: Indonesian and Javanese. The language mixing occurs at mostly all linguistic levels. The syntax, the morphology, and lexicon are formed or taken from both languages. The analysis also reveals that the child is still at the initial level of a bilingual. He has one lexical system with words from both languages. He also uses a mixed syntactical system. Both are evidence that he is a simultaneous bilingual, a bilingual from the start. Such language mixing is so common among normal bilinguals. A child who grows up simultaneously learning two or more languages usually goes through such a phase. This also makes possible that the child has been exposed to a mixed language input.

Key Words: *Bilingual children, language mixing, mixed languages.*

1. Introduction

Bilingualism has often been defined by Bloomfield (in Romaine, 2000: 11) as “a native-like control of two languages”. By contrast Haugen (in Romaine, 2000: 11) draws attention to the other end, when he observes that “bilingualism begins when the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language”. Thus, we can assume that a bilingual is an individual who can demonstrate any skill between these two extremes.

Scholars in the field often differentiate two possible routes involved in bilingual acquisi-

tion: simultaneous and consecutive or successive. Children may acquire more than one language up to the age of three and they should be considered as simultaneous. They may also acquire one language in infancy and the second after age three and this is considered as successive.

When bilinguals talk to each other, they often produce utterances, which do not exist in monolingual speech. Phenomena such as interference, borrowing, individual creation, code switching, and code mixing often exist in their speech. Language mixing is one of the typical features which characterize a simulta-

neous bilingual speech. Young children often use in their speech words or sentences in a single utterance. The kinds of mixing may involve the insertion of a single statement or of a particular or entire phrase, from one language into an utterance in another. The mixing can be of a phonological, morphological, syntactic, or lexicon semantic level. Such phenomena can be one of particular interests for bilingual studies.

In sociolinguistic field, language mixing is often viewed negatively as part language interference. It occurs when two languages are in contact. It is an example of deviation from the norms of bilinguals as a result of the bilingual's familiarity with more than one language. Another view is that it is an example of cultural diffusion; it is the speaker's attempt to produce in one language, patterns which he has learned in another.

Language mixing usually results in the existence of mixed languages. For example, a phenomenon in which bound morphemes are in language A, free lexical morphemes are in language B; free grammatical morphemes can be in either language; and syntax is that of language A. Thus, a mixed language may be mixed at any (or all) levels of grammar.

In this paper, I would like to focus the discussion on the bilingual speech of a 3: 4 bilingual boy named Reza, who is bilingual in Javanese and Indonesian. The objective of this study is to investigate language mixing which results in a mixed speech. To show the evidence of language mixing, I would focus on some main linguistic components, namely: syntax, morphology, and lexicon.

Several researchers have conducted studies on mixed languages in child's bilingual speech. Smith (in Romaine, 2000: 203-204) conducted a study of bilingual children in an English/Chinese family. The children were born in China of missionary parents and remained there until the youngest child was 1: 8, except for one year in the United States. They heard

Chinese from nurses, servants, and Chinese children. The parents, however, used both English and Chinese to their children.

Smith reported the occurrence of mixing. English and Chinese were mixed until third year of most of the children. He concluded that because the parents spoke to the children in both languages, there was no clear demarcation between the two.

Another case study was reported by Tabouret-Keller (in Romaine, 2000: 204-206). He studied on a child of working class background. The father was bilingual from childhood in French and German. The mother spoke the local Alsatian German dialect and had learned French in school. Both parents mixed both languages in speaking to their child. By two years of age, the child had a much larger French than German vocabulary and about 60 percent of her sentences were mixed. Tabouret-Keller also observed that the child became aware that she was speaking two languages when she was around 5.

The third case, which reports mixing, is discussed by Berling (in Romaine, 2000: 205-206). He studied his son's acquisition of English and Garo, a non-Indo-European language of the Bodo group of Tibeto-Burman. This child heard only English until he arrived in India at 1: 4. Subsequently, he had more contacts with monolingual Garo speakers and Garo became his dominant language. At the age of 2: 9 the child apparently had separate phonemic systems for the vowels of the two languages, but the consonants system never became differentiated. The Garo consonant were used as replacements of the English ones. Morphological development in Garo outstripped that in English. Before the age of 2, the boy had learned the verb suffixes marking the past, future, and imperative. Shortly thereafter, he acquired adverbial affixes interrogative suffixes noun endings and numerals.

