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ABSTRACT

This study examined ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child increased her productive communicative ability in her weaker language through interaction in pretend play with more capable peers. Resting in the framework of Vygotskian sociocultural theory, this case study focused on the language development of a four year old child as she engaged in unstructured play with peers ranging from 5-9 years old. In order to create a simulated immersion setting, the researcher and her family moved to a predominately Hispanic trailer park so their daughter could interact with other children through play. Play sessions were recorded 2 to 3 times per week over a five week period. Data was transcribed and analyzed using the CHILDES Child Language Data Exchange System.

Analysis revealed ways in which peer playmates scaffolded linguistic production and participation. Production was scaffolded as playmates worked with the less proficient learner to collaboratively construct utterances by providing direct translations in Spanish, asking leading questions, and explicitly correcting mistakes through modeling. Scaffolding of participation occurred as playmates dictated lines to the less proficient peer and used phrases which cued her participation.

Productive proficiency increased as the learner incorporated a range of different linguistic functions into her speech: describing ongoing events in the present tense, discussing past events using the preterit, expressing wants and needs, discussing preferences, expressing feelings, asking questions, describing objects or actions using adjectives and adverbs, using command forms to affect the behavior of peers, and using possessive adjectives, possessive pronouns, and object pronouns to specifically describe events. Analysis found that this child used her peers’ speech as a mediational tool in order to verbally participate in interactions by incorporating linguistic structures, vocabulary and phrases into her own speech or repeating the speech of others. Other identified participation techniques included repetition of her utterances, asking playmates for direct translation or clarification, and using commands to gain attention in order to take the floor. Coping strategies were also identified. Findings also included ways in which playmates scaffolded the less proficient child’s participation in the telling of collective narratives by providing topics, appropriating turns, and elaborating on content.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Recent international events affecting the United States have called attention to the fact that most Americans are deficient when it comes to intercultural communication skills (Grubbs, 2003). Having citizens who are proficient in multiple languages and who can function in different cultural environments is vital for the country’s defense and economic development (Baucom, 2005; Grubbs, 2003). At a recent summit on U.S. language policy held by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) emphasis was placed on the fact that cultural awareness and development of proficiency in multiple languages is vital for peace, international relations, defense, national security, human relations, and for people as well as for jobs and the economy (Baucom, 2005).

However even professional language educators realize that gaining high levels of language proficiency in a typical classroom environment is a difficult task. Germano (2004), a language professional himself, jokingly articulates three “untruths of foreign language study” (¶ 1) as he explains how often students fall short of reaching the goals of communicative proficiency - speaking, reading and writing - in the classroom environment.

Since 1946, in response to a need for language professionals, the US government has been providing intensive courses to over 3,500 students in twenty three languages at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California. These courses typically range in duration from 25 weeks long, for a Romance language course, to more than a year for courses in Chinese, Japanese, or Arabic. However according to Romaine (2000), after completing a 47 week training program in Korean that costs the US government about $12,000.00, a graduate’s proficiency is typically less than that of “a 5 year old native speaker” (p. 229).

Despite the need for language professionals, children who already have some degree of proficiency in languages other than English do not have opportunities or support to maintain or develop these languages in school. “In 1986 there were 10,000 Korean students in California’s public schools lacking opportunities and encouragement to develop their native language skills. Most of them will lose their knowledge of Korean
before they reach adulthood” (Romaine, 2000, p. 229). Some suggest that since multilingual, multicultural children already serve as linguistic and cultural interpreters it would be highly beneficial to develop and maintain their native languages as they have great potential for developing high linguistic proficiencies (Children Valuable, 2004).

Statement of the Research Problem

There is an increasing interest in foreign language education in early elementary school. The issue of how to expose children to additional languages and cultures at a young age so that they can develop high levels of language proficiency later goes hand in hand with the issue of childhood bilingualism. In addition, with increasing immigrant populations in the United States more attention has been focused on the issue of maintaining and developing native language skills in bilingual children (De Houwer, 2004). Research shows how children of immigrant parents in the United States often become English dominant and do not develop or maintain productive language skills in their native languages (De Houwer, 2004).

Children raised in bilingual families in the United States also face issues of cultural and linguistic identity. Bilingual, bicultural children who grow up with parents from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds need to understand two sets of linguistic and cultural norms. An exceptional few ever attain the ability to function completely within the linguistic and cultural communities of both of their parents (López, 2005). The fastest growing minority in the United States, Latinos, struggle to function in the mainstream language of the community and to maintain their native language in the home (López, 2005).

Although research on childhood bilingualism since the 1960s has shown evidence of positive cognitive effects, unfounded fears about negative consequences of childhood bilingualism still have an impact on language policy (De Houwer, 2004; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985; Meisel, 1990; Pleh, Jaronvinskij, & Balajan, 1987). It is necessary to continue to study the development of bilingual children in the United States in order to understand the language acquisition process as well as to identify ways in which they become members of multiple speech communities.
Research Questions

This study examined ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child increased her productive communicative ability in her weaker language through interaction in pretend play with more capable peers. Fundamentally related concepts are the ideas that engaging in play necessitates the production of language (Corsaro, 2003), therefore a child that is less linguistically capable will be forced to produce language that is slightly beyond her current level of development in order to participate in play with older peers. This study rests in the framework of Vygotskian sociocultural theory with the assumption that development begins on the social plane and is then internalized. Both language and social interaction are tools that are used to mediate human cognition. “Through an expert’s assistance, novices are enabled to accomplish tasks that they would not be capable of performing independently” (Kasper, 2001, p. 34).

The children in this study were placed in situations that allowed them to spontaneously create play. These interactions took place within a Spanish speaking community and were a simulated immersion experience for the child whose Spanish language development was examined. This set-up provided the necessary context for the children to co-construct play through language and for the researcher to observe and analyze their interaction. Vygotsky’s concept of microgenesis that allows for the observation of “new abilities as they emerge while learners are engaged in an activity” was employed (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 35).

Children co-construct pretend play episodes that are representative of the world of the culture in which they live (Corsaro, 2003), therefore each child in the playgroup was a reflection of the cultural realities of which they are a part. These play sessions revealed ways in which one child language learner was socialized through language and learned to use language (Ochs, 2001) within the culture of her playmates as she began to become a member of their speech community.

Given the dynamic nature of bilingualism this study documented ways in which language dominance can shift or change through peer interaction. Romaine (1995) reviews case studies that she states clearly reveal that language dominance is not fixed. Bialystock (2001) refers to Döpke’s (1992) classification of bilinguals as productive and
receptive. Receptive bilinguals “can understand or possibly be able to even read a language without being able to produce it” (Bialystock, 2001, p. 4). Imaginative play, especially fantastic play, by nature lends itself to creation of fantastic events and stories through language (Corsaro, 2003). The present research documented ways in which a receptive bilingual developed productive skills in the weaker language within the setting of imaginative play.

Research Questions

1. How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?

2. How are a) the ability to engage in extended dialogue, b) the ability to participate in conversations, and c) the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?

3. What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language?

Description of Theoretical Framework

This study used sociocultural theory to examine language development within the context of pretend play among peers. Vygotskian sociocultural theory assumes that human development takes place within the context of social interaction (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; LeBlanc & Bearison, 2004). According to Vygotsky “development appears twice: first on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane” (as cited in Wertsch, 1980, p.151). Development can be examined objectively at the microgenetic level to reveal changes taking place as they unfold minute by minute, from day to day or over a period of months (Block, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002). In this manner development can be analyzed objectively within the context of a single learning experience (Wertsch, 1980).

It has been established that children develop linguistically and socially though interaction in pretend play (Corsaro, 2003; Garvey, 1990; Vygotsky, 1966). Vygotsky (1966) states that play is the leading source of development for children in the preschool years. During play children take on themes present in the adult worlds and embellish and reenact them. Corsaro (2003) describes several different types of play spontaneous play,
socio-dramatic play, and imaginative play. All of these fall under the definition of pretend play given by Garvey (1990) as “Play in which children voluntarily transform the Here and Now, the You and Me, and the This or That, along with any potential for action that these components of a situation may have” (p. 82). It is through play that children perform at levels which are beyond their current abilities (Vygotsky, 1966).

Language is an essential part of pretend play as children must communicate verbally in order to co-construct play episodes (Neuman, 2003). In spontaneous fantasy play children animate objects and verbally describe actions as they complete them. Since this play takes place within groups of children the verbal description serves as a cue for other participants (Corsaro, 2003). In socio-dramatic play children actually embody the characters they create and role play actions done by those characters. When children engage in role play they explore relationships between context and behavior through language.

Sociocultural theory views language as a primary tool used to mediate cognition and regulate behavior. As development occurs and is internalized children no longer have to use spoken language to guide themselves as they complete a task. Development occurs as individuals go from being regulated by objects, signs, or others to being self-regulated. A child who is unable to complete a task on his own may be able to do so in collaboration with someone else (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985). Other regulation occurs when a child develops by carrying out tasks with the assistance of a more skilled peer. Other regulation is primarily achieved through dialogic speech (Frawley & Lantolf; 1985; Wertsch, 1980, 1998). Self-regulation occurs when the learner can then function autonomously.

Scaffolding occurs when a person who is more skilled works with a less skilled participant who assists them accomplishing a task. The more skilled participant aids the novice in the “appropriation of new knowledge by co-constructing it with him or her through shared activity” (Block, 2001, p. 101). By working with a more capable peers, or even peers of approximate developmental levels learners are able to move toward higher levels of development (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Ohta, 1997).

Internalization takes place within the zone of proximal development (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; LeBlanc & Bearison, 2004). The zone of proximal development, as defined by Vygotsky (1978) is the “distance between the actual developmental level as
determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under the guidance of another human being” (as cited in Block, 2001, p. 101).

Sociocultural theory is a theoretical foundation of language socialization in that “both perspectives emphasize the developmental roles of interaction and assisted performance in concrete sociohistorical contexts” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 44). Learning a language is about much more than acquiring a linguistic code. While sociocultural theory centers on interaction and language as mediational tools for cognitive development language socialization concentrates on the relationship between linguistic and cultural practices (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Ochs, 2001). Acquisition of the ability to communicate effectively takes place through interaction in concrete activities with others:

The locus of language socialization is concrete activities in which novices participate with experts- in the case of children, with peers, older siblings or adults- and in which they attain, through language use in interaction, sociocultural knowledge of specific activities and contexts as well as those of the wider society (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 45).

Contribution to Theory and Practice

This study will contribute to the current understanding of the process of bilingual language acquisition. Many studies of bilingual children have focused on the parent child relationship for the purpose of determining effective strategies for raising bilingual children (Geissler, 1938; Romaine, 1995; Saunders, 1982). The children studied in the majority of case studies come from the upper middle class backgrounds and take place within the nuclear family environment (Caldas & Caron-Caldas, 2002). This study examines the language acquisition of a bilingual child in interaction with bilingual Hispanic children who are generally marginalized within the educational system in the United States due to cultural differences, the migratory nature of their stay in any one area, their socioeconomic status and lack of teachers who are trained to accommodate their language needs (Grubbs, 2003).

Many existing case studies of bilingual children (Leopold, 1949; Ronjat,1913; Taeschner, 1983) document a single aspect of bilingual language acquisition such as development of grammar, phonology, word formation or sentence structure. Quantitative
studies, such as Fantini (1985) compare vocabulary size and phonemic inventory. In addition there are studies that serve to establish metalinguistic awareness as a cognitive advantage in bilingual children (Fantini, 1985; Levy 1985; Taeschner, 1983). Existing case studies also seek to establish a developmental sequence for bilingual language development (Saunders, 1982). Case studies that document particular aspects of language development such as lexical/syntactical development (Clark, 1973; Thordardottir, 2005; Tomasello, 1987), or grammatical development (Dromi, 1987; Marchman, Martínez-Sussman & Dale, 2004; Namei, 2004; Paradis, 2005; Salameh, Hakansson & Nettelbladt, 2004) also make up part of the literature.

It has been established that there is a role for imaginative play within child bilingual language development (Bourne, 2001; Riojas-Cortez, 2000, 2001). Byun (1993) focuses on ways in which a child second language learner, Joon Ho, was able to participate in play situations through the co-construction of dialogue. Over a ten month period consisting of 14 interactions ranging in length from nine to twenty-nine minutes, this second language learner was able to increase his use of negation, verbal regulation, elaboration techniques, challenges, and requests for confirmations. In addition the language forms he used became more complex.

The present study seeks to employ an established definition of pretend play. However the design of study, focus of research and context of bilingualism are quite different. Byun’s (1993) study took place over a ten month period with observations occurring every other week. The child in that particular study, Joon Ho, began his exposure to his second language at age four when he moved to the United States and was placed in a public preschool program. He could therefore be classified, according to Kessler (1984), as a *sequential bilingual*. The child in the present study has been exposed to her second language since birth but chooses to use English unless she is convinced that someone only speaks Spanish. This study will take place over a period of four to six weeks with one to two hour recording sessions occurring three to four times per week. However, the major method of socialization into a second language will be through play sessions with Hispanic children.

These intensive pretend play sessions will be the principal opportunity for this child to be socialized into actual language use for communication. She will not be
attending pre-school in the non-dominant language in addition to these interactions as has been the case in previous studies.

In addition to examining ways in which a language learner develops her ability to produce extended discourse, this study also seeks to understand ways in which she begins to develop narrative competence in the weaker language through pretend play. Narratives are a form of extended discourse as they require several turns to complete (Uchikioshi, 2005). Broadly defined narratives consist of multiple sequential clauses and describe a past event (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Labov, 1972; Umiker-Sebeok, 1979).

Presently there are no studies in the literature that address the development of narrative skills in simultaneous bilinguals within the context of pretend play. Studies on the narratives of bilingual children focused more on cross language comparison of narratives than on the developmental process of acquiring narrative skills (Uchikoshi, 2005). Narrative skills in both languages have been analyzed and compared (Pearson, 2002). Influences on the development of narrative competence for second language learners by television programs have been explored (Uchikoshi, 2005).

Definition of Terms

Due to multiple existing definitions of related terminology it is necessary to identify the meaning of terms employed in this study. The following terms will be used in the study as defined below.

*Active bilinguals:* See *Productive bilinguals*

*Alternation:* When a single speaker uses one language and then changes to another (Muysken, 2000).

*Bilinguality:* The acquisition of two linguistic codes which are seen as being socially distant (Hamers, 2004).

*Circumstantial bilinguals:* Bilinguals who develop their second language for survival purposes in an immigrant situation where their native language is a low status language (Valdés & Figeroa, 1994).

*Code-switching:* Use of more than one language by bilinguals within one conversational turn (Reyes & Ervin-Tripp, 2002).
Cognitive Complexity Hypothesis: Slobin’s (1973) theory of language acquisition which suggests that simpler forms are acquired before more complex forms and that the age of acquisition of any grammatical feature depends on its complexity.

Communicative competence: Knowledge of language and how to use it in a variety of situations for effective communication. This includes knowledge of grammar and rules for their use in socially appropriate circumstances (Romaine, 2000).

Congruent lexicalization: The use of vocabulary from multiple languages into grammatical structure that is similar in two languages (Muysken, 2000).

Credibility: refers to ways in which a researcher establishes that the claims they are making are true (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Critical Mass Hypothesis: Conception of bilingualism which incorporates that idea that social-cultural context is the most important factor in maintaining bilingualism. Asserts that speaking proficiency in a given language is only important if there are others nearby who speak the same language (Linton, 2004).

Dependability: The degree to which an additional independent researcher would agree with the study’s conclusions based on collected and displayed data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Discourse: Linguistic unit made up of more than one sentence (Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams, 2003).

Domain: Place where a particular language is used. Refers to time, setting, and role relationships (Romaine, 2000).

Dominance: Occurs when a bilingual has superior proficiency in one of two languages. This is a non-static condition that changes based on the linguistic context of the bilingual (Kohnert, 2004).

Double non-dominant home language without community support: Context for bilingual language acquisition when parents have different native languages but neither of their languages is that of the community (Romaine, 1995).

Illocutionary force: The intended effect of what a speaker says. The motive behind a given speech act.
Illocutionary speech act: Objective a person tries to accomplish through speaking. Examples include making statements, asking questions, requesting, greeting, refusing, vowing (Trask, 1999).

Imaginative play: Play episodes in which children create interactive routines in their peer culture based on the adult world and use language to embellish the adult models to address their own concerns and socio-emotional needs (Corsaro, 2003).

Independent development hypothesis: (Also known as the dual system or autonomous hypothesis) asserts that those acquiring bilingualism from infancy initially develop two differentiated language systems provided that the input is fairly even in both languages (Bergman, 1977).

Insertion: Occurs when items from one language are placed into a structure from another (Muysken, 2000).

Language choice: Refers to which language or languages a person actually chooses to use in communicative interaction. Often based on the particular domain in which a person is interacting (Romaine, 2000).

Language crossings: Choosing a way of talking based on the situation, location or other participants in the conversation. (Kramsch, 1998)

Language field: See Speech field

Language loss: A phenomenon in which skills in the first language regress due to lack of use (Kohnert, 2004).

Language play: Playing with language sounds and grammatical structures (Cook, 1997).

Language socialization: Learning to be a member of a society through language as one learns how to use language appropriately within a given speech community (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986).

Language Time Approach: Method for raising bilingual children in which different languages are used in different time periods during the day or week (Grosjean, 1982).

Limited bilingualism: See Semilingualism

Locutionary act: The act of speaking.
Make believe: A form of play in which children take on imaginary roles and behave as characters by acting out their roles linguistically.


Metapragmatic comments: Comments about language that arise as a result of inappropriate behavior in a conversation (Blum-Kulka, 1997).

Mixed languages: A home context for childhood bilingualism. This occurs when the parents are bilingual and parts of the community are bilingual as well. Parents do not employ any type of language strategy but freely use either language or code switch (Romaine, 1999).

Non-dominant home language: Also known as the One language-one-environment context for bilingual language acquisition. In this type of situation parents have different native languages with one of their native languages being the dominant language of the community. Both parents speak the non-dominant language to the child in the home. (Romaine, 1995).

Non-dominant home language without community support: Context for bilingual language acquisition which occurs when the native language of the parents (which is the same) is not the dominant language of the community (Romaine, 1995).

Non-native parents. This context for bilingualism occurs when both parents have the same native language which is the dominant language of the community. In order to raise the child bilingually one of the parents addresses the child in a language that is not their native language (Romaine, 1995).

One parent-one language: Also known as One-person-one-language. In this type of bilingual home setting each parent has a different native language which they use with the child. Each parent is somewhat proficient in each language. Also, the dominant language of one of the parents is the dominant language of the environment in which they live (Romaine, 1995).

Pragmatics: The domain of linguistics that studies actual speech use in discourse. Pragmatic studies examine how single utterances communicate meaning within a particular context (Trask, 1999).
**Pragmatic rules:** Norms for appropriate and effective language use within a given situation so that communicative goals are achieved without offense or misunderstanding (Ninio and Snow, 1996).

**Pretend play:** Play in which children transform their surroundings and create an alternative environment in which to act (Garvey, 1990).

**Private speech:** Speech directed to one’s self. It is social in origin but takes on a private, cognitive function (Lantolf, 2000).

**Productive bilinguals:** Also known as Active bilinguals. Can communicate orally and possibly in writing in two languages (Döpke, 1992).

**Private verbal thinking** is a category of private speech which specifically deals with verbal reasoning during the completion of a problem solving task (Centeno-Cortes & Jiménez Jiménez, 2004).

**Receptive bilinguals:** Also known as Passive bilinguals. Can understand and possibly read a second language but do not use productive language skills. Still considered to be bilingual provided that they continue to be exposed to the minority language and have age appropriate passive skills (Döpke, 1992).

**Rigor of methodology:** See Dependability.

**Scaffolding:** The process by which a person who is more skilled works with a less skilled participant who aids him in the construction of new knowledge through their interaction (Block, 2001; Lantolf, 2000; McCafferty, 2004).

**Semilingualism:** Occurs when bilinguals lose their non-dominant system and never truly become proficient in the dominant language of the community either. Also known as limited bilingualism (Scheffner Hammer, Miccio & Rodriguez, 2004).

**Sequential bilingualism:** Occurs as a result of exposure to one language in early infancy and a second at a later time (Scheffner Hammer et. al, 2004).

**Simultaneous bilingualism:** Language acquisition that occurs as a result of more or less equal exposure from birth. Grosjean (1982) classifies simultaneous bilinguals as those who acquire two languages before age three and sequential bilinguals as those who acquire the second language after three.

**Socio-dramatic play:** Play in which children actually embody the characters they create and role play actions done by those characters (Corsaro, 2003).
Speech Act: An attempt to do something through speech. Examples of speech acts include making a promise, asking a question, ordering or requesting someone to do something, threatening, naming, and declaring. Also used to denote a specific illocutionary act (Trask, 1999).

Speech community: A group of people who regularly interact by speaking and who share a set of underlying norms for language use (Romaine, 2000).

Speech events: Different types of situations involving speech such as conversations, events or introductions. These particular activities are governed by norms of use and consist of one or more speech acts (Hymes, 1972).

Speech field: (Also known as Language field.) The range of speech communities in which a person is potentially able to effectively communicate (Hymes, 1972).

Spontaneous play: Play that is generally not scripted or planned and takes place through verbal interaction (Corsaro, 2003).

Transferability: The degree to which a given study could be applicable to another situation which is equivalent in context. This can be established based thick, rich description of theoretical and methodological orientations. (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Truth value: See Credibility.

Valorization: Attributing certain functions or values to a particular language in an individual’s linguistic repertoire (Hamers and Blanc, 2000).

Zone of Proximal Development: Developmental zone established by Vygotsky (1978) which is the “distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under the guidance of another human being” (Block, 2001, p. 101)

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations will be discussed in chapters 3 and five:

1. This study will investigate the language development of only one child through pretend play.
2. This will be an intensive yet short-term analysis of bilingual language development.
3. The researcher is the parent of the principle child being studied.
4. There is no instrument designed to specifically gauge language proficiency of a bilingual child in their weaker language.

Organization of the Study

This study contains five chapters. The first chapter introduces the research questions to be addressed. The second chapter is a review of the literature related to sociocultural theory, bilingualism, pretend play, discourse, and communicative and narrative competence which provide the theoretical framework for the study. Chapter III outlines the research methodology to be used in the study by describing the participants and setting, and outlines data collection and analysis procedures. The fourth chapter will present the data analysis. The final chapter will discuss the findings and provide recommendations for future research related to this study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of concepts related to language, culture and society. A discussion of discourse and communicative and pragmatic competence is also included within this section. Narrative development in monolingual and bilingual children is addressed. Definitions of bilingualism and related topics such as contexts for bilingualism, measuring bilingualism, and perceptions of bilingualism are also present. Linguistic systems in bilinguals and bilingual development are also examined in this section. In order to provide a theoretical background the literature related to sociocultural theory, language socialization, and play will also be reviewed.

Language Related Concepts

Language as Culture

It has been established that language plays an integral role in the transmission of culture (Goodenough, 1981; Hamers, 2004; Kramsch, 1998; Romaine, 2000). Language expresses, symbolizes, and embodies cultural reality (Kramsch, 1998). Communicative tools are established by groups or cultures according to their ways of viewing the world. Hamers (2004) states that humans have universal communicative and cognitive functions but have culturally specific ways of communicating them linguistically. According to Hamers (2004) “In contrast to the stability of the communicative and cognitive functions, the particular surface forms that are used to encode these functions vary greatly across languages” (p.71). In a similar fashion, Hickmann (2003) claims that “all children acquire the type of semiotic system that is characteristic of our species (human language), while acquiring the particular language that surrounds them (their native language)” (p. 1). Kramsch (1998) elaborates on the way in which behavior is shaped through language: “Etiquette, expressions of politeness, social dos and don’ts shape people’s behavior through child rearing, behavioral upbringing, schooling, professional training” (p. 6). These cultural values are shaped through language and reproduced in successive generations (Hamers, 2004). According to Hamers (2004):
Language behavior is the product of culture and as such it follows the rules of enculturated behavior. It is not a mere product of biological endowment, but it is a product of culture, transmitted from one generation to the next in the socialization process and appropriated by each individual. In turn, language behavior molds culture, that is, cultural representations are shaped by language behavior. (p. 71)

Languages are dynamic and are changed and shaped by the cultures that use them. Language has the potential for making meaning but actual significance is shaped and interpreted by those who use it (Halliday, 1975; Hamers, 2004). Culturally established language norms provide unwritten rules for interaction and interpretation and are, in a sense, cultural rituals for language users (Kramsch, 1998). According to Hamers (2004), all language development occurs within interactions in the context of the social environment. Through socialization children internalize societal values (Hamers, 2004) and appropriate them for later use as they become contributing members of a society.

**Language and Society**

There is a direct relationship between individual language use and language use at the societal level. Although individuals appropriate language norms that are present in the society, language use at the societal level is influenced by individual language behavior (Hamers, 2004). Also, there is an intricate relationship between form of language behavior and the function it fulfills.

 Appropriateness of language usage for a given population is defined by its community members, their patterns of language use, and their beliefs about language norms (Romaine, 2000). People who “share a set of norms and rules for the use of language” are said to be part of a speech community (Romaine, 2000, p. 23). Hymes (1972) defines a speech community as “a community sharing a set of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety” (p. 54). In order to be able to function within a speech community a person must have know how to employ language in accordance with appropriate social usage (Gumperz, 1964; Hymes, 1972). Depending on interactional experiences within multiple communities individuals are able to function within multiple speech communities. The terms *language field* or *speech field* refer to the range of communities in which a person is potentially able to communicate (Hymes, 1972). In order to examine
children’s abilities to communicate within a given speech field it is necessary to see how they are able to engage in interactions at the level of discourse.

**Discourse**

Discourse is the “linguistic unit that comprises more than one sentence” (Fromkin, Rodman & Hyams, 2003, p. 581). In terms of verbal communication discourse can be defined as “Any sequence of two or more utterances produced by a single speaker or by two or more speakers who are interacting with each other (Keenan & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 340). Analysis of discourse is a way to understand how people function in conversational interactions. Through analysis of individual moves, interactional patters and norms of communicative competence can be understood. Related topics include style, appropriateness, cohesiveness, rhetorical force, topics, and subtopics (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2003). In analyzing discourse, speech is examined in terms of the exchanges between individuals and patterns in initiation of conversation, turn taking, response, and follow up.

In order to understand the cultural construction of speech it is necessary look at it analytically from its basic units to how these come together for participation in discourse. A *speech act* is the minimal unit in which a person tries to accomplish something through speaking (Hymes, 1972; Trask, 1999). *Speech events* are different types of situations involving speech such as conversations, lectures, or introductions (Hymes, 1972). Speech events are “activities or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech” (Hymes, 1972, p. 56) and consist of one or more than one speech act. By examining individual speech acts and events it is possible to determine the types of communicative skills that fall within an individual’s communicative repertoire.

*Communicative competence*

In 1965, Noam Chomsky proposed a mentalist model of grammar and asserted that linguistic theory should be concerned with the discovery of the mental reality underlying behavior (Duranti, 2001). Chomsky thought of *competence* as being purely grammatical knowledge and *performance* as being the study of language use (Duranti, 2001). Chomsky asserted that competence of ideal speaker-listeners in homogenous speech communities who know their language perfectly should be the focus of linguistic
research (Duranti, 2001). Performance, according to Chomsky (1965), should not be studied until complete descriptions of competence could be produced (Duranti, 2005).

Hymes (1972) rejected the idea that linguistic knowledge should refer to purely linguistic knowledge and claimed that speakers are competent not only when they have knowledge of grammatical rules but when they know how to use them for communication. Hymes (1972) employed the term *communicative competence* to refer to grammatical knowledge and a speaker’s ability to use it. Romaine (2000) explains that the term communicative competence “is intended to replace the dichotomy between competence and performance central to mainstream linguistics” (p. 30). According to Hymes (1972) language competence goes beyond knowledge of grammatical rules because in order to interact with others a child must “be able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events and to evaluate their accomplishment by others” (p. 277). This definition of communicative competence provides a means in which to study the diversity of language and its relation to social life. Communicative competence, as defined by Hymes (1972), “includes both tacit knowledge and the ability to use language” (p. 277). Research on communicative competence necessitates investigation through ethnography in which a researcher systematically observes and documents language in use to describe the existence of associated norms (Hymes, 1972).

Romaine (2000) defines communicative competence as being “a speaker’s underlying knowledge of the rules of grammar (understood in the widest sense to include phonology, grammar, lexicon, and semantics) and rules for their use in socially appropriate circumstances” (p. 25). Communicative competence implies that a speaker can choose what to say and know how to say it at an appropriate time (Romaine, 2000).

*Pragmatics*

In order to communicate effectively, a child must learn how to interact within a wide variety of situations and contexts. Pragmatics is the domain of linguistics that studies actual speech use in discourse. Pragmatic studies examine how single utterances communicate meaning within a particular context (Trask, 1999). Studies on pragmatic development are concerned with how children learn to use language appropriately in interpersonal situations (Ninio & Snow, 1996).
In order to participate in any type of verbal exchange children must have sufficient linguistic knowledge. Insufficient linguistic knowledge puts a strain “the kinds of speech uses they can understand and come to produce on their own” (Ninio & Snow, 1996, p. 17). Ninio and Snow (1996) report general trends in the order of acquisition of communicative acts for children up to two years old. First children are able to call and direct the hearer’s attention. Later they are able to engage in participatory or performative acts such as imitation, repetition, answering simple who or what questions. The next type of communicative acts in which children engage are negotiations and discussions. Finally children learn to request clarifications and ask more complex questions. Ninio and Snow (1996) summarize the sequence for pragmatic development:

The verbal communicative system undergoes rapid, although somewhat uneven growth between ages 0;8 and 2;8. By two years children have mastered most of the basic moves of the central communicative uses of speech namely discussions about various topics and the negotiation of action. After age two they turn to acquiring the more complex, infrequent, and specialist speech uses and to developing skill at deploying in a variety of situation the basic repertoire acquired in parent-child dydactic interaction. (p. 103)

As children develop increase their linguistic repertoires they also develop their ability to produce extended discourse and to respond in socially appropriate ways within a given situation. Pragmatic rules “define appropriate and effective language use- using language in such a way that that one’s own communicative goals are achieved without giving offense or causing misunderstanding” (Ninio & Snow, 1996, p. 4). In order to use language effectively children must be able to perform illocutionary speech acts such as making statements, asking questions, requesting, greeting, refusing, vowing (Ninio & Snow, 1996; Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969).

