

Sezgin Ballıdağ

Istanbul Medeniyet University, Türkiye
Bahcesehir University, Türkiye

Kenan Dikilitaş

University of Bergen, Norway

NON-NATIVE PARENTS RAISING A BILINGUAL CHILD IN TURKEY

Annotation. This case study explores the bilingual upbringing of a 5 year 2 months old child in Turkish and English through “non-native parents (NNP) strategy” within a context where English is neither the first nor the majority language of the community. Drawing on the Parental Discourse Hypothesis (Lanza, 1992) and Modeling Hypothesis (Comeau et al., 2003), the researchers examined not only the development of the child’s English, but also the approach of the father towards the child, and his self-perception as a father seeking opportunities to raise a bilingual child. The data were collected by means of a series of video recordings of the interaction between the child and the father, as well as via two semi-structured interviews with the father. The findings show that even quite limited exposure to a (second) language may lead to the acquisition of that language thanks to strict adherence to NNP strategy, and the parents’ concentrated efforts at refraining from code-mixing in their own speech.

Keywords: non-native parent bilingual upbringing; bilingualism in Turkey; father-led bilingualism.

Introduction

People have learned languages in response to the necessity of communicating across cultural boundaries (Baker & Wright, 2017), but how bilingualism is developed is a complex phenomenon (Bialystok & Luk, 2013). Various research studies have defined it as having acquired varying degree of knowledge of both languages. To start with, according to Weinreich (1974), it is the practice of switching between two languages. Bloomfield (1985) defines it as a native-like control of two languages. For Macnamara (1969), a bilingual individual is someone who can communicate in a second language at least at a minimum degree in the four language domains, such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and it was also defined by Grosjean (1989) as ability to use two or more languages in daily encounters. The impact of being bilingual on cognition was also studied by scholars who revealed many the cognitive

advantages of speaking more than one language in the bilingual children's executive functioning skills – the ability to ignore distracting information and to attend to the changing task demands (Bialystok, 2011). Partially motivated by these positive theoretical argumentations, there have been many authentic contextual idiosyncratic practices of raising bilingual children. An increasing number of children have been growing up as being bilingual in our cosmopolitan world or raising a bilingual child have been perceived as a praiseworthy goal. Hence, families struggle to create opportunities for their young children to learn a foreign language (King & Fogle, 2006) for various reasons, such as better opportunities in the future (Akgül et al., 2019) and, in immigrant settings, preserving their own native cultures and language (Lee et al., 2015). More and more non-native parents also attempt to create bilingual environments in the family context where each parent uses one language even though the surrounding societal context is monolingual (Senaydin & Dikilitas, 2019). Especially, parents who can speak English fluently prefer to do so, and they are motivated to continuously communicate with their children in all walks of life since birth. However, once such families have decided to raise their children bilingually, they need to decide on the additional language. Decisions regarding which language to speak to children, namely family language policies (FLPs) are shaped by three components: language beliefs, language practices, and language management decisions of a community (Spolsky, 2004); therefore, the stance that parents take on family language reflects their opinions about the language's status quo. Furthermore, the choice of language in the family is influenced by the parents' opinions of what makes a good or bad parent and public discourses (King & Fogle, 2006). For example, a mother who is trying to raise a bilingual child could have a "good" identity as a mother, or she might be criticized as she is not talking to her child in her heritage language. This dilemma makes it even a harder endeavour to raise a bilingual child and adds to the emotional struggles of the parents in a non-native environment (Kouritzin, 2000) by creating a challenge for them (Smith-Christmas et al., 2019).

Research on the family language policy tends to focus on maintaining the minority language of the family through one parent one language (OPOL) policy. However, in monolingual countries where there is only one official

language, despite not being native speakers of that language, parents may also strive to teach their children foreign languages from a young age (Liu & Lin, 2019). In families where neither parent is a native speaker of the desired foreign language, either of the parents chooses the role of the input provider. When taking on these roles, the parents may embed the target structures in everyday mundane activities as in the case of Fernandes (2019), in which the input provider, the mother, intentionally selected structures, and lexical items to scaffold her daughter. A growing number of studies have examined how parents employ various bilingual child raising strategies; however, bilingual child-raising through non-native parenting remains an underexplored area (Lopez, 2021). Apart from rare studies on paternal input (Döpke, 1992), previous research on non-native bilingualism focused on families where the mother was the primary input provider for the additional language (Fernandes, 2019; Garcia Armayor, 2019; Min, 2011; Senaydin & Dikilitas, 2019). Similarly, in first language acquisition, the associations between parental language input and language development have largely focused on the mother (Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2010) leaving paternal input especially in L2 acquisition an underexplored area (Kim & Starks, 2010). Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the literature on NNP bilingual raising and the success of a family language policy (FLP) from multiple perspectives (Smith-Christmas et al., 2019). To this end, in this case study, we investigate the effects of parental discourse strategies, parental language choice, and the type of oral corrective feedback strategies on a 5 years 3 months old bilingual child raised with limited exposure to the target language in a non-English monolingual society. To address the multifaceted aspect of bilingualism, this study also sheds light on the struggles of the father in a non-native family in his efforts to raise their child bilingually.

Parental Strategies for Language Use to Raise Bilingual Children

Romain (1995) discusses six types of child bilingualism in the context of how children are raised bilingually. The first type she mentions is one-parent-one-language (OPOL) strategy, initially suggested by Ronjat (1913). In

this strategy, each parent in a family speaking different mother languages communicates exclusively in their mother language to their children, with the expectation that children will associate one language with one parent and respond appropriately. The second type is "non-dominant home language", in which both parents speak different mother languages, and one parent's home language is the dominant language in the society. In such a case, both parents speak non-dominant language to their children. A third type involves parents who share the same mother language, yet the language of the community is not that of theirs, and parents speak their mother language to their children. The fourth type Romaine mentions is called "double non-dominant home language without community support". In this type, both parents have a different mother language, and the dominant language is different from the parents' mother language. In such a scenario, both parents speak their own language to the child starting from birth. Another type is a "mixed type", where both parents are bilingual, and various languages are spoken in the society. Parents in this type of family code-mix and code-switch languages. The final type that she mentions is "non-native parents", in which both parents share the same mother language, and the dominant language of the society is the same as the parents' mother language, however, one of the parents opts for addressing the child in a language which is not his or her mother language. In a setting where one language is the majority language, the term "non-native bilingualism" (Jernigan, 2015) or "NNP" strategy, which is used in this paper, is also referred to as additive bilingualism (Kielhöfer & Jonekeit, 1983), elective bilingualism (Baker & Wright, 2017), or elite bilingualism (Piller, 2001).

Raising a bilingual child through a strict language policy in which either of the parents decide to address the child in one language is challenging (Thomas, 2012), and parents may find themselves trapped in the face of their children's resistance to the language other than the native, commonly spoken language, which brings about emotional burden to the parents (Kouritzin, 2000). As consistency is the key element and parents should refrain from shuttling between languages (Barron-Hauwaert, 2011), determined parents may need to insist on addressing their children in a specific language through various strategies. However, Ortega (2020) is critical about the too much coercion from authoritarian parents because of the danger of silencing children,

hence, parents who opt for raising bilingual children are to be aware that their child may cease talking the desired additional language due to parental approaches as can be seen in some cases in Döpke's (1992) study.