The child assimilated English vocabulary into Garo and used Garo endings on English

words, as in the following examples, “*mam laiko tunonaha*”. The roots of every word are in English, but the suffixes *-ko* (direct object marker) and *-aha* (past tense), word order and phonology are in Garo. Later, when English sentences appeared, he borrowed Garo words into them and gave them English inflections. The child also never seemed to confuse word order between the two languages.

Throughout the family’s stay in India, the mother spoke English to the child, and the father spoke English and Garo. By the time they left, when the child was 3: 4, the child was fluent in Garo. When back in the United States, his father tried to speak Garo with his son occasionally, but this was not sufficient to maintain the language. Within six months in the new environment, he had trouble even with the simplest words.

A lot of studies on bilingual acquisition have been conducted. The earliest systematic studies of childhood bilingualism go back to Ronjat (in Romaine, 2000: 182-183) and Leopold (in Romaine, 2000: 180) who raised their children bilingually. One of the current studies on bilingualism is the one conducted by Harding and Riley (1986) and Romanine (1996). Among the results of their studies is the type of bilingual acquisition in childhood.

Romaine (2000: 183-203), following Harding and Riley, has classified early childhood bilingualism into six types: one person-one language, non-dominant home language (one language-one environment, non-dominant home language without community support, double non-dominant home language without community support, non-native parents, and mixed languages.

The characteristics of each type can be simply described as follows:

Type 1 : One Person-One Language
 Parents : The parents have different native languages with each having some degree of competence in the other’s language.

Community : The language of one of the parents is the dominant language of the community.

Strategy : The parents each speak their own language to the child from birth.

Type 2 : Non-Dominant Home Language/ One Language-One Environment

Parents : The parents have different native languages.

Community : The language of one of the parents is the dominant language of the community.

Strategy : Both parents speak the non-dominant language to the child, who is fully to the dominant language only when outside the home, and in particular in Nursery school.

Type 3 : Non-Dominant Home language without Community Support

Parents : The parents share the same native language.

Community : The dominant language is not that of the parents.

Strategy : The parents speak their own language to the child.

Type 4 : Double Non-Dominant Home Language without Community Support

Parents : The parents have different native language.

Community : The dominant language is different from either of the parents’ languages.

Strategy : The parents each speak their own language to the child from birth.

Type 5 : Non-native Parents

Parents : The parents share the same native language.

- Community : The dominant language is the same as that of the parents.
- Strategy : One of the parents always addresses the child in a language that is not his/her native language.
- Type 6 : Mixed languages
- Parents : The parents are bilingual.
- Community : Sectors of community may also be bilingual
- Strategy : Parents code-switch and mix languages.

When observing bilinguals talking to each other, we are aware of certain features, which do not exist in monolingual speech. Phenomena such as interference, borrowing, individual creation, code switching, and code mixing often exist in their speech.

In sociolinguistic field, the term interference has been used to refer to language interactions, such as linguistic borrowing and language switching or code switching, that occur when two language communities are in contact (Wardaugh, 2000). According to Weinreich (1968: 1), interference is “those examples of deviation from the norms of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of languages in contact.” According to Haugen (1957: 376), linguistic borrowing is “an example of cultural diffusion, the spread of an item of culture from people to people.” Haugen (1957: 370) said further “borrowing is linguistic diffusion and can be unambiguously defined as “the attempt by a speaker to produce in one language, patterns which he has learned in another. It is the language of the learner that is influenced, not the language he is learning. The contrastive analysis hypothesis, on the other hand, states that interference is “due to unfamiliarity with second language, that is, the learner has not learned the target patterns or forms” (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1992: 98). Interference is

manifested in the language the learner is learning, not the first language of the learner.

Language borrowing refers to the terms that have passed from one language to another and have come to be used even by bilinguals (Grosjean in Hoffmann, 1999: 102). He further distinguishes it from ‘speech borrowing’, which refer to instances where the bilingual borrows items spontaneously and adapts their morphology.