Pragmatic rules are culturally defined (Ninio & Snow, 1996; Trask, 1999). Ninio and Snow (1996) state that in order to “describe linguistic politeness rules and to study how children are socialized into using them, we need to consider the totality of a culture” (p. 5). They explain that the following skills are essential for pragmatic achievement: defining types of social situations, procedural skills necessary for the conduct of conversations such as turn taking, cultural knowledge underlying social appropriateness,
and social skills necessary for appropriate and efficient employment of speech in various situations (p. 13). In short, pragmatic development includes: development of rules governing the communicative uses of speech, development of conversational skills, and the development of the ability to produce extended discourse and genre specific forms (Ninio & Snow, 1996).

**Social Control Acts and Politeness**

The following major pragmatic forces, for example, have been determined to be present in mother child interactions: Directives and Responses, Speech Elicitations and Responses, Commitments, Declarations, Markings, Statements, Questions, Performances and Evaluations, Demands for Clarifications, Text Editing and Vocalizations (Ninio & Snow, 1996).

Social control acts are culturally constructed verbal moves such as requests, orders or offers which affect behavior of another person (Blum-Kulka, 1997). Politeness is related to social control acts in that politeness acts have to be executed in a way which causes the person receiving the order not to “lose face” by feeling disrespect or humiliation (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1967).

There are two basic types of face needs. The first is the “need for freedom from imposition” and is accomplished through what Blum-Kulka (1997) terms *negative politeness*. The second type is the “need for enhancement of a positive self image” which is accomplished through *positive politeness* focusing on in group solidarity (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 143). Some cultures have systems of politeness that emphasize solidarity while other cultures of groups may specifically mark “distance, power, and imposition by means of those negative politeness” (p. 143).

Metapragmatic comments or “comments made in response to perceived violations of conversational norms” are another type of social control act (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 143). Metapragmatic comments can reveal cultural patterns of pragmatic norms and are an explicit way in which speakers can learn rules for verbal participation (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Grice, 1975; Silverstein, 1976). These types of comments give learners direct information on mistakes they make in regard to violations of norms for participation in conversation.
Blum-Kulka (1997) creates three categories for comments related to verbal behavior. The first type category is that of *discourse management* and includes talk about how turn taking should occur such as bidding for a turn, allocation of turns, negating a turn and upholding a turn (p. 181). The second category has to do with comments related to *Maxim violations* (Grice, 1975) or whether or not a speaker follows unwritten rules about relevance, quality, quantity or manner during conversation. The third category is that of *metalinguistic comments* or “all talk about language- queries and responses about word meanings as well as comments topicalizing language, including cross-linguistic comparisons (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 182).

Face needs are culturally defined. Children learn to use politeness forms through interactions: “Children observe surface forms and are expected to induce underlying rules. The politeness system is one about which a great deal of information is available to children from the interactions in which they engage and from those they observe” (Snow, Perlmann, Gleason & Hooshyar, 1990, p. 304). Despite the complexity and abstract nature of the politeness system children are able to master it by adolescence: “Clearly children do learn about the dimensions of power, social distance and degree of imposition; by the time they are adolescents these dimensions govern their public interactions just as they do adults” (Snow, et al., p. 304). Pragmatic competence continues to develop as children are exposed to interactions in which culturally appropriate responses are required.

Narrative Development in Children

Narratives can be defined broadly as conversations that retell past events. (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Labov 1972; Umiker Sebok, 1979). Narratives are a form of extended discourse as they require several turns to complete (Uchikoshi, 2005). Labov (1972) sets the minimum requirement at two sequential clauses. Narratives contain fictional and nonfictional events and are in nature so that a narrator must use linguistic skills alone to create the context for the story (Preece, 1992; Uchikoshi, 2005).

There is varying thought on the role of listeners in the construction of a narrative. According to Blum-Kulka (1997), scholars such as Owens (1984) have defined narratives to be more akin to monologues or uninterrupted speech in which the narrator tells an extended story to a listener without much participation from the listener. Others assert
that narratives can be a part of conversations as people relate stories or past events to others. (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Hymes, 1974). Narratives take place within conversations and also follow discourse norms (Hymes, 1974). Dell Hymes (1974) states that “like all speech events, narratives  have specific norms governing the scene, participation rights, message content, message from, and rules of interpretation.

Children with developed discourse and narrative skills have more opportunities for success in a school environment and are more likely to achieve high levels of literacy (Camp & Wolf, 2004; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Griffin, Hemphill, Paul & Smith, 1993; Uchikoshi, 2005). Uchikoshi (2005) states that "narrative skills have been pointed out as being strong predictors of later language and literacy achievement for monolingual English children” (p. 1). Children who are able to engage in the types of storytelling that fall within a classroom norm are more likely to participate in classroom discourse and have more success in reading and writing (Fang, 2001, p. 205).

Narrative skills are particularly important to school success because the act of storytelling involves a logical progression of events. Discourse skills are important however narratives require logical and sequential progression (Peterson & McCabe, 1983).

Components of Narratives

Narrative styles are culturally defined (Dart, 1992; Heath 1982, 1986; Minami & McCabe, 1991; Ninio, 1980; Shiro, 1995; Silva & McCabe, 1996; Tannen, 1980; Uchikoshi, 2005; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). Peterson and McCabe (1992) state that although narration is present in all cultures, the definition of a well structured narrative varies from culture to culture. Despite variations there are some standard components to narratives across cultures. These components include accounts of past experiences or events that have occurred embedded within a spatiotemporal framework (Peterson & McCabe, 1992).

Labov (1972) identified a six part structure for oral narratives that consists of an abstract or summary, an orientation which provides the setting or context for the narrative, complicating actions or events, an evaluation or explanation, resolution of complicating events and a coda or ending.

The schema approach to narrative analysis recognizes a similar narrative structure
based on common underlying structures of narratives. (Maddler, 1983). This structure consists of a *setting component* which is followed by *episodes* that make up the plot. The episodes consist of five different categories called nodes. These nodes can be *initiating events* (problems requiring action or response), *internal responses* (emotional or cognitive reactions stating a goal), *attempts* (carrying out of planned actions), *consequences* (results of actions) or *reactions* to consequences (Bamberg, 1987).

Evaluation is a key component of narratives that occurs as the narrator interprets or reflects verbally on the meaning of the events. “In telling stories of experiences, children not only report what happened to them but also exhibit their thoughts and feelings about the experiences” (Chang, 2004, p. 84) Linguistic devices that speakers use to evaluate narratives include intensifiers, adjectives, negatives or defeats of expectations, references to emotional states or cognitions, references to physical states, causal markers, and words with high evaluative content (Beck, Coker, Hemphill & Bellinger, 2003; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Uchikoshi, 2005). Evaluations can take place at the phonological, syntactic or discourse levels (Labov, 1972; Chang, 2004; Polanyi, 1989). Linguistic evaluation of reported past events has been identified in the narratives of children as young as 2;5 years old (Chang, 2004).

Narratives of four to five year old monolingual children typically contain little evaluation of story events (Bamberg & Damand-Frye, 1991; Eaton, Collins, & Lewis, 1999, Peterson & McCabe, 1983). Peterson and McCabe (1983) found an increase in use and variety of type of evaluation devices by age and identified 21 evaluative devices in the narratives of American children ages four to nine. Chang (2004) also reports an increase in evaluative devices in Mandarin speaking preschool children over a nine month period.

In order to relay a narrative it is essential to establish *where* and *when* the narrative takes place. This is known as *spatiotemporal framing* (Blum-Kulka, 1997). Children must learn to set the story within its spatio-temporal context in addition to recalling the events that took place (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Polanyi, 1982). These details will make the narrative comprehensible to the listeners. According to Peterson and McCabe (1983), narratives must provide contextual information including when and where the story takes place, and information about the participants and events. Children
must develop a way to introduce a story and set up the organization for the entire event assuming no prior knowledge on the part of the listener. All of these details must be established verbally (Beck, et. al., 2003). According to Chang (2004), temporality is established linguistically through devices such as “tense/aspect, connectives, [and] lexical temporals” (p. 84). Narratives can be classified according to when and where they take place. Blum-Kulka (1997) classifies narratives temporally and spatially into the categories of today (past events), recent past, and distance past and home, school, work or any other location.

Blum-Kulka (1997) also identifies possible protagonists of narratives as being self, other or us. Structures of narratives such as spatiotemporal framing and content such as protagonists vary according to culture: “Groups differ culturally on the dimensions of spatiotemporality… the actual telling is enacted in a culturally specific, ritualistic way” (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 111).

Fang (2001) established three components of schooled narrative: autonomy, conventionality and specialized grammar. Autonomy refers to the fact that narrators must use words to create the spatiotemporal context for the story. Conventionality is achieved when narrators follow established structural patterns for creating a narrative. Specialized grammar refers to the grammatical structures or devices utilized to complete the narration.

**Narrative Development**

Narrative and discourse skills develop over an extended period of time through social interaction (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Chang, 2004; Fang, 2001; Preece, 1992). Fang (2001) states that the development of narrative competence is “non-uniform, unstable, and complex” (p. 219). Developing narrative competence is closely related to discourse competence as the ability to tell stories is developed through participation in conversations. Some children begin to narrate personal experiences at two years of age and engage in fantasy storytelling before attending school (Chang, 2004). However children may produce early narratives that are “short, simple and fragmented” and rely on their caregivers for assistance in constructing “the content and structure of their narratives” (Chang, 2004, p. 84). Telling a story is a complex event. Children develop their ability to relate and understand stories over time between the ages of two and ten
years old (Kemper, 1984). In order to narrate past events children must learn how to select and initiate appropriate topics and recount and retell stories while maintaining the floor. Development of narrative competence is a process that takes place throughout childhood as changes occur in the content, themes, characters, plot structure, and causal structure included in the narratives children tell (Kemper, 1984).

High point narrative analysis (Labov, 1972; Labov & Waletzky, 1967) looks at narratives as having two basic functions: evaluation and reference. The referential function refers to the subject of the narrative and the time and place of occurrence. In addition to these two functions high point narratives have the following structures components: initial orientation (or introduction), complication (events or actions advancing the storyline), resolution and an optional coda towards the end (Bamberg, 1987; Change, 2004; Labov, 1972; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Snow et. al., 1995; Uchikoshi, 2005; Willenberg & Kand, 2001). This particular pattern is also referred to as the classic narrative (Uchikoshi, 2005).

The content of stories will vary and expand as children are exposed to new information and circumstances (Kemper, 1984). As children are exposed to narratives they become more aware of plot structure and employ varying narrative patterns in their own stories. For example, “children gradually learn to use formal openings and closings as well as settings, outcomes, and episodic structure to construct stories” (Kemper, 1984, p. 100). A third developing dimension of narrative competence is causal structure. As narratives become more complex, children begin to actually explain why some events occur.

Children began to provide spatiotemporal or contextual information as young as two years old. This information increases in quality and quantity between the ages of three and nine years old (Peterson & McCabe, 1983). Connective devices such as and have been found in use in the stories of children as young as 3;5 years old (Peterson & McCabe, 1991). Chang (2004) also found growth in the number of temporal devices for Mandarin children between the ages of 3;6 and 4;3. Preschoolers in this study also increased Mean Length of Utterances (MLUs), number of clauses, and Mean Length of Turn (MLT) in their narratives over a nine month period.

According to Uchikoshi (2005), the most common type of narratives for four to
five year old monolingual English speaking children are *Leap Frog Narratives* and *Chronology Narratives*. In *Leap Frog Narratives* "children jump from one event to another and leave out major events" (Uchikoshi, 2005, ¶ 11). In *Chronology Narratives* children simply recount past events in the order in which they occur (Peterson & McCabe, 1983). Five year olds most often use *Chronology Narratives* and *Ending-at-the-High-Point* narratives which typically have no resolution (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Uchikoshi, 2005). Around age six the *Classic* narrative pattern begins to emerge. "The narrator builds up to a high point, evaluatively dwells on it, and then resolves it” (Peterson & McCabe, 1983, p. 36).

Although researchers present findings that show narrative development is a process in which certain developmental milestones have the potential to be accomplished at specific ages, it is acknowledged that there is variation among children in terms of the rate of development. Chang (2004) states that it is “worth stressing that the growth patterns and rates of change for the children’s narrative competence in construction of narrative components and use of evaluative and temporal devices are not completely the same across children” (p. 100). Individual variation in performance of narratives may be related to the type of interactions with parents or caregivers (Chang, 2004).

**Factors affecting development of narrative skills**

"People from all cultures narrate, although there are cultural differences in what is considered to be a well-structured narrative" (Peterson & McCabe, 1994, p. 937). Since the format and style of narratives are culturally defined, children must be socialized to tell about past events through social interaction and additional environmental influences. Studies have shown that parental discourse and narrative style is directly related to their children's development of narrative skills (Fivush, 1991; Fivush & Fromhoff, 1988; McCabe & Peterson, 1991). Parental responsiveness, types and number of parent-child conversational exchanges during books reading, detail of reference to past events, amount of narrative conversation used by parents, use of open ended and context eliciting questions, and exposure to book reading and discussion are all elements that can influence development of narrative skills in children (Uchikoshi, 2005).

Vygotskian sociocultural theory would account for a child's narrative development through engagement in narrative activities with parents and peers. A
sociocultural approach “would hypothesize that the sorts of narrative interactions engaged in by adults and children would play a key role in facilitating children’s narration” (Peterson & McCabe, 1994, p. 938). Discourse style of peers and playmates will affect narrative development. An elaborative style occurs when a speaker extends each narrative topic (Fivush, 1991; Fivush & Fromhoff, 1998; Hudson, 1990; Peterson & McCabe, 1994). Children who are engaged in dialogue with someone who uses an elaborative style will be led to provide more information than those who are engaged in dialogue with someone with a repetitive style with or someone who constantly switches narrative topics (Peterson & McCabe, 1994).

An example of the influence of parental scaffolding on children’s narrative development comes from Peterson and McCabe’s 1992 study. Conversations between parents who were topic extending, elaborative narrators and their children were tape recorded and analyzed. One mother consistently prompted for specific orientative information (where, when, who, why and what) whereas the other mother asked for information about actions that had occurred. In spontaneous narration each of the children included the types of information their respective mothers had requested during the interactive construction of earlier stories (Peterson & McCabe, 1992).

Peterson and McCabe grounded their 1994 study in Vygotsky’s idea that there is a “time-lagged relationship between parental behavior and subsequent child performance” (p. 946) and concluded that parental discourse styles “predate and correlate highly with child performance” (p. 946). Children also learn what type of information needs to be included in a narrative through social interaction.

Pellegrini and Galda (1989) identified adult strategies that facilitated children’s narrative development. Following Vygotsky (1978) and Wertsch (1985), they suggest that in co-construction of narratives adults who are working with children should work within their zones of proximal development and use different interactional styles when working with children of different competencies. “Adults assume more responsibility when for task completion with the less competent than with the more competent children” (Pellegrini & Galda, 1989, p. 128). As children develop their narrative competence, they gain different understandings of how a narrative should be told based on their structured interactions with adults. This understanding is “socially negotiated
according to children’s competence in specific contexts” (Pellegrini & Galda, 1989, p.129). Research shows ways in which adults aid children in facilitating development of children’s narrative competence by “inviting them to recount events and retell stories, supplying the topic, helping them gain and hold the floor, using questions to signal [information that listeners expect], assisting with sequencing, encouraging elaboration and modeling ‘tellable’ content and acceptable delivery style” (Preece, 1992, p. 277).

Family dinner time narratives in which children participate are jointly constructed affairs (Erickson, 1988; Ochs, 1989) in which the collaboration can occur in the form of co-narration, question-answer sequences, or be told with periodic participation from listeners (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 105). For analytical purposes, and since narrations are often collaborative in nature, Blum-Kulka (1997) employs the terms mainteller, for the predominant narrator, and initiator as the person who begins the narration.

Polss (1990), as cited in Blum-Kulka, 1997, has identified different narrative response styles. High involvement response strategies include “devices such as requests for information, confirmations of information and listener contributions to the narrative” (p. 108). These are response techniques which could possibly help a child develop narrative competence. Low involvement response strategies include uptake signals or signals of “message reception” that can be neutral or emotional (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 108). High involvement responses are seen as being more facilitative to the development of narrative competence as they encourage the narrator to include missing details and to elaborate further on missing components.

Environmental influences

Frequent exposure to books or television programs that follow a structured narrative sequence will also have a positive impact on children's ability to narrate (Purcell Gates, 1991; Rice, Huston, Truglio & Wright, 1990; Uchikoshi, 2005; Van Evra, 1998). Uchikoshi (2005) uses five measures of narrative growth including story structure, events, evaluations, temporality and reference, and storybook language. Uchikoshi examines narrative growth of English Language Learners after watching Arthur a television show with an embedded narrative structure (plot, conflict, resolution). In his qualitative observations he notes that many children were prevented from narrating in English because of a lack of vocabulary in their second language. Instead of producing
English narratives children would stay silent or produce narratives in their native language, Spanish. Students who were more advanced in English were able to connect a few sentences together thus creating a plot. Uchikoshi (2005) concludes that these children, who lacked control of basic communicative tools in English such as vocabulary, produced narratives that could be classified as chronological or leap frog narratives. Seven months later students included more events in their narrations. In addition, they included advanced story structures such as direct language, titles for the narratives, traditional beginnings and formal endings, resolutions and codas. Their later narratives could be classified as ending-at-the-high-point narratives or classic pattern narratives. (Uchikoshi, 2005)

Narratives can take on interaction rituals (Bruner, 1983; Blum-Kulka, 1997; Goffman, 1967). Blum-Kulka (1997) articulates the combination of three ritualistic features that make up narratives. These are “the recurrent nature of activity type and the role expectations that it entails; the formulaic, repetitive language of the opening phrase; and the ritual constraints governing the type of conversational contribution expected” (p. 112). In the same manner that interaction in childhood serves a purpose in the language acquisition process, “narrative events act as critical socializing events for the acquisition of narrative skills” (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 112).

Also to be considered is who actually knows the information which is being narrated. A-events are events that are known only to the teller. A-B events are known to the teller and to one other participant. O-type events are known to the teller and to one other participant (Blum-Kulka, 1997). As children learn to narrate they must learn to include sufficient contextual information so that other participants will be able to understand the information.

Narrative modes are the ways in which a story is actually told. In monologic modes of narration the primary narrator is generally in control of the floor throughout the entire episode and the episode is generally self initiated or follows the question of some other participant. Dialogic mode occurs between two people and generally in the form of a question and answer sequence. This is the mode generally used in caretaker talk or in teaching children to read stories. (Heath 1982; Ninio, 1988; Snow, 1991) Polyphonic
mode is when several participants construct the narration together in such a way that is difficult to distinguish a primary or secondary narrator. (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 123)

Bilingualism

It is estimated that approximately half the world’s population is bilingual and that bilingualism is present in most nations (Romaine, 2000). The declaration of one language or another as official is a political decision that has widespread implications for a society. Historically in the United States, many immigrants have been forced or shamed into not using native languages because of beliefs that “their languages and cultures were inferior and therefore had to be abandoned for the sake of being American” (Romaine, 2000, p. 43). Within any group or society the consequences for those who speak a language outside of the prestige language can be subtle or explicit. This has been particularly true in the United States. According to Romaine (2000), speaking Spanish in public schools in Texas was illegal until 1971. Although the principle language of the United States is English, the number of students in grades K-12 with limited English proficiency in the 2002-2003 school year was 5,014,047 (NCELA Bulletin, 2005).

A necessary but difficult task central to discussing bilinguals is defining what is meant by the terms bilingualism and bilingual. Bloomfield’s (1933) definition of bilingualism as “full native-like control of two languages” (p. 56) lies at one of the continuum of definitions used to discuss bilingualism. At the other extreme, Saunders (1988) defines a bilingual as a person who is “able to use two languages (for some or all of the skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing” (p. 6). A myriad of additional definitions exist that adapt some aspect of these two or fall somewhere in between.

Bilingualism is influenced by many factors and has many manifestations. Hamers and Blanc (2000) question definitions of bilingualism that do not take its multiple dimensions into account. Since bilingualism is directly related to the context of acquisition, bilinguals are often additionally classified based on initial age of exposure and developed bilingual competencies.

The initial age of exposure is one factor that heavily influences order of acquisition of languages. Simultaneous and sequential bilingualism are terms used to address the order in which children are exposed to languages. Generally simultaneous language acquisition refers to the process of learning two languages at one time while
sequential language acquisition applies to situations in which a second language is introduced some time after initial exposure to the first.

More specific definitions of bilingualism give exact information on the time and amount of exposure to each language required for a person to be classified into one of these categories. Scheffner Hammer, Miccio, and Rodriguez (2004) state that sequential bilingualism occurs when the “child is exposed to one language in infancy and the second sometime later” (p. 22). While Scheffner Hammer et al. consider simultaneous language acquisition a result of more or less equal exposure from birth, Grosjean (1982) classifies simultaneous bilinguals as those who acquire two languages before age three and sequential bilinguals as those who acquire the second language after three (p. 36).

Bilinguals are also classified by the competencies they are able to develop in their respective languages. The terms receptive, passive, productive, and active are employed to describe bilingual competencies. Receptive or Passive Bilinguals can “understand (and possibly read) the minority language” while Productive or Active Bilinguals can “talk and possibly write in both languages” (Döpke, 1992, p. 3). Passive bilinguals are still considered to be bilingual provided that they continue to be exposed to the minority language and have age appropriate passive skills (Döpke, 1992).

Due to the dynamic nature of bilingualism, receptive skills provide a solid base for developing the productive language skills. Children’s language production is directly related to their need for communication in that language. Being able to understand a language does not necessarily mean that there will be any need for a child to productively use the language; however “passive language skills can easily be activated when the linguistic environment changes and a real need for speaking the minority language is experienced by the child” (Döpke, 1992, p. 3).

An additional set of terms used to describe bilingualism have to do with comparing a language user’s perceived proficiency in both their languages. Balanced bilingualism refers to comparable skill level across languages whereas dominance occurs when a person is more proficient in one of the languages (Kohnert, 2004). Language dominance, which will be discussed further in a separate section, occurs when productive skills are utilized to a greater degree in one language.
Classifying children as bilinguals is an even more difficult task due to the fact that children’s developing linguistic systems are still developing and their “knowledge of any language is partial at best” (Bialystock, 2001, p. 1). Individual experiences in each language are directly related to the competencies children develop. According to Bialystock (2001), children who are placed in situations in which they are exposed to more than one language have specific “kinds of interactions with each language, interact in different types of social situations with each, encounter different opportunities for formal study, and may also develop different kinds of attitudes toward each language” (p. 3). These varied experiences lead children to different degrees of competence or “functional fluency” in each language (Bialystock, 2001, p. 20).

In order to understand bilingualism, the social and cultural factors in the home and outside environment must also be taken into account (Goldstein, 2004). According to Goldstein (2004), social and cultural factors that have an influence on bilingual development include “parental language input, the community in which the children are raised, parents’ beliefs about language development, child rearing practices and environmental factors” (p. 21). These factors not only make an impact on the amount of input a child will receive in a given language but also have an impact on the attitudes he or she develops about each language.

**Measuring Bilingualism**

Throughout the twentieth century many researchers claimed that bilingualism had detrimental affects on the cognitive abilities of children (Barke, 1933; Dunn, 1987; Jones & Stewart, 1951; Kittel, 1959; Macnamara, 1967; Saer, 1923; Smith, 1923; Yoshioka, 1929). Bilingualism was considered to be unnatural and morally and intellectually damaging to a child (Dodson, 1983; Schmidt, 2000), and bilingual children were not expected to succeed in school (Dodson, 1983; Jespersen, 1922). Abundance of negative beliefs about bilingualism continued until bias in testing of intellectual capabilities of bilingual children was revealed (Peal & Lambert, 1962). Testing in studies such as Doyle, Champagne & Segalowitz (1977), Peal & Lambert (1962) and Smith (1949) have shown that “the fact that bilingual children do not have twice the number of words in their vocabulary as monolinguals does not impair their ability to communicate” (Romaine,
Their total repertoire of vocabulary is based on the experiences they have in the two different languages.

Measures used to assess bilingual children are often invalid because they only assess one portion of the individual’s communicative repertoire. According to Romaine (2000), a bilingual’s language abilities can not be assessed as if he or she were a combination of two monolinguals. Intelligence tests are often misused because “there has been a tendency to regard bilingual competence as the sum of the acquisition of monolingual competence in each of the two languages rather than as a unitary system which allows the pooling of resources across two languages” (Romaine, 2000, p. 258). Bilingual children have been shown to have vocabularies equivalent to those of monolingual children when both of their languages are considered in measuring their total lexicon (Hamers & Blanc, 2000).

According to Romaine (2000), selection of correct answers on tests is highly dependent on an individual’s life experiences:

Just because children do not choose the answers which the testers decide are the correct ones does not mean that their early experience is deprived or that they are unintelligent. It just means that they have not had the experiences which the tests focus on. (p. 220)

Due to the fact that intelligence tests are linked to context and culture, students will earn scores based on the experiences they have had. Romaine (2000) explains the necessity of interpreting test results based on the context of their sociolinguistic background. Intelligence and achievement tests often contain quantitative test items that measure vocabulary size, response time, spelling accuracy, mastery of complex syntax, and punctuation. Bilingual students’ success in these areas will be directly linked to classroom instruction. Often times items are included that are not explicitly covered in classes. Romaine (2000) asserts that is unfair and questionable to “separate analytically different aspects of language competence without reference to the context of use” (p. 235).

Peal and Lambert’s (1962) landmark study revealed previous bias in research that reported negative cognitive effects associated with bilingualism. Since then research has established that there are cognitive benefits associated with childhood bilingualism.
These include greater metalinguistic awareness, greater capacity for divergent thinking (creativity), extra sensitivity to semantic relationships, heightened awareness of phonological and linguistic rules and structures, heightened awareness of the systematicity of language, superior verbal fluency in storytelling, and greater cognitive maturity (Bain & Yu, 1980; Bialystock, 2001; Clyne, 1987; Döpke, 1992; Doyle, et. al, 1977; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985; Levy, 1985; Pleh, Jaronvinskij, & Balajan, 1987; Scheffner Hammer et al., 2004). In addition, bilingual children learn to separate word and referent at an early age (Hakuta & Diaz, 1985). Hakuta and Diaz (1985) explain that “because bilingualism induces an early separation of word and referent, it is possible that bilingual children also develop an early capacity to focus on and analyze the structural properties of language” (p. 322). Döpke (1992) reports that in the past twenty years negative developmental effects related to bilingualism have only been reported in a few studies. However these conclusions could be attributed to factors other than bilingualism such as socioeconomic status, language prejudices, social groups, and self esteem.

**Contexts for Bilingual Language Acquisition**

The language used in the home and the languages that are used in the environment set the context for bilingual development (Ben Zeev, 1977; Clyne 1972, Döpke, 1992; Grosjean, 1982; Romaine, 1995). Bilingualism is influenced by the language parents and caregivers use with their children, social and psychological factors, amount and quality of linguistic exposure, and social support in the community (De Houwer, 1990; Döpke 1992; Grosjean, 1982; Lanza 1997, Pérez-Bazán, 2005). In addition, the native languages of the parents and the relation of parent languages to dominant community languages also have an impact on bilingual development (De Houwer, 2004).

Children acquire language necessary to communicate with those around them. According to Döpke (1992), children “will learn to use the language if they have a need to understand it, i.e. if one or more people who are important to the children will consistently use the minority language in interaction with them” (p. 55). Since home environment has such a direct impact on bilingual development, previous research has identified home and community contexts in which bilingual language acquisition occurs.
Romaine (1999) lists identifies six different home and community contexts of bilingualism. These contexts, which could occur naturally or be planned as strategies for raising bilingual children, lead to different input and interactional patterns. The first of these strategies is known as One-person-one-language (Döpke, 1992; DeHower, 1990; Leopold, 1947; Ronjat, 1913; Romaine, 1999; Taeschner, 1983). In this type of bilingual home setting, each parent has a different native language they use with the child. Each parent is somewhat proficient in each language. Also, the dominant language of one of the parents is the dominant language of the environment in which they live. A second type of childhood bilingualism is known as Non-Dominant home language or One language-one environment (Fantini, 1985). In this type of situation parents have different native languages with one of their native languages being the dominant language of the community. Both parents, however, speak the non-dominant language to the child in the home. Two naturally occurring linguistic environments are often the linguistic realities for children of immigrants. The phenomenon of Non-dominant home language without community support occurs when the native language of the parents (which is the same) is not the dominant language of the community (Oksaar, 1977). Double non-dominant home language without community support is the case when parents have different native languages but neither of their languages is that of the community (Hoffman, 1985). A fifth type of childhood bilingualism is Non-native parents (Döpke, 1992; Saunders 1982, 1988). This type of bilingualism occurs when both parents have the same native language that is the dominant language of the community. In order to raise the child bilingually one of the parents addresses the child in a language that is not their native language.