Parental Discourse Strategies

Parental discourse strategies (PDS) are those strategies caregivers or parents employ when interacting with bilingual or multilingual children, and it has been suggested that the extent to which a child is able to keep two languages distinct according to the adult interlocutors could be affected by specific discourse features they use (Mishina-Mori, 2011).

PDS are especially important when parents react to the unwanted utterances of children because they are not in the preferred language, or two languages are mixed within one language. The relationship between PDS and a child's code-mixing was initially studied by Lanza (1992), who examined the relationship between parental discourse strategies and children's language patterns (Min, 2011). Grounded in the framework of socialization, Lanza (1992), having studied a 2-year-old Norwegian/English girl, Siri, argued that parents' reaction to child code-mixing has a strong effect on the code preferences of children. In her study, Lanza (1992) found out that Siri displayed relatively less language mixing due to the PDS that her mother employed. This observation was later developed into the *Parental Discourse Hypothesis (PDH)*; Lanza (1992) isolated five PDS which are minimal grasp, expressed guess, adult repetition, move on, and code-switching as displayed in Table 1. On the continuum from the most monolingual to most bilingual practices, Lanza (1992, p. 649) orders PDS as follows:

Table 1

Parental Discourse Strategies by Lanza (1992)

Monolingual Context					Bilingual Context
	Minimal grasp	Expressed guess	Adult repetition	Move on strategy	Code- switching

Lanza's (1992) hypothesis has been tested by numerous researchers. To name a few, the findings from the studies by Min (2011) and Takeuchi (2006) support PDH, asserting that parents' strictness in the specific language use correlates negatively with the number of children's code-mixing. Also, in Chevalier's (2015) study, the strategies that Lina's aunt utilized contributed to her English production while she was not encouraged to speak in French with his father as he used more bilingual strategies. Earlier studies by Christiansen (1995), Juan-Garau and Perez-Vidal (2001) also documented a significant impact of parental discourse strategies on the amount of code-mixing that children did. On the other hand, some other studies in the literature report no significant correlation between PDS and the amount of code-mixing by children; therefore, they do not support PDH (Deuchar & Muntz, 2003; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1998).

The Relationship Between Parental Code-Mixing and Code-Mixing by Children

Children who grow up bilingually usually display language patterns that deviate from monolingual speech (Quick et al., 2019), and alternating between languages is seen as a widespread and significant phenomenon in bilingualism (Grosjean, 1982). Code-switching has been studied from the sociolinguistic (Ludi, 1987), grammatical (Amuzu, 2005; Maschler, 2000), and language use and speaker perspectives. As one of the most dynamic areas in linguistics (Muysken, 2011), ample attention has been paid to the topic. When it comes to the definition of the term, no consensus has been reached. There has been a long debate in the literature regarding the definition of code-switching and constraints it involves (Cantone, 2005). According to Meisel (1994), code-switching is the ability to choose the language depending on the interlocutors, discourse, and the topic of the dialogue. For Numan and Carter (2001), it is "transition from one language to another within the same discourse" (p. 275). In the current study, we use the term code-mixing as the child's and father's use of words from the two languages at lexical or sentential level. Several studies in the literature reported that nearly all children pass through a stage where they mix in both of their languages (Cantone, 2005).

Regarding the possible reasons of code-mixing, even though it was hypothesized by some scholars (Deuchar & Quay, 2000) that the children could not differentiate the two language systems that they have, it has been disconfirmed by other scholars such as Meisel (1989) and Döpke (1992). The expertise of a child in a language system was found to interfere with the other in a positive way by helping solve problems and assist them build a bridge lexically and structurally (Gawlitzeck-Maiwald & Tracy, 1996).

The studies on child code-mixing are not limited to discourse features, but also include statistical features of the input, which are the rates of code-mixing produced by children in relation to the rates of code-mixing heard. Comeau et al. (2003) refer to this correlation between parental and child code-mixing as the *Modeling Hypothesis*. The assumption made by this hypothesis is that young children's processing capacity is sensitive to bilingual code-mixing in the input; hence, they are able to model their language production in line with input (Comeau et al., 2003). Many studies conducted on parental input support the considerable positive effect of parental language use on children's code-mixing (Karanovic, 2003); however, a number of studies testing the modeling hypothesis (Deuchar & Muntz, 2003; Genesee et al., 1995; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1996) reported no significant correlation between the rate of parental and child code-mixing, revealing inconclusive empirical evidence for the modeling hypothesis.

Methodology

This study aims to investigate the effect of PDS, the parents' frequency of code-mixing and the type of oral corrective feedback on the frequency of child's code-mixing in a family which adopts a NNP strategy to make their child bilingual. To this end, a qualitative research design was adopted since it is inductive, with the purpose of describing multiple realities, developing deep understanding, and capturing everyday life and human perspectives (Trumbull, 2005). To be more specific, a single case study was employed to gain in-depth knowledge about the participant in his natural environment, since this method is suitable for analysing unique circumstances (Yin, 2009). In order to explore the effectiveness of the amount of input in this particular context, this study

will examine the daily conversations between a father who learned English as a foreign language, and his child, to whom he, and nobody else, spoke English to from birth, in a monolingual context. The study will address the following research questions:

1. Do reacting to the bilingual children's code-mixing and correcting their errors play a role in children's adherence to the language of the interlocutor?
2. Does the code-mixing frequency of bilingual children depend on the frequency of their parents' code-mixing when addressing their children?
3. How does the father reportedly perceive his role in the process of raising a bilingual child by adopting an English speaker identity in Turkey?

The Context and The Participants

This study was conducted in Istanbul, the most populous and multicultural city in Turkey, where, despite being inhabited by speakers of various languages, English is the most widely taught and spoken language after Turkish (Acar, 2017). In Turkey, there is one official, mainly spoken language (Turkish), and no other languages are spoken frequently by its members. With the latest change in the education system of Turkey in 2013, foreign language education gained more significance, and English education became mandatory from second year of primary school and on (Ministry of National Education, 2018). The value of speaking English in the country encouraged the parents to raise Mete as a bilingual. The case of Mete is of interest from various aspects.

To start with, neither of the parents are native speakers of the target language, but they learned English at school and became teachers of English. As Spolsky and Shohamy (2000) state language policy is the struggle to alter the linguistic activities of other people by authorities. In our case, as a family language policy (FLP), the family wished to talk in English to the child, and they adopted a "non-native parents (NNP)" language policy in which the father was the only input provider in English. As part of their effort to make Mete bilingual

in Turkish and English, the father took on the role of a teacher and made use of repair strategies through which he fixed errors overtly (Hall, 2007). He also utilized certain strategies to formally teach English and to prevent Mete from shuttling between languages when he was interacting with him. The mother did not want to undertake this role, as she reported that she desired to show her affection to her son in her mother language, Turkish. This selection of language roles for mother and father contrasts with the case of Maya in another study in Turkey by Senaydin and Dikilitas (2019). Mete's father has communicated with him solely in English since he was born. However, the time that Mete spent with his father was quite limited, since he was often away for business reasons. Even when in town, the father's commitments meant that they were not able to spend more than about one hour a day together. The interaction between the father and mother was chiefly in Turkish, even in Mete's presence; hence, Mete was quite aware that his father could speak Turkish. This case is similar to that of the sample in the case study by Min (2011), in which Hy was also aware that her mother spoke both languages. Even though no negative consequences of this awareness were mentioned in Min (2011), it is important to acknowledge that it might have hindered Mete's progress in English.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection lasted for three months, starting when Mete was 5 years 2 months old. In this study, collection instruments were interviews and video recordings, with the latter representing the major source of evidence. Since the father was the only English language input provider, all videos except for one case consisted of father-child dyads. The father himself recorded his conversations with the child upon the approval of the family. The researchers never observed the conversations in person, nor did they meet Mete, the data was collected solely by the father. The pseudonym Mete was used for the child in the study.

Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews, in total, about 100 minutes, were conducted with Mete's father, both at the outset of the study to collect in-depth information about Mete's L2 background until the starting time of the research, and at the end of the study, to clarify the emerging issues. The interview questions had two aims. First, to gain a detailed insight into the endeavour of the family to raise a bilingual child, including the strategies employed, and psychological challenges for parents. The second focus of the interview was to investigate the extent of Mete's language exposure within home as compared to outside settings. The researcher took notes rather than recording the face-to-face interviews.

Video Recordings

Video recordings are excellent tools to observe the behaviours of the participants. In the current study, Mete's authentic utterances were recorded by his father over 3 months (72 minutes in total) on various occasions, including but not limited to inside a toy shop, at the dining table, and in the bedroom. During these recordings the son was always on task, in other words he was always in a kind of conversation with his father. The reason was to ensure the naturality of the data as the Mete's language production was documented under authentic conditions without manipulating the input or the context. It must be noted here that by the authenticity of the data, we mean that despite its look like a formal teaching bearing some insistence in the dyads, all the interactions are as they occur in the family on a daily basis. During the interview at the outset of the study, it was considered that Mete might be inhibited by having to talk to strangers or to talk while others were recording him, so all the recordings were done by the father, which meant that Mete never met the researchers. The father assured the researchers that since the child was accustomed to being recorded since his birth, his reactions would not be affected by his recordings that we used as data. The recordings were uploaded by the father to a shared folder in Google Drive right after they had been recorded, and the researchers could easily access them.

Data Analysis

We analysed the data set in two ways. To answer the first and second research questions, in order to identify the father's discourse and corrective feedback strategies, we analysed the data deductively with a predetermined categorization of the strategies as mentioned earlier in Lanza's (1992) Parental Discourse Hypothesis and within the Comeau et al.'s (2003) framework of Modeling Hypothesis. To start with, the researchers transcribed all the data verbatim (72 minutes), to avoid missing any possibly important details in the interpretation of the discourse. To establish the inter-rater reliability, having reviewed the transcription, the father and son dyads were grouped by the researchers independently under a total of eight categories: the first three were in response to code-mixing by the child and remaining five were used in case of structural misuse of utterances. Finally, the researchers negotiated the examples for each classification for their congruity under each category. Besides examining the parents' discourse strategies, in order to answer the second research question, i.e. to understand the father's code-mixing frequency during the interaction with the child, we also examined the utterances in the transcribed conversations.

Table 2

Emerging Categories and Themes Regarding the Father's Perceptions

Categories	Themes
Correcting errors Giving feedback Making complete sentences Accelerating learning	I should correct errors immediately
Urging father to speak Turkish Being consistent Avoiding translanguaging Having English speaking father identity Avoiding confusion Adapting the parental language	I do not respond when Mete speaks Turkish
Teaching strategies Expectations from child Retaining Vocabulary Lacking exposure to L2	I am a jug, and he is a vessel
Acting like a teacher Translating Assuring accuracy	I am Mete's teacher

Categories	Themes
Teaching explicitly Wishing to learn more languages Obeying father	
Challenging times Creating bonds	I chose to be the one who would sacrifice

Finally, to answer the third research question, which sought to uncover the father's self-perceptions regarding the bilingual upbringing of his child, we inductively analysed the data from the interviews at the outset and at the end of the study. The two authors open-coded the data independently and initially reached twenty-three open codes that identified the father's feelings and ideas about raising a bilingual child. In the next stage, aiming to identify the emerging themes, the authors used constant comparative analysis and categorized these open codes to induce the main themes (See Table 2). During this categorization and thematization process, the authors negotiated and debriefed the emerging categories and themes to ensure representability of the meanings in the data.

Findings

The data collected by means of the child's dyads with his father and interviews with the father are presented below under the corresponding research questions.

Research question 1: Do reacting to the bilingual children's code-mixing and correcting their errors play a role in the children's adherence to the interlocutor's language?

The transcribed dyads between the father and Mete were investigated to find the parental discourse strategies and the types of corrective feedback that the father utilized (see Table 3). Table 3 involves the instances that the father had to use any kind of discourse and correction strategies while interacting with his son. In only 48 interactions father felt the need to interfere with any of the strategies mentioned in the table, which means the rest of the conversations with Mete did not require any kind of intervention through a discourse strategy or corrective feedback. To evaluate the accuracy or fluency of Mete's utterances is beyond the scope of this study, however, the

fact that the father needed to intervene in such fewer instances can be thought of as a sign of success in achieving bilingualism.

Table 3

Parental Discourse Strategies and Corrective Feedback That Father Utilized

Minimal Grasp (pretending not to understand)	6
Expressed Guess (reformulating utterance in question format)	4
Adult Repetition (repetition of the meaning in the expected language)	6
Move-on (continuation of the interaction in the expected language)	11
Code-Switching (use of words from the two languages at lexical or sentential level)	0
Explicit Error Correction (giving out the correct form of inaccurate structure)	6
Metalinguistic Feedback (asking questions about errors without explicit correction)	2
Elicitation (getting Mete to give information rather than giving it to him)	3
Urging Subject Verb Object Sentences	11

Parental Discourse Strategies and Corrective Feedback Types

The study revealed an uncommon method of father-child interaction, with the father acting more like a teacher than a parent. Among the dearth of research in the field that has explored non-native parents' struggles to make their children bilingual, this current case stands out as a peculiar one. To the best of our knowledge, very few such interactions in bilingual child raising have been reported so far, and the effectiveness of such a kind of interaction will be revealed and discussed in the following parts of the paper. Two key findings emerged from this study. The first is that due to Mete's very limited use of code-mixing, only three strategies mentioned by Lanza (1992) were observed in the father's turns in dialogues, providing support for PDH. The father's strong determination to communicate with his son through only English seems to be justified by the limited number of code-mixing incidents in the data, with the child showing no resistance to speaking English. Another crucial finding of the current study, which we believe provides support for PDH, is the father's oral corrective feedback (CF) strategies. Those strategies together with discourse strategies seem to have been highly influential in minimizing the code-mixing frequency of this particular child. As can be seen in the transcriptions, to the best of our knowledge, results of such

a combination of discourse and error correction strategies have not been reported in child language acquisition studies by NNP strategy. The parents' various discourse and corrective feedback strategies are given below under the aforementioned categories. To start with, the data was coded to identify the father's parental discourse strategies.

PDS Minimal Grasp (MG)

The following excerpts illustrates one of the only three code-mixing cases in the data; the father adopts the minimal grasp (MG) strategy, pretending not to have understood a mixed utterance, and asking Mete to reformulate the vocabulary item.