At the phonological level, a word may be assimilated, in which case there is no adaptation to the phonology of the recipient language, or it may be partially or wholly assimilated. Similarly, at the morphological level and syntactic levels, there may be assimilation of various degrees or assimilation. According to Haugen (in Romaine, 2000: 56) words, which are adapted phonologically and morphologically are referred to as ‘loanwords’, e.g. English words *boulevard*, *brochure*, *ballet*, *picnic* are taken from French. The words are often used by monolinguals who may or may not be aware their foreign origin, unless they happen to know the history of the language. In other words, they are probably not perceived as foreign by the majority of speakers.

Another type of borrowing is a loan shift. This consists of taking a word in the base language and extending its meaning so that it corresponds to that of a word in the other language. This type of loan shift has also been called semantic extension. For example, Indonesia has taken English word *hostess* (the owner of the house) and has been extended negatively to refer to a woman who works in a nightclub as a prostitute woman. A loan shift might involve “rearranging words in the base language along a pattern provided by the other and thus create a new meaning” (Romaine, 2000: 57). Such a loan shift is also often called “a creation, loan translation, or calque” (Romaine, 2000: 57).

In the same way as monolingual speakers do, bilingual children often come up with

their idiosyncratic linguistic creation and novel formation. Bilingual children, of course, draw on recourses of two languages and use their knowledge to produce specific forms. They can make up new forms in either language and in addition, use elements from both and combine them creatively. These new items are not the result of either interference or borrowing. Take for example; a bilingual child says *tivi kecil* to refer to *game watch*.

The most general description of code switching is that it involves the alternate use of two languages or linguistic varieties within the same utterance or during the same conversation (Hoffmann, 1999: 110). According to Polpack (in Romanine, 2000: 122-123; and in Hoffmann, 1999: 112-113) there are three types of code switching: tag or emblematic switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching. Tag or emblematic switching involves the insertion of a tag or exclamation in one language into an utterance, which is otherwise entirely in the other language. These serve as an emblem of the bilingual character. Take some examples, English expression *you know, I mean, no way, etc.* are inserted in Punjabi-English code switching as in "*I mean k rijane, I wish, you know kem pure Panjabibol s ka*".

The second type of code switching is inter-sentential switching. It involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. It may also occur between speaker turns. Inter-sentential switching can be thought of as requiring greater fluency in both languages than tag switching, since major portions of the utterance must conform to the rules of both languages.

The third type of code switching is intra-sentential switching. It involves the greatest syntactic risk, and may be avoided by all but the most fluent bilinguals. Here, switching of different types occurs within the clause or sentence boundary, as in the example of Tok Pisin/English code switching, "What's so funny?

Come; be good; other wise, *yu bai go long kot*. (What's so funny? Come be good. Otherwise, you'll go to court). Another example is from Grosjean (in Hoffmann, 1999: 111), a code switching of a French/English bilingual, "*Va cherche March and bribe him a vec un chocolat chaud with cream on top*". (Go and fetch March and bribe him with a hot chocolate with cream on top). Such intra-sentential code switching is also termed as code mixing.

Code mixing in general refers to the combining of elements from two languages in a single utterance. Thus, code mixing occurs at lexical level within a sentence (intra-sentential switching). It is differentiated from switches that occur within phrases or sentences (inter-sentential switching), which Poplack (1988) refers to as code switching.

Bilingual children often mix the two languages in their conversation. The kind of mixing may involve the insertion of a single element and a partial or entire phrase. Such mixing may occur for a number of reasons. The most important of which can be summarized from Hoffmann, 19996: 107) as follows:

- If an item has been acquired in one language but not yet in the other, the child may use the one device he has available to express a certain lexical or grammatical meaning.
- If an item is temporarily unavailable, the subject is likely to resort to an equivalent form in the other language (or what he thinks is one).
- If an item is more complex, or less salient, in one language, the young bilingual may make use of the corresponding one from the other.
- If the child is exposed to mixed input, he will often respond with mixed production.

A code mixing results in the existence of mixed languages. Backer and Mous (in Field, 2002: 13) define the term mixed language as follows:

- a. Bound morphemes (always of grammatical nature) are in language A;
- b. Free lexical morphemes are in language B;
- c. Free grammatical morphemes can be in either language;
- d. Syntax is that of language A.