Romaine (1999) also includes Mixed Languages as a home context for childhood bilingualism. This occurs when the parents are bilingual and parts of the community are bilingual as well. Parents do not employ any type of language strategy but freely use either language or code-switch (Smith, 1935; Burling, 1959). Romaine (1999) states that this is a very common type of bilingualism because of the multilingual nature of the most of the world. This type of bilingualism, however, is not often represented in the literature due to the fact that most investigations are done by linguists who conduct studies on their
own children’s bilingual development within environments in which the linguistic roles of parents are predetermined.

Grosjean (1982) also mentions different strategies that are employed for the sake of bilingual development, which include sequential exposure to language and interchangeable use of two languages based on context. An example of a German-Peruvian child whose parents started off his language experiences with German in order to delay the speaking of the majority language for two years is provided (Grosjean, 1982). Interchangeable use of two languages based on context and topic is an additional strategy. Grosjean also mentions the language time approach in which different languages are used in different time periods such as “one language in the morning and the other in the afternoon or one language during the week and the other during the weekend” (p. 174).

Despite differing linguistic roles of the parents and community support for each language, Bhatia and Ritchie (1999) argue that the defining factor in bilingual language acquisition is whether or not children are receiving heterogeneous input:

The input to the bilingual children is always divided, so that the quantity of his or her exposure to each language is much smaller at any given time than that of the monolingual child and, in addition, the input from each language is intermittent with that from the other. (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999, p. 572)

An additional dimension concerns the actual relationships that parents and family members have with their children. “Interactive styles of the parents are likely to have an effect on the child’s acquisition of two languages…The child’s language development will reflect the nature of the emotional bond between child and parent” (Romaine, 1999, p. 269). If a child spends more time or has more interaction with one parent, the child will develop that particular language faster (Döpke 1992; Kielhöfer & Jonekeit 1983). Also, parents who have a more child-centered interactive approach will help to develop their children’s language skills. Scheffner Hammer et al. (1994) reference the fact that Mexican American mothers may see their parental roles as ‘mothering’ rather than ‘teaching,’ and this can make an impact on bilingual development. Based on this information, Romaine (1999) summarizes that “quality of input is more important than amount” (p. 269). Parents’ emotional bonds with their children, the amount of time they
Linguistic Systems in Bilingual Children

Whether or not children separate their multiple linguistic systems at the initial stages of speech production has been highly debated within the field of bilingual language acquisition (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999). Two main hypotheses seek to address this issue: the unitary hypothesis and the dual system hypothesis.

The unitary hypothesis (also known as the single or initial one-system hypothesis) posits that bilingual children initially have one language system which gradually separates into two separate systems (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999). Volterra and Taeschner (1978) and Taeschner (1983) articulated a three step process for language differentiation in bilinguals acquiring two languages from infancy. The first stage consists of one lexical system with words from both languages. In this stage children often do not know corresponding words in each language. During the second stage the lexicon is differentiated:

The child distinguishes two different lexicons, but applies the same syntactic rules to both languages. For almost any word in one language, the child has a corresponding word in the other language. Moreover, words drawn from the two lexicons no longer occur together in constructions. (Volterra & Taeschner, 1978, p. 312)

Later, in the third stage, the lexicon and syntax are differentiated and each is associated with a person who uses it. Additional research supports the idea of a single initial lexical system (Arnberg, 1987; Grosjean, 1982; Hayashi & Klausen, 1990; Leopold 1947; Meisel, 1989; Redlinger & Park, 1980; Saunders, 1982; Taeschner, 1983; Vihman, 1986).

The Independent Development Hypothesis (also known as the dual system or autonomous hypothesis) asserts that those acquiring bilingualism from infancy initially develop two differentiated language systems provided that the input is fairly even in both languages (Bergman, 1977). Researchers claim that absence of translational pairs of lexical items at the early stages of language development does not mean that children are not able to communicate about these equivalent terms in each language (De Houwer, 1995). Questioning the idea of a single lexical system in the first stage, additional
research shows that in the early stages of language development children actually do produce translational pairs (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999; De Houwer, 1990; Quay, 1993). The idea of a second stage in which lexicon is differentiated but syntactical rules are applied to both languages has also been challenged (Meisel, 1989). In support of the independent development hypothesis, research has shown that some children develop the two languages separately (DeHouwer, 1990; Nair, 1984; Paradis & Genesee, 1996, Schlyter, 1990).

Slobin’s (1973) Cognitive Complexity Hypothesis suggests that simpler forms are acquired before more complex forms and that the age of acquisition of any grammatical feature depends on its complexity. Döpke (1992) claims that because the complexity of grammatical structures differs from language to language “what is acquired early in one language might be acquired late in another language” (p. 6). Frequency of occurrence in input has also been show to affect rate of acquisition. De Houwer’s (1990) subject Kate first acquired the most frequently used forms in Dutch and English respectively as she developed both languages indicating that frequency of occurrence of forms is related to rate of acquisition.

*Bilingual Language Development*

Romaine (2001) asserts that a normal developmental sequence has not been established for monolingual or bilingual children: “there is no general agreement among child language researchers about the ‘normal’ course of development among monolingual, let alone bilingual, children” (p. 236). However many linguists agree that general patterns of language development are similar for monolinguals and bilinguals (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999; Bialystock, 2001; De Houwer, 1990: Grosjean, 1982; Lindholm, 1980; Meisel, 1986; Padilla & Lindholm, 1984; Taeschner, 1983). Bilingual children go through stages of development that are similar to monolingual children. In the same manner that monolingual children do, bilingual children pass through an initial period in which they babble, then proceed to a one word stage, a two word stage and a multiple word stage (De Houwer, 1990; Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999). Bhatia and Ritchie (1999) assert that “no study has suggested that the sequence of such stages is different in bilingual children from in monolinguals” (p. 591). Approximate ages for the occurrence of these
stages of linguistic development in bilingual children correspond to those for monolingual children.

Bhatia and Ritchie (1999) report that underlying principles and mechanisms of bilingual development are not different from those related to monolingual development, and similarities have been reported in terms of phonological, lexical and morphosyntactic development. In terms of phonology bilingual children must be able to function with two separate phonological systems. These phonological systems are generally acquired separately. Lexical development occurs in a similar way in monolingual and bilingual children, with both groups going through similar processes of overextension and underextension of lexical items (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999). Bilingual children, however, have access to lexical information in an additional language, which can affect the rate of lexical development (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999).

According to Bialystock (2001), despite the fact that monolingual and bilingual children are cognitively and linguistically different, they have “striking similarities” in that they “follow more or less the same process or more or less the same schedule” (p. 88). Although development seems to occur on a similar timetable, differences arrive in cognitive skills as the two systems develop.

Conceptions of Bilingualism

Other models of bilingualism emphasize development as the result of interactional experiences (Hamers, 2004; Kohnert 2004). Hamers (2004) proposes a sociocognitive model of bilingual development that explains the different developmental outcomes associated with varied bilingual experiences. She discusses the acquisition of bilinguality, or the “acquisition of two codes perceived as socially distant by the linguistic community” (p. 82). Hamers claims that language development, monolingual or bilingual, is dependent on three factors: “language socialization processes, the development of functions for which language will be used, and the existence of language-behavior models in the child’s environment” (p. 70). Hamers and Blanc (2000) state that incorporating both languages for daily use leads to valorization, which they define as the “attribution of certain positive values to a language as a functional tool, that is as an instrument that will facilitate the fulfillment of social and cognitive functioning at all societal and individual levels” (p. 18).
Depending on the languages spoken in the child’s environment, he or she will valorize language functions and “be motivated to learn and use language for all or some of the functions” (Hamers, 2004, p. 95). This model rests in the idea that complex mapping occurs in which children map language forms with the functions they need to accomplish (Bates & MacWhinney, 1982). When children acquire bilinguality simultaneously, they valorize functions in both languages and map both appropriate forms to the same function, whereas when children learn languages consecutively they first map form to function in one language and later learn an alternative form to fulfill the same function (Hamers, 2004).

Kohnert (2004) defines two stages of language development that monolingual children experience. During the first wave of development children, amass “linguistic forms such as sounds and words, and rules for how these forms can be combined in the language” (Kohnert, 2004, p. 55). She states that this accumulation of knowledge is dependent on experiences in each language. During the second wave or stage of development a child actually learns how to use these rules to engage in conversation. This stage is “characterized by gains in the efficiency with which known information is used” (p. 56).

Romaine (1999) points out that social context may have more impact on development than the complexity of grammatical features. She argues that “many of those who have argued for a link between complexity and order of emergence have not taken account of the fact that social context is an important mediator” (p. 267) in acquisition. A particular grammatical feature may appear first in speech due to its frequency of use in particular social contexts.

**Language Separation and Domain Allocation**

Finding a bilingual with abilities that are exactly equal in each language is a difficult if not impossible task (Kohnert, 2004; Romaine 2000). This is due to the fact that bilingual individuals allocate specific languages to different tasks leading to different degrees of competence in each language. According to Romaine (2000),

Where bilingualism exists at the societal or individual level, the two languages are functionally differentiated and coexist in a diglossic relationship. In such
situations the same competence does not develop in both languages or varieties, although together they bear the same functional load as one language does in a monolingual community. (p. 46)

Language allocation is related to the specific situations in which each language is used as bilingual individuals allocate different languages to specific domains. Romaine (2000) defines a domain as “an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings, and role relationships” (p. 44). Sociolinguists have created a basic framework for which includes five domains of language use including language used within the family, friendship, religion, employment and education (Romaine, 2000). These domains have been divided further in more complex frameworks for domain allocation.

Domain allocation is often related to strategies for developing bilingual proficiency in children. Many assert that children need consistency in language use within certain domains in order to fully develop the ability to process two languages separately (Clyne 1987; Keihlhofer & Jonekeit 1983; Leopold 1947; McLaughlin 1978; Ronjat, 1913; Saunders 1982; Taeschner 1983).

Language Choice refers to which language or languages a person actually chooses to use in communicative interaction. Language choice is also often based on the particular domain in which a person is interacting (Romaine, 2000). Factors affecting language choice include attitudes of the family, the school and the society at large. Also included are specific situations and the people participating in the conversation.

In addition to one parent- one language approach previously mentioned other strategies for raising bilingual children based on domain allocation include: one place- one language, in which one language is used in a certain place such as the living room and another language elsewhere; a language time approach in which one language is used during specific times of the day and the second language during other times; and a topic related approach in which a particular language is associated with particular topics (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999).

Identified limitations to using domain allocation as a teaching strategy for children include an unnatural pattern of input, possible imbalance of exposure to both languages, and difficulty in maintaining the proposed pattern of input (Scheffner Hammer
et al., 2004). In addition such an unnatural context for language development may lead to an environment which is socially unnatural. Acquiring a language in a contrived context could impede the development of pragmatic competence (Scheffner Hammer et al., 2004). For this reason some conclude that the development of bilingualism requires continuous language use in naturalistic settings (Kessler, 1984).

**Language dominance, maintenance and choice**

Differences in amounts of exposure to both languages will result in dominance in one of the languages over time (Scheffner Hammer et al., 2004). Dominance occurs when a bilingual has superior proficiency in one of two languages (Kohnert, 2004). Language dominance is not a static entity (Döpke, 1992; Grosjean, 1982; Scheffner Hammer et al., 2004). Patterns of dominance change as context changes: “A child’s fluency in one language or another may be subject to temporary progression or regression when there is a change in his or her language environment” (Scheffner Hammer et al., 2004, p. 25). Age and degree of proficiency in the languages when the change in environment occurs are two factors that make an impact on the way in which the child continues to use each of the languages (Scheffner Hammer et al., 1994).

In order to maintain the weaker language, it is established that the child must have a need to use it in everyday life (Burling, 1959; Grosjean, 1982). If this need does not exist, it is possible that the non-dominant system will be lost. Bilingual children are subject to environmental changes that can result in attrition or language loss (Kessler, 1984; Schlyter, 1993). *Language loss* is a phenomenon in which “L1 skills stagnate and then regress with relative disuse” (Kohnert, 2004, p. 56). Grosjean (1982) concludes the following:

Bilingualism in childhood usually occurs because of the need to communicate with those who play an important role in the child’s life- parents, siblings, other family members, peers and teachers. As long as these factors are important to the child, he or she will remain bilingual; when they loose their importance or are removed altogether, the child will naturally revert to monolingualism. (p. 179) Psycho-social factors, including the use of language in the family or in school may actually be more influential on language development than age of initial exposure to the language (Grosjean, 1982).
Community support for bilingual development is another factor that plays into children developing bilingualism (Scheffner Hammer et al, 1994). In an environment where monolingualism is the norm and there is an absence of community support for the non-dominant language, it is estimated that children need to receive input from both of their parents in the minority language 90% of the time in order to maintain the non-dominant language (Pérez-Bazán, 2005). Within a given domain, there may be competing pressures that push a person toward the use of one language or another (Romaine, 2000). “In cases such as these, the setting takes precedence over role relationship and the speaker chooses the language associated with that setting or the role relationship takes precedence and the speaker uses the language associated with it” (Romaine, 2000, p. 45). Additionally bilinguals may lose the non-dominant system and never truly become proficient in the dominant language of the community either. This phenomenon is referred to as semilingualism (Kohnert, 2004) or limited bilingualism (Scheffner Hammer, et. al., 2004).

Linton (2004) proposes a Critical Mass model of bilingualism which incorporates that idea that social-cultural context is the most important factor in maintaining bilingualism. Following Stevens (1992), she states that due to the communicative value of language, “speaking a particular language is valuable to an individual only to the extent that others nearby speak the same language” (Linton, 2004, p. 286). This is a type of tipping model that implies that individuals have choices, but collective choices have an impact on the choices that a particular person makes. Without this support it is difficult to maintain bilingualism unless there is a strong individual motivation to do so: “Absent an individual-level motive (e.g., having a Spanish monolingual in the household, maintaining business or family connections in a Spanish speaking country), most bilinguals will not actively maintain their Spanish or teach it to their children” (Linton, 2004, p. 286). However when there are others in the community, critical mass can make an impact. “A critical mass augments the group-level incentive for bilingualism and monolingualism in that one can add ‘lots of people are doing this’ or ‘enough people are doing this to make it worthwhile’ to the benefits attributed to a particular choice” (Linton, 2004, p. 286).
Language maintenance is often discussed within the context of the historical perspective and the language loss of communities in language contact (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Fishman, 1985; Gal, 1979; Weinrich, 1953). It has been established that unless immigrant children live in isolation with their families, they will speak the dominant language of the community by the second to fourth generation (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Sharwood-Smith, 1983; Weltens, 1987). Based on Saville Troike’s (1986) study, Blum-Kulka (1997) reports that three year-old immigrants to the United States could barely produce their native tongue by the age of 6 even if it was used by parents in the home (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p. 221).

Patterns of language use within bilingual families and communities have a direct impact on the degrees of languages proficiencies children will develop as well as ways in which these proficiencies will be maintained by the children. According to Blum-Kulka (1997), “in order to understand bilingual language maintenance it is necessary to understand how actual bilingual discourse of the families promotes bilingualism as a goal of language socialization” (p. 221).

In a different type of bilingualism, Circumstantial bilinguals are forced to acquire a second language in order to survive within an immigrant situation in which their native language has little prestige (Valdés & Figueroa, 1994). Valdés and Figueroa (1994) state that “the nature and type of language proficiency individuals acquire…depends on factors such as generational level, age, occupation, opportunity for contact with speakers of English, exposure to English media, and so on” (p. 15). For successive generations of immigrants proficiency will be determined by the range of opportunities they have for interaction in each language.

López (2005) identifies factors that influence language choice in the homes of Latino immigrants in the United States. Three of these factors include immigration status, motivation for achievement, and educational levels of parents. According to López (2005), parents who have been in the United States for a short time continue to teach their children Spanish simply because they have a better grasp of the language. She also concludes that the higher level of education parents have the more likely they are to find methods to supplement instruction in both languages. The idea that parents are directly responsible for children’s motivation to learn languages is also supported by López:
“Children whose parents believe bilingualism is an asset and provide children with the resources to become bilingual perform well on tasks in both languages” (p. 1382). Effort on the part of the parents is vital to the maintenance of the non-dominant community language.

First language skills can have an impact on development of skills in a second or weaker language. The interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 1984) links abilities a child is able to develop in the second language to their native language abilities. Pearson and Oller (1984) state that “a strong foundation in the first may facilitate second language development, which in turn may facilitate educational success, even in the second language” (p. 13).

**Language Mixing**

When languages are in contact, users combine them as they communicate. A variety of terms such as mixing, borrowing, and code-switching are employed to describe this phenomenon (Romaine, 1999). A general definition of code-switching would be using more than one language or language variety within the same utterance or discourse. While some view code-switching as evidence of language development in progress, others consider it a manifestation of an individual’s complete language repertoire. Possible explanations for code-switching in child language include deficiency in one language, fusion of linguistic systems or employment of whatever means necessary to convey meaning (Bialystock, 2001).

Bhatia and Ritchie (1999) differentiate the terms code-mixing (CM) and code-switching (CS) with code-mixing referring to intra-sentential mixing and code-switching referring to inter-sentential mixing. Intra-sentential mixing refers to mixing of languages within a single sentence whereas inter-sentential mixing means switching that occurs from one sentence to another. In this perspective, code-switching and code-mixing are the result of the interaction of two fully developed linguistic systems and do not apply to the use of multiple codes by children whose linguistic systems are not differentiated (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999). Some have taken intra-sentential code-switching as a result of lack of language proficiency (Weinrich, 1953).

The claim has been made that code-mixing is evidence that two linguistic systems are under development and have not yet been differentiated (Genesee, 1989; Volterra &
Taescher, 1978). Others argue that true code-switching occurs once there are already two established linguistic systems and are is not related to fusion or the inability to separate two separate systems (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999; Meisel, 1995). Meisel (1995) proposes that the term mixing be restricted to errors in language choice on the part of a child already possessing two grammatical systems.

Some researchers claim that mixing and switching cannot be used as evidence of separation or fusion of languages (DeHouwer, 1990; Genesee, 1989; Romaine, 1999). Bilingual children can be seen as using language in the same fashion as monolingual children to fill in gaps when they do not know how to express something (De Houwer, 1990; Deuchar & Quay, 2000; Goodz, 1989). “Just as monolinguals will use a close but incorrect label for an object they want to talk about so too will bilingual children use an item from their other language when it is necessary to express their current meaning” (Bialystock, 2001, p. 109).

Muysken (2000) questions the assumption that a single language should be used for expression of a thought and that code-switching is evidence of limited language proficiency. She states that the idea of employing multiple grammars and lexicons “is often seen as a threat, a disruption, a malady” (p. 1). Questioning the necessity of domain allocation for language teaching, Muysken refers to early studies on childhood bilingualism such as Ronjat (1913) and Leopold (1949) and summarizes their one parent-one language approach to bilingualism: “…bilingualism within the family is ok, but it should remain tidy” (p. 1). Muysken (2000) refutes claims that intra-sentential code-switching results from lack of language proficiency by citing studies such as Poplack (1980) and Nortier (1990) that reveal frequent switching within sentences in ordinary conversation among bilinguals proficient in both languages.

Muysken (2000) identifies processes related to intra-sentential code-mixing as insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Insertion occurs when items from one language are placed into another or “insertion of material (lexical items or entire constituents) from one language into a structure form the other language” (Muysken, 2000, p. 3). Alternation occurs when a speaker uses one language and then the next. Congruent lexicalization is the “insertion of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure” (Muysken, 2000, p. 3). Romaine (1998) agrees that
the use of more than one linguistic code at one time provides the speaker with increased opportunities for expression. “One way of surviving culturally in immigration settings is to exploit rather than stifle the endless variety of meaning afforded by participation in several discourse communities at once” (Kramsch, 1998, p. 70). Kramsch (1998) defines *language crossings* as “choosing one way of talking over another depending on the topic, the interlocutor, or the situational context” (p. 70). Language crossings include switching of codes, the insertion of elements from one language into another, whether they are isolated words, sentences, or prosodic features of speech (Kramsch, 1998; Muysken, 2004).

Blum-Kulka (1997) broadens the definition of code-switching to include changes made from both the perspective of the *speaker* and from the perspective of the *floor*. The perspective of the speaker refers to whether or not an individual changes codes within a turn or in subsequent turns. The perspective of the floor refers to whether or not there has been an alternation in the language of the conversation.

It is established that code-mixing can serve as an act of identity to strengthen a relationship with a person from a similar linguistic background and to establish solidarity (Auer, 1984, 1989; Cromdal, 2004; Cromdal & Aronsson, 2000; Jørgensen 1998; Kramsch, 1998; Paugh, 2005; Rampton, 1998; Woolard, 1995). On the other hand, a person can also choose to use language to create distance between two speakers. Kramsch (1998) states that:

Speakers who belong to several cultures insert the intonation of one language into the prosody of another, or use phrases from one language as citational inserts into the other to distance themselves from alternative identities or to mock several cultural identities by stylizing, parodizing, or stereotyping them all if it suits their social purposes of the moment. (p. 71)

The employment of components of a person’s full linguistic repertoire can be employed as needed to accomplish an individual’s communicative goals in a particular situation.

**Narrative Development in Bilinguals**

Analysis of the developmental process of narrative skills has not been conducted for bilingual children. According to Uchikoshi (2005), "most studies of Spanish-English bilinguals' narrative performance, i.e. Guiterrez-Clellan (2002) have focused on cross
language comparison, not on charting the developmental process involved” (p. 4).

Pearson (2002) reports on her analysis of narrative skills bilingual children in Miami. In her 2002 study children were asked to create a story or extended discourse that was later analyzed as a whole and as a sum of its grammatical parts. A direct relationship was found between narrative abilities in both languages. However, in examining the individual elements that make up narrative abilities in both languages Pearson (2002) found that there were differences in language skills such as morpho syntactic accuracy and lexicon. “The narrative/discourse elements showed carry-over across languages while specific language elements did not” (Pearson, 2002, p. 149). As monolingual children aged Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) increased as their overall narratives got shorter revealing their ability to more efficiently express information. Bilingual children had an even more statistically significant increase in MLU however their narratives increased in length during this time period. Pearson (2002) summarizes that the bilingual children performed at age appropriate levels in “difficult tasks like creating a unified plot, motivating events through reference to internal states, and providing narrator’s comments on the unfolding story” (p. 169).

Young children often mix languages in multilingual settings in order to structure play activities and negotiate meanings and rights (Halmari & Smith, 1994; Kwan-Terry, 1992; Paugh, 2005). In addition they may change languages for the purposes of clarification, emphasis, or to gain or maintain attention (Goodz, 1989; Lanza, 1997; Paugh, 2005). In play activities, children often change registers in order to embody characters and to narrate events within the pretend scenario. “Children distinguish roles using language features that index salient characteristics of the way individuals speak” (Paugh, 2005, p. 64). Studies have shown children to use adult registers to participate in play in which they mimic adult activities (Andersen, 1990, 1996; Hoyle, 1998). Paugh (2005) explains that when children employ different registers and varieties use language varieties in play and other activities this gives “insight into their emergent understandings of linguistic variation and multilingualism, language attitudes, and the links between language and social identity” (p. 64). The fact that children employ different linguistic features is evidence that they are aware of their uses in society and may recognize the implications for using each linguistic feature.
Sociocultural Theory

The work of Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1896-1932) views cognitive development as being sociocultural in nature. Vygotsky asserts that human development is a product of the socio-historical environment. According to Vygotsky (1981) “development appears twice. First on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category” (p. 194).

A central premise of Vygotskyian sociocultural theory is that people use tools to mediate their worlds (Block, 2003; Lantolf, 2000; Van Lier, 2000). Van Lier (2000) explains that “in Vygotsky’s vision of human development, language and thought emerge (and merge) through the child’s engagement in human activity, both with physical objects and artifacts (tools), and with social, historical and cultural practices” (p. 254). Humans use psychological or symbolic tools such as language to mediate thoughts and relationships in the same way that physical tools are used to control the environment. These physical and psychological tools are left to successive generations as artifacts and each generation adapts these tools to meet their current needs (Lantolf, 2000).

Vygotsky reasons that since mediational tools are passed from generation to generation, human development can be studied at four historical levels or domains (Lantolf, 2000; Block, 2001). This is known as a genetic approach to the study of development. The four interlocking levels at which development can be studies are the phylogenetic level, which examines the development of the species; the sociocultural level, which allows for study of how different cultures’ tools affect the type of mediation favored; the ontogenetic level, which allows for study of development over one human lifetime; and the microgenetic level, which addresses “changes taking place over the span of weeks, days, hours or even seconds” (Block, 2001, p. 100). Observation within the microgenetic domain allows an observer to see developmental changes over a short period of time. Within the microgenetic domain, “interest is in the reorganization and development of mediation over a relatively short span of time (for example, being trained to criteria at the outset of a lab experiment; learning a word, sound or grammatical feature of a language)” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 3).
Kasper (2001) states that, “examining novices in interaction with expert participants affords a view on the microgenesis of cognitive processes” (p. 34). This type of interaction can be analyzed as actual learning in process if the origin of cognitive functions is in social relationships. In relation to language acquisition, actual development can be seen in progress as learners interact with peers integrating new linguistic features as they work toward the goal of communication.

Language is one of the major symbolic or psychological tools that humans use to mediate cognition (Block, 2003; Lantolf, 2000; Van Lier, 2000). Self-regulation occurs through language and the process of internalization. Internalization occurs when socially mediated activities are reconstructed on the inner, psychological plane. It is “the process through which higher forms of mentation come to be” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 13). Lantolf (2000) explains that

at first the activity of individuals is organized and regulated (i.e. mediated) by others, but eventually, in normal development we come to organize and regulate our own mental and physical activity through appropriation of the regulatory means employed by others. At this point psychological functioning comes under the voluntary control of the person. (p. 14)

Van Lier (2000) summarizes Vygotsky’s position that “the development of higher mental functions is possible because of an increasing interdependence of speech and thought, and because it is mediated by signs (including, but not only, linguistic ones)” (p. 254). Internalization occurs as individuals move from being regulated by objects or others to being self regulated (Block, 2001). Although there is an initial need for objects or others in the accomplishment of tasks over time an individual may be gain the ability to complete the task on their own. Other regulation occurs when a child develops by carrying out tasks with the assistance of a more skilled peer. Self-regulation occurs when the learner can then function autonomously. In other words learners gradually move from performance that is externally regulated to performance that is regulated internally.

Vygotsky’s notion of children’s speech as being social in nature is in contrast to Piaget’s notion of speech as being egocentric, useless and insignificant in child behavior (Corsaro, 2005). Vygotsky sees language development as occurring from the social to the private as private speech becomes internalized.
The Zone of Proximal Development as established by Vygotsky (1978) is the “distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under the guidance of another human being” (Block, 2001, p. 101). Vygotsky (1978) states that “what is in the zone of proximal development today will be the actual developmental level tomorrow—that is, what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow” (p. 87). By working with a more capable peers, or even peers of approximate developmental levels (Ohta, 1995; Wertsch, 1985), learners are able to move toward higher levels of development. Wertsch (1985) shows how children engaged in a task such as putting together a puzzle initially under the direction of their parent’s verbal guidance are later able to appropriate that language in order to complete the activity themselves.

Scaffolding is the process by which a person who is more skilled works with a less skilled participant (Block, 2001; Lantolf, 2000; McCafferty, 2003). The more skilled participant “promotes the novice’s appropriation of new knowledge by co-constructing it with him or her through shared activity” (Block, 2001, p. 101). This metaphor has been extended to address ways in which peers may work with each other (Ohta, 1995; Wells, 1999). Cumming-Potvin et. al (2003) use the term multi-tiered scaffolding to describe “sequenced partnerships involving at least three individuals” (p. 65) in which different group members take turns leading others in the accomplishment of a task and the co-construction of knowledge. When collaboration is required to complete a task all participants involved in an activity and aspects of the activity itself are potentially transformed (McCafferty, 2002).

According to McCafferty (2002), four areas of potential transformation related to the zone of proximal development include the transformation of the learner’s capacity to perform similar activities in the future, invention of new tools and modification of those already in the learner’s repertoire, transformation of the actual activity, and transformation of the social group. He asserts that immersion in a different language and culture in a naturalistic setting is a transformational process in itself. “Learning a new language-culture in a country where the L2 is dominant, that is, in naturalistic contexts, is
itself a transformational process that, as described by Vygotsky for children, moves from an interpersonal to an intrapersonal plane of development” (p. 192).

Private Speech

Private speech is defined as “speech that has social origins in the speech of others but that takes on a private or cognitive function” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 15). Children use private speech to mediate activities that they have not yet internalized.

Private speech occurs as a form of self-direction as someone is undertaking a difficult task. Inner speech is an internalized form of private speech. According to Lantolf (2000) inner speech develops as “private speech becomes sub vocal…looses its formal properties and condenses into pure meaning” (p. 15). However inner speech can resurface in the face of a difficult task as it is externalized to guide in the completion of the activity (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Lantolf, 2000). Vygotsky perceived children’s private speech not as evidence of their asocial nature but as internalization and intellectual development. McCafferty (2004) states that:

Vygotsky revolutionized Piaget’s notion of egocentric speech arguing that instead of revealing the asocial nature of children, it is a modality of thought stemming from the internalization of dialogic interaction as formed within specific cultural-historical contexts of activity, and thus that it is eminently social and, moreover, a critical aspect of intellectual development. (p. 1)

Vygotsky’s terms private and inner speech have also been applied to second language learning as learners use them in order to self regulate during the language acquisition process (McCafferty, 2004). Private Verbal Thinking is a category of private speech conceptualized by Centeno-Cortes and Jiménez Jiménez (2004) that specifically deals with verbal reasoning during the completion of a problem solving task.