Excerpt 1

Dad: Which is your favourite? (Pointing at various snacks on the table)

Mete: *Cips* [Crisps]

Dad: In English what we call it?

Mete: Crisps.

Dad: Oh, yes. Crisps.

PDS: Expressed Guess (EG)

Another strategy was expressed guess (EG). In the following example, the father reformulates Mete's utterance in a closed question format in the desired language.

Excerpt 2

Mete: daddy, can I call him *görüntülü* [video calling]

Dad: Oh, do you want to give him a videocall?

Mete: Yes, daddy, I [inaudible voices] videocall.

CF Adult Repetition (AR)

A third strategy which was found in the data was adult repetition (AR) where the parents repeat the children's utterances in the expected language.

Excerpt 3

Mete: I am afraid for me
Dad: Are you afraid of him

We present below some examples of error corrective feedback strategies that the father utilized when he was interacting with Mete.

CF Explicit Error Correction (EEC)

After the presentation of the parental discourse strategies found in the data above, the following section displays the father's reaction to errors in the target language. Also, a careful perusal of dyads revealed the father's use of certain oral corrective feedback strategies in response to erroneous or incomplete utterances. Among those, the most prevalent is the explicit error correction (EEC), seen in two examples below:

Excerpt 4

Dad: I like
Mete: I like watch video
Dad: Watching video!
Mete: Watching video
Dad: What kind of things do you like watching?

Another example of explicit feedback occurred when the father explicitly provided the equivalent target form of a code-mixed lexical item. The following dyad displays the father's approach to code-mixing.

Excerpt 5

Mete: Can you *hazine* [treasure]? (they are in the garden now, and they watched a cartoon where the character found a treasure)
Dad: It is not *hazine* [treasure] *oğlum* [my son], it is treasure.
Mete: Can you do me treasure and I will find gold.

The following dialogue displays another incident when the father prevents the child from continuing conversation until he makes the correction.

Excerpt 6

Dad: How do we play the game?
Mete: We will run and kick the balloons.

Dad: Ok then?
Mete: When song stop
Dad: [stops]
Mete: When song stops, we will stop.
Dad: Ok, how many balloons will there be?

CF Metalinguistic Feedback (MF)

Another common error correction strategy observed was metalinguistic feedback (MF), in which the interlocutors ask questions about errors without explicit correction, seen in the following dyad:

Excerpt 7

Dad: Ok, does he behave good to his friends?
Mete: No
Dad: No, he

Mete: Don't
Dad: He don't or doesn't, which one?
Mete: He doesn't.

Another example of correction via metalinguistic feedback is shown below:

Excerpt 8

Mete: I wake up eight.
Dad: Your mom?
Mete: I wake up seven, mom wake up 8
Dad: Mom wake up or wakes up, which one?
Mete: Wakes up

CF Elicitation (E)

The analysis revealed an occasion when the father tried unsuccessfully to elicit the correct possessive pronoun, as can be seen below, so eventually, explicitly provided the correct word:

Excerpt 9

Mete: and from here she is hand can go to America. (while watching a cartoon)
Dad: She is hand, or. . (waits for the correct structure) she is hand orrrr??? Her
Mete: look!
Dad: What did he do?

Urging SVO Utterances (U)

Another striking finding was the father's insistence on the full sentence utterance (SVO). The father consistently insisted on full, structurally appropriate utterances, examples of which can be clearly seen in the excerpts below:

Excerpt 10

Dad: What are you wearing?

Mete: Hat

Dad: I'm...

Mete: I'm wearing hat

However, the father was not always successful, as can be seen in the following turn:

Excerpt 11

Dad: What will happen in the end, will he be a good person or a bad person?

Mete: Good person

Dad: He will be ...

Mete: Good person

Dad: Do his friends like him?

PDS Move-On Strategy (In Response to Structural Errors) (MO)

Finally, there are some instances when the father simply moved on. This move-on strategy was suggested by Lanza (1992) to refer to instances when parents ignored code-mixing; however, since there are no such cases in this study, here, a move-on strategy was used to refer to the father's overlooking of erroneous utterances. The following examples display the rare cases of moving on without feedback on utterances with errors:

Excerpt 12

Dad: (they are looking at a page where some kids are playing basketball) Why?

Mete: Because he push him.

Dad: Will he score a basket here? Say, he will

Mete: He will score.

The following excerpt shows the father's insistence on full SVO sentences, but also shows an erroneous structure being allowed to pass without correction.

Excerpt 13

Mete: Cake. For you. Happy birthday cake

Dad: She is

Mete: She is *doing* happy birthday cake

Dad: Ok, thank you. But wasn't it a surprise?

Informed by *Parental Discourse Hypothesis* (Lanza, 1992) framework and corrective feedback strategies of the father, which we believe significant in raising Mete bilingually, this part of the article dwells on the father's discourse and error correction strategies when Mete code-mixes. Aiming to answer our second research question, we are also concerned about the possible effect of the amount of paternal code-mixing on how much the child code-mixes. In this vein, the following data is analysed within the *Modeling Hypothesis* (Comeau et al., 2003) framework.

Research Question 2: Does the code-mixing frequency of bilingual children depend on the frequency of their parents' code-mixing when addressing their children?

The Language Choice of Parents and That of The Child

Within the framework of the modelling hypothesis, the data from the current study were analysed to determine how the father's code-mixing influences the amount of code-mixing the child makes. In this vein, an analysis of the code-mixing rates in the father's and the child's turns was done. It was observed that in the speech directed to the child (220 turns), there were few instances of code-mixing, meaning that the father addressed Mete mainly in English. This finding is in line with father's comments in the interview, in which he repeatedly highlighted the importance of not shuttling between the languages while talking to Mete. The only instances of code-mixing by the father were found at lexical level. The most common Turkish word that he uses is *oğlum* [my son]. The use of this word is really important to the father

as he states in the interviews that it is the only word with which he could show his affection to the child and feel bonded with him, an example of which can be seen in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 14

Mete: Take it (offering some more)

Dad: You eat *oğlum* [son] you eat. Ok, thank you. What do you like while you are eating food?

Mete: Video

Apart from *oğlum* [my son], when Mete utters a Turkish word, father gives the English equivalent of the Turkish words by repeating the Turkish word first. Mete, on the other hand, only code-mixed three times in 72-minute video recording, all which were at lexical level. He code-mixed when he did not know some words in English. The excerpt below displays an example of how Mete code-mixes, and father repeats the mixed word prior to supplying the English equivalent.

Excerpt 15

Mete: Can you *hazine* [treasure]? (they are in the garden now, and they watched a cartoon where the character found a treasure)

Dad: It is not *hazine* [treasure] *oğlum* [my son], it is treasure.

Besides almost no code-mixing incidents, another significant finding of the study is the child's ability to shift quickly between the languages. Although the ability of bilinguals to shuttle between the languages (Canagarajah, 2011) has been reported repeatedly in the literature, the evidence if such an ability is evident in children grown up bilingually by non-native parents is scarce. In our case, despite the limited input in the acquisition process in a non-native environment, Mete could effortlessly adapt his language depending on the interlocutor without mixing between the languages. The following excerpt shows his ability to rapidly express himself in the wanted language when with his mother and father without any code-mixing:

Excerpt 16

Dad: What does drone do?