Field (2002: 13-14) has modified these four criteria somewhat to describe more accurately many of the actual results of mixing. First, it is certainly not the case that all free-standing lexical items can come from language B (the donor). Although it is difficult to distinguish between lexical and grammatical elements cross linguistically, it still remains to be demonstrated that every content item of a language can indeed be replaced. Second, given the fact that the originators of a mixed language were members of bilingual community exhibiting various acquisition scenarios and continua of proficiencies in the relevant varieties, a number of significant effects of contact can be expected on the matrix (recipient) system itself. Hence, one should be somewhat circumspect in acceptance both (a) and (d) in their extreme forms. Only (c), which leads us to expect forms from either language, allow us for the assumption of variation and implies that a mixed language may be mixed at any (or all) levels of grammar.

2. Research Method

In what follows, I present the research method used in this study. The present study is a type of a longitudinal case study in which I observed the development of linguistic performance, especially the spontaneous speech of the subject. The performance data were collected at one period, that was, from December 2003 to March 2004.

The subject of this study is my own nephew named Reza. At the beginning of the data collection period, he was about 3:4 years old. The child language performance was written down in field note. I focused only on his

mixed speech. Thus, any time I heard him producing mixed speech, I put it in the list of data.

All members in the family are bilinguals in Javanese and Indonesian. We often communicate more in Indonesian than in Javanese at home and at work and in Javanese outside home, particularly with local community. Reza heard both Indonesian and Javanese from early age. He heard Indonesian more frequently than Javanese at home and at kindergarten (Play Group). He heard mostly Javanese outside home, particularly from his peers.

The data of this study are in the form of sentences, containing language mixing. There are 50 sentences that can be collected and these are used as primary data. Two main techniques of data collection are observation and note taking. All the mixed utterances produced by the subject are written down in a field note.

This research is qualitative in nature, in which descriptive method is used to analyze the data. The description particularly tries to reveal the existence of mixed languages at the level of syntax, morphology, and lexicon.

3. Research Findings and Discussion

In this section, I describe the research findings and provide with the discussions on the existing phenomena. To show the evidence of language mixing, I focus on some main linguistic components: syntax, morphology, and lexicon.

3.1 Syntax

The analysis shows that the word order and the appearance of grammatical morphemes in the child's language indicate the occurrence of a mixed syntax. It shows that the child has no matrix language, that is, one language as the main or base language into which elements from the others are embedded. The utterances produced are some in Indonesian syntax and others are in Javanese. It means that the child sometimes uses Indonesian syntax as the matrix and at other time he uses Javanese syntax.

Thirty-two sentences (64%) of his utterances are in Indonesian syntactic system and in ambiguous one as in:

- (1) *Bu guru sudah teka.*
- (2) *Bude aku bisa ngaggo baju dewe.*
- (3) *Bu', mainanku neng mana?*
- (4) *Bu', minta duit tiga receh.*

These are ambiguous since they can be either in Indonesian or Javanese syntactic system. There exist some similarities between Indonesian and Javanese word order, such as Indonesian: “*Bu guru sudah datang*” and Javanese: “*Bu guru sampun rawuh*”. The rest, 18 sentences (36%) are in Javanese syntactic system as in:

- (5) *Merahnya di ngisor.*
- (6) *Bu, ini dibuang entuk.*
- (7) *Mandinya kosek.*
- (8) *Minum susunya sedikit wae.*

Thus, I can conclude that the child has no matrix language. He uses two types of word order. In other words, he has mixed syntax. This means that the child acquires both Indonesian and Javanese syntax simultaneously.

3.2 Morphology

The child's mixed speech is also significant in morphological level. The analysis indicates that some utterances are formed from both Indonesian and Javanese. Consider the examples below:

1. Indonesian affix and Javanese verb. He attaches Indonesian affix *di-* and *-kan* as passive marker to Javanese verbs “*ceklek*” and “*golek*” as in “*diceklekkan*” and “*digolekkan*”.
2. Javanese preposition and Indonesian noun. He forms question indicating place “where” by using Javanese preposition “*neng*” and Indonesian word “*mana*”. These are mixed to become question word “*neng mana*”.
3. Indonesian definite article and Javanese noun. English uses definite article to show

that something is definite; Indonesian uses the suffix *-nya* that is added to the noun, as in *bukunya*. However, the study indicates that the child uses this Indonesian suffix to Javanese noun “*sambel*” as in “*sambelnya*”.