Microgenetic analysis focusing on small scale development during the course of adult-child interactions has shown the forms of children’s egocentric speech in problem solving situations to be heavily dependent on the guidance provided by adults in earlier discourse (Hickmann, 2003, Wertsch 1991). Vermette, Harper, and Dimillio (2004) assert that children between the ages of four and eight benefit from collaborative peer activities. Although their development could be guided by an adult instead, children can enthusiastically engage in interactive play for multiple hours at a time.
Language Socialization

Through language children learn how to become members of a particular society. Language socialization, as defined by Ochs and Schieffelin (1986) refers to “socialization through language and to use language” (p. 2). Language socialization assumes that learning a language is part of the process of becoming a member of a society (Ochs, 2001). In addition to acquiring a linguistic code, learning a language is about learning how to function within a particular cultural group. Language socialization, according to Ochs, is “the process whereby children and other novices are socialized through language, part of such socialization being a socialization to use language, meaningfully, appropriately and effectively” (1996, p. 408). Within this framework, researchers seek to understand how someone uses the language to communicate within a specific culture or subculture. Acquisition of the ability to communicate effectively takes place through social interaction. Kasper (2001) states that

The locus of language socialization is concrete activities in which novices participate with experts—in the case of children, with peers, older siblings or adults—and in which they attain, through language use in interaction, sociocultural knowledge of specific activities and contexts as well as those of the wider society. (p. 42)

Some researchers consider sociocultural theory to be a theoretical foundation of language socialization in that “both perspectives emphasize the developmental roles of interaction and assisted performance in concrete socio-historical contexts.” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 44). While sociocultural theory centers on interaction and language as mediational tools for cognitive development, language socialization concentrates on the relationship between linguistic and cultural practices.

It is through interaction with adults and peers that children attain the cultural and linguistic capacity to function in society. In this same manner they acquire “ideologies about class, status, race, ethnicity, gender, morality and language itself” (Paugh, 2005, p. 65). This occurs because socio-cultural information is encoded in discourse (Labov, 1972; Ochs & Schieffelen, 1986). Due to the fact that linguistic structures are culturally organized, many features of discourse relay information about social order and the way a given group or society thinks about the world (Ochs & Schieffelen, 1986). Ochs and
Schiefflen (1986) state that “language in use is then a major if not the major tool for conveying sociocultural knowledge and a powerful medium of socialization” (p. 3).

Play

Through interactive play children develop both emotionally and linguistically while learning to become members of a particular society. Play situations create contexts for cultural and linguistic learning, exploration and socialization (Goodwin, 1990; Ochs & Schieffelen, 1986; Paugh, 2005). Play affords younger or less skilled participants the opportunity to imitate peers and older participants the chance to serve as leaders, director and mentors (Goodwin, 1990; Paugh, 2005). According to Kyrantis (2000, as cited in Paugh, 2005, p. 65),

Children’s play is not simply a process of imitating others or passively developing into an adult end state. It offers a context within which children can actively explore power dynamics, social rules, identities, and roles normally not accessible to them in everyday life when they are subordinate to adults.

Children’s play relates to the Zone of Proximal Development and L2 learning because of the adult roles children frequently assume in play (McCafferty, 2002; Sullivan 2000). Vygotsky (1966) states that play serves a purpose much greater than diversion for the child and is in fact the “leading source of development in the preschool years” (p. 6). Children engage in play activities in order to fulfill unrealizable goals through an imaginary situation (Vygotsky, 1966). According to Vygotsky, even play that happens in the preschool years is constructed according to the norms of the child’s social environment and is rule based. He states that “what passes unnoticed by the child in real life becomes a rule of behavior in play” (1966, p. 9). In play children engage in everyday activities which are beyond the realm of their current abilities (Vygotsky, 1978). It is through play that children learn to accomplish these activities on their own in the future: “A child’s greatest achievements are possible in play- achievements which tomorrow will become his average level of real action and his morality” (Vygotsky, 1966, p. 14). Preschool children also develop abstract thought through the creation of imaginary play situations (Vygotsky, 1966). According to Vygotsky (1978), within the context of play a child “always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior” (as cited in
McCafferty, 2002, p. 102). Children take on themes present in the adult world and embellish and reenact them (McCafferty, 2002).

**Types of Play**

Corsaro (2003) describes several different types of play: *spontaneous play*, *socio-dramatic play*, and *imaginative play*. *Spontaneous play* is generally not scripted or planned and takes place through verbal interaction. Corsaro (2003) states that “play activity emerges in the process of verbal negotiation; shared knowledge of the adult world, although referred to at times, is not relied upon continuously to structure the activity. In short the activity is highly creative and improvised” (p. 92). In spontaneous fantasy play children animate objects verbally describing actions as are acted out. Verbal description serves as cues for other participants as to what is occurring and how the episode may develop (Corsaro, 2003). In this type of play children move dolls or figures rather than actually embodying them and acting out the roles themselves.

Communicative strategies are employed within spontaneous fantasy play (Corsaro, 2003). Paralinguistic cues such as voice and pitch to structure play. According to Corsaro (2003), “In their talk, they use high pitch heavy stress at the end of utterances and rising intonation to mark that *they are the animals they are manipulating*” (p. 93). In other words play is structured not by an explicit verbal assignment of roles but by using pitch and intonation to engage others to participate via inanimate objects in the play session.

In *socio-dramatic play* children actually embody the characters they create and role play actions done by those characters. The collaborative pretend episodes produced in socio-dramatic play are related to experiences from their actual lives and are important for socio-emotional development. When children engage in role play they explore relationships between context and behavior through language. In addition children actually learn about the existence of roles. Corsaro (2005) summarizes:

In socio-dramatic play, children simultaneously (1) use, refine and expand a wide range of communicative skills; (2) collectively participate in and extend peer cultures; and (3) appropriate features of and develop an orientation to wider adult cultures. (p. 140)
Children also role play the actions of animals or fantasy characters in imaginative play. In these play episodes children create interactive routines in their peer culture based on the adult world and use language to embellish the adult models to address their own concerns and socio-emotional needs.

Cook (2000) employs the term make-believe to describe “The acting-out of an imaginary world by behaving as a character in it, and often by dressing up as one, too” (p. 39). This type of make believe play inherently involves language as children create imaginary worlds, negotiate roles and then interact verbally as those characters (Cook, 2000). Although language play is often a collaborative affair (Cekaite & Aronson, 2005), children often use language within the context of make believe when playing alone (Cook, 2000).

**Purposes of Play**

All of these types of play fall under the definition of pretend play given by Garvey (1990) as “Play in which children voluntarily transform the Here and Now, the You and Me, and the This or That, along with any potential for action that these components of a situation may have” (p. 82). It is through these play situations that children learn to communicate within groups of peers and in society in general. Children use language to structure and act out play situations (Paugh, 2005). In addition, it is used to assign or signal social roles (Paugh, 2005).

Children also use language in itself for entertainment. Cook (1997) defines language play as “play with sounds to create patterns of rhyme, rhythm, assonance, consonance, alliteration, etc. and play with grammatical structures to create parallelisms and patterns” (p. 170). There is also a semantic level to language play which includes “play with units of meaning, combining them in ways which create worlds” (Cook, 1997, p. 170). According to Saville-Troike (1989) “one of the greatest influences the peer group has on the acquisition of communicative competence in many languages comes through various kinds of speech play” (p. 250). Speech play, or language play, aids in the development of the linguistic system (Cook, 2000; Saville-Troike, 1989). In addition, language play allows children to practice adopting different social roles (Saville-Troike, 1989) and gives children experience in interpersonal relations (Cook, 2000). According to Saville-Troike (1989) some types of language play influence development of lexicon,
phonology and grammar while others “include games which provide license for children to play roles not appropriate in non-play contexts, games which allow nonviolent modes for expression of aggression and hostility, and games which reinforce cultural knowledge and values” (p. 250).

Play and language learning

Children’s speech play reveals information about the culture they are a part of and its social structure (Saville-Troike, 1989). Linguistic play that takes the form of manipulation of forms has been said to lead to storytelling, creation of images, and to provide a means of social interaction (Cook, 2000). The importance of language play to language acquisition has been established (Cazden, 1976; Chuvovsky, 1963; Garvey, 1977; Iwamura, 1980; Jakobson, 1980 Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 1976; Weir, 1962). Language play has also been show to have a direct impact on second language learning (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005; Wong Fillmore, 1979). Peer group interactions have been shown to afford ample opportunities language play within the context of classroom second language acquisition (Broner & Tarone, 2001; Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005; Rampton, 1999; Willet, 1995). Cook (2000) asserts that being able to play with language can be seen as “a necessary part of advanced proficiency” (p. 150).

Ritualized play has a role in socializing children into turn taking patterns. According to Garvey (1984) ritualized play is “made up of alternating turns-at-speaking, but the content, duration and intonational pattern of the turns are relatively invariant” (p. 53). Examples of ritualized play are seen in repetitive interactions that occur as play among children. An example of this type of interactional exchange is the I am not / You are too interchange (Garvey, 1984). Garvey reports that as two to three year old children participated in this type of interchange turns occurred over a period of 0.5 to 0.7 seconds with a standard intonation and rhythm. The switching pause (SP) between turns is short due to the structured nature of the interaction. This type of play “permits automatic turn exchange, since the context is set and each child knows when the other is finished and what he himself will say next” (p. 54). As children participate in naturally occurring conversations these turn taking procedures are integrated into their interactions. Garvey explains that in conversation switching pauses associated with repetitions and exchanges
of greetings are shorter whereas those associated with complex exchanges take longer between turns.

Evidence of peer interaction and its impact on the socialization of turn taking skills has also been shown (Garvey, 1984). Garvey (1984) found that children who are interacting with peers of approximately the same age do not engage in simultaneous speech in the same frequency as adult with instances of overlapping among peers rarely lasting longer than two words. However, when engaging in conversations with older peers or adults, children’s developing conversational skills may be insufficient. According to Garvey (1984), “The young child has difficulty in following fast-paced exchanges of two or more other people and this may intrude with messages that infringe on others’ turns or that are seen as irrelevant to ongoing talk” (p. 56). More opportunities for participation in a conversation, along with fewer instances of overlap allow a child to gain experience “with the requirements of transmitting and receiving talk” (Garvey, 1984, p. 56) and to learn to link his or her thoughts with those of a partner and present them in an understandable way.

One example of developing of pragmatic competence during play has to do with children learning to verbally respond to conflicts (Garvey, 1984). Through play children learn to attempt to resolve conflicts that arise during interactions. Garvey (1984) identifies eight categories of moves that can occur in response to conflict during play. These categories include compromise, which refers to resolution by sharing or turn taking; condition which refers to agreement of resolution upon meeting some additional condition; counter, which includes the proposal of an alternative plan; reason which is an attempted justification or explanation; request for explanation; mitigation or aggravation which includes involves adding please to a previously stated position or intensification of the request; insistence, and ignoring. Garvey (1984) states that certain types of moves on the part of one child lead to predictable responses from the other child.

According to Garvey (1984)
Several of the patterns of move sequences were so regular that a child could well derive the following practical rules from experiences of conflict with peers: 1) Insistence leads the partner to insist also. 2) Ignoring the partner’s message is most likely to result in the partner rephrasing the message. 3) A move that offers
compromise, a counterproposal, or even a condition for accepting the partner’s position is likely to lead the partner to end the conflict. 4) Supplying a reason for one’s position is likely to lead to a rigid or inflexible response. (p. 147)

Through actual interactions with other children a child is able to identify which types of responses will lead to effective responses thus building his or her ability to verbally resolve differences or disagreements that occur in conversation.

*Play and second language acquisition*

Much of the work related to play and second language learning considers play that takes place within a classroom setting. According to Cekaite and Aronsson (2005) collaborative language play among children learning a second language created opportunities for language practice and provided opportunities for attention to linguistic form. In their study, they show examples of what they see as informal peer language lessons that arise from language play and feature repair work, word definitions, explanations of language use, and opportunities for pushed output.

In her 2001 case study on the development of identity in multilingual classrooms, Bourne demonstrates ways in which children show awareness of multiple discourses and use them for interaction in imaginative play settings at school. As children engage in play activities they employ multiple voices among and to themselves including teacher talk as well as the multiple languages of the classroom which included Bengali, Cantonese, and English. In addition this study shows evidence of ways in which students played with language through puns, songs, rhymes and the incorporation of voices which were imitations of teachers, characters from books or magazines, and friends (Bourne, 2001).

From her (2000) ethnographic study, Riojas-Cortez concludes that linguistic and cultural repertoires of children can be observed through analysis of socio-dramatic play. Riojas-Cortez concludes that socio-dramatic play gives bilingual children the opportunity to exercise and develop linguistic skills. In addition she claims that the socio-dramatic play that children create is based on their cultural knowledge and the cultural patterns in which they live.

Riojas-Cortez’s (2001) microethnographic study of socio-dramatic play in a bilingual classroom identifies cultural traits that are evident in play episodes constructed by children. These cultural traits included language knowledge, values, beliefs about
discipline, beliefs about education, and knowledge about roles and customs. According to Riojas-Cortez, “During sociodramtic play, children practice the cultural behaviors transmitted by their families and use them as resources to enhance their play” (p. 36). In this study children’s beliefs about roles related to household care, child care, and family traditions were enacted in play sessions. Riojas-Cortez asserts that “culture is intertwined in play” and is a way for children to enact perceptions about their roles and their way of life (p. 39).

Byun (1993) focuses on ways in which her son Joon Ho, a child second language learner, is able to develop his ability to produce sustained discourse through the co-construction dialogue in a pretend play situation. A principle purpose of this study was to identify structures and themes present in pretend play. An additional objective was to find out how a language learner engaged in play over time. Over a ten month period consisting of 14 interactions ranging in length from nine to twenty-nine minutes, this second language learner was able to increase his use of negation, verbal regulation, elaboration techniques, challenges, and requests for confirmations. In addition the language forms he used became more complex.

Summary

This review of the literature for the present study is divided up into the study of Language and Language Related concepts, Narrative Development in Children, Bilingualism, Sociocultural Theory, and Play. Within the first section the relationships between language and culture and language and society have been discussed. In addition concepts such as discourse, communicative competence, pragmatics and related terms have been reviewed. Since the development of the ability to construct narratives in a child’s weaker language will also be examined, narrative development in monolingual and bilingual children has also been examined and related studies have been reviewed.

The literature review on bilingualism defined concepts related to bilingualism and incorporates information regarding the measurement of bilingualism and information of identified contexts in which bilingualism occurs. A literature review on hypotheses regarding the linguistic systems in bilingual children is included along with theories of bilingual development. In addition the concepts of language separation and domain allocation, language dominance and mixing are also explored.
In order to provide a theoretical background the literature related to sociocultural theory, language socialization, and play has been discussed. Within the framework of sociocultural theory, development is seen as occurring through mediational tools such as language and being sociocultural in nature. It has been established that interactive play provides children with opportunities to develop emotionally and linguistically while learning to become members of a particular society. Play situations afford younger or less skilled participants the opportunity to act out situations and take on roles that are beyond their current abilities.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The present chapter describes the research design and methodology utilized in this study. A qualitative method of investigation was necessary due to the nature of the research questions. This investigation examined bilingual development through a case study approach that included observation and ethnographic techniques. The purpose of this study was to identify ways in which a bilingual child, presently dominant in one language, developed communicative competence in a weaker language through interaction with other children in a pretend play setting. Through observation and analysis the study identified language functions that were developed in an immersion situation. Specifically this study addressed the following research questions:

Research Questions
1. How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?
2. How are a) the ability to engage in extended dialogue, b) the ability to participate in conversations, and c) the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?
3. What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language?

This chapter begins with a discussion of the characteristics of qualitative research, case study and naturalistic inquiry, which is followed by a description of the linguistic and cultural background of the child to be studied. A summary of the methodological field test and its implications for the present investigation precede the study design and are followed by procedures for data collection and analysis. Procedures for establishing trustworthiness of the data are also discussed. This chapter ends with a discussion of possible limitations of this study.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research takes place in the natural world. It is highly focused on context and is emergent rather than tightly prefigured in design (Rossman & Ritchie,
Rossman and Rallis (2003) summarize the characteristics of a qualitative research project as one that:

takes place in the field, relies on multiple methods for gathering data and calls on the researcher to be pragmatic, flexible, politically aware, and self reflective. It is fundamentally interpretive and emergent, characterized by a stance of openness, curiosity and respect. On the practical side, qualitative research is labor intensive, time consuming, frustrating and challenging. There are no formula, no rules to follow, only guiding principles gleaned from direct experience. (p. 13)

Qualitative research allows for interpretation of descriptive data which the investigator collects through the ethnographic techniques of observation, description, interpretation and explanation. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) state that “ethnography and its qualitative design variants provide educational and other social researchers with alternatives for describing, interpreting, and explaining the social word” (p. 28).

A common goal of qualitative research is to find out “how things happen” and to “make the facts understandable” (National Science Foundation, 2004, p. 10). The National Science Foundation (NSF, 2004) defines qualitative research as “in-depth, case oriented study of a relatively small number of cases, including the single case” (p. 10). This type of research seeks detailed information on few cases and less emphasis is places on “deriving inferences or predictions from cross-case patterns” (NSF, 2004, p. 10) as is done in experimental or quasi experimental research. The purpose of qualitative research is to build theory through meticulous accounts of an occurrence and its surrounding circumstances.

In contrast to experimental research that takes place in controlled settings, qualitative research takes place in naturalistic environments. Qualitative researchers actually go into the field to the people in order to understand some phenomenon in relation to the context in which it occurs (Bogdan & Bilkin, 1992). Research is highly dependent on context in qualitative studies. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), this consideration for context “draws [researchers] to look at social worlds holistically, as interactive, complex systems rather than as discrete variables that can be measured and manipulated statistically” (p. 10). The main purpose of qualitative research is description and interpretation rather than measuring and prediction (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).
In order to establish credibility, qualitative studies employ multiple methods in their research designs. Multiple methods that are employed in qualitative research include “interviewing, observing, gathering documents and observing material culture” (Rossman & Ritchie, 2003). Material culture includes items such as photographs, videos, objects documents, music, written materials, and records (Rossman & Ritchie, 2003).

Analysis of naturally occurring speech is also a form of qualitative research. Naturally occurring speech refers to speech occurring in situations that are not specifically created by a researcher. Although naturally occurring speech can be video or audio taped, it is not set up in the form of an interview (Rossman & Ritchie, 2003).

Qualitative research requires rich, thick description. In order to establish trustworthiness all evidence must be documented in a comprehensive, detailed manner so that anyone reviewing the details would be able to follow the researcher’s reasoning. Bogdan and Bilkin (1992) state that “Description succeeds as a method of data gathering when details face accounting” (p. 31). A thorough account aids a researcher in the establishment of credibility.

Case Study as a Research Approach

Due to the in-depth nature of qualitative studies, many seek to examine a small number of cases with single cases being a valid number (NSF, 2004). Examining a small number of cases enables the researcher to be able to gather in depth information about the issue at hand (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In these circumstances the detailed information that is gained can be seen as a trade-off for being able to examine a large number of cases. In case studies researchers choose to gain deep insight into a single case, sacrificing the breadth of knowledge that can be acquired from studying a larger number of cases (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

The definition of a case is not limited to a single person: “Cases may be utterances, actions, individuals, emergent phenomena, settings, events, narratives, institutions, organizations, or social categories such as occupations, countries and cultures” (NSF, 2004, p. 10). Although more than one person may be the object of the study the defining element of the case study is that it is “rooted a specific context” (Ritchie & Lewis, p. 52).
Case studies have been used as a research strategy within the fields of medicine, education, psychology, sociology, political science, social work, business and community planning for many years (Hwang, 2001; Yin, 2003). Qualitative study has been utilized within the field of bilingual language acquisition to build theory about the nature of language development. Qualitative research, specifically case studies, have been widely used within the field of linguistics, often by parent-linguists, to study child language development (Arnberg, 1981; Bergman, 1977; Brown, 1973; Burling, 1959; Caldas & Caron-Caldas, 2002; De Houwer, 1990; Döpke, 1992; Fantini, 1976; Hakuta, 1976; Leopold, 1947; Mishina-Mori, 2002; Nicholadis, Mayberry & Genessee, 1999; Ravem, 1968; Ronjat, 1913; Saunders, 1988; Saville-Troike, 1987; Scollon, 1976; Søndergard, 1981; Stone-Kang, 2001; Taeschner, 1983). In addition, research case studies have been employed to study issues related to language use and cultural adjustment and language acquisition (Hwang, 2003; Pierce & Brisk, 2002). Bilingual narrative competence has also been examined by means of case studies (Montanari, 2005; Uchikoshi, 2005). These studies show support for the established practice of parent linguists studying their children’s language development.

Rationale for Case Study Approach for Present Study

According to Yin (2003), there are three central questions that must be considered when determining the appropriate research methods for a particular investigation. These three conditions are a) the type of research question posed, b) the extent of control investigator has over actual behavioral events and c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events” (Yin, 2003, p. 5). A qualitative approach places emphasis on process (Bogdan & Biklin, 1992). The research questions in the present primarily address process issues. This investigation describes ways in which a receptively bilingual child, a child who understands a second language but does not use that language for productive communication, develops communicative competence in her weaker language through play within the context of an immersion situation. It also describes ways in which children are able to aid other children in the development of communicative competence. In order to answer these questions, actual interactions were observed and analyzed.
During play sessions the children’s behavior was not controlled by the researcher but systematically described in an attempt to understand how it occurred. Whereas experimental designs are appropriate for research within a controlled or laboratory setting, case studies are more relevant to examine naturally occurring behaviors that are not manipulated (Hwang, 2003; Stone-Kang, 2001; Yin, 2003). Talk that occurs naturally during pretend play was recorded for the purposes of this research. The present inquiry focused on current interactions requiring direct observation and recording. Microgenetic analysis was done by observation and recording of the discourse resulting from play activities as they unfolded in a moment by moment analysis. Microgenetic development refers to “developmental transitions that occur over the course of a training or experimental session” (Wertsch, 1990, p. 65). Vygotsky’s microgenetic approach to analysis of development allows development to be seen as “changes taking place over the span of weeks, days, hours or even seconds” (Block, 2001, p. 100). As Noemí interacts with other children her language development was observed on a moment by moment basis to identify changes that were integrated into her speech.

**Justification of Parent as Researcher**

Deuchar and Quay (2000) articulate benefits associated with the study of language development by parents of the actual children studied. Because parents are present for more than scheduled observations or interviews they will be able to obtain a more complete sample of language and keep diary notes as well with detailed phonetic transcription. According to Deuchar and Quay (2000) there are three rationales for parent-linguists to study their own children including a) the quantity of required observations, b) the large amount of data to be collected, and c) the exclusive background knowledge the parent has about the child. Parent/researcher’s knowledge of the linguistic and social background of the child is especially important due to the highly contextual nature of bilingualism. If the researcher is someone who comes from outside the family, that person will need to spend an extensive amount of time understanding the context of linguistic interaction within the family. Deuchar and Quay (2000) cite the example of DeHouwer (1990) who first spent six months getting to know the family before beginning to collect data in sessions that occurred once per week. Lanza (1997), who reported on language mixing during the bilingual acquisition of two Norwegian/English
children, engaged the parents in the actual data collection process, thus increasing her access to the language of the children being studied.

As the researcher and parent of the child being studied, the researcher was uniquely aware of her linguistic and emotional development as well as her cultural and linguistic background. The researcher was certain that this child would be in an emotionally secure environment as data was collected as she lived with both of her parents during the study. Participating in this research was not especially disruptive to this child as she maintained a similar home environment throughout the study. Also, due to the researcher’s knowledge of her particular background, she was certain the child was accustomed to changing linguistic and cultural backgrounds and that this move would not have a negative impact on her emotional well being.

**Participants and Setting**

*Language Background of the Child Studied*

Noemí, a four year old girl who has been raised in a bilingual bicultural setting, has been exposed to both English and Spanish since her birth in 2001. Her father is a native of Colombia who grew up in the Amazonian region speaking Spanish and Portuguese. Her mother (the researcher) was raised as a monolingual English speaker in Georgia, holds degrees in Spanish and Spanish literature, and spent extended periods of time in Mexico and South America. Before Noemí was born it was determined that her parents would speak to her exclusively in Spanish in the home. However her mother found that difficult and somewhat unnatural and did not speak Spanish exclusively to her daughter. Nevertheless, a large percentage of Spanish was spoken in the home and her father consistently used Spanish in his interaction with the child.

From the time she was born Noemí was cared for during the day by her monolingual English speaking grandparents. When her grandparents became unable to care for her for a period of time at age twenty to twenty four months, Noemí spent approximately eight hours per day several days a week with a Spanish speaking caregiver. Her caregiver was the oldest daughter of Colombian immigrants and grew up in a Spanish speaking home in Miami.

Noemí also experienced intensive periods of Spanish use during travel and visits from family members who exclusively spoke Spanish. The first of these visits was a two
week visit by a Colombian aunt and seven year old cousin when Noemí was seventeen months old (1;5). In addition she was exposed solely to Spanish when she visited her extended family in Colombia for two weeks when she was two years and one month old (2;1) and for three weeks when she was two years and six months old (2;6).

Noemí’s home language environment changed substantially during the three month visit of her Colombian grandmother at age two years and two months (2;2). During this period virtually all household interaction was in Spanish. Noemí had difficulty communicating with her Colombian grandmother due to the fact that she had become English dominant and many of the discourse patterns used by her grandmother were foreign to her. Despite this difficulty, and her frustration at not being able to get her point across, she actually began to attempt to produce more Spanish during this period.

At two years and seven months (2;7), Noemí began to assert herself and to protest the use of Spanish by her mother. During this time tension arose in the family as her parents realized that English had become by far her stronger language. Her increasing English dominance arose in part from the fact that her English speaking grandparents had reassumed the role of caregivers during the day.

Noemí spent five weeks living in Mexico at the age of 3 years old (3;0). During that time she began to produce some limited Spanish – to herself in pretend play and to try to communicate with others solely when she deemed them unable to speak English. During those five weeks she had no regular interactions with Spanish speaking children. In fact her principal playmates, on a daily basis, were the American students her mother was working with on a study abroad trip. Noemí knew they were native speakers of English and resisted their attempts to practice Spanish with her, always answering in English and even changing Spanish words to what she deemed to be their English equivalents (i.e., Puerto Vallarta, became Port Vallart when the students asked her where we were going on a local excursion).

Upon returning from Mexico, Noemí once again spent a great deal of time with her English speaking grandparents and great grandmother and spoke very little Spanish at all. She and her mother resided in her grandparents’ home for a period of approximately four months while her father was on sabbatical out of the country.
From three years and nine months to four years old (3;9 to 4;0) Noemí fell into the receptive bilingual category (Döpke, 1992). She could understand spoken Spanish and was able to respond to it but chose to do so in English. She did not mind watching videos or listening to music in Spanish. She also was familiar with several songs and liked to sing them in Spanish and was able to articulate a number of fixed expressions and vocabulary words. When asked to speak to her Colombian relatives on the phone she would ask her father how to say phrases in Spanish and then repeat them to her family members. The day after Noemí turned four we traveled to Guadalajara, Mexico and I began a methodological field test of the recording equipment I planned to use for this study to a) verify the system’s components would work as planned and, b) determine the feasibility of using the wireless microphones with different age groups of children.

Setting

The setting of the study was in a trailer park in Southwest Georgia that is predominantly Hispanic. Of the eighteen homes in Hayne’s trailer park, sixteen contain families from Mexico and Central America whose heads of household are typically undocumented workers. Although the children of Hispanic families in this community do attend local schools and have varying levels of English proficiency, Spanish is the language that is used in the homes and in interactions among families.

I rented a trailer in this park for the purpose of this study and our family resided in the park from mid October to December. Data collection occurred over a five week period in which 2 to 3 play sessions per week were recorded on audio and video tape. The average length of the recorded sessions was 1 hr and 28 minutes. Recording sessions took place in our home in the trailer park or near the homes of the Spanish-speaking children who are participating in the study. Play sessions were not structured.

Luis and Catalina Campos are one of the families who live in this trailer park and agreed to allow their children, Angelina age 7 and Rosalinda age 9, to participate in play sessions with Noemí in the afternoons. Originally from Veracruz, Mexico, Catalina and the girls have lived in the United States for almost two years, yet they continue to conduct all household interactions in Spanish due to the fact that Catalina and their extended family members, who live in nearby trailers, only speak Spanish.

I first met this family through my work with Southern Pines Migrant Extension
Agency (SPEMA). SPEMA is a federally funded state organization that provides year-round educational services to children of migrant farm workers. These services are designed to support the learning of children whose learning is often impeded by linguistic and cultural barriers and interrupted due to the movement of their parents for employment purposes. In order to be eligible for services, children ages three to twenty-one must have parents or guardians who have moved across state or district lines within the last 36 months due to employment in the agricultural industry (SPEMA, 2005). In addition to supplementing classroom instruction SPEMA also offers supportive health services, summer school programs, career awareness programs and early childhood development services in conjunction with other organizations.

I met this family last year when the girls were being tutored by Spanish speaking students in my community practicum class that Valdosta State University offers in conjunction with SPEMA. The girls understand that I am a teacher who will be studying Noemí’s language development. They have agreed to speak to her only in Spanish. Noemí first met the girls in August of 2005 and enjoyed playing with them in Spanish.