Mete: *Anne, bana aynısından alır mısın?* [mommy, can you buy

the same one?]
Dad: Ask me?
Mete: Can you buy?
Dad: what?
Mete: that same drone

Mete is also able to shuttle between the languages effortlessly depending on the interlocutor as can be seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 17

Mete: and from here she is hand can go to America.
Dad: She is hand, or she is hand orrrr??
Mete: [look]
Dad: What did he do?
Mete: *Annee eline elektrik aldı adam* [mommy the man held electricity in his hand]
Mete: Daddy I can't tell because we need this chocolate. We need the chocolate.
Dad: Tell me how to play ok?

The final focus of the current study was to find out about challenges that the father has been through and gain more insight into why the father employs certain strategies in an attempt to raise Mete as a bilingual child. To achieve this, two interviews were held, and the results are presented below.

Research question 3: How does the father reportedly perceive his role in the process of raising a bilingual child by adopting an English speaker identity in Turkey?

Father's interaction with Mete in English. In the interview, we aimed to understand how the father interacted with Mete in the family environment and his views on their struggle to raise a bilingual child. To gain a deeper insight into the father's strategies and approaches, two interviews of about 100 minutes each were held with the father at the outset of the study and after the analysis. The interview data were analysed inductively through open-coding, categorization, and selective coding processes. At the open coding stage, the researchers coded the transcriptions separately. In the next stage, linked codes were grouped in categories. Finally, in the selective coding process, reduced and grouped codes were collectively analysed, and five core themes, which are presented below, were identified. Finally, member checking was utilized to increase credibility; the researchers' themes were returned to

the father in order for him to validate their accuracy. These themes are presented below.

I should correct errors immediately. The father believes that he needs to correct errors immediately because he thinks "immediate correction can not only save time but also accelerates the pace of acquisition". While the father tries to speed up his child's learning, he also prioritizes the accuracy for appropriate communication, stating that "Mete needs to produce accurate sentences." To make this possible for Mete, in most cases, he corrects any errors in his speech right away. He also asks Mete to repeat after feedback. Another concern of the father is to be able to speak in complete sentences (SVO), and he tries to induce Mete to communicate through sentences rather than short phrases, guiding Mete to start with "a subject" as soon as he hears a minimal answer. To the father, "in order to be able to communicate freely, he must make proper sentences, and to prolong conversations, he must be able to make negative and interrogative sentences flawlessly." He did, however, think that he might have overlooked certain errors under certain conditions: "If I think that a word is important, I immediately correct it; however, I sometimes only recast his errors when I feel that they are not based on knowledge gap, and I keep the conversation going." As can be understood from the father's statement, the few occasions when he does not provide corrective feedback are when he is sure that the problem is not due to the lack of acquisition.

I do not respond when Mete speaks Turkish. Mete very rarely code-switches with his father, who sees this as a result of his consistency in speaking English to him and not responding to Turkish utterances. About his consistency, the father states, "I have had the English-speaking identity with Mete since he was born; therefore, Mete has always seen me as someone he can speak to solely in English," and he adds, "in order to prevent any confusion that Turkish can lead to, I have never talked to him in Turkish." That is, the father considers that alternating between languages will hinder his son's acquisition process. The interviews revealed that, from time-to-time, Mete tried to make his father switch to Turkish, claiming that "he did not understand his father when his father spoke in English." After several such attempts to make

the father give up, the father is of the opinion that the following incident marked a turning point:

"One day, I came back from a football camp in Antalya, and Mete was about 2.5-year-old. He asked for water from me in Turkish. I said, "what," but he insisted on asking for water in Turkish. Finally, he realized that I did not have mercy and said, "daddy can you give me water."

The father's consistency in approach even manifests itself while Mete is playing alone in his room. Even when playing alone, that is, when there is no interaction with the child, Mete switches language depending on who is present in the room.

"There is an interesting thing I noticed. Let's say; Mete is playing alone with his spiderman toys in his bedroom. If I am in the room with him, even if I am not a participant in the game, he makes the toys speak in English; however, he makes the toys speak in Turkish when his mother is in the room. Even though he is not communicating with us, the language he prefers depends on who is around him."

I am a jug, and he is a bucket. Since, in our case, the father is the major input provider, he aims to teach the majority of the vocabulary items or grammar structures explicitly. To do this, he needs to introduce every single item that he seeks to teach. He starts off by introducing a lexical item and gradually adds new lexical items or structures. In this vein, he stated:

"Think like this, I am a jug, and he is a vessel. He pours me back the amount of water I fill in it. Therefore, I had to teach new words each time I wanted to fill in more water. I wanted to make him talk with the amount of knowledge I provided for him, not more. Since he was instructed with information, which is a little bit above his limit, I did not need to explain anything to him in Turkish."

This way, the father makes sure that whatever he is trying to teach already has a background, and he is building on it; therefore, he is certain about his expectancies from Mete.

I am Mete's teacher. The father adopts an unusual approach to raising a bilingual child, acting more like a teacher than a natural input provider. To start with, he asks Mete to articulate the correct form of an incorrect utterance through various elicitation strategies. The father argues that due to his role as "a teacher", Mete does not react negatively towards his instant error correction, and in this regard, he says, "Mete has always seen me as a teacher; hence, when I ask him to correct something, he does it without being lazy."

Another conspicuous strategy of the father as a teacher is providing the translated versions of mother's utterances to Mete as input in their daily discourse. Also, from the very beginning, the father encouraged Mete to translate Turkish utterances into English or vice versa so that he could develop in English.

"We have had a practice like this since the birth of Mete. Let's say his mother said something to him in Turkish, I said the English translation of it right after his mother, or his mother said what I said in English to him in Turkish."

The father states that they continue this practice in their everyday discourse. For practice purposes, he sometimes asks Mete to communicate a message to his mother, which the son needs to translate first before asking his mother. Then the father asks him to translate back his mother's reply. The interview also revealed that Mete does not need to be prompted to translate all the time because he is used to this teaching strategy. The father recalls the earliest example of this as follows:

"Mete was about two years old; he even had a diaper on him. We were playing with a ball and talking about a goalkeeper. Then his mother said, "if you eat enough food, you can catch the ball" in Turkish, and to our amazement, he translated and uttered the same sentence correctly in English."

I chose to be the one who would sacrifice. Emotional and psychological burden of raising Mete bilingual is also evident in the interviews. Another important finding from the interviews is the father's inability to create

a close bonding with his son due to the difficulty of communicating in the target language. In this regard, the father acknowledged:

"There are things that I have not been able to share with him, such as emotional things or complicated things that we cannot discuss in English. Mete needed to share such issues in Turkish with his mother."

Failing to communicate emotions or complex ideas is not the only challenge for the father of this bilingual child. He was at times so emotionally exhausted that he almost lost his hope.

"There came the point when Mete was about to refuse me as a father. That was when I had to be away from home about one week every month. So, I was about to give up this struggle."

The father states that it has been a very challenging period, and he is rather anxious about its future direction. He is unsure of Mete's continuing enthusiasm, which can be seen from the comment below:

"This has been a very challenging period for us, and it has not finished yet. I am also looking forward to seeing the result. At one time in the future, since he will be older, Mete might want to cease speaking in English. Let's see what time will show."