4. Indonesian preposition and Javanese noun. He uses Indonesian preposition referring to place “*di*” together with Javanese words referring to directions, “*ngisor*” and “*nduwur*” as in *di ngisor* and *di nduwur*.
5. Indonesian auxiliary and Javanese verb. He uses Indonesian modal auxiliary representing capability “*bisa*” together with Javanese verb *ganggo*, as in “*bisa nganggo*”.
6. Javanese relative pronoun and Indonesian noun. He uses Javanese relative pronoun “*sing*” together with Indonesian nouns, as in “*sing putih*”, “*sing merah*”, and “*sing satunya*”.

3.3 Lexicon

3.3.1 The Use of Verb

The analysis indicates that the child uses more Javanese verbs than the Indonesian ones. There are 24 (64.9%) Javanese verbs used in his utterance, such as in:

- (9) *Mainanku didokok mana.*
- (10) *Ini yang nyuweki bukan saya*
- (11) *Laronnya ada yang bisa mabur.*
- (12) *Minta tali dingo nalenini*

And there are 13 (35.1%) Indonesian verbs such as in:

- (13) *Mbak pakai sandal ndak kotor.*
- (14) *Ambil lap neng ngendi.*
- (15) *Aku bisa pakai klambi dhewe.*
- (16) *Anggere minta uang empat, receh.*

Some Javanese verbs like “*nyuwek*, *ndokok* (*ndekek*), *teka*, *ndeleh*, *nalenini*, *madahi* etc.” never appear in their Indonesian counterpart. Even the verbs *ndokok*, *nganggo*, and *teka* appear more than once. It indicates that the child has not yet acquired

their equivalence in Indonesian. However, the child could use some Javanese verbs and its Indonesian equivalence such as *mabur/terbang*, *nganggo/memakai* as in:

- (17) *Laronnya ada yang bisa mabur. Mosok, terbang pakai tangan, yo ra enjoh.*
 (18) *Budhe aku bisa nganggo baju dhewe. Mbak, pakai sandal, ndak kotor.*

Among the classes of words, mixed verbs appear the most frequently. This indicates that the child still have difficulty to identify which verbs are Indonesian and which ones belong to Javanese.

3.3.2 The use of Noun

Compared to the verbs, the use of mixed nouns is less significant. Most of the child's nouns are in Indonesian (16 or 72%) such as *telur, mainan, perut, baju* etc. as in:

- (19) *Telurnya dua, satu emoh.*
 (20) *Bu mainanku didokok mana?*
 (21) *Aku bisa nganggo baju dhewe.*

The rest (6 or 28%) are in Javanese, such as *klambi, salin, oleh-oleh* etc. as in:

- (22) *Aku bisa pakai klambi dhewe.*
 (23) *Oleh-olehnya apa, iki emoh?*
 (24) *Engko nek berangkat saline didokok mana?*

This indicates that he acquires nouns in Indonesia more than in Javanese. Only one noun referring to money that appears both in Indonesian and Javanese, that is, *uang* and *duit*.

- (25) *Uangku mana? Digolekkan!*
 (26) *Bu, minta duit tiga, receh.*

3.3.3 The Use of Adjective

There are five sentences that contain adjectives, three in Javanese such as "*angel, peteng, pedes*", as in

- (27) *Lampunya diceklekkan, peteng.*
 (28) *Sambelnya emoh, pedhes.*

The data show three adjectives in Indonesian such as *kotor, besar, and sakit*, as in:

- (29) *Nggak mau makan, perutku ndak sakit.*
 (30) *Mbak, pakai sandal, ndhak kotor.*

They indicate that the child acquires both Indonesian and Javanese adjectives simultaneously. His Indonesian adjectives never appear in their Javanese counterpart and his Javanese adjectives also never appear in Indonesian. Consider the table below, showing the mixing in syntax and lexicon: verb, noun, and adjective.