Thus the design of the present study necessitated an extensive time investment in taking the child to live in a sub-community that is culturally and linguistically isolated from the mainstream language and culture and immersed in an alternative linguistic and cultural environment. The researcher transplanted this child into an immersion situation which necessitated moving and residing with the researcher in a different place. This intensive immersion situation generated a large amount of data as the researcher and her family lived in the field. It would have been impossible to capture the entire context of this particular situation as an outside researcher who only entered the field at assigned times.

Data Collection

The focus of this study was the language development of one child’s weaker language through pretend play with other children in a simulated immersion situation. Data consisted of recordings of individual and collective discourse produced by the children during interaction. Data was collected in the form of audio and video recordings and a descriptive journal. Selections in which there was verbal interaction between children during play were identified on audio and video recordings and transcribed. In
addition detailed observations of Noemí’s communicative interactions with her father were made and used as data.

**Data Collection Techniques**

Data for the present study was collected through both observation and recording. Denzin and Lincoln (1998) define naturalistic observation as “going to a social situation and looking” (p. 31). In this type of enquiry, researchers study people in their normal routines and settings (Bogdan & Bilken, 1992). Meticulous descriptive field notes were kept which included descriptions of “detailed notation of behaviors, events, and contexts surrounding the events and behaviors” (Best & Kahn, 2003, p. 164).

Naturalistic observation has been established as a useful tool for gaining insight into the process of language acquisition. According to MacWhinney (2000), “language acquisition research thrives on data collected from spontaneous interactions in naturally occurring situations” (p. 5). Johnson and Saville-Troike (1992) describe the need for “intensive participant observation that gets beyond overt behavior” (p. 603) in second language acquisition and teaching research and examines underlying assumptions.

Despite the fact that the researcher was also the parent of one of the children being studied, every effort was made to ensure neutrality and provide data that were dependable and credible. Please refer to the section *Establishing Trustworthiness of the Data* that follows in this chapter for a full discussion of steps taken to dependability and credibility.

In this study, play sessions were not structured by the researcher but unfolded as the children spontaneously invented and created scenarios for pretend play episodes. During each session children’s discourse was recorded by audio and video tape. Each child wore a 900 Mhz collar microphone and a wireless audio transmitter. Sound from the transmitters was picked up by a wireless receiver and recorded onto cassette tape. (See Appendix C, Figure C1) As a backup method, a central public address wireless microphone was placed in the play area. A wireless receiver with an output line to a cassette recorder was in place to pick up the sound from this microphone. A video camera was also used to capture the context of the verbal interactions. When interactions occurred outdoors, the video camera was the central data collection device.

An observation journal was also utilized to elaborate on context and provide a
detailed record of the date and time of each observation, the place where they occurred, the names of participants, observations of the researcher, initial analysis of the researcher and related contextual information. In addition the journal served as a place to record in depth detailed information about spontaneous events that occurred when the camera was turned off and to take notes on informal discussions among participants about the language learning process.

In order to establish a general measure of Noemí’s, assessment measures were employed at the beginning and at the end of the study. Tests considered included the Bilingual Verbal Ability Tests (BVAT) and the Stanford FLOSEM Foreign Language Oral Skills Evaluation Matrix.

The BVAT is composed of three different tests which measure picture vocabulary, oral vocabulary and verbal analogies. The picture vocabulary test measures how well a person can name familiar and unfamiliar objects shown in pictures. The test gradually presents less familiar words. The second test is a test of oral vocabulary which attempts to assess knowledge of the meanings of words by having the learner present a synonym or an antonym of the word presented. The Verbal Analogies measure requires the subject to describe relationship between words.

The BVAT allows for the assessment of a person’s collective language abilities based on two different clusters. The first part of the assessment measures, the English Language Proficiency Cluster (ELP) measures receptive and expressive proficiency in English. The second part of the BVAT measures receptive and expressive language ability in the two languages combined. The BVAT is available for testing individuals who are bilingual in English and 15 additional languages, Spanish being one of the additional languages. This test can be used as an entry and exit exam for bilingual programs and is often used in order to make placements or adapt classroom instruction to meet linguistic needs of diverse students. Muñoz-Sandoval, Cummins, Alvarado and Ruef (1984) state that the BVAT may also be used for research purposes “in studies investigating dual language, verbal cognitive development, and efficacy of programs and services for bilingual individuals” (p. 6). In addition this test can be used to collect longitudinal data on individuals due to the fact that it is designed for use with children through elderly individuals.
The FLOSEM allows those familiar with a given learner’s productive abilities to score their communicative proficiency in 5 categories including comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar (Appendix, D). The FLOSEM proficiency scale is divided into the following six levels: 0-5 Preproduction, 6-10 Early Production, 11-15 Speech Emergence, 16-20 Low Intermediate Fluency, 21-25 High Intermediate Fluency, 26-30 Advanced (Native-like Speaker). According to Padilla and Sung (1999), the FLOSEM “provides detailed descriptions of each of the different categories in the various levels of oral proficiency” allowing a person familiar with a given learner’s communication skills, or the learners themselves, to identify the specific category that most appropriately describes the learner’s current skill level in each of the five areas. Although the FLOSEM was designed for evaluating student proficiency within the context of foreign language classes, the authors assert that it is “intended to capture general behavior of language learning in a new language” (Padilla & Sung, 1999). For this reason they state that the FLOSEM is valuable as an instrument to evaluate growth “in any language learning situation” (Padilla & Sung, 1999).

The Stanford FLOSEM was chosen and administered both by the researcher and an independent evaluator in order to establish a baseline of Noemí’s communicative abilities before participating in the play sessions. This baseline was necessary in order to be able to determine what aspects of competence were actually developed during the play sessions as opposed to what she was already able to do before the study began.

Transcription and Analysis

A central goal of qualitative data analysis is systematically “sifting, charting and sorting material according to key issues and themes” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 312). The five steps involves in this process include, “familiarization, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting, and mapping and interpretation” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 312). During this process the researcher identifies themes present in the descriptive data and organizes them in order to answer research questions.

Familiarization. In order to begin data analysis, an initial review of all video and audio tapes will take place after data collection is complete. Instances in which language Noemi’s production of Spanish is guided by a peer during a pretend play episode were identified in the initial review. This stage of data analysis, known as familiarization,
“involves immersion in the data: listening to tapes, reading transcripts, studying observational notes” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 312). During review I was able to develop a general idea of segments of the tapes in which language learning was occurring and of general themes that seemed to be emerging in the written observational notes about our integration into the community and Noemi’s ability to use Spanish to communicate.

Identification of thematic framework. During the review and subsequent transcription process the researcher will recognize “recurrent themes and issues which emerge” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 315). At this point key issues, concepts and themes were identified. Different categories of assistance from children who are linguistically more capable emerged in the data during this part of the analysis. Examples of ways in which discourse developed through play included instances of explicit language instruction, modeling of linguistic forms or discourse patterns, socialization through language to use language, and socialization into deviant discourse patterns. Examples of emerging themes that centered on ways in which a language learner attempts to use language while engaged in a pretend play situation included creative use of language and language play.

Indexing and mapping. After recurrent themes have been established, they can be sorted or organized through processes known as indexing and mapping. In indexing and mapping the researcher examines and reorganizes the data in order to define concepts, map the range and nature of phenomena, create typologies, find associations, provide explanations, develop strategies or to address other issues presented in the research questions (Huberman & Miles, 2002). The CLAN data analysis system, which will be explained in the following section, was instrumental in the indexing and mapping of data.

Additional tools for the analysis of talk. In addition to coding and indexing themes that occur in the written observations by hand, I employed additional tools for the analysis of talk that occurred during play. While reviewing transcripts, instances in which Noemi produced language within the context of pretend play were identified. Pretend play was defined as instances in which the children embody the characters they represent and role play those character’s actions (Corsaro, 2003). Recordings that contain verbal interactions in pretend play situations were transcribed according to the CHAT Codes for
the Human Analysis of Transcripts transcription system that is part of the CHILDES system (MacWhinney, 2000).

This system was created to provide a standard method for transcriptions of face to face interactions (MacWhinney, 2000). The CHAT system provides specific conventions for transcription of words, utterances and conversational features. There are prescribed methods of transcription for linking utterances in order to analyze ways in which turns and discourse occurs. In addition there are transcription conventions for code-switching, elicited narratives and picture descriptions. This system also allows for the coding of speech acts with the major categories being directives, elicitations, commitments, declarations, markings, statements, questions, performances, evaluations, demands for clarification, text editing, vocalizations. Instances in which Noemí produced narratives were identified and analyzed.

Methodological Field Test

Findings about equipment

In the summer of 2005, I tested this equipment with six children ranging in age from four to seven years old. Recording sessions included play episodes from groups of two to three children. The participants were mostly girls however one play session also included a male child. The recording system that I designed consisted of three collar microphones, three 900MHz wireless audio link transmitters, and three 900 MHz wireless receivers. (See Appendix C, Figure C2). Each receiver was linked to a single audio input line so that each child’s voice could be recorded onto a single cassette tape. This was done so that the voices could be digitized and mixed together or listened to and analyzed individually. I originally equipped myself with enough recording devices to capture data from three children simultaneously. In addition, I planned to use a video camera in each room in order to visually capture the context of the play that was occurring.

An initial learning experience had to do with the wireless microphones. I lost hours of valuable data due to my inability to record during the initial play sessions. I did not want to push the children, who had just met each other, into wearing wireless microphones and resorted to placing a small cassette recorder in the middle of the room in order to capture the children’s voices. This method did not result in a very clear,
intelligible recording. I also failed to predict that some of the children’s interactions would take place outdoors in places where there were no outlets to plug in the wireless receivers. At the second session with one child, for example, I took my wireless microphones, transmitters and receivers but the children decided to go to the park and I had no portable recording device.

Also, there were occasions in which some of the children simply refused to wear a wireless microphone. Although they became more accustomed to wearing them after other playmates put them on. I had to supplement the cassette recordings with video recordings when they tired of wearing them or when we went to the park. In response to these findings I have decided to incorporate a central public address microphone into the data collection of the present study. This central microphone has a range of two hundred feet and includes a wireless transmitter that will send the signals to a receiver to be recorded. This microphone is more sensitive, has a low distortion, and produces a clearer recording than the small hand held microphone I used during the equipment field test.

During this experience, I was able to test the equipment in a real situation. This allowed me to explore the range of the equipment to see how large the prospective play area could be. I learned that I did not need a separate receiver for each of the wireless transmitters if I wanted to record all of the voices on one channel. This happened because I only took two receivers to the first play session with some of the children. I had planned for only two of the children to wear wireless microphones. However one of the younger girls also wanted to wear a wireless microphone. I set the two receivers to the same transmitter and was able to record two voices onto one cassette.

I had initially planned on recording all of the voices on separate tracks because I thought this would increase the clarity of speech on the recording. After listening to the tapes with three sets of voices recorded on one cassette I determined that the recording was very intelligible and made the decision to record all voices with one receiver in the present study. This would allow me to skip the step of mixing all the voices back together digitally and make transcription of data easier. If I needed to isolate a single track, it would be easier to do so once they were digitized.

Findings about the setting

The field testing led me to several conclusions about the design of the setting for
the actual data collection. Two of the play sessions took place in our apartment in Guadalajara. Despite the fact that we were in Mexico, we still had movies, books and music in the house that were in English which led to some use of that language. As I created the setting for the current study, I was aware of creating a space that contained only authentic Spanish materials. I furnished the trailer with Spanish books, music, videos, and related Spanish toys and materials purchased in Mexico.

Information about length of time for each play session was also gleaned from the methodological field test. In many cases the children were tired after two hours of play. Generally after one hour of play the children wanted to take off the microphones. For this reason I designed data collection episodes that ranged from one to two hours in length and planned for back up recording methods after one hour when children grew tired of wearing the microphones.

Establishing Trustworthiness of the Data

Quantitative research has historically judged the value of research in accordance with the criteria of reliability, validity, and generalizability. Research conducted within the qualitative paradigm has related standards that should be considered in evaluating the study. These corresponding standards appropriate for qualitative research include truth value, rigor of methodology, and usefulness of the study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

**Truth value**, or credibility, refers to ways in which a researcher establishes that the claims they are making are true. Rossman and Rallis (2003) suggest strategies related to truth value include: gathering data over time or intensively, sharing emergent findings with participants, and triangulation. Triangulation refers to using multiple sources of data or multiple methods or theories in the research design. In addition the qualitative researcher should relay any potential biases they might have to the readers.

**Rigor of methodology**, or dependability, has to do with “the extent to which an outsider would concur with the results of the study, given the data collected and displayed” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 46). Dependability relays the idea that the logic, assumptions and reasoning are clear, that analytical procedures are clear, and that interpretations are grounded in the data. Multiple methods of data collection, and clear documentation of the analytical and interpretive processes are techniques that aid in establishing dependability.
Qualitative research does not seek to be statistically generalizable (Rossman and Rallis, 2003). However information gained from a qualitative study can be applicable, or transferable, in cases that are contextually similar. In order to establish Transferability the researcher must provide thick, rich description of theoretical and methodological orientations as well as of the context so that other researchers can determine if their situation is similar enough that results will be applicable to their situation (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 47).

Integration of multiple methods in the present study

The present study integrated multiple methods of data collection during the study including observation, audio and video recording, informal interviewing of participants, and a journal of detailed observations. In addition, a formal language assessment measure was used at the beginning and the end of the study. Data was collected in an intensive manner in this study. Video and audio recordings were set up 2 to 3 times per week. Detailed notes and descriptions were recorded on a daily basis as the family lived at the research site.

Qualitative research, according to LeCompte and Preissle (1993), “is distinguished partly by its admission of the subjective perception and biases of both participants and researcher into the research frame” (p. 92). In conducting qualitative studies the researcher must be explicit about subjectivity in order to explain how it might affect conclusions. Johnson and Saville-Troike (1992) state that “researchers minimally have the responsibility to provide information concerning themselves, the circumstances of data collection, and the representativeness of examples presented” (p. 604) in order to explain their subjective positioning. In order to ensure credibility strategies suggested by Rossman and Rallis (2003) including triangulation, and prolonged engagement were incorporated.

Triangulation of data refers to using, “multiple sources of data, multiple points in time, or a variety of methods… to build the picture you are investigating” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p.69). Data for this study included observational field notes, transcripts of audio and video tapes, and pre and post linguistic proficiency measures. The CHILDES system was employed to increase dependability and show evidence of objectivity in data analysis. Commands that are part of the CHAT system allowed the researcher to pull out
specific linguistic or pragmatic features in the order of their occurrence. During analysis the researcher traced linguistic or pragmatic features as they occur in Noemi’s speech to their origin in the speech of a playmate. Although the researcher is the parent of one of the child being observed, the patterns of evidence were generated by an impartial data analysis system.

Prolonged engagement refers to the time the qualitative researcher observes a particular phenomenon. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), “being present for a long period of time in the setting or spending a substantial amount of time with participants also helps ensure that you have more than a snapshot view of the phenomenon” (p. 69). The intensive nature of the data collection for this project ensured that there was a substantial amount of experiences from which to draw conclusions about emerging linguistic and pragmatic competence. Prolonged engagement alleviated concerns about child participants changing their behavior due to the fact that they are being observed because over the course of the play sessions of the novelty of the presence of recording devices diminished.

A co-rater participated in the transcription and coding of data in order to establish credibility. The co-rater was a native speaker of Spanish currently pursuing a Master’s degree in Foreign Language Education. I trained the co-rater to use the CHILDES transcription and coding systems. I conducted an inter-rater reliability test on samples of the data to ensure credibility. The following formula, established by Tawney and Gast (1984), was used to measure inter-rater agreement:

\[
\text{Number of agreements} \div (\text{Number of agreements + number of disagreements}) \times 100
\]

Provided that the transcripts give accurate descriptions of the children’s verbal interactions any outside researcher would be able to verify the occurrence of linguistic and pragmatic features and track when they occur. These were cross checked with detailed field notes to verify that development was not the result of some other interaction. The inter-rater reliability between the researcher and the co-raters was 100%,
as any discrepancy was discussed until agreement was reached.

Deuchar and Quay (2000) discuss the established body of research on bilingual language acquisition which includes case studies where a parent served as principle investigator. These cases include parents studying acquisition of multiple languages as a whole or some aspect of linguistic development: Ronjat (1913) and Leopold (1947) keeping detailed diaries of their children’s bilingual development, Smith’s (1973) detailed report on his child’s English phonological development, Dromi’s (1987) investigation of her child’s lexical development in Hebrew, Hernandez-Piña’s (1990) report on her son’s acquisition of Spanish, and Tomasello’s (1992) report on his daughter’s acquisition of verbs. In addition, Taeschner (1983) reports on her daughter’s acquisition of Italian and German. The case study by Kielhofer and Jonekeit (1983) details the simultaneous acquisition of German and French of Jonekeit’s sons. Saunders (1982, 1988) studies deal with his sons bilingual language development English and German. The subject of Deuchar and Quay’s (2000) study, which focuses on the emergence of British English and Spanish in the second year of life as well as phonology, lexicon, syntax, and language choice, was Deuchar’s own daughter. Additional recent studies include Caldas & Caron-Caldas (2000) report on their children’s language dominance and its relation to environment and adolescence and Olsson and Sullivan’s (2004) study of provoking dominance shift in Sullivan’s four year old child.

Automated analysis of transcriptions

In addition to qualitative analysis of journal material and reoccurring themes found in this data, the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES) was used for the purposes of transcribing and analyzing interactional data. The CHILDES system was conceptualized in 1983 by child language researchers Elizabeth Bates, Brian MacWhinney, Catherine Snow and others. The goal was to have a system that would a) automate the process of data analysis, b) provide better data in a more consistent, fully documented transcription system, c) provide more data from more children, from varying ages in more languages (MacWhinney, 2000).

This system consists of three parts: a) The actual CHILDES database, B) the CHAT transcription system and c) CLAN a computerized language analysis system. According to MacWhinney (2000), “these three tools are like the legs of a three-legged stool”
functioning as a complementary set of tools (p. 9). The actual CHILDES database consists of computerized transcripts from child language learners, most of which are spontaneous conversations. According to MacWhinney (2000), these transcripts are of speech occurring between monolingual and bilingual children and their parents or siblings. In addition, the database contains transcripts of the speech of school-aged children, adult language learners, and children with language disabilities. Transcripts of development in twenty-six languages are archived in the database (MacWhinney, 2000).

Transcriptions of individual child language samples and children’s discourse were transcribed according to the CHAT transcription system and coding format as described in MacWhinney (2000). The purpose of having a standard coding scheme was to enable researchers to understand each other’s work for the purpose of collaboration and to increase the dependability of research. MacWhinney (2000) speaks of analysis of child language samples before the creation of a standardized system: “Each investigator devised a project specific system of transcription and project specific codes. As we began to compare hand-written and typewritten transcripts, problems in transcription methodology, coding schemes, and cross-investigator reliability became more apparent” (p. 7). CHAT has been designed to achieve goals of clarity, readability and ease of data entry in regard to transcription (MacWhinney, 2000). In terms of clarity, the goal of CHAT is to increase systematicity across transcripts or corpora. MacWhinney (2000) states that, “codes, words and symbols must be used in a consistent manner across transcripts” (p. 17). Designers of CHAT have incorporated functions that allow users to suppress markings on a transcript to make it more readable. In terms of ease of data entry, this system provides computational aids to assist in the basic process of transcription. CLAN programs assist in the transcription process by providing systems for checking transcription accuracy, automatic analysis of morphology and syntax, and tools for the semiautomatic entry of codes (MacWhinney, 2000).

Transcription and coding conventions are available through the CHAT system. According to MacWhinney (2000) “transcription focuses on the production of a written record that can lead us to understand, albeit only vaguely, the flow of the original interaction” (p. 16). MacWhinney specifies that transcription should be done directly off an audio or a video tape. Coding is the “process of recognizing, analyzing and taking note
of phenomena in transcribed speech” (MacWhinney, 2000, p.16). According to MacWhinney (2000), coding should ideally be done while viewing a videotape of the interaction so the coder has access to the context in which the interaction occurred.

CHAT provides coding conventions for words, special form markers, unidentifiable material, actions without speech, incomplete and omitted words, letters, acronyms, kinship terms, shortenings, assimilations, exclamations, interactional markers, dialectical variations, baby talk, utterances, prosody within words, overlap, code-switching and voice switching, narrative and picture descriptions, errors, and speech acts. Of particular interest to the present study is the coding system for speech act codes because these codes will be useful in determining which types of linguistic functions Noemí is able to develop in Spanish. The Inventory of Communicative Acts INCA-A system, developed by Ninio, Snow, Pan and Rollins (1994) has been incorporated into the CHAT transcription system. This system incorporates both interchange types and illocutionary forces into a coding system. (See Tables B1 and B2, Appendix B).

Once data is transcribed using CHAT, a user is able to perform different automatic analyses using CLAN. CLAN is an acronym for computerized language analysis. This program was designed by Leonid Spektor at Carnegie Mellon University who continues to develop it. CLAN has a graphic interface and can be run on MacIntosh and Windows machines. CLAN can perform automatic analysis on transcript data. These analyses include frequency counts, word searches, co-occurrence analyses, mean length of utterance (MLU) counts, interactional analyses, text changes, and morphosyntactic analysis. (See Appendix B Table B3 for a complete listing of CLAN commands)

The strength of CLAN, with respect to this study, is that it allowed me to perform a variety of automated analyses on the transcribed data. Several of the command functions allow the user to search for words or codes and calculate their frequency or view them within the context of their use. The command FREQ allows the user to count how many times certain words occur in a file or set of files. This works for all languages because the delimiter for a word is a space. This analysis also can be used to measure lexical diversity as it calculates what is called a type-token ratio. This is a ratio of the number of unique words produced by a selected speaker divided by the total number of words used by the same speaker. FREQ can also be used to analyze the development of
lexical groups. MacWhinney (2000) explains:

If you are interested, for example, in how children use personal pronouns between the ages of 2 and 3, a frequency count of these forms would be helpful. Other lexical groups that might be interesting to track could be the set of all conjunctions, all prepositions, all morality words, names of foods, and so on. (p. 78)

This function can be useful in the analysis of pragmatic functions as words associated with particular pragmatic functions can be tracked and actually pulled out so that the researcher can see the utterances in which they occur. The FREQ command can also be used to tabulate speech act and interactional codes and list the utterances in which they occur. The command STATFREQ allows the researcher to summarize the frequencies of words or codes across a set of files. This command allows you to examine one speaker at a time. An additional command that allows for the measurement of Vocabulary diversity is VOCD. These functions allowed me to compare Noemí’s use of language and linguistic functions from play session to play session and across time. I was able to pull out occurrences of specific language functions in Noemí’s speech and see whether or not they first occurred in the speech of other children during play.

KWAL is an additional command that allows a researcher to search for a particular keyword. KWAL outputs the utterances that match these keywords and display them so that the researcher can view keywords in the contexts in which they occur. The COMBO command “provides the user with ways of composing Boolean search strings to match patterns of letters, words or groups of words in the data files” (MacWhinney, 2000, p. 61). This allows the researcher to search for one item immediately followed by another specified item, or to search for one of two possible items. In addition samples in which an item does not occur can be called up. The DIST command gives the distance between occurrences of words or codes so that the researcher can tell how often a particular speech act or word is occurring.

Several commands that are useful for measuring also seem applicable to this study. These commands are MAXWD, WDLEN, MLT and MLU. The MAXWD command measures words and utterances and identifies and prints the longest word or utterance in a given file. The WDLEN command tabulates the frequencies of various
word and utterance lengths. The MLT command computes “the mean number of utterances in a turn, the mean number of words per utterance, and the mean number of words per turn” (MacWhinney, 2000, p. 98). The MLU command calculates the mean length of utterance. These commands were useful in the present study for analyzing ways in which Noemí developed the ability to produce extended discourse by holding the floor in Spanish and to examine how she developed the ability to produce more complex utterances over time.

Other commands that were useful in the actual of data include the TEXTIN command allows the user to take a set of sentences written in paragraph form and have them converted into a chat file automatically. The COLUMNS command separates the speech of different speakers into separate columns. The GEM command is designed to permit the transcriber to mark portions of a transcript for additional analysis at a later time. These marked portions of the transcript can later be displayed by the use of the command GEMLIST. I used these commands in the initial transcription and analysis of data.

Limitations of the Study

This study investigated the language development of a single child through pretend play in an immersion context. The findings in this case are transferable to studies that are similar in context but do not attempt to be generalizable to a large population. Due to the highly contextualized nature of bilingualism, findings from this study will only be applicable in situations in which a child is developing bilingualism under similar contexts.

While intensive in nature, this investigation only sought to explore bilingual development over a period of five weeks. Instead of a longitudinal investigation of a language development over time, this study identified processes that occur in development within the context of an intensive immersion situation. This study did not provide information on the child’s ability to maintain her bilingualism after moving out of the immersion environment.

The fact that the principle research subject is the child of the researcher could also be seen as a limitation of this study. However it has been previously established that parent linguists are often the most appropriate researchers to investigate child language
development due to the amount of time they spend with the children and their detailed contextual understanding of the child’s background (de Villiers & de Villiers, 1979).

During the early stages of the methodological field test, I learned that my presence and the presence of others had an impact on the willingness of the English dominant children to speak Spanish. The design of data collection procedures for this study attempted to address this concern by keeping my presence at play sessions to a minimum through the use of recording equipment that did not necessitate my active presence during play sessions.

Summary

The present investigation examined linguistic development within a context that generally lies outside the mainstream of child language investigation. This study examined the language acquisition of a bilingual child in interaction with Hispanic children who are generally marginalized within the mainstream U.S. educational system due to the migratory nature of their stay and their socioeconomic status (Grubbs, 2003). The majority of case studies of bilingual child language acquisition include participants who come from upper middle class backgrounds and study interactions that occur within the family unit (Caldas & Caron-Caldas, 2002).

The intensive nature of play sessions was unique to this study. Existing studies related to play and bilingual child development examine language development longitudinally over a period of months or years. This study reveals how intensive play sessions are able to bring out productive language skills when receptive language skills are already in place. Findings could have implications for children who grow up in bilingual households understanding a spoken language but not developing speaking proficiency on of the languages.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to define ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child, presently dominant in English, was able to develop communicative competence in her weaker language through pretend play with older peers who speak Spanish. In particular, this study focused on the development of her ability to engage in extended dialogue, to participate in conversations, and to create narratives or monologues.

This chapter presents an analysis of data collected in an attempt to address these research questions. Data sources included transcriptions of audio and video tapes and excerpts from field notes. A discussion of the participants is included in this section followed by a description of the play sessions. Data related to expansion of communicative competence, linguistic participation, use of Spanish versus English, and scaffolding of linguistic production, through pretend play are presented. Also included is a summary of play scenarios developed by the children. A summary of pretend play sessions are given along with an analysis of how they facilitated engagement in extended dialogue, participation in conversation, and the creation of collective narratives. Finally emerging strategies employed by the receptive bilingual child will be presented.

The three main questions addressed by the present study are

1. How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?

2. How are a) the ability to engage in extended dialogue, b) the ability to participate in conversations, and c) the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?

3. What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language?

Description of Participants and Setting

Over a five week period beginning November 1 and ending December 12, 2005, Noemí engaged in play sessions with two different groups of children in Hayne’s trailer park, a trailer park that has a high percentage of Hispanic residents in rural South Georgia. One of the groups of children, Rosalinda and Angelina
resided in the trailer park, however, the other two children resided in another park across town and had to be brought over to play in the afternoons. Although there were many families with Hispanic children in the park, these two sets of children from two family groups were the only two selected for participation due to dynamics within the trailer park and the amount of time and energy needed to build trust between the researcher and each family unit.

_Noemí’s linguistic proficiency_

At the beginning of the study Noemí fell into the receptive bilingual category (Döpke, 1992). Noemí showed evidence of being able to understand spoken Spanish but chose consistently to respond in English. She did not protest watching movies, videos or television programs in Spanish and was familiar with many Spanish songs and would even sing along. When she was asked to speak to Colombian family members on the phone she would either ask her father how to say phrases in Spanish and then repeat them or run away. As Noemí’s parents attempted to speak to her in Spanish, she consistently answered in English refusing to even attempt to produce Spanish language.

An evaluation of Noemí’s Spanish language proficiency was made using the Standard FLOSEM Foreign Language Oral Skills Evaluation Matrix by the researcher and by an independent evaluator. As described in Chapter III the FLOSEM is a rating scale for assessing students’ language proficiency and for determining growth in proficiency both within and across instructional levels. In order to use the FLOSEM an evaluator does not need to conduct a structured interview, but uses the knowledge they have of the students’ communicative abilities (Padilla & Sung, 1999).

The outside evaluator was proficient in English, Spanish and French and is a trained to administer the Spanish Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) by ACTFL, the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language. He is not related to Noemí and is a professor of Spanish and French at the University where Noemí’s mother teaches. The evaluations were made based on his knowledge of Noemí’s communicative abilities in Spanish and on cassette tapes of Noemí verbally interacting with her father in August of 2005 and in early December of 2005, the day after the last play session.

The FLOSEM evaluates linguistic proficiency in 5 categories which include comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar (Appendix D). The
FLOSEM proficiency scale is divided into the following six levels: 0-5 Preproduction, 6-10 Early Production, 11-15 Speech Emergence, 16-20 Low Intermediate Fluency, 21-25 High Intermediate Fluency, 26-30 Advanced (Native-like Speaker).