Discussion

The current case study investigated three factors: the parental discourse strategies, the language choice of parents and the reactions of parents to the structural errors. It also investigated the outcome of these factors on the frequency of code-mixing by a 5;2,3-year-old boy raised by an English teacher couple of Turkish origin by utilizing NNP strategy in Turkey with the aim of raising the child bilingual in Turkish and English.

Parental Discourse Strategies

The qualitative analysis of the natural conversations of the father and child at various domains revealed that the father consciously adopted

a monolingual strategy when interacting with his son. It is evident in the conversations that insisting strategies (Döpke, 1992; Taeschner, 1983) that the father employed led to a monolingual context as stated by Lanza (1992). However, the findings from this case study do not seem to be consistent with the previous findings (Döpke, 1992) given that the case Keith in her case ceased talking the target language despite the insisting strategies by father. On the other hand, it is in accordance with the findings by Taeschner (1983) as the father in her case was consistent in using German to her daughter by using overt corrections in grammar, which eventually helped the daughter improve the target language (German). As can be seen from our data and the ability of Mete to communicate in English despite limited input, the insisting strategies of the father in our case could be said to prove to be successful. The strategies he employed towards Mete's code-mixing were examined under Lanza's (1992) continuum; it is evident that the father employed the strategies at the monolingual pole, namely, minimal grasp (MG) and expressed guess (EG). The father's speech contained no strategies positioned towards the bilingual pole, such as move-on (MO) strategy, and code-switching (CS). This finding from the dyads between Mete and his father are in line with the expressions of the father in the interview, where he highlighted the significance of communication through one language to avoid causing any confusion. The findings from this study, in terms of parental discourse strategies, conflict with the findings from the study by Brooksbank (2017) and Min (2011) in which the parents mostly employed MO strategy after hearing code-mixing in their interactions.

This study, despite limited data, could be regarded as empirical support for the parental discourse hypothesis (PDH) put forward by Lanza (1992). The data from this study also displays that the parents' responses to the child's code-mixing have a clear effect on the child's inclusion of items from the two languages. The data derived from this study confirms the findings in the studies by Brooksbank (2017), Döpke (1992), Lanza (1997), Min (2011), Mishina-Mori (2011), Takeuchi (2006), which all report a positive correlation between parents' responses and the amount of code-mixing by the child. A possible explanation of this result might be the strict adherence of the father to monolingual strategies while addressing the child without using Turkish lexical

or structural items. On the other hand, the findings from this study contradict the studies by Deuchar and Muntz (2003) and Nicoladis and Genesee (1998), which reported no significant relationship between the frequency of child's code-mixing and the parental discourse strategies.

The Relationship between Parental Code-mixing and Code-mixing by Children

The most conspicuous finding of this study is the lack of code-mixing by the child. Even though code-mixing indicates typical behaviours of bilingual people (Nikula & Moore, 2016), the dyads between father and son in this context revealed only three instances of code-mixing in 72 minutes of recordings with a total of 386 turns. Another significant finding of the current study is the lack of parental code-mixing; that is, the careful analysis of the father's turns in the data revealed no incidences of Turkish lexical or structural intervention during interactions held in English. The lack of parental code-mixing by the parent was also observed in the study by Fernandes (2019) in which the mother abstained from using the dominant language while talking to her daughter, which, possibly, encouraged her to speak in Russian. It is unrealistic or at least, very difficult to maintain conversations in a language in which the child has limited knowledge, especially in a discourse where there is disproportionate input in one of the languages (Mishina-Mori, 2011); nevertheless, the father in this particular case seems to have succeeded in refraining from the use of the first language (Turkish) by stringent adherence to NNP strategy while interacting with the child. Unlike Juan-Garau and Perez-Vidal (2001), in whose study the father adopted a transitional approach in raising his son, the father in the current study preferred to speak in English from the day his son was born. In one of the few studies on bilingual child raising through NNP strategy, in the case of Keith in Döpke's (1992) study ceased talking in German after a while. The finding from the current study, indicating a strict FLP, also underscores the need to evaluate the success of bilingual upbringing from multiple perspectives resulting from parents' expectations on language use and overt language policies (Smith-Christmas et al., 2019).

The literature revealed that both the quantity (Hart & Risley, 1995) and the quality (Rowe, 2012) of input positively correlate with child outcomes, however, the quality of input was found to predict the language output more strongly than the quantity (Hsu et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the endeavour to raise a bilingual child with limited, disproportionate input in a country where that language is not the societal language, still raised psychological difficulties, as the father himself expressed in the interviews that "he was about to give up this endeavour", which implied the extreme nature of challenge (Thomas, 2012). As the father expressed in the interviews, psychologically he went through rough times when his son did not want to interact with him, however, he persevered as he thought this endeavour would pay back in the future. As he started to be able to communicate with Mete, he realized that strict adherence started to pay off, which as the father states was a driving force for himself. The success of the outcome could also be said to result from the dynamic and supportive interaction between the father and Mete, which could be interpreted high quality input (Anderson et al., 2021). It is also evident in the data that the father never shuttled between languages, despite psychological and societal limitations, which was a clear indicator of the father's determination to persist in the face of the challenge. As the idiosyncratic and local efforts lack documentation (Senaydin & Dikilitas, 2019), this particular case is crucial in addressing the gap in the related literature.

To address the second research question, the correlation between parental code-mixing and children code-mixing was examined within the modelling hypothesis framework. Due to the inadequate data to quantify the findings, no quantitative analysis was conducted. Previous research testing the modelling hypothesis yielded inconclusive results (Mishina-Mori, 2011); therefore, it is important to conduct more research to test the modelling hypothesis.

The data in this study revealed very surprising results, having analysed this 72-minute naturally occurring discourse. We refer to this context as *natural* not because "teaching" a second language to make children bilingual is a common and natural phenomenon, but because this way of interaction was a natural practice within the family. In these 72 minutes, Mete only codemixed three words, and the father not codemix at all. This finding is surprising as

bilingual acquisition studies have shown that almost all children mix between languages (Cantone, 2005). In this case, the child modelled his father and managed to conform to his language choice. Given this, it can be inferred that the amount of code-mixing by the child correlated with the input he received from his father, indicating his sensitivity to code-mixing in the input (Comeau et al., 2003). Therefore, it can be assumed that the finding from this study supports the monitor hypothesis by mirroring the findings by Genesee (2000).

The Effect of Error Correction Techniques on Child Code-mixing

The reaction of the father to the child's lexical or syntactic erroneous language was another key finding. The study revealed that the father hardly ever allows the child to continue after making an ungrammatical utterance; instead, he overtly corrects every such ungrammatical utterance he hears, adopting both the roles of a father and a teacher. This role of the father is evident through error correction strategies such as recasts, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback during everyday mundane conversational exchanges. However, what is peculiar in our study is the almost complete absence of code-switching which was widely observed in the literature (Cantone, 2005; Min, 2011). Additionally, the data from the interviews not only revealed that the father is aware of his role as a teacher, but also that his son regards him as a teacher. This fact could have contributed to a role in minimizing the code-mixing occurrences as the child strived to do his best to avoid disappointing his father in his teacher role. The father's emphasis on accuracy seems to have played an essential role in the child's adaptation to the father's language choices, as Mete became aware of his errors; being aware of one's errors is suggested to foster learning (Schmidt, 1990). Contrary to what Ortega (2020) suggests – that excessive coercion may lead children to cease using the language – and to Döpke's (1992) similar finding in his study, the father's insistence strategies helped Mete persevere and be able to communicate in both languages. This finding could be explained by the father's disciplined approach stemming from his perceived role as a language model, and Mete's learned obedience, as he had no other alternative. The success or the strict obedience of Mete to his father's instructions could also be explained by

the bridge hypothesis by Gleason (1975), in which he suggests that fathers are the bridges to the outside world and children should expand their conversational skills in order to be understood by their fathers, and communication pressure is helpful in developing communication skills. In our case, Mete could have complied with what his father requested, as Gleason (1975) also suggested, father caregivers use more imperative language with children. This is further supported by Tomasello et al. (1990) who found that children tended not to persist when what they said was not acknowledged by their fathers, and conversations did not return to children's original topic. This could also be said to support the bridge hypothesis and the success of the father as the sole language provider for Mete in English.