The above description has shown us some instances where the child's language seems to

Category	Indonesian		Javanese	
	Total	%	Total	%
Syntax	32*	64	18	36
Verbs	24	64,9	13	35,1
Nouns	16	72	6	38
Adjectives	3	50	3	50

* This includes the ambiguous sentences that represent both Indonesian and Javanese word order.

be a hodge-podge of constructions and vocabulary items, some drawn from Indonesian and some from Javanese. Such language mixing is an inevitable consequence of bilingual development, since the child was exposed to two languages simultaneously. He heard two languages at the same time; even the inputs are also mixed. Some implications can be drawn as follows:

- (1) The Child's Linguistic Portrait can be sketched as Follows:

He was a child who could not yet equally well function in Indonesian as in Javanese. At this age, his language is colored with mixed utterances from both languages exposed to him. This phenomenon is common to any early bilingual child, since there will come the period when the two languages are separated.

This finding is in accordance with the theory of child bilingualism type 6 (mixed languages) proposed by Romaine (2000). It occurs in bilingual children whose parents are bilingual and in their communication they use strategy of code switching and code mixing. Because the parents spoke to the children in both languages, there was no clear demarcation between the two. Thus, mixing in the child bilingualism is something unavoidable in this situation. This is an agreement with Grosjean (1982) and Andersson (1991) who claim that language mixing is so common among normal bilinguals.

- (2) He has one Lexical System and a Mixed Syntactic System

Viewed from the lexical system, it indicates that the child has one lexical system with words from both languages (Indonesian and Javanese). The study also shows that the child's language mixing tended to be verbs and to a lesser degree nouns, and adjectives. This is not in agreement with the theory that says, "language mixing tends to be nouns rather than verbs" (Hoffmann, 1999).

Viewed from syntactic system, it shows that the child's first syntactic system is a mixed syntactic system (Indonesian and Javanese). It is clear that he is a simultaneous bilingual. This is, again, in accordance with Volterra and Teashner's theory. After the child has gained his lexical system, he can later recognize that there are two lexical systems but uses both in one syntactic system. There are two important issues here. Firstly, whether the first syntactic system used by the child is a truly mixed syntactic system, or is an approach to one of the available grammars; and secondly, whether language mixing is significant as claimed. If the postulated first syntactic system is mixed syntactic system, the child is bilingual from the start (a simultaneous bilingual).

3.3.3 Mixed Language Input

The language mixing in the child's speech is likely to occur since the language the child hears is already mixed, and that some of it, at least, contains borrowed words or loan words. It is true that bilingual speakers are not always aware of the language they use. It is supported by Genesee (in Lyon, 1999) and Romaine (2003) who suggested that language mixing in young children could be related to mixed parental language.

4. Conclusion

The present study deals with mixed languages in the speech of a bilingual child named Reza, whose tongues are Indonesian and Javanese. It is a longitudinal case study that tries to portrait the typical mixing in the child's speech. The finding shows that the child's language is a mixed language. It contains the linguistic elements of the two languages. Its syntax, morphology, and lexicon are from the two languages. Even the two languages often appear in one short constituent. The above discussion has shown us some instances where the child's language seems to be a hodge-podge of constructions and vo-

cabulary items, some drawn from Indonesian and some from Javanese. Such language mixing is an inevitable consequence of bilingual development, since the child was exposed to two languages simultaneously. He heard two languages at the same time; even the inputs are also mixed. Some implications can be drawn as follows.

The proximate causes of such mixing undoubtedly lie in the interaction of social, psychological, and linguistic conditions. Anyhow the actual mechanisms seem to be restricted to language contact phenomena. Mixed languages emerge also as the result of sequential acquisition of two or more languages. The one

already established in (indigenous) to community is more likely to form grammatical matrix. It also implies that this native language is acquired through normal process of transmission—in the home, among family members, and so on.

Scholars agree in their reports that mixing diminishes as the child gets older. A decrease in mixing is seen as evidence of the gradual separation of the child's initially mixed language system. This can be explained as well in terms of the young bilingual's growing awareness of sociolinguistic norms and his greater susceptibility to linguistic clues in his environment.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, Una Cunningham and Staffan Andersson. 1999. *Growing up with Two Languages: A practical guide*. London: Routledge.
- Field, Fredric W. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Context*. Amesterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grosjean, Francois. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harding, Edith and Philip Riley. 1986. *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for parents*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Hoffmann, C. 1996. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Hugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana U.P.
- Lyon, Jean. 1999. *Becoming Bilingual: Language Acquisition in a Bilingual Community*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters. Ltd.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 2000. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2000. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Weinrich, Uriel. 1968. *Languages in Contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.