The following table shows the scores given by the researcher, the independent evaluator, and then the mean score of the two based on their knowledge of Noemí’s language and on a cassette tape of a speech sample of Noemí’s verbal interactions with her father.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented above the mean score Noemí received in the ratings done before the study was 13. Using the FLOSEM Scoring Guide, this score falls in the *Speech Emergence* range. Noemí’s comprehension was given a rater of 4 by the researcher which means that she understands most of what is said in short and long passages, at average speed, even when abstract concepts are mentioned. Some repetition may be necessary, however, when abstract information is included. The independent evaluator rated her comprehension at 5 which means that he thought Noemí understood almost everything at normal speed with repetition only occasionally necessary. Both the researcher and the independent evaluator assigned Noemí a score of 1 in Fluency in the first rating. This score meant that she could only provide short responses to simple questions. Generally, she answered “Sí” (Yes) to questions addressed to her by her father in August, responding in English to questions that required explanation. Noemí’s vocabulary was also rated as a 1 due to the fact that she could identify some common objects at that point. An example from the first tape included her identification of flowers and trees. Noemí’s pronunciation was scored high by both the researcher and the independent evaluator with the researcher assigning a score of 5 representing “near native like ability” and the independent evaluator assigning a score of 6 which means that the “learner’s
pronunciation and intonation is clearly native-like” (Padilla & Sung, 1999). Noemí’s grammar was scored as a 1 by both the researcher and the independent evaluator in the original rating.

The following example is an excerpt from the conversation between Noemí and her father taped in August, 2005. JUA represents Noemí’s father, Juan Carlos and NOE stands for Noemí in the transcripts. The English translation is provided in brackets under the original statement. When words or phrases are incorporated into the sentence in English, they appear in italics in the translation.

**Example**

JUA: Este lago es bien grande, ah Noemí?

[This lake is very big, right Noemí?]

NOE: Sí.

[Yes.]

JUA: Si quieres, párate allí si puedes y te saco una foto.

[If you want to, stand there and I’ll take a picture of you.]

NOE: Pues sí.

[Well, Ok.]

JUA: Sabes qué podemos hacer Noemí? Sacamos más fotos y las mostramos a mama cuando venga. Entonces párate allí.

[You know what we can do Noemí? We can take more pictures and show them to mama when she comes. So wait there.]

JUA: Exacto, entonces vamos a dejar esto allí. Eso. está muy bien.

[Exactly, then we can leave this there. Like that… that’s good.]

JUA: Ah, huh, no pero ah, linda cuéntame una historia.

[Ah- hah, no, but honey, tell me a story.]

NOE: Pues, flores are bonitas.

[Well flowers are pretty.]

JUA: ¿Vamos a otro lugar?

[Should we go somewhere else?]

NOE: A otro otro lugar. Let’s go another place.

[To another, another place. Let’s go to another place.]
JUA: Otra vez linda porque no salió bien.
[Again honey because it didn’t turn out well.]

JUA: Hay que poner flash.
[I have to turn on the flash.]

JUA: A ver Noemí, a ver, párate voy a tener que tomar otra.
[Come on Noemí, look, stand there and I’m going to have to take another.]

NOE: I’ve gotta walk.
(Speaks in English.)

The example presented above illustrates Noemí’s complete understanding of what her father says, however she consistently responds in one word answers, with the word “Sí” (Yes), or by answering in English. In addition she incorporates some single, high frequency vocabulary words into this dialogue.

The following table presents the ratings given based on interactions with Noemí and on speech samples of her verbal interactions with her father taken after the completion of the study.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speech samples taken after the study were scored and the mean total score of the two evaluations was 17.5. This falls in the Low-Intermediate Fluency on the FLOSEM Scale. In the second round of evaluations, both the researcher and the independent evaluator scored Noemí’s fluency at 2 which means that she “frequently must pause to formulate short, simple non formulaic statements and questions when participating in a simple conversation on familiar everyday topics” (Padilla & Sung, 1999). The researcher rated Noemí’s vocabulary skills at level 2 which means she has enough vocabulary to “make simple statements and ask questions about concrete things in a simplified conversation” (Padilla & Sung, 1999). The independent rater assigned
Noemí a score of 3 for vocabulary during the second evaluation which according to the FLOSEM scale means that she “has an adequate working vocabulary” and “is at a beginning stage of showing knowledge of synonyms and a limited number of alternative ways of expressing simple ideas” (Padilla & Sung, 1999).

Both the researcher and the independent evaluator assigned Noemí a score of 3 for her grammar in the second evaluation. A score of three on the FLOSEM scale means that the “learner is beginning to show a limited ability to utilize a few complex constructions, though not always successfully. Other noticeable grammar errors persist which may make meaning ambiguous” (Padilla & Sung, 1999).

The Hernández Campos Family

Angelina and Rosalinda Hernández Campos, ages 7 and 9, live in a two parent home. The girls have resided in the United States for over two years and are currently doing well in school. Although they are from Veracruz, Mexico the entire family speaks only Spanish, never having learned the indigenous languages, Totoneco or Zapoteco, spoken in some parts of Veracruz. The elementary school they attend has an ESOL pull out program and both girls have done sufficiently well to pass from one grade level to the next each year since they have attended. In addition their mother is their advocate, visiting the school on a weekly basis, attempting to communicate with the girls’ teachers through translators and taking advantage of all tutorial services offered by the school or by Southern Pines Migrant Extension Agency. For example, these girls attended Saturday school every other week in order to prepare for state-wide yearly testing and were tutored on a bi-weekly basis by students from the migrant extension services this year.

Luis Hernández, the girls’ father, is employed by a local construction company. He is well-liked and well-paid by his employers. He explained to us the types of jobs that migrants have and talked about how his quality of life has improved since his days of working in the fields. According to Luis, a field worker who picks crops is paid a low weekly wage and five cents per bucket. His job as a construction worker is on the high end of the pay scale for undocumented workers and his wife also has several jobs outside the home.

A recurring theme in conversations with the girls’ mother is her desire for her daughters to get a good education. Catalina Campos frequently speaks of her desire for
her children to have a better life than she has had, stating that the multiple cleaning jobs and all the sacrifices she and her husband have made will be worth it if her girls are able to make it through high school. She considers herself to be a very strict mother who values cleanliness and good manners. Furthermore, she makes sure that her daughters do their homework each night before going to bed. She is critical of other mothers in the trailer park who do not take advantage of programs designed for English language learners. This year she has taken additional cleaning jobs in the afternoons, but is home by six o’clock to prepare dinner and get her daughters ready for bed.

 Difficulty arose in arranging play sessions with Catalina Campos’s daughters because she has a strict policy of not allowing anyone to come to her house while she is not at home. The girls are not allowed to open the door for any reason or for anyone in the afternoons when their mother is away at work - not even for family members who live nearby. This restriction made organizing play sessions extremely difficult because the earliest our play sessions could start during the week was around 7:30 or 8:00 p.m., resulting in children who were tired and irritable.

 Catalina Campos’s distrust for her neighbors and even for her relatives in the trailer park also made it difficult for me to set up recording sessions with other local families. In early November, while several neighbors were visiting Catalina Campos, she had an epileptic seizure. The women did not know what was happening and because of their fear of deportation they left her trailer without calling an ambulance. Catalina expressed the anger she felt toward these women she had previously considered her close friends to the researcher. In order not to disrupt the arrangement I already had with her for daughters’ participation in the study, it was necessary for me to find additional children outside the trailer park in order to be able to conduct the number of play sessions originally planned during the allotted time period. For this reason, I arranged to bring other children over to play on the days on which I was unable to organize play sessions with Catalina Campos’s children.

Rosalinda

Rosalinda is a nine-year-old child currently in third grade at a local elementary school. She speaks English fluently with a hint of a Spanish accent. Rosalinda came to the United States at age six and began first grade at the end of that year. Rosalinda
attended a public Mexican school in Veracruz, Mexico, for a year and a half before coming to the United States. Her teachers state that she is a responsible student who always does her homework.

Angelina

Angelina is seven years old and currently in second grade. She completed a half year of the equivalent of a preschool program in a public school program in Mexico before coming to the United States at age four. She does not read in Spanish – in fact, the first children’s books in Spanish she remembers seeing were in our trailer during the play sessions. Her school teachers say that she is an obedient child that who does whatever is asked of her. She participates in the accelerated reader program by reading leveled English books at home and taking tests on her comprehension of the stories at school. Her test scores are average and her teachers have expressed that they would like her to read more and to choose books that are more challenging.

Ramos Family

Margarita and Anita Ramos, ages five and nine, live with their father in Heavenly Trailer Park in Clyattville, Georgia. I first met them last year when one of my students was tutoring them in their home in the afternoon as part of the community practicum class I supervise in connection with the Southern Pines Migrant Extension Agency. Their parents, originally from Mexico City, had lived in two separate trailers since they divorced and her mother remarried approximately two years ago. Anita and Margarita’s mother left for Mexico in April in of 2005 planning to visit her ill mother and immediately return to the United States, but she has not since contacted her daughters. The girls now reside with their father who works long hours in a local pipe plant. He cares for them and arranges for them to stay with his brother’s wife in the afternoons when he is not at home. However, domestic violence in his brother’s family often disrupts the child care arrangements. The girls are well cared for however, they have no advocate in their schooling process. Margarita, the older child repeated the first grade for three years in a row before making it to the second grade this year. The younger sister, Anita, has managed to pass from grade level to grade level each year. There is no ESOL pull out program at the school they attend, and the girls have no one to assist them with nightly assignments as their father speaks very little English. They have been assigned
tutors from the migrant extension agency, but the instability of child care arrangements forces their father to seek alternative places for the girls to stay in the afternoons resulting in the girls frequently not being at home when the assigned tutors arrive.

Luis Ramos, Anita and Margarita’s father, permitted me to pick them up at any time and to take them to our trailer for play sessions. He did not ask very many questions and worked with me to set up places to drop off or pick up the girls if he was busy running errands or doing laundry in town. Workers at the pipe plant where Luis works are paid significantly less than construction workers. Since they are hired and paid by temporary agencies by presenting false papers or social security numbers, social security and medicare taxes are withheld from their meager weekly paychecks, an occurrence that does not happen with construction workers who are simply paid under the table.

The trailers in this park are not as well cared for as the trailers in Hayne’s trailer park, which is located adjacent to a military base. Whereas the majority of the tenants in Hayne’s trailer park are construction workers, most of the adult inhabitants of Heavenly trailer park are field workers who are not as well paid. Tenants in Heavenly trailer park move in and out more frequently, and the trailers are in a deteriorated condition. The park itself is generally scattered with trash and has giant holes full of standing water that are difficult to drive cars through. The Ramos’ trailer has portions of the aluminum siding opened and piped to a hot water heater kept outside.

Anita

Anita and Margarita’s mother told me the story of how she came to live in the United States when I visited their trailer in April of 2005 before she disappeared to Mexico. She attempted to come to the United Stated and bring her infant daughter, Anita, when she was less than three months old, but she was caught illegally entering the country. That time the police or immigration officials accused her of stealing the baby because she looked too young to have a baby. Finally, they released her and she waited three more months before they illegally entered by swimming across the river. She was stuck in the desert for two weeks without money, or diapers and her food for the baby ran out. Their goal was to get to the United States to meet Anita’s father. They survived thanks to other illegal immigrants who shared what they had with her.
Anita is currently in the second grade at age nine. During the early years of her life the family moved frequently making it impossible for her to attend pre-kindergarten or kindergarten. She began school at age six, staying at home with her mother or accompanying her mother everywhere she went until they moved to Clyattville, Georgia, three years ago where she started the first grade. Anita left Mexico before she reached school age and does not read or write in Spanish. Her schooling experience in the United States has not been successful and her comments reveal that she is resigned to the fact that she will never do well in school. After repeating first grade twice, her report card in spring of 2005 showed 41 grades that were non-satisfactory out of 63 total categories. Despite her non-satisfactory performance she was somehow passed to the second grade.

Anita cares for her younger sister, doing most of the talking for both of them when they first meet someone new or when they are in an unfamiliar situation. Spanish is definitely the language of their home as their father speaks little English. Their aunt who cares for them on weekdays has just arrived from Mexico and has a six-month-old baby. Because she has had no outside employment since her arrival and thus very little contact with the English speaking community, Spanish is the language used in her interactions with the girls each afternoon.

*Margarita*

Whenever the girls are asked where they are from, Anita explains that she is from Mexico and her sister Margarita is from the United States, a fact that she proudly states. Margarita was born in the United States. She speaks both English and Spanish, but Spanish is definitely the language of her home since neither of her parents is very proficient in English.

*Context*

During the month of August 2005, Noemí and her family resided in Tallahassee maintaining a language environment in which the parents attempted to speak only Spanish to each other and to Noemí. However, this was not always the case considering that her parents frequently discussed matters related to their daily lives, which were in English. In addition, her mother found it awkward and sometimes difficult to address her daughter in a language that was not her native language. Despite their attempts to encourage Noemí to use Spanish, she refused to speak Spanish with her parents. When
spoken to or asked a question, Noemí would answer in English. With the exception of a few words or fixed phrases, Noemí did not produce Spanish at all at the beginning of the study. She would, however, sing a few songs with her father such as *Fina Estampa*, *La Cucaracha*, and *Cielito Lindo* when encouraged to do so by her father.

In September, the family moved to Valdosta to the researcher’s parents’ home so that I could have dedicated time to explore the literature related to childhood bilingualism while Noemí’s grandparents cared for her. Noemí’s grandparents are monolingual English speakers; therefore, interactions in her grandparents’ home were in English. Noemí’s mother and father attempted to address her in Spanish while staying in her grandparents’ home but Noemí refused to answer in Spanish, replying only in English.

The Galeano family first visited the trailer park in September to allow Noemí to meet Angelina and Rosalinda and to talk to their parents a little more about the possibility of their daughters participating in the study. The researcher had previously discussed the project with Catalina Campos and explained the importance of having her daughters speak only Spanish to Noemí beginning with the first visit. Before visiting the trailer park Noemí’s parents told her that they were going to a place that was somewhat like Mexico because all the people who lived there were from Mexico or Central America and most spoke Spanish. Before meeting the girls, the researcher told Noemí that we would also be living in a trailer in this Mexico-like place and that she would need to speak only Spanish while we were there. On the first visit to Angelina and Rosalinda’s house Noemí and the girls got along very well as they took her into their rooms and showed her their toys while speaking in Spanish. They had a musical piano that played Mexican songs, one of which was *La Cucaracha*, a song that Noemí had learned in Mexico over the summer. After playing with the musical piano, the girls went outside and chased each other around singing *La Cucaracha*, a traditional Mexican song. The girls also played outside on a makeshift swingset that their father had constructed. Angelina and Rosalinda expressed their desire for Noemí to come back and play with them again the next day, and we explained that we would be moving there soon and we would be back to play. The next time we returned Angelina and Rosalinda’s father had added another swing to the makeshift swingset that the girls said was for her. They seemed excited to see her again.
Before moving into the trailer park, we attended events at the Campos-Hernández home in Haynes trailer park. One of the events was Luis Hernández’s birthday party. Also in attendance were several neighbors and three of Luis’s brothers. On another occasion we attended a party which was a type of bridal shower for Luis’s brother’s wife. During these events the women sat and talked to each other in Spanish. One of Luis’s brothers had married an American, who was in the process of learning Spanish; she and the researcher were the only non-native speakers of Spanish present. The men cooked and spoke to each other in separate conversations. Noemí played with Rosalinda, Angelina and their cousin Jema. Play was conducted in Spanish as Jema had just arrived from Mexico in August and had not learned very much English yet.

The day we moved into the trailer park, the researcher’s husband set up a cookout outside our trailer and invited Luis and his family. That night Luis’s brother’s wife, an American college student from a rural area near Valdosta, was there. She asked me questions about my employment, Juan Carlos’s employment, my parents, how I learned Spanish and why we were moving into the trailer park. It was a very difficult situation because to her it was obvious that this was a trailer park for Hispanic immigrants who live here to survive while they attempt to earn a living and educate their children and that my family and I did not quite fit in. I wanted to fit in and be considered a friend and not just emphasize my research as the reason I was living there, even though we had told Luis and Catalina up front about the research project.

Living in the trailer park was difficult for all family members. The researcher and her family entered the study with a certain set of assumptions about how the participants would behave and how they themselves would become part of the community. These assumptions were proven incorrect. This integration into the community did not happen due to various factors. First the researcher, her husband, and Noemí all continued their lives outside the trailer park. The researcher’s husband’s job was over two hours away, requiring a long commute three times per week. Noemí began pre-school for the first time in August and continued to attend school each morning from 8:00 to 12:15. Pre-school brought its own set of related activities in which she wished to participate. In addition she also began to make English-speaking friends who occasionally invited her to birthday parties, play groups and seasonal events such as Halloween Parties, Trick-or-
Tidewater, and the Nutcracker Christmas Ballet. The researcher had a job and school-related responsibilities in which she needed to invest a large portion of her time. The families from the trailer park were very busy as Catalina Campos had multiple cleaning jobs that lasted until 6:00 p.m every day except for Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday. Sunday and Wednesday, however, were church days, resulting in the children returning home from services after 8:00 in the evening. As previously mentioned, Catalina Campos did not permit her daughters to open the door for anyone while she was not home.

Our interactions with both the Campos-Hernández and Ramos families were frequent and informal and included attending extended family gatherings, cookouts, and collaboration on car repairs. The researcher served as translator at parent meetings for the Hernández family and their relatives. The researcher and her husband were also consulted by extended family members on other matters such as immunizations, an injury lawsuit and a situation in which a family member needed to be bailed out of jail. Since Mr. Ramos allowed his daughters to go on outings with the researcher and her family, they often did so, attending local seasonal events or visiting a local amusement park. Although we interacted with our neighbors on a daily basis, recordings were done when there would be an extended period of time for play.

A major source of frustration was the need to adapt to an environment that was completely unfamiliar to the researcher and her daughter while maintaining the same roles and responsibilities that we had prior to the move. Due to this issue, the researcher had to depend on her husband to take an active role in establishing trust and contacts with their neighbors. Being in an unfamiliar place was particularly difficult for Noemí because she did not have her familiar toys or her favorite books in English. She also was forced to live without her favorite television programs on The Disney Channel as she did not have access to cable in the trailer park. In addition, she missed her daily interactions with her grandparents. She was also afraid in the trailer, due to the fact that Rosalinda and Angelina had told her some scary stories about a bad guy who had lived in our trailer before, and how someone had broken the windows and come inside in the night.

Noemí was not the only one who was scared. These stories were somewhat frightening for me. The locks on the doors were not very substantial and recent robberies
and murders in Hispanic trailer parks in a nearby city had everyone worried. I also felt isolated due to lack of cell phone service, and Internet access at the trailer. The only television channel that could be accessed had bad reception, and I was only able to sneak it on for a few minutes while Noemí was outside playing or asleep. It was very difficult for the researcher and her husband to complete job-related work at their trailer due to lack of Internet resources, books and other needed materials that there was not room for in the trailer.

At times, when we went by my mother’s house to eat lunch or for a visit, Noemí would try to refuse to go to back to the trailer. One night in particular we had an event to attend at Noemí’s school and were trying to arrange a play session after the event. We stopped by Noemí’s grandmother’s house on the way home, and as we began to leave, she ran to her grandmother and jumped into her arms crying that she did not want to go to the trailer park. She stated that she hated it there and wrapped her arms and legs around her grandmother. When her mother tried to convince her to go, she cried and screamed louder and louder. Her mother had to pull her from her grandmother and place her into her car seat. After being placed in her car seat, she jumped out once again screaming that she did not want to go there. Her mother picked her up again and forced her into her car seat, quickly closing the door and driving away. Future play sessions were arranged earlier in the afternoons or on the weekends with the hope that she would not act like this if she weren’t so worn out from her daily activities. Noemí, who had been fully potty trained for over a year and a half, began wetting the bed each night about a week after we moved in. After repeated visits to the doctor’s office to rule out a urinary tract infection, she began to sleep in night diapers. In early January she decided to stop wearing them and her bed remained dry all night long. Although the bed-wetting cannot be directly linked to stress she felt as the result of being in a new place, it did stop after the experience was over.

As previously mentioned, the researcher also teaches a community practicum class for Spanish majors at a local university. She is in charge of the supervision of her students as well as pairing up Spanish language students with Hispanic children they can tutor in the community. The researcher met both of the sets of girls who would become playmates in this study through this activity the previous year. I thought it was very
important to have a responsible tutor to continue working with these girls, so I assigned my most responsible tutor to work with both sets of girls. The tutor came two days per week as soon as the girls got out of school. She was the only person allowed to enter the house while Catalina Campos and Luis Hernández were not home. Catalina Campos explained that her desire for her daughters to do well in school would outweigh her fears about the things that could happen to her daughters if they allowed anyone to come in while she was not home.

Two weeks into the study Catalina Campos told me one day that the tutor had upset her by talking to her young daughters about her new boyfriend and her date with him to a local amusement park. Catalina explained to the researcher that her daughters would be trained to behave as respectable girls in her community of origin- they would never be allowed to go out on dates alone. In the event that a boy wanted to go out with one of her daughters when she reached an acceptable age, the entire family would accompany them. Needless to say, Catalina Campos was furious that the tutor had been discussing such issues with her daughters and asked me to convey this message to the tutor. She told me that her daughters were now asking her why the tutor could go on dates alone and they would never be able to. I informed the tutor, explaining this cultural difference and she agreed not to discuss her dates with her boyfriend with the girls. When she went to visit the next week, however, the tutor took her boyfriend with her to meet the girls while Catalina and Luis were not at home! Needless to say, Catalina Campos was extremely upset about this. The researcher then told the student tutor to focus her attention on Margarita and Anita and attempted to find another student to tutor Catalina Campos’s girls. This situation was very stressful as I wanted to do something positive for the girls. Although I could give explicit instructions to the student tutor, I could not control her behavior. I also could not tutor the girls myself because I did not want Noemí to see me interacting with them in English.

The researcher also accompanied Catalina Campos and her daughters to parent-teacher conferences serving as interpreter for them and for Catalina’s sister-in-law and her daughter Jema. At one of the parent teacher conferences a serious issue arose in which the girls were being bothered by an older boy on the school bus who was hitting
them and threatening to kill them. After several consultations with teachers, the principal and the school counselors, the boy was moved on the bus.

In order to create an immersion-like environment the researcher took only reading and media material in Spanish to the trailer. The Spanish language books were of particular interest to the children. Both groups of sisters, Anita and Margarita and Angelina and Rosalinda, were very interested in the books, and when the books were placed near them, they stopped playing and started reading during the play session. This happened to the point that the researcher had to move the books from Noemí’s room because as the girls attempted to read the books individually no verbal interaction was taking place.

In one of the earlier sessions, Angelina came out with a Spanish language book and began to try to read it to her mother. Upon seeing her daughter attempt to read the book, Catalina Campos responded that the girl could not read Spanish because she had never tried, telling her to “get over there and try.” A similar thing happened between the other pair of sisters as they were equally eager to read the Spanish language books. As the younger sister, Margarita, attempted to read a book in Spanish, her sister criticized her saying she had never read anything in Spanish before. When she continued to try, slowly pronouncing each word, her sister ridiculed her asking her how she could have so much difficulty with such an easy book. When Angelina and Rosalinda asked, the researcher allowed them to take books home and read them, bring them back on their next visit and choose more to take home.

Description of Pretend Play Settings

In total eleven play sessions were recorded and transcribed with the recordings ranging from 13 minutes to two hours and thirty minutes. The average length of recorded play sessions was 1 hour and 28 minutes. Table 3 presents the dates and lengths of each play session and identifies the playmates who participated in each session. As shown in Table 3, the duration of each recorded session varied in length. Recorded material from the first session was especially short due to technical difficulties with the equipment. Typically, the children arrived and began to create spontaneous play situations. The presence of a hand held microphone intrigued the girls and became a toy that they like to play with. They tended to use it to create imaginary fashion shows, newscasts, and to
narrate stories. Variation in duration of play sessions arose because play episodes ended as children became tired. The attention span, interest and cooperation of young children are not controllable.

Table 3

Record of Taped Play Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 11, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Rosalinda Angelina</td>
<td>8:21 to 8:34</td>
<td>13 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>8:00 to 8:58.</td>
<td>58 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>6:30 to 8:00</td>
<td>2 hrs 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>2:57 to 4:58</td>
<td>2 hrs 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>6:31 to 8:18</td>
<td>1 hr 43 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Rosalinda Angelina</td>
<td>2:18 to 3:06</td>
<td>48 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 27, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Rosalinda Angelina</td>
<td>2:17 to 3:22</td>
<td>1 hr 05 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>6:20 to 8:05</td>
<td>1 hr 45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Rosalinda Angelina</td>
<td>4:24 to 5:54</td>
<td>1 hr 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Rosalinda Angelina</td>
<td>2:55 to 3:25</td>
<td>1 hr 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2005</td>
<td>Noemí Anita Margarita</td>
<td>6:30 to 7:44</td>
<td>1 hr 14 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes of play varied and are presented in Appendix F. Themes that recur between both groups of girls include buying and selling things at the market or flea market, dressing up, abandoned children with an older sister defending a younger sister, finding food and shelter, and going to school. Play sessions with Rosalinda and Angelina often include themes of sisters dealing with a strict mother.

Themes of television shows for children are also the basis for the creation of some sessions where good characters try to defend themselves against an evil character. Rosalinda and Angelina draw from TV television shows for children presented in the United States and Mexico. English shows that were mentioned included *Teen Titans* and *SilverHawk*, programs with characters who fight evil. The character of Chapulín Colorado also appeared in several play sessions to defend the weak and restore justice. Chapulín Colorado is a character from a Mexican TV show that began in the 1970s and was broadcast all over Latin America. Chapulín is the anti-hero protagonist who defends against evil shouting his motto, “¡Síganme los buenos!” (Good guys follow me!). Rosalinda and Angelina also teach Noemí several games that have scripted verses such as “La Cucaracha” (The Cockroach), and “El Lobo” (The Wolf). These are games in which the children take turns repeating a chorus before an animal attacks and they run and chase each other. For example, in “La Cucaracha” the girls form a circle with one person in the middle who is the designated cockroach. The two girls in the circle sing the following words as they walk around in a circle around the roach:

| En el patio de mi casa, [On my patio] |
| Había una cucaracha [there was a cockroach] |
| Échale gas, [Spray him with gas] |
| Échale más, [Spray him with more gas] |
| ¡Ya revivió! [He came back to life!] |

As the girls sing the lines “spray him with gas” and “spray him with more gas” they make noises as if they are squirting the roach with bug spray. When the roach comes back to life, she chases the girls who have just been squirting her and they run away screaming. Whoever the girls catch becomes the roach next. Play sessions with Anita and Margarita
frequently include playing with dolls, changing Barbie doll clothing, dancing, singing, fashion shows, going shopping, and making television shows.

The play sessions were held in or around our trailer in Hayne’s trailer park. Angelina and Rosalinda walked over from their trailers or rode over on bicycles on days they played with Noemí. Their visit was always preceded with a visit from Noemí’s father who would go to ask permission and supervise the girls as they rode or walked over. When Noemí played with Ana and Margarita, the researcher made arrangements in advance with their father by telephone. The researcher would then go and pick the girls up and bring them back to Hayne’s trailer park for the play session. Before each session began the researcher would set up the audio and video recording equipment and label all video and audio tapes with dates and names of participants. As the children arrived they would greet Noemí and the researcher would equip them with the audio recording equipment by fastening radio transmitters on their belts and microphones on their shirt collars.

The children would then begin to play, inventing their own themes and playing with Noemí’s toys that were present in the trailer or toys they brought with them when they came over. When the girls played on the weekends, they would go outside for some of the play sessions; however, on weeknights it was usually too dark and cold to play outside.

Play sessions ended as children became tired. Noemí was the child whose tolerance for play sessions was not always stable. The researcher used her discretion to determine when to end play sessions due to the children becoming tired or hungry and resulting in behavior that was not conducive to learning or peaceful play. Noemí, being the youngest and an only child, was the child who most frequently displayed behavior that caused the researcher to end the play session.

To present the reader with an idea of the events of a typical play session, I will describe the session that took place on November 27, 2005. There was not a play session that was typical, however, so the researcher chose a play session that happened around the middle of the study. This description deals with the play themes that arose and does not detail the linguistic interaction that took place in the play session. Relevant examples from linguistic data will be presented later in the chapter.
On that date Noemí played with Rosalinda and Angelina. The play session was set for 2:00 that afternoon and Noemí walked over with her father to the Campos-Hernández house to let the girls know we were ready to begin and to escort them over. While he was gone the researcher set up the equipment, labeling cassette and video tapes. When they arrived, the girls began to discuss whether they should play inside or outside because it looked like rain. This discussion led into pretending that they were weather forecasters on television with Angelina taking the microphone and beginning the weather report. The weather report turned into a newscast with Noemí as a reporter who introduced herself. Then Rosalinda began inventing a story about workers who couldn’t come to work anymore because there was a hurricane on the way that had spawned four tornadoes. Angelina and Noemí begin to act out the part of the workers who are made to stop working and flee to safety. Then Rosalinda changed the story to one about two sisters who were abandoned by their parents and go to live with an old woman. They must work harvesting crops with a machete to provide food for themselves and the woman. The destruction caused by natural disasters was described and the sisters fled to safety asking each other questions about where their parents might be. Rosalinda told them that their parents were in jail because some bad people put them there. In the next scene the parents returned after having been in New York. The mother told the girls to get in the car so they could also go to New York where their lives would be prosperous. Then they began preparing food for an imaginary church pot luck dinner. Then, in a sudden twist, the woman who had returned as their mother turned out not to be their mother but their older sister. Rosalinda continued as narrator as Noemí and Angelina pretended to be girls running in the forest escaping from a snake. All of a sudden Angelina turned into Chapulín Colorado, the Mexican superhero, shouting “Síganme los buenos” (Good guys follow me!) as Noemí ran after her. Rosalinda took over the lead narration and changed the storyline back to sisters whose parents had once again disappeared. The scared sisters returned to the old woman’s house and then went out to look for food. They found food and began to make a soup. At that point a monster appeared, but Angelina pretended to feed him some leaves which supposedly were covered with honey. The monster died as Angelina declared that the sauce on top of the leaves was not really honey. Then, Noemí began to shout that the monster had come back
to life. The sisters once again teamed up trying to escape from the monster, played by Rosalinda. They escaped from the monster but then a tiger that eats people appeared and they had to flee again. The play session then was paused as the girls asked for drinks and a snack. When they finished their food and drinks they began to pretend that they had the power to become invisible. Rosalinda played the role of a wolf who pretended to be nice by inviting Noemí and Angelina into his castle. They then had to escape from the wolf who tried to eat them. The play session ended as Luis Hernández arrived to pick up the girls and take them to church.