Another significant finding regarding error correction techniques was that the father insisted on the production of complete Subject Verb Object (SVO) sentences. While earlier studies report parents' insistence on the use of proper grammatical structures (Döpke, 1992; Taeschner, 1983), a special attention on SVO sentences has not been reported. In this vein, the father frequently asked the child to expand one-word answers into a complete sentence, often by providing the subject or sometimes subject auxiliary for guidance. This pedagogical demeanour could be considered to have a demotivating effect on the child due to constant interruption. However, in the interviews, the father argued that Mete was making a sustained effort to repeat the sentences, which, according to the father, results from the fact that Mete sees his father as a teacher. This finding is also significant to display the place of child agency in FLP (Smith-Christmas, 2021) as he preferred to negotiate language use while engaging with different interlocutors, in different social contexts based on his communication needs.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between parental discourse strategies, parental code-mixing rate, and the child code-mixing rate, along with the intertwined relationship with the adopted FLP. The father's reactions to erroneous sentences were also studied to shed further light on the child's code-mixing behaviour. The findings from the study support both PDH

and the Monitor Hypothesis, indicating that the interlocutors' discourse pattern and the amount of code-mixing both play a crucial role in the children's code-mixing frequency. Furthermore, it can be hypothesized that despite limited and disproportionate input, simultaneous acquisition of a second language is possible in a monolingual community only if the parents adhere to a strict "non-native parents" strategy, accompanied by immediate oral corrective feedback strategies.

However, these findings are limited by the amount of data we collected. Even though we sought to collect data through various dyads between Mete and his father at various natural instances, such as at the dinner table or in a toy shop, it is still limited as we were able to record only 72 hours of interactional exchanges. This shortcoming of the study was discussed with the father, and he assured us verbally that with the longer data, there would not be a significant difference in the amount of codeswitching by the father and Mete, yet more empirical data is needed to justify the findings. Another limitation of the research lies in the nature of the interviews where the participants tend to present their attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, or experiences (Talmy, 2010) rather than facts; therefore, the findings from the interviews may represent the jointly constructed ideas between the researcher and the father. Another arguable weakness of the study could be the fact that all dyads were video recorded by the father with the son being aware of this. Further research should therefore employ only voice recording of the children or video recording without children noticing the camera. Finally, the age of the participant child Mete could have had an impact on the amount of code-mixing or oral corrective feedback by father. Even though father remembers that there has never been a time when they communicated in Turkish or used relatively more Turkish words in their conversations, more data with younger children is needed to see how age affects the types and number of parental discourse strategies, code-mixing and the types and amount of error correction strategies employed.

References

- Acar, E. (2017). Obstacles of utilizing English at language schools in Turkey. *The Anthropologist*, 20(3), 562–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891760>
- Akgül, A., Yazıcı, D., & Akman, B. (2019). Views of parents preferring to raise a bilingual child. *Early Child Development and Care*, 189(10), 1588–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2017.1400541>
- Amuzu, E. K. (2005). "Ewe-English codeswitching: A case for composite rather than classic codeswitching." [unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Australian National University.
- Anderson, N. J., Graham, S. A., Prime, H., Jenkins, J. M., & Madigan, S. (2021). Linking quality and quantity of parental linguistic input to child language skills: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 92(2), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13508>
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (6th ed.)*. Multilingual Matters.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2011). *Bilingual siblings: language use in families*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology / Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale*, 65(4), 229–235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025406>
- Bialystok, E., & Luk, G. (2013). Bilingualism is not a categorical variable: Interaction between language proficiency and usage. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 605–621. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2013.795574>
- Bloomfield, L. (1985). *Language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Brooksbank, J. (2017). *Family language policy: Parental discourse strategies and child responses*. [Master's Thesis, University of Ottawa, Canada]
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Cantone, K. F. (2005). Evidence against a third grammar: Code-switching in
-

- Italian-German bilingual children. In J. Cohen, K. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism* (pp. 477–496). Cascadilla Press
- Chevalier, S. (2015). *Trilingual language acquisition: Contextual factors influencing active trilingualism in early childhood*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tilar.16>
- Christiansen, K. M. H. (1995). 'Ka looking for du?' A study of language differentiation and the effect of context on language mixing. [Doctoral Thesis, University of Bergen, Norway]
- Comeau, L., Genesee, F., & Lapaquette, L. (2003). The Modeling hypothesis and child bilingual code-mixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(2), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069030070020101>
- Deuchar, M., & Muntz, R. (2003). Factors accounting for code-mixing in an early developing bilingual. In M. Natascha (Ed.), *(In)vulnerable domains in multilingualism* (pp. 161–190). Benjamin
- Deuchar, M., & Quay, S. (2000). *Bilingual acquisition: Theoretical implications of a case study*. Oxford University Press.
- Döpke, S. (1992). *One parent one language: An interactional approach*. John Benjamins
- Fernandes, O. A. (2019). Language workout in bilingual mother-child interaction: A case study of heritage language practices in Russian-Swedish family talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 140, 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.021>
- Garcia Armayor, O. (2019). The possibilities of elective bilingualism in BFLA: Raising bilingual children in monolingual contexts. *Elia*, 1(1), 265–296. <https://doi.org/10.12795/elia.mon.2019.i19.11>
- Gawlitzek-Maiwald, I., & Tracy, R. (1996). Bilingual bootstrapping. *Linguistics* 34, 901–926.
- Genesee, F. (2000). Early bilingual language development: One language or two. In L. Wei (Ed.) *The Bilingualism Reader* (pp. 306–322). Routledge.
- Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., & Paradis, J. (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, 22, 611–631.
- Gleason, J. B. (1975). Fathers and other strangers: Men's speech to young
-

- children. *Developmental Psycholinguistics: Theory and Applications*, 1, 289–297.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). "Neurolinguists, Beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person." *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(89\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5)
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 510–525.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Paul H Brookes.
- Hsu, N., Hadley, P. A., & Rispoli, M. (2017). Diversity matters: Parent input predicts toddler verb production. *Journal of Child Language*, 44, 63–86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000915000690>
- Jernigan, C. (2015). *Family language learning: Learn another language, raise bilingual children*. Multilingual Matters.
- Juan-Garau, M., & Perez-Vidal, C. (2001). Mixing and pragmatic parental strategies in early bilingual acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 28, 59–86.
- Karanovic, V. (2003). *Early childhood bilingualism: A study of the development of the noun phrase in Bosnian and English in light of the 'single system' and the 'separate system' hypotheses*. [Doctoral Thesis, University of Hertfortshire]
- Kielhöfer, B., & Jonekeit, S. (1983). *Zweisprachige Kindererziehung [Bilingual parenting]*. Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Kim, S. H. O., & Starks, D. (2010). The role of fathers in language maintenance and language attrition: The case of Korean–English late bilinguals in New Zealand. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(3), 285–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903193958>
- King, K., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb362.0>