Data Transcription and Analysis

Data for this study were transcribed using the CHAT Child Language Transcription system and analyses were conducted via the CLAN Child Language Analysis system. Video and audio tapes were reviewed by the researcher to obtain an idea of types of play that had arisen during in each session. During initial reviews the researcher made notes about re-occurring themes and noted interesting occurrences. Transcription was done by the researcher directly from the videotapes, and occasionally from the audiotapes, when videotapes were not available or clear.

Verification of transcripts was undertaken by two co-raters, the first of whom was a native speaker of Spanish pursuing a Master’s Degree in Foreign Language Education and the second was a student pursuing a Bachelor’s degree in Spanish. The second student is a native speaker of English who has learned Spanish as a second language and who has a documented score of Advanced Low on the American Council of Foreign Language Teacher’s Oral Proficiency Interview Test (OPI), a nationally recognized test that is administered by national reviewers and rated by two trained outside reviewers. Tapes and transcripts were distributed evenly to the two reviewers and each reviewed approximately half of the transcriptions that had previously been done by the researcher.

The co-raters reviewed the video tapes while reading along with the transcripts. When discrepancies arose the reviewer and the researcher reviewed the video tape together to see if they could come to consensus on what was said. On several occasions, the other reviewer was also consulted to clarify an utterance.

The CLAN Computerized Language Analysis System was used to analyze the data in relation to Noemí’s participation using the Mean Length of Turn (MLT) function.
and to sort data for qualitative analysis using the KWAL command. The KWAL function within the Computerized Language Analysis program outputs utterances which match keywords specified by the user. This command allows the user to view the context in which keywords are used by providing the entire utterance and its line number in the output. As the researcher noticed patterns in forms or words, she used the KWAL command to search for similar patterns in the transcripts.

Using the *Mean Length of Turn* (MLT) function within CLAN, an analysis was conducted to establish whether or not Noemí was able to increase her linguistic participation in the play sessions. The MLT function yields the following results: number of utterances produced by each speaker, number of words produced by each speaker, and the number of turns taken by each speaker. This information reveals each person’s participation in a given conversation by showing the amount of language they produce in various ways. Based on this information the MLT function also gives the ratio of words over turn, utterances over turn, and words over utterances. This information could reveal the efficiency and/or elaborateness with which speakers are able to express themselves. An increase in words per turn or words over utterances could show that a speaker is able to produce more elaborate sentences. On the other hand a decrease could show that a speaker has learned to express his or her thoughts more efficiently. Results of the MLT function detailing the linguistic participation of all playmates in each play session is presented in Appendix E.

*Expanding Communicative Competence*

**Research Question #1: How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?**

The first research question seeks to identify ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child expands communicative competence in the weaker language through play. This idea assumes that children develop linguistically through interaction in pretend play (Corsaro, 2003; Garvey, 1990; Vygotsky, 1967). Linguistic production becomes necessary in order to participate in play sessions. In play situations peers can help each other accomplish a task through the process of scaffolding. In this study case peers who
were linguistically more skilled in Spanish, helped one playmate begin to produce language. This process is observed over eleven play sessions from a microgenetic perspective. According to Vygotsky emerging abilities can be observed as learners are engaged in a given activity (Kasper & Rose, 2002). In this section examples will be presented in which playmates were able to scaffold Noemí’s linguistic production and her participation to aid in her development of communicative competence. Examples of scaffolding techniques to be presented include collaborative construction of utterances, providing direct translations, asking leading questions, and explicit correction of mistakes through modeling. Examples will also be presented that reveal playmates’ awareness of their roles in helping Noemí learn Spanish. Examples of techniques peers employed to scaffold participation including dictation of words, providing allotted time for verbal participation in the interaction will also be presented. Examples of ways in which Noemí’s participates by repeating words or phrases that were not cued or modifying sentences provided for repetition until she finally begins to take the floor without being cued will also be provided. Finally percentages of Noemí’s linguistic participation and use of Spanish in each play session will be presented.

Examples in this chapter will be presented in the following way. Abbreviations will be given for each speaker’s name. Table 4 outlines the names and related abbreviations for speakers. Utterances produced in Spanish will be followed by bracketed translations in English.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANG</td>
<td>Angelina Hernández Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANI</td>
<td>Anita Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUA</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Galeano, Researcher’s Husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>Margarita Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE</td>
<td>Noemí Galeano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Rebecca Galeano, Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS</td>
<td>Rosalinda Hernández Campos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noemí’s Linguistic Participation

Table 5 presents the percentages of Noemí’s total utterances, turns and words over the course of the eleven play sessions. These percentages are calculated based on the data obtained from the MLT function over the eleven play sessions. Due to that fact that each play session varied in the length, the total number of utterances, turns and words given as a result of the MLT function were used to calculate the percentages made by Noemí during each play session.

Table 5

Percentages of Noemí’s Total Utterances, Turns and Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Sessions</th>
<th>Percent Total Utterances</th>
<th>Percent Total Turns</th>
<th>Percent Total Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 illustrates the percentage of utterances of the total conversation that Noemí made in each play session over time. Noemí increased the number of utterances made in each play session from 13% in the first play session to 16% in the second play session. During the next three play sessions Noemí’s percentage of utterances produced ranged from 25% to 28% before hitting 38% in the sixth play session. During sessions 7, 8, 9 and 10 the percentage of total utterances made by Noemí ranged from 21% to 36% before peaking at 41% of all utterances in the final play session.
The MLT function data was also used to compute the percentage of total turns that were taken by Noemí. As shown in Table 6, Noemí’s percentage of total number of turns increased from 15% in the first play session to 23% in the second play session. She continued to take percentages of turns in the twenties through the fifth session spiking to 36% of all turns in the sixth session. She continued to take turns ranging from 23% to 38% for the remaining play sessions.

Table 5 also shows the percentage of total words Noemí produces. Increases are noted again that spike in the sixth play session and then vary between 13% and 27% of total words from the seventh to the tenth play session. The highest percentage of total words spoken by Noemí was during the final play session and was 37% of the total number of words.

Figure 1 specifically presents the percentage of turns Noemí took in each of the individual play sessions over time. As illustrated in Figure 1, Noemí increases the percentage of the number of turns as the play sessions continue.

![Figure 1](image)

*Figure 1. Percent of turns taken by Noemí over the course of the play sessions.*

The following table shows evidence of Noemí’s language usage over the eleven play sessions showing the ratio of total number of words over total number of turns. As shown in Table 6, during the two initial play sessions, Noemí’s averages 3.8 words per conversational turn. In sessions three through six Noemí’s word per turn ratio ranges from 5.5 to 6.5. In the next three sessions her number of words per turn increases from 3.4 to 6.0 before dropping to 4.0 and 4.2 in the last two play sessions. Noemí’s ratio of utterances over turns begins at 1.2 in the first play session. In the second and third play
sessions it rises to 1.4 before spiking to 1.7 in the fourth play session. In the fifth and sixth play session her ratio of words over utterances goes from 1.4 to 1.6 before fluctuating between 1.2 and 1.8 in sessions seven through nine and leveling off at 1.3 in the last two sessions.

The ratio of number of words over number of utterances in Noemí’s speech begins at 3.2 in the first play session, drops to 2.7 in the second session and then ranges from 3.5 to 4.1 through session six before dropping to 2.8 in session seven. An examination of the last four sessions reveals Noemí’s number of words over number of utterances to range from 3.1 to 3.7 in the last session.

Table 6
*Ratios of Noemí’s linguistic participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Number</th>
<th>Words over Turns</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>Words over Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use of Spanish vs. English*

An analysis of the number of Noemí’s turns involving Spanish, English, or a combination of both was also conducted. This analysis was conducted by hand due to the
inability of the CHILDES program to distinguish whether some words were phonetically realized in Spanish or English. In this case the researcher reviewed each transcript classifying each of Noemí’s turns as Spanish, English, or mixed. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Number</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>Spanish Turns</th>
<th>English Turns</th>
<th>Mixed Turns</th>
<th>% of Turns in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first session Noemí only used Spanish in 43% of the turns she took. This increased in the second play session to 91% of turns. The third play session was the one in which Noemí’s usage of Spanish was lowest, rising to 57% in session four. During session five Noemí used Spanish 43% forty-three percent of the time. Her use of Spanish jumped to 77% in session six and continued climbing to 84 % in session seven. In the eighth session Noemí’s use of Spanish was 74% and then ranged from 80% to 84% in the last three sessions.

**Scaffolding of Linguistic Production**
The following section will present examples that show how playmates were able to scaffold Noemí’s linguistic production and her participation to aid in her development of communicative competence. Examples in this section will show playmates collaboratively constructing utterances, providing direct translations, asking leading questions, and explicit correction of mistakes through modeling. The following section also presents evidence of playmate’s awareness of the roles they are taking in assisting Noemí to learn to use Spanish. Examples revealing techniques peers employed to scaffold participation will show dictation of words, providing allotted time for verbal participation in the interaction.

From the beginning of the study both sets of playmates are aware that they are participating in a research study and that their job will be to speak Spanish with Noemí so that she can learn to produce it. In the first recorded play session with Rosalinda and Angelina, Rosalinda makes a statement while she is alone in the room with the video camera that reflects that she understand the role she is to play in this study:

**Example 1**

ROS: Hola, mi nombre es Rosalinda y estoy aquí para enseñar español a Noemí. Mi hermana y yo. Estoy aquí con el VCR y está muy fun! Gracias.

[Hello, my name is Rosalinda and I am here to teach Spanish to Noemí. My sister and I. I am here with the VCR and it is very fun! Thanks.]

In the above statement Rosalinda articulates her awareness that through play she and Rosalinda will be teaching Spanish to Noemí. All of the participants, including Noemí, are aware of the language restriction that has been placed on them for the play sessions. In the following example taken from the first recorded session the girls and the researcher discuss which language should be used as they begin to play with a stuffed pink horse:

**Example 2**

ROS: Hablen inglés. [Speak English.]
ANG: Español. [Spanish.]
ROS: Angelina, habla inglés. [Angelina, speak English.]
REB: inglés! [English!]
ANG: no, español. [No, Spanish!]
ROS: El caballo sólo habla español. [The horse only speaks Spanish.]
NOE: I think that is what Rebecca meant. (Speaks in English.)

In initial play sessions the researcher participated in interactions assisting Noemí to express her thoughts in Spanish or setting the stage for the girls to provide guided assistance. In the following example, the researcher, Ana and Margarita work together to help Noemí express a thought:

**Example 3**

NOE: Get a plastic cup or a bowl. (Speaks in English.)

REB: Dime en español. [Tell me in Spanish.]

ANI: ¿Para qué es esto? [What is that for?]

REB: Dile para qué es. [Tell her what it is for.]

NOE: (Silence)

REB: ¿Cómo se dice esto en español? [How do you say that in Spanish?]

NOE: ¡No sé! [I don’t know!]

REB: ¡Sí sabes! [Yes, you know!]

NOE: Para llenar… [To fill…]

ANI: agua. [water]

NOE: No para la… para la lluvia. [No, for the, for the rain.]

MAR: ¿agua? [water?]

ANI: lluvia. [rain.]

NOE: para la lluvia. [for the rain.]

ANI: OK. [Okay.]

After this is settled they go outside and begin to collect rain in plastic cups. This play session was initiated by Noemí, however in order to carry it out the group worked together to express the idea Noemí was trying to convey. In the next example Noemí’s playmate works with her to help her give a short talk about herself as they are pretending that they are TV hostesses:

**Example 3B**

NOE: Yo soy Noemí Galeano y. [I am Noemí Galeano and.]

ROS: ¿Qué más? [What else?]

ROS: Noemí, Noemí, ¿Qué más? [Noemí, Noemí, What else?]

NOE: Y, yo juega, juega… [And I play, play…]
ROS: ¿Juegas a qué?  
NOE: a muñecas.  
ROS: ¿Te gustan las muñecas?  
NOE: Sí  
ROS: ¿Mucho?  
NOE: Sí.  
ROS: ¿Mucho, mucho?  
NOE: Sí.  
ROS: ¿Mucho, mucho, mucho, mucho?  
NOE: Y yo quiero a bailar ahora.  

In a similar example, one peer provides grammatical form in addition to vocabulary so that Noemí can state that she would like to fly in Spanish:

**Example 4**

NOE: I wish I could fly!  
REB: ¿Cómo se dice esto?  
MAR: Me gustaría…  
NOE: Fly!  
REB: ¿Cómo se dice fly?  
MAR: Volar.  
NOE: Me gustaría volar.  

In the final sentence Noemí combines structure and vocabulary to say that she would like to fly. Later Noemí uses the verb “volar” (to fly) to talk about flying in other play sessions and with other children.

Ana and Margarita also show evidence of their understanding of restricting language use in the play sessions to Spanish only as they provide Noemí with unrequested direct translations in play sessions. In the following example Ana requests that Noemí, who is pretending to be Princess Erika, a character from a recent Barbie movie, repeat her previous statement in Spanish and provides her with a direct translation so that she can do so:

**Example 5**
ANI: Yo una vez vi a diez Margaritas en la casa y una vaca que se llamaba Margarita.

[And once I saw ten Margaritas in the house and a cow that was named Margarita.]

NOE: My name is Erika and I live in a house.

(Speaks in English.)

ANI: ¿Cómo? En español: “me llamo Noemí y vivo en una casa”.

[What? In Spanish say: “ My name is Noemí and I live in a house.”]

NOE: Me llamo Noemí y yo vivo en una casa.

[My name is Noemí and I live in a house.]

MAR: ¡Mírame!

[Look at me!]

ANI: Es que es muy chiquito para ti.

[That is too little for you.] 

NOE: (Screams and runs away.)

In an additional example Ana questions Noemí about how she would say something in Spanish when she originally makes the statement in English:

**Example 6**

NOE: Wow! This is very high! (Speaks in English.)

ANI: ¿Y en español? [And in Spanish?]

NOE: Es muy… [It’s very…]

MAR: alto. [high.]

NOE: Es muy alto. [It’s very high.]

In this example, one peer guided Noemí to use Spanish while another aided her to find the vocabulary word she needed to complete her sentence. The product of this guided assistance was a complete sentence in Spanish. Noemí’s playmates let her know that they are available to provide assistance if there is a word she does not know in Spanish.

**Example 7**

NOE: Oh, ésta, ésta.

[Oh, this one, this one.]

ROS: Puedes decirme palabras que no sabes en español.
[You can tell me the words you don’t know in Spanish.]

NOE: Por supuesto.

[Of course.]

The last statement of this example shows that Noemí understands that her friend is available to help out if she needs assistance producing a particular word.

In the next example Noemí asks for clarification of meaning as she does not understand what they are going to be doing when her playmate proposes the initiation of a fight scene:

**Example 8**

ROS: Porque vamos a estar peleando.  
[Because we’re going to be fighting.]

NOE: What does that mean?   
(Speaks in English.)

As she has been told to do by her playmates, Noemí directly asks what she is supposed to do when she does not understand what she is told to do or what will happen next in what they are playing.

As Noemí attempts to speak, her peers explicitly correct her grammar mistakes as in the following example. In the following example Noemí has used the Spanish possessive pronoun “mi” which she has confused with the English word (me) instead of the first person pronoun “yo” (I) as she tries to assert that she wants something.

**Example 9**

MAR: Ten, yo voy primero. Primero tienes ésta y después te doy la otra. (to Noemí)  
[Take this, I’ll go first. First you have this one and later I’ll give you the other.]

MAR: Y después la pasas a quien quiera.  
[And later you pass it to whoever you want.]

NOE: Ok.  
[Okay.]

ANI: ¿Quién quiere esta mona? La vendo por diez pesos.  
[Who wants this doll? I am selling it for ten pesos.]

NOE: Me! Me! Me!  
(Speaks in English)
MAR: “yo”
   [I do.]
NOE: yo.
   [I do.]

In this case Margarita corrects her by saying “yo” (I) or (Me) in English, resulting in
Noemí’s correct usage of this first person pronoun in this example and in dialogue in
subsequent play sessions.

*Play Scenarios*

Throughout the play sessions the girls structure play scenarios in which they all
become actresses and take on and perform varying roles in order to act out the scenario.
A summary of themes of related play sessions is presented in Appendix F. Dialogues
created within these play scenarios can serve as linguistic scaffolds as peers aid group
members to produce language in order to contribute to the dialogue and collectively tell a
story or enact a drama.

During these play sessions the playmates create what could be considered scripts
in a drama and then collectively act them out as they unfold the plot. Lines are dictated
from playmate to playmate so that the action can continue as the appropriate person
produces the next necessary line. In the play session related to the next example,
Rosalinda played the role of the strict mother and Noemí and Angelina were the
daughters who should have already been asleep:

**Example 10**

ROS: Ustedes deben de estar dormidas.
   [You all should already be asleep.]
ANG: Yo dormía allá y tú me dijiste: “Hermana, tengo miedo.”
   [I was sleeping over there and you said: “Sister, I’m scared.”]
   [Sister. Sister, I’m scared.]

In this example Noemí uses the sentence that is dictated to her by her friend in order to
act out this situation, adding only the word hermana as she plays the role of the scared
sister pretending to try to get the older sibling’s attention. The same expression appears a
few minutes later as the children continue this play session. In this case the scene is
structured once again by Angelina with explanations from her sister Rosalinda. This scene occurs as the children pretend to arrive at school:

**Example 11**

ANG: Tú dijiste: “Hermana, tengo miedo. Hermana ven conmigo”.

[You said: “Sister, I am afraid. Sister come with me.”]

ROS: Pero tú te necesitas que estar acostando, Noemí, Noemí.

[But you needed to be asleep, Noemí, Noemí.]


[Lie down. You said: “Sister, I am very, very afraid. Come.”]

NOE: Tengo mucho miedo, ven.

[I am very afraid, come.]

An additional example in which lines are dictated to Noemí so that she can also participate in the play session occurs as part of the same dialogue and is listed in the following examples:

**Example 12**

ANG: Hermana. [Sister.]

NOE: mmm? [Hmmm?]


NOE: Mmm. [Hmm?]

ANG: Me voy a mi cuarto cuando duermas. Tú dijiste: “No te vayas”.

[I’ll go to my room when you are asleep. You said, “Don’t go.”]

NOE: No te vayas. [Don’t go.]

Once again, Noemí’s playmate aids her participation in the enactment of this drama by providing her with the linguistic means to participate in the action. In the following example Rosalinda redirects Noemí’s speech. Instead of saying “¿para qué?” Rosalinda decides that “¿Para quién?” would be more in line with the drama of the current scene:

**Example 13**

ANG: Noemí, ¿puedes llevar mi maleta? [Noemí, can you carry my suitcase?]

NOE: ¿Para qué? [For what?]

ANG: Tú dijiste ¿pa(ra) quién? [You say: for whom?]

NOE: ¿Pa(ra) quién? [For whom?]
ANG: ¡Para mí! Me voy a la casa.  
[For me! I’m going home.]

The following example, taken from a scene in which the girls are going to have a birthday party for their evil mother, begins with Rosalinda telling Noemí exactly what she should say again. Then, when Rosalinda screams “¡Sorpresa!”, Noemí follows her cue and does the same.

**Example 14**

**ROS:** No me van, no me van a mentir.  
[Don’t lie, don’t lie to me.]

**ANG:** No le estoy mintiendo.  
[I’m not lying to you.]

**ANG:** Tú dijiste: prende la luz. (to Noemí)  
[You said: turn on the light.]

**NOE:** ¡Prende la luz!  
[Turn on the light!]

**ANG:** Sorpresa.  
[Surprise.]

**NOE:** ¡Sorpresa!  
[Surprise!]

In the following example Noemí also repeats her dictated line as they talk about a boy that the girls are no longer supposed to see anymore:

**Example 15**

**ANG:** ¡A mi mamá no le gusta!  
[My mother would not like this.]

**NOE:** O, ¡no no no!  
[Oh, no, no no!]

**ANG:** ¡Despídelo, ahora mismo!  
[Tell him goodbye, right now!]

**ROS:** Dile, vete, vete ahora. No te quiero ver!  
[Tell him go, get out of here right now! I don’t want to see you anymore!]

**NOE:** Amigo, vete.  
[Friend, go.]

**NOE:** No, no te quiero ver.  
[I don’t, I don’t want to see you.]

**ANG:** ¿No le dijiste al niño?  
[Didn’t you tell the boy?]

**ANG:** Él estaba allí, allí estaba, Noemí.  
[He was there, there he was, Noemí.]

**ANG:** Un niño allí, ¡tienes que decirle!  
[A boy over there, You have to tell him!]

**NOE:** Oye, oye, oye.  
[Listen, listen, listen.]

**ANG:** “Yo no te quiero volver a ver”.  
[I don’t want to see you again.]

**NOE:** Yo no te quiero volver a ver.  
[I don’t want to see you again.]

**NOE:** Sí.  
[Yes.]

**ROS:** El niño se fue.  
[The boy left.]
Noemí manages to put her own touches onto the lines as she acts them out, adding “amigo” before “vete” and then adding an entire line when she says “oye, oye, oye.”

*Pretend Play for Language Production*

**Research Question #2a: How is the ability to engage in extended dialogue developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?**

The second research question attempts to identify ways in which the ability to produce spoken language is developed through pretend play with Spanish speaking children. In initial play sessions Noemí tends to participate by answering questions that are addressed directly to her. She does this with the assistance of her peers who directly or indirectly provide her the necessary vocabulary or grammatical structures. As her participation intensifies in later play sessions Noemí must expand her repertoire of linguistic functions in order to participate in play activities. Examples presented in this section will show when and how the following communicative functions arise in her linguistic production: Describing ongoing events in the present tense, discussing past events using the preterit tense, expressing wants and needs, discussing likes or preferences, expressing feelings, asking questions, describing objects or actions using adjectives and adverbs, using command forms to affect the behavior of peers and using possessive adjectives, possessive pronouns, and direct and indirect object pronouns to specifically describe events.

*Engaging in Extended Dialogue*

In order to engage in extended dialogue Noemí must produce vocabulary and incorporate new linguistic functions into her speech. A central task is to produce sentences with subjects and verbs. Since the conjugation of a verb in Spanish reveals the subject it is important that she learn to conjugate verbs in the proper form in order to communicate what she is trying to say. The verbs “querer” (to want), “poder” (to be able to), and “ir” (to go) are verbs that Noemí uses repeatedly conjugated in the first person singular (yo/ I) or first person plural (nosotros/ we) form from the second play session forward. The following example shows her use of the first person plural (nosotros/ we) form of the verb “ir” (to go).

**Example 16**

ANI: Pon música. [Put on music]
NOE: Vamos a bailar. Vamos a bailar.          [Let’s dance. Let’s dance]
ANI: Margarita                                  [Margarita]

This structure was used three times by Angelina and Rosalinda in the initial play session.
Noemí begins using this structure as soon as the second play session begins.
The next example reveals Noemí’s use of the first person singular (yo/I) form of “querer”
to want) in the second play session, a structure which has previously been used by
playmates in the first two play sessions.

**Example 17**
ANI: Es que le gustan las monas.    [It’s that she likes dolls.
NOE: ¡Quiero tirarlas!    [I want to throw them!]
MAR: Ok. Ésta va ir en el carro.    [Ok, this one is going in the car.]

By the end of the third session Noemí is correctly using the yo form of poder to
ask someone to give her something as Margarita comes into the room with an armful of
Barbie dolls. Up to this point the yo form of poder had been used eight times over the
past three play sessions by Noemí’s peers or the researcher.

**Example 18**
NOE: Quiero hacer esto.    [I want to do this.]
NOE: ¿Puedo tener esto?    [Can I have this one?]
ANI: Traje éstas, las monas.    [I brought these, the dolls.]
MAR: Tengo el chiquitico, la mujer y el hombre.   [ I’ve got the little one, the
woman and the man]

*Use of “yo” with verbs*
In the fourth session Noemí uses the verb “venir” (to come) for the first time. Since it is
an irregular verb, and its first person singular “yo” (I) form has not been previously used
by her peers, she uses an incorrect form as she attempts to pronounce the first person
form of this verb. She does, however, put the first person pronoun “yo” (I) in front of the
verb as she uses attempts to express her intentions using this verb.

**Example 19**
NOE: ¡Yo vieno!    [I’m coming!]
ANI: ¿Cómo dices?    [What are you saying?]
NOE: ¡Yo vieno!   [I’m coming!]
NOE: ¡Yo vieno!   [I’m coming!]
NOE: Yo quiero montar un caballo.   [I want to ride a horse.]
ANI: Oh, sí puedes.   [Oh, you can.]
ANI: ¿Cuál quieres Noemí?  [Which one do you want, Noemí?]
NOE: ¿Puedo usar esto?  [Can I use this one?]

In the play session that provides the context for the next example, the girls are pretending to be on a show where famous people are being interviewed. Noemí is being interviewed by her friend, Ana.

**Example 20**

ANI: ¿Hay otra cosa que hiciste en casa?  [Is there anything else you did at home?]
NOE: Yo jugar.    [I to play.]
ANI: Ven, parate aquí.   [Come, stand here.]
ANI: ¿Hay algo más que haces en casa?  [Is there something else you do at home?]
NOE: Yo jugar.    [I to play.]
ANI: Son buenas cosas.   [Those are good things.]

Ana first asks Noemí a question in the preterite or simple past tense. In both cases she responds with the pronoun “yo” (I) and an unconjugated infinitive. “Yo” (I) is also placed in front of the verb in the next related example:

**Example 21**

ANI: Dinos algo…que tú has hecho para poder hacer un show bien bonito.  
[Tell us something… that you have done to make such a good show.]
NOE: Yo feed mi pescado.   [I feed my fish.]
ANI: Ok bien.   [Ok good.]

In this example, however, the verb happens to be in English.

The sixth play session contains a scene in which the girls are pretending to have magical powers. Noemí is pretending to work in a store and to have a magic stick she draws with. In order to state her role to the other girls she needs help coming up with the word draw.
Example 22

NOE: How do you say draw in Spanish?  
[How do you say draw in Spanish?]

REB: Pregúntale a ella.  
[Ask her.]

NOE: Yo dibujar.    
[I to draw.]

NOE: I work in a store. I draw.  
(Speaks in English.)

REB: ¿Por qué? ¿Por qué? No entiendo.  
[Why? Why? I don’t understand.]

JUA: Pregúntale a ellas, linda, como se dice.  
[Ask them, honey, how it is said.]

NOE: ¿Cómo se dice porque, because, porque, work in the store and draw?  
[How do you say because, because, because work in the store and draw?]

ROS: Porque yo dibujo en la tienda.  
[Because I draw in the store.]

NOE: Porque yo dibujo en la tienda.  
[Because I draw in the store.]

Rosalinda tells her how to say what she wanted to know how to say and gives her the yo form of to draw, simplifying her sentence at the same time.

The fourth play session contains more examples of Noemí formulating sentences with subjects and verbs. She conjugates multiple verbs in the first person to express her wants and needs: “estar” (to be), “ser” (to be), “querer” (to want), and “ir” (to go) estar, thus building the repertoire of verbs she is able to use in the present tense. She also uses other forms of verbs to ask questions and describe the actions of others. In the following example she uses the yo form of “estar” plus an adjective to tell how she feels about something.

Example 23

MAR: ¿Quieres jugar con mermaids?  
[Do you want to play with mermaids?]

NOE: Estoy triste.  
[I am sad.]

ANI: ¿Por qué?  
[Why?]

NOE: They went to the fair.  
[They went to the fair.]

Discussing Past Events.

Noemí begins to use the preterite, or simple past tense, to express events that have already occurred beginning in the fifth play session as she tells the other girls that she has found a doll inside an end table.

Example 24
ROS: Tú debes de estar allí. [You should be there.]

(Directs Noemí to get inside the end table)

NOE: ¡Yo (en)contré, yo (en)contré aquí! [I found, I found here!]

ROS: ¿Qué encontraste? [What did you find?]

NOE: Ésta. [This.]

ROS: ¿muñeca? [Doll?]

NOE: Sí, un, una muñeca. [Yes, an, a doll.]

She uses this same verb to talk about other things she has found later in the same session.

**Example 25**

NOE: Yo encontré dos palos y otro palo. [I found two sticks and another stick]

ROS: Mira, hay una estrella. [Look, there is a star.]

Other examples of the use of preterite verbs emerge in the tenth play session. When Rosalinda accidentally is hit by her sister, Noemí uses the past tense to ask her what happened.

**Example 26**

ROS: Tú tiene… ¡Auch! [You have… Ouch!]

NOE: ¿Qué pasó? [What happened?]