- Kouritzin, S. G. (2000). A mother's tongue. *TESOL quarterly*, 34(2), 311–324.
- Lanza, E. (1992). Can bilingual two-year-olds code-switch? *Journal of Child Language*, 19, 633–658.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Clarendon Press.
- Lee, M., Shetgiri, R., Barina, A., Tillitski, J., & Flores, G. (2015). Raising bilingual children: A qualitative study of parental attitudes, beliefs, and intended behaviors. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 37(4), 503–521.
- Liu, W., & Lin, X. (2019). Family language policy in English as a foreign language: A case study from China to Canada. *Language Policy* 18, 191–207. <https://doi.org/ezproxy.uned.es/10.1007/s10993-018-9475-5>
- Lopez, M. E. G. (2021). *Family language policies of non-native bilingual parents raising bilingual first language acquisition children in monolingual contexts*. [Master's Thesis, National University of Distance Education, Spain]
- Ludi, G. (1987). "Les marques transcodiques: Regards nouveaux sur le bilinguisme," In L. Georges (Ed.), *Devnir bilingüe-parler bilingüe: Actes du 2e colloque sur le bilinguisme, Universite de Neuchatel, 20–22 septembre, 1984* (pp. 1–21). Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Macnamara, J. (1969). How can one measure the extent of a person's bilingual proficiency? In L. Kelly (Ed.), *Description and measurement of bilingualism: An international seminar, University of Moncton, June 6–14, 1967* (pp. 80–97). University of Toronto Press.
- Maschler, Y. (Ed.). (2000). Discourse markers in bilingual conversation - Special issue. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 437–561. <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/ijba/4/4>
- Meisel, J. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. In K. Hyltenstam, & L. K. Obler (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the Lifespan: Aspects of acquisition, maturity, and loss* (pp. 13–40). Cambridge University Press.
- Meisel, J. (1994). Code-switching in young bilingual children. The acquisition of grammatical constraints. *Studies in Second*
-

- Language Acquisition*, 16, 413–439.
- Min, H. (2011). A case study on parental discourse strategies and a bilingual child's code-mixing. *Bulletin of Educational Psychology*, 43(1), 175–202.
- Ministry of National Education. (2018). Primary education English teaching program. <https://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=327>
- Mishina-Mori, S. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of language choice in bilingual children: The role of parental input and interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(13), 3122–3138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.016>
- Muysken, P. (2011). Bridges over troubled waters: Theoretical linguistics and multilingualism research. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 40, 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.5774/40-0-37>
- Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1996). A longitudinal study of pragmatic differentiation in young bilingual children. *Language Learning*, 46, 439–464.
- Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1998). Parental discourse and code-mixing in bilingual children. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(1), 85–99.
- Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2016). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151>
- Numan, D., & Carter, D. (2001). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, L. (2020). The study of heritage language development from a bilingualism and social justice perspective. *Language Learning*, 70, <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12347>
- Pancsofar, N., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2010). Fathers' early contributions to children's language development in families from low-income rural communities. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 25(4), 450–463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.02.001>
- Piller, I. (2001). Private language planning: The best of both worlds. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 2(1), 61–80.
- Quick, A., Hartmann, S., Backus, A., & Lieven, E. (2019). Entrenchment and
-

- productivity: The role of input in the code-mixing of a German-English bilingual child. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 12(2), 225–247. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0027>
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le Développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Champion
- Rowe, M. L. (2012). A longitudinal investigation of the role of quantity and quality of child-directed speech in vocabulary development. *Child Development*, 83, 1762–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01805.x>
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Senaydin, F., & Dikilitas, K. (2019). Exploring child bilingual identity in Turkish context: A single case study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1(25), 131–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1639130>
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2021). Using a 'Family Language Policy' lens to explore the dynamic and relational nature of child agency. *Child & Society*, 36, 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12461>
- Smith-Christmas, C., Bergroth, M., & Bezcioglu-Göktolga, I. (2019). A kind of success story: Family language policy in three different sociopolitical contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 13(2), 88–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2019.1565634>
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B., & Shohamy, E. (2000). "Language practice, language ideology, and language policy." In R. D. Lambert, & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honour of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 1–41). John Benjamins.
- Taeschner, T. (1983). *The Sun is feminine: A study on language acquisition in bilingual children*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-48329-5>
- Takeuchi, M. (2006). The Japanese language development of children through the 'one parent-one language' approach in Melbourne. *The Journal of*

- Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(4), 319–331.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000085>
- Thomas, C. (2012). *Growing up with languages: reflections on multilingual childhoods*. Multilingual Matters.
- Tomasello, M., Conti-Ramsden, G., & Ewert, B. (1990). Young children's conversations with their mothers and fathers: Differences in breakdown and repair. *Journal of Child Language*, 17(1), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000900013131>
- Trumbull, M. (2005). Qualitative Research Methods. In G. R. Taylor (ed.), *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research* (2nd ed., pp. 101–126). University Press of America.
- Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in contact* (9th ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th Ed.). Sage.

Sezgin Ballıdağ

Stambulo Medeniyet universitetas, Turkija

Bahčeşehir universitetas, Turkija

sezgin.ballidag@medeniyet.edu.tr

Kenan Dikilitaş

Bergeno universitetas, Norvegija

kenan.dikilitas@uib.no

**NEGIMTAKALBIAI TĖVAI, AUGINANTYS DVIKALBĮ VAIKĄ
TURKIJOJE**

Anotacija. Šiame atvejo tyrime nagrinėjamas dvikalbio 5 metų ir 2 mėnesių vaiko auginimas šeimoje, kurioje kalbama turkų ir anglų kalbomis; taikoma „negimtakalbių tėvų strategija“ kontekste, kuriame anglų kalba nėra nei pirmoji, nei daugumos bendruomenės kalba. Remdamiesi Tėvų diskurso (Lanza, 1992) ir Modeliavimo (Comeau ir kt., 2003) hipotezėmis, tyrėjai nagrinėjo ne tik vaiko anglų kalbos raidą, bet ir tėvo požiūrį į vaiką, taip pat tėvo, ieškančio galimybių auginti dvikalbį vaiką, savęs suvokimą. Duomenys buvo renkami darant vaiko ir tėvo bendravimo vaizdo įrašus bei du pusiau struktūruotus interviu su tėvu. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad net ir gana ribotas (antrosios) kalbos pažinimas gali paskatinti tos kalbos mokymąsi, jei tėvai griežtai laikosi „negimtakalbių tėvų strategijos“ ir sutelktai stengiasi susilaikyti nuo kodų maišymo savo kalboje.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: dvikalbis vaiko auginimas, kai antroji kalba nėra tėvų gimtoji kalba; dvikalbystė Turkijoje; tėvo palaikoma dvikalbystė.