ANG: ¿Dónde te pegué? [Where did you hit yourself?]

In this case Noemí asks a question that has been asked many times throughout the play sessions by Noemí’s playmates as in the following example taken from the beginning of the sixth play session:

**Example 27**

NOE: Ouch, I hurt my shoulder! (Speaks in English.)

ANG: ¿Qué te pasó? [What happened to you?]

JUA: ¿Qué te pasó Noemí? [What happened to you Noemí?]

NOE: I hurt it. (Speaks in English.)

Irregular preterite is seen in Noemí’s speech in the following example:

**Example 28**

ANG: Invisible, nadie lo puede ver. [Invisible, nobody can see it.]

ROS: Lo vi. [I saw it.]

NOE: Lo vi. [I saw it.]
As shown in this example this verb form is a repetition of what the previous speaker has just said. It is not seen again in the remaining play sessions.

Expressing Needs.

Both Rosalinda and Angelina use the formulaic expression “Necesitar + que + infinitive” to express needs. This form, “Necesitar + que + infinitive,” differs from the “Necesitar + infinitive” structure that is used in our home. Instances of the incorporation of this formulaic expression into speech have already been cited previous examples. In the next example Angelina tells Noemí to come to the room and follow her as they try to hide themselves inside the end tables.

Example 29

ANG: Necesitas que venir atrás de mí.
[You need to come after me.]
ANG: ¡Noemí, Noemí, Noemí, Noemí!
(Calling Noemí.)
ROS: Si ustedes se van a meter en una de estas cajas.
[If you are going to get in one of these boxes.]
ANG: Noemí tienes que seguirme.
[Noemí you have to follow me.]

An additional example follows in which Angelina uses a form of necesitar + que + infinitive to express what she needs to do.

Example 30

ANG: Yo necesito que ir a la escuela, ma.
[I need to go to school, ma.]
NOE: Caliente
[Hot.]
ANG: Hermana, te necesito que llevar a la escuela. Ven hermana.
[Sister, I need to take you to the school. Come sister.]

In subsequent dialogue, Noemí also uses this formula to talk about what she needs to take home from school.

Example 31

ROS: No sé pero estás en problemas.
[I don’t know but you’re in trouble.]
ANG: ¡Ah! Hm. Ya me voy de la clase y a mi casa.
[Ah! Hmmm. I’m leaving class right now and going home.]
ROS: Voy a llamar a tu mamá entonces.
[I’m going to call your mother then.]
NOE: Necesito que llevar mi mochila.
[I need to take my bookbag.]
ANG: Llámala.
[Call her.]

Asking questions.

In addition to being able to form simple sentences to describe events that happen or have happened, the ability to ask questions is an important linguistic function. Interrogatives are used by Noemí’s peers in the first play session. Noemí begins to incorporate these interrogatives into her own speech to form questions as play sessions continue. She then uses these questions to have others elaborate on their ideas and to clarify meaning.

The interrogative “¿dónde” (where) is used by the girls beginning in the second play session and is commonly used in all additional sessions to identify the locations of toys or to ask where things are. Noemí uses the interrogative “¿dónde?” to ask where things are beginning in the third session.

Example 32

NOE: Yo tengo otra, está bien.
[ I have another, it’s okay.]
NOE: ¿Dónde está la enemigo, enemiga?
[Where is the enemy, enemy?]
ANG: Tú eres nuestra enemiga, pero siempre nos tratas como tus hijas.
[You are our enemy, but you always treat us like your daughters.]
ANG: Mira, estoy confundida.
[Look, I am confused.]

In the third play session Noemí also uses this interrogative to clarify locations being pointed out to her.
Example 33
ANG: Hermana, hermana. [Sister, sister.]
ANG: Mira allí. [Look over there.]
NOE: Allí, ¿dónde? [There, where?]

When a roaming pit bull interrupts their play in the fourth play session, Noemí uses this interrogative to clarify information the girls give her about the location of the dog’s activities as they watch him through the window:

Example 34
ROS: Mira lo que está haciendo. [Look what he is doing.]
NOE: ¿Dónde? [Where?]
ANG: Allí. Por allí. [There. Over there.]

The interrogative “¿quién?” (who) is not used by Noemí until the sixth play session. The first time that she uses ¿quién? it is dictated to her by her playmate Angelina in the following dialogue:

Example 35
ROS: Dilo: “quien nos puede ayudar?” [Say it: “Who can help us?”]
NOE: “¿Quién?” [Who?]
ANG: Yo, el Chapulín Colorado. [Me, Chapulín Colorado.]
ANG: ¡Síganme los buenos! [Good guys follow me!]

This interrogative continues to be used by her playmates, although it is not used again by Noemí until the eleventh play session as she tries to figure out who she is hearing over the speaker system from the other room:

Example 36
NOE: ¿Quién está diciendo esto? [Who is saying this?]
NOE: Vamos, vamos. [Let’s go, Let’s go.]
NOE: Hey, hey, why am I talking to myself? (Speaks in English.)

This example shows Noemí using this interrogative as she talks to herself alone in the living room. During the same play session she uses it to define who is being assigned the role of younger sister.

Example 37
NOE: Ok, eres la hermana mayor. [Ok, you are the older sister.]
MAR: Ella puede ser la hermana.  [She could be the sister.]

NOE: ¿Quién?  [Who?]

MAR: Tú.  [You.]

The interrogative “¿qué?” (what) is the interrogative most frequently used throughout the play sessions. However Noemí does not begin to ask questions using ¿qué? until the seventh play session in a discussion about what type of food is going to be served.

**Example 38**

ANG: Hola, usted podría probar ésta para ver si le sirve?
[Hey, could you try this to see if it fits you?]

ANG: Hermana, ten, comida.  [Sister, take this food.]

NOE: Yum, yum, yum yum yum.  (Speaks in English.)

ANG: Ven hermana hay más.  [Come here sister there is more.]

NOE: ¿qué?  [What?]

NOE: Yum, yum.  (Speaks in English.)

NOE: Yum yum yum.  (Speaks in English.)

Noemí also uses the interrogative to find out what one of her playmates is doing in the last play session

**Example 39**

MAR: El caballo dijo, hola pato, ¿Qué estás haciendo?
[The horse said, hello duck, what are you doing?]

NOE: hola pato.
[Hello duck.]

NOE: ¿Qué estás haciendo?
[What are you doing?]

ANI: Se le perdió la mamá.
[He has lost his mother.]

MAR: Y el caballo también.
[And the horse did too.]

This example reflects Margarita dictating that Noemí, who is playing the role of the horse, use this line to ask what the duck is doing so that the plot can be developed. Ana
then adds on that the duck has lost his mother and then Margarita state that the horse has, too.

The interrogative “¿cómo?” (how) begins to be used by Noemí during session three.

**Example 40**

ROS: Ahora, no puedes respirar porque estás debajo del agua.
[Now you can’t breathe because you are under the water.]

NOE: ¿Pero cómo respiro?
[But how will I breathe?]

ROS: Allá adentro.
[There inside.]

ROS: Este, toda la agua se va para abajo y allí y luego tú puedes respirar.
[This one, all the water goes down and there and later you can breathe.]  

NOE: Sí, ¿pero cómo?
[Yes, but how?]

ANG: Cierra la puerta un poquito.
[Close the door a little bit.]

REB: Pues, no te metas, entonces.
[Well, don’t get inside, then.]

By the tenth session Noemí asks a wide variety of questions. In the following example she is questioning her father about why he is demanding that she speak only in Spanish during the play session and also asks her friend why she can not hear her.

**Example 41**

NOE: Rosalinda, Rosalinda, can you hear me?

(Speaks in English.)

JUA: No, no te escucha.
[No, I can’t hear you.]

NOE: ¿Por qué?
[Why?]

REB: Bueno, empiecen ustedes y yo busco algo.
[Well, start and I’ll look for something.]
JUA: Empiecen ustedes en español.

[Start in Spanish.]

NOE: ¿Por qué?

[Why?]


[Speak Spanish. Don’t speak English. Speak in Spanish.]

In the seventh play session the girls pretend that they are left behind as their parents have to flee a hurricane devastated area to find work elsewhere. The parents are not able to come back and have been put in prison. Noemí uses the interrogative “¿por qué?” (why) to ask why her parents have gone away.

Example 42

ANG: Y las hermanas están muy tristes.

[And the sisters are very sad.]

ROS: Ella era la más chiquita y ella era mi chiquita hermana.

[She is the smallest, and she was my little sister.]

ANG: Es la hermana chiquita.

[She is the little sister.]

ROS: Eres mi chiquita hermana.

[You are my little sister.]

NOE: ¿Por qué mi mamá y papá no está aquí?

[Why aren’t my mother and father here?]

ROS: Porque se fueron a otro lado.

[Because they went somewhere else.]

ANG: Por eso.

[That’s why.]

NOE: Oh, ¿ah?.

[Oh, what?]

ROS: Por eso.

[That’s why.]

ANG: Por eso, tu mamá y tu papá tuvieron que ir a otro lugar muy feo a causa del huracán y una gente los metieron en el cárcel.
[That’s why, your mother and father had to go to another very ugly place because of the hurricane and some people put them in jail.]

This question causes replies by both playmates. Noemí’s reply in the second turn signals a need for additional information leading to a more detailed response from Angelina.

In addition to using interrogatives, or question words, to form questions Noemí also uses verbs to formulate yes/no questions. In the following example she uses the third person plural form of “querer” (to want) to ask the girls if they would like to put some plastic princesses up on the wall in her bedroom:

**Example 43**

NOE: ¿Quieren poner esto en la pared?
[Do you want to put this on the wall?]

REB: No, es de ella. Podemos poner tus tuyas en la pared.
[No, those are hers. We can put yours on the wall.]

NOE: Tres princesas.
[Three princesses.]

*Describing with adjectives and adverbs.*

Adjectives and adverbs are incorporated into descriptions to provide more detailed descriptions and elaborations as in the following example:

**Example 44**

ROS: Tienes que comer.
[You have to eat.]

ANG: Ya tenemos mucha comida, ahora vamos a hacer una sopa.
[We already have a lot of food, and now we are going to make a soup.]

NOE: Una sopa muy rica.
[A very delicious soup.]

As the friends pretend to be sisters preparing soup, Noemí elaborates on the taste of the soup declaring it to be very delicious. In the next example, Noemí uses both adjectives “muy” (very) and “buena” (good) to describe the food they are preparing.

**Example 45**

NOE: Mira ésta.  [Look at this.]

NOE: Ésta es muy buena!  [It is very delicious!]
In a related example Noemí attempts to describe herself and the other girls as they pretend to be Barbie Princesses.

**Example 46**

NOE: Yo soy Barbie. [I am Barbie.]
ANI: Tu eres Barbie. [You are Barbie.]
NOE: Yo soy Barbie. [I am Barbie.]
NOE: Y yo soy muy muy muy. [I am very, very, very.]
NOE: yo. [I.]
NOE: Tú beautiful y yo es beautiful también [You are beautiful and I is beautiful, too.]

Although she does not know the word for beautiful here, she uses the word *muy* to elaborate on the magnitude of what she is about to express.

In addition to adjectives, Noemí elaborates by incorporating the adverbs “también” (also) and “tampoco” (either, neither) as well as possessive adjectives into her sentences.

**Example 47**

ROS: Ésta es mi flor. [This is my flower.]
NOE: Pero yo quiero, yo quiero una flora. [But I want, I want a flower.]
NOE: Yo quiero la flor también [I want the flower, too.]

As possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns are incorporated into Noemí’s language, her speech becomes more specific and detailed in the following example Noemí uses the possessive adjective “mis” (my) in order to inform her playmates about her problem of not being able to carry her books up the stairs.

**Example 48**

NOE: No puedo llevar mis libros. [I can’t carry my books.]
NOE: ¡Ayúdame! [Help me!]
ANI: Te ayudo. [I’ll help you.]
ANI: Ven. [Come on.]

In a discussion about their Barbie dolls’ shoes Noemí uses a possessive pronoun to direct her playmate’s attention to her doll so that she can confirm that her doll also has high heals.
Incorporation of pronouns.

The following example shows Noemí beginning to incorporate possessive pronouns into her descriptions in session eight as the girls look for their Barbie dolls.

Example 50
MAR: ¿Dónde está mi mona?  [Where is my doll?]
ANI: Aquí es la tuya.   [Here is yours.]
ANI: Noemí, la tuya estaba aquí?  [Noemí, is yours here?]
NOE: No sé.    [I don’t know.]
NOE: La mía está aquí.  [Mine is here.]

In later play sessions prepositions also appear in the Noemí’s sentences. Noemí, Rosalinda and Angelina are playing with dolls in the next example, and Noemí’s sentences are extended as she incorporates the preposition “con” (with) into her instructions to her friend.

Example 51
ROS: Mejor me voy a poner algo más. Mejor me voy a poner algo mas pa(ra) pa(ra) dormir.
[I think I’d better put on something else. I think I’d better put on something else to, to sleep in.]
NOE: Mamá… tú vas a la casa con mamá.
[Mama, you go to the house with mama.]

Describing preferences.

During the play sessions Noemí begins to articulate her preferences and to talk about likes and dislikes. In the following example the girls discuss what they like about Christmas.
Example 52

ANI: ¿Por qué te gusta Navidad? [Why do you like Christmas?]
NOE: Porque Christmas trees are up. [Because Christmas trees are up.]
REB: ¿Cómo se dice Christmas Trees? [How do you say Christmas trees?]
MAR: Árboles de Navidad. [Christmas trees.]
NOE: Árboles de Navidad son mis favoritas. [Christmas trees are my favorites.]
NOE: Navidad es muy divertido. [Christmas is so much fun.]
NOE: Yo quiero Navidad. [I love Christmas.]

In this case Noemí talks about how Christmas trees are one of her favorite things and then goes on to say that Christmas is fun and that she loves it. In the play session where the pit bull appears and the girls decide to return to the trailer because they are very afraid, Noemí talks about her dislike for the dog and the fact that it slobbered on Rosalinda.

Example 53

REB: No te preocupes, que no nos va a hacer nada. [Don’t worry, he is not going to harm us.]
NOE: No, pero este perro es malo. [No, but this dog is bad.]
ROS: Me hizo babas. [He slobbered on me.]
NOE: No me gusta. [I don’t like him.]

Participating in Conversations

Research Question 2b: How is the ability to participate in conversations developed through pretend play in an immersion setting with Spanish speaking children?

Noemí is able to gain entrance and participate in conversations by using structures provided by her peers as scaffolds that assist her in formulating her own responses. Examples of participatory techniques that will be presented in the following section include repetition of the speech of others, repetition of her own utterances, asking playmates for direct translations, asking playmates for clarification, and using commands to gain attention in order to take the floor. In the case of the following example Noemí responds to the question by using her peer’s response to the same question as a scaffold to form a complete sentence.

Example 54

ANG: Ok, ¿cuál es tu nombre? [Ok, what is your name?]
ROS: Mi nombre es Angelina Andrea Campos. [My name is Angelina Andrea Campos.]
ANG: ¿Y el tuyo? (to Noemí) [And yours?]
NOE: Noe. Mi nombre es Noemí Galeano. [Noe. My name is Noemí Galeano.]

Without such a scaffold she answers the same question but responds only with her name—not producing a complete sentence:

**Example 55**

ANG: ¿Cuál es tu nombre? [What is your name?]
ANG: ¿Y qué estás comiendo? [And what are you eating?]
NOE: A candy bar. (Speaks in English.)

Noemí is able to provide a response to this question however she answers the second question in English. In a similar example Noemí is able to participate in conversation by using words that others have recently stated.

**Example 56**

ANI: Anyway se cayeron las dos. ¿Qué les pasó? [Anyway, they both fell down. What happened to them?]
MAR: ¡Ayuda! ¡Ayuda! [Help! Help!]
ANI: ¿Qué? No escucho. [What? I can’t hear you.]
MAR: Ayuda. [Help.]
ANI: Oh, ¿ayuda? [Oh, help?]
NOE: ¡Ayuda! [Help!]
ANI: Necesitan ayuda. [They need help.]
In this example Noemí uses a single word and receives confirmation from Ana after demanding help. In the second play session Noemí uses informal commands to get attention and to gain entrance to conversations:

**Example 57**

MAR: Ana, Las monas van a bailar hoy.

[And, the dolls are going to dance today.]

NOE: Mira! Mira!

[Look! Look!]

NOE: la, la, la, la, la!

(Singing)

NOE: Una historia de…

[A story about…]

ANI: Margarita, Margarita. Margarita es… (begins a story about her sister).

[Margarita, Margarita. Margarita is…]

MAR: Una vez vi a una persona Ana Ramos y era como una casa. Vi a cuatro Anas y después a cinco y estaban caminando allí.

[Once upon a time I say a person Anita Ramos and she was like a house. I saw four Anas and later five and they were walking around there.]

In this example Noemí changes the topic of conversation to a storytelling episode using the informal command form “mira” (look). In following turns she sings to hold the floor and then tries to begin to tell a story. Later Noemí uses the informal command form of the verb “venir” (to come) to get her pretend mother to come to her as shown in the following example:

**Example 58**

NOE: Ven, ven.

[Come, come.]

Rosalinda: Allí voy, ¿Okay?

[I’m coming, Okay?]

Noemí: ¡Ma, ven!

[Mama, come!]

Once she begins using these commands with some regularity one of her peers attempts to lead her to the use of the plural command form of the verb mirar:

**Example 59**

NOE: ¡Eh! You ladies. You, everybody. (Speaks in English.)
REB: Habla en español. [Speak in Spanish.]
NOE: Mira, ¡mira! [Look, Look!]
ROS: Miren [Look]
ROS: Miren. [Look.]
NOE: Miren. [Look.]

Noemí is receptive to the correction, although she originally pronounces the form that she is familiar with, when she receives no positive feedback on either of the forms she offers she listens to the next form and repeats it. In the next play session Noemí uses the third person plural command form to call for help from both playmates. It is in this session that she incorporates the use of the direct object pronoun with the previously acquired verb ayudar and offers the command in the plural form:

**Example 60**

NOE: Ayúdenme. [Help me.]
ROS: Déjenme entrar allá en su cuarto! [Let me come into your room!]
NOE: ¡No puedo respirar! [I can’t breathe!]
ANG: Al caballo. Ya vamos a dormir. [Give it to the horse. We are going to sleep now.]

In the following examples Noemí attempts to integrate the direct object *lo* into her speech as she tells her playmate that she needs something.

**Example 61**

ROS: La Barbie está dormida, hermana. Necesito esto, Noemí. [The Barbie is asleep, sister. I need this, Noemí.]
NOE: No I lo necesito. [No, I need it.]
ANG: Dámelo. Vamos a tapar el caballo. Tiene mucho frío. Dámelo, [Give it to me. We are going to cover the horse. He is very cold. Give it to me.]

*Request for translation.*
In order to be able to participate in conversations or dialogues, Noemí asks for direct translations in order to convert her English structures into their Spanish equivalents:

**Example 62**

ANI: Margarita, Margarita, aquí. Margarita se cae y rompe la calabaza.  
[Margarita, Margarita, here. Margarita falls and breaks the pumpkin.]

NOE: I fell.  
(Speaks in English)

MAR: “Me caí”  
[I fell]

NOE: Me caí. Rebecca, how do you say on the carpet?  
[I fell. *Rebecca, how do you say on the carpet?*]

REB: En el piso.  
[On the floor.]

NOE: en el piso.  
[On the floor.]

ANI: Tú empujabas esta cosa y Margarita te conocía y después eran amigas, Margarita. Tú te venías acá, acá, y tu te venías acá a comprar corn. Y ves a Erika, y después le dices hola.  
[You were pushing this thing and Margarita met you and later you were friends, Margarita. You were coming here, here, and you were coming here to buy corn. And you see Erika and later you say hello.]

NOE: (Runs off screaming.)

This direct translation allows Noemí, who is playing the role of Erika, to contribute briefly to the conversation but Ana takes over after Noemí repeats the translated phrase and takes control setting the scenario for play. This results in screaming on the part of Noemí.

**Repetition.**

A similar request also leads to repetition of single words or phrases in order to take the floor for a moment within the conversation.

**Example 63**
NOE: How do I say it’s too tight?
   (Speaks in English.)
REB: Dile que no vas a llevar esto porque es muy apretado.
      [Say you are not going to wear it because it is very tight.]
NOE: Muy apretado.
      [Very tight.]
In the following example the girls are discussing values they found at WalMart during a pretend shopping trip.

**Example 64**
ANI: Fuimos también y me compré unos tacones bien bonitos.
      [We went too, and I bought myself some very pretty high heeled shoes.]
NOE: Me too!
      (Speaks in English.)
ANI: Y los compré por treinta dólares allí en WalMart.
      [And I bought them for thirty dollars there in WalMart.]
ANI: Está bien.
      [That’s good.]
NOE: Sí, está bien.
      [Yes, it’s good.]
Not only does Noemí repeat what others have says but maintains the floor by repeating her own statements twice. In the following example she and her friends are talking about the fact that Noemí does not have a sister.

**Example 65**
NOE: Oh, yo quiero un sister.  [Oh, I want a sister.]
ANI: ¿No tienes una hermana?  [You don’t have a sister?]
NOE: ¡No tengo!  [I don’t have one!]
NOE: ¡No tengo!  [I don’t have!]
ANI: Mira allí, ella es tu hermana.  [Look there. She is your sister.]
NOE: No, sólo tengo prima.  [No, I only have a cousin.]
In the following example, Noemí verbally agrees with each statement that her playmate makes repeating the word yes after each of her playmate’s turns.
Example 66

ANG: Ya va a ser noche. [Soon it is going to be night.]
NOE: Sí. [Yes.]
ANG: Ya va a estar lista. [And it’s going to be ready.]
NOE: Sí. [Yes.]
ANG: Ya vamos a probarla. [And we’re going to try it.]
NOE: Sí. [Yes.]

Constructing Narratives or Monologues

Research Question 2c: How is the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?

The third part of research question number two sets out to look at ways in which Noemí developed the ability to create narratives or monologues through pretend play. In the next section examples will be given in which Noemí begins to produce statements that direct the development of the group’s narrative. Examples will be provided in which Noemí expresses her thoughts, tells stories or helps to develop the collective story by taking multiple turns. By the ninth and tenth sessions Noemí is not only contributing to the stories and to the dramatization by repeating dictated prompts, she also questions plot development suggested by her peers, elaborating on their suggestion and producing her own lines based on the developing plot and storyline. In the following example Noemí seeks to define Angelina’s role within the drama they are currently enacting:

Example 67

ANG: Porque tú eres mi amiga. [Because you are my friend.]
ANG: Tú vives conmigo ahora. [You live with me now.]
NOE: Es su hija. [She is your daughter.]
NOE: Estoy lista. [I am ready.]

After defining Angelina’s role Noemí states that she is ready to begin to act out the assigned roles. The next examples show that Noemí questions her playmate as she instructs her to close herself inside a wooden end table.

Example 68

ROS: Sí, Ustedes se van a meter en una de esas cajas.
[Yes, you all are going to get in one of these boxes.]

ANG: Noemí, tienes que seguirme.
[Noemí, you have to follow me.]

ROS: Si ustedes se meten en una de estas cajas, allá dentro ustedes tienen aire.
[If you all get inside one of these boxes, there inside you have air.]

ROS: Métete allá dentro, pero bien.
[Get in there, really inside.]

ROS: Ahora no puedes respirar porque estás debajo del agua.
[Now, you can’t breathe because you are there under the water.]

NOE: Pero, ¿cómo respiro?
[But how do I breathe?]  

ROS: Allá adentro.
[There inside.]

ROS: Este, todo la agua se va para abajo y allí y luego tú puedes respirar.
[It’s that all the water goes down and there and later you can breathe.]

NOE: Sí, ¿pero cómo?
[Yes, but how?]

ROS: Cierra la puerta un poquito.
[Close the door a little bit.]

In this case Noemí is not simply repeating what others say as in earlier play sessions, but asking for clarification of an issue about which she is concerned. In the next example she also asks a question in order to receive clarification about whether or not there will be a piñata at the birthday party.

**Example 69**

ANG: Ma, ¿qué pasa?
[Ma, what is happening?]

ROS: Una fiesta tan bonita y dijeron: “queremos pastels.”
[Such a pretty party and you all said: “we want cake.”]

ROS: ¿Primero la piñata?
[The piñata first?]

NOE: Sí, una piñata ahora.
[Yes, a piñata now.]

ANG: Ok.

[Okay.]

ANG: No traje una piñata pero ahora la traigo.

[I didn’t bring the piñata but now I bring it.]

NOE: ¿No hay piñata?

[There’s no piñata?]

ANG: Aquí está, ma.

[Here it is, ma.]

During a pretend birthday party in which the students are having imaginary cake, Noemí offers spoons to her playmates. After several turns one of the playmates volunteers the Spanish word for spoon.

**Example 70**

ANG: Queremos pastel.

[We want cake.]

ROS: Allí lo voy a traer.

[There, I am going to bring it.]

ANG: Tú dijiste: “no mandes” (to Rosalinda)

[You said: “Don’t give orders.”]

ROS: ¿un chiquito o muy grande?

[A small one or a very big one?]

ANG: Porque necesitamos uno grande.

[Because we need a big one.]

NOE: ¿Quieres un spoon para, para tu pastel?

[Do you want a spoon for, for your cake?]

NOE: ¿Quieres un spoon para tu pastel?

[Do you want a spoon for, for your cake?]

NOE: ¿Quieres un spoon para tu pastel?

[Do you want a spoon for, for your cake?]

ROS: Una cuchara, si una cuchara.

[A spoon, yes a spoon.]
NOE: Sí, una cuchara para el pastel.
   [Yes, a spoon for the cake.]
ROS: ¡Que lo muerda!
   [Bite it!]
NOE: Si quiere una cuca, una cuchara.
   [Yes she wants a sp, a spoon.]
ROS: Alguien me lo va a dar.
   [Someone is going to give it to me.]

After learning the word for spoon Noemí produces two more utterances in which she
talks about or offers the spoon to her pretend mother and sister.

   In play session ten Noemí begins to add to the pretend dialogue by verbally giving
instructions to her playmates as to what they should do next to help the story unfold.

   **Example 71**

   NOE: Tú, tú eres la hermana loca y empiezas a saltar y brincar en todas partes.
   [You, you are the crazy sister, and you begin to jump and jump all over
the place.]
NOE: ¿No?
   [No?]
ANG: No, mentira.
   [No, not true.]

The next example also shows how Noemí helps set the scene for something spooky and
then expands upon her playmate’s idea that there is a coyote lurking nearby.

   **Example 72**

NOE: Who was that? (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Escuché algo. [I heard something.]
ANG: Di “¿Qué paso?” [Say: “What happened?”] (To Noemí)
ANG: Vamos, vamos. [Let’s go, Let’s go.]
ANG: Es un coyote. [It’s a coyote.]
NOE: Un coyote entra. [A coyote comes in.]
ANG: Vamos, Vamos. [Let’s go, Let’s go.]
NOE: ¡Un ghost! [A ghost!]
ANG: Fantasma, se dice.  [A ghost, you say.]
NOE: Fantasma.  [A ghost.]

In other examples Noemí verbally contradicts instructions for lines that she is told to say and comes up with her own words, therefore, changing plot development.

**Example 73**

ANG: Dices, esa, es pa(ra) Santa.  [You say, that is, it is for Santa.]
NOE: Ésta es para el caballo.  [This is for the horse.]
NOE: Ésta es para el caballo.  [This is for the horse.]
ROS: Bueno, bueno, bueno, bueno.  [Good, good, good, good.]

Rosalinda accepts the change in storyline but reminds her playmates that if they don’t treat Santa well, he won’t bring them anything. In the following example Noemí defines the play session. It takes her several turns to narrate exactly how this scene will be set.

**Example 74**

NOE: Yo vivo acá.  [I live here.]
NOE: Siempre duermo allí.  [I always sleep here.]
NOE: Nos dijimos que no puedo, pero yo puedo.  [We said that I can’t, but I can.]
NOE: No me importa.  [I don’t care.]

In this sequence of statements Noemí sets the scene where the sleepover will take place as being where she lives. She also goes on to show where she lives. Although she uses an incorrect form in “Nos dijimos,” she attempts to assert that even though Angelina has told her she can’t sleep on the top bunk she still can, and doesn’t care what they say. Later in the same story Rosalinda attempts to convince her that her doll should sleep somewhere else.

**Example 75**

ROS: Creo que es mejor si tu te vas a dormir allá.  [I think its better if you go to sleep over there.]
NOE: Yo quiero dormir aquí.  [I want to sleep here.]
NOE: Yo necesito esto.  [I need this.]
NOE: No puedo, no puedo, no puedo.  [I can’t, I can’t, I can’t.]

Over several turns Noemí states that she can not move and that she refuses to move.
Use of Strategies

Research Question #3: What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language? This section will provide examples of communicative strategies, including participation and coping strategies.

Strategies for Linguistic Participation

This section will present selected portions of dialogues in which Noemí strategically participates in dialogue. Examples will reveal humming, singing, grunting, blowing into the microphone, laughing and making unintelligible noises, insertion of English words, pronouncing English words or phrases in Spanish, repetition to gain the floor and participate, repetition for acknowledgement and language play.

In the second play session Noemí has been forbidden to speak in English. Her participation then is restricted to fixed expressions which she repeats, commands, singing and humming, or making noises. In the following example the girls are attempting tell stories about things they have seen. Noemí enters the conversation by using the command mira and then holds the floor by singing in the next turn.

Example 76

ANI: Había una niña que se llamaba Margarita.  [There was a girl named Margarita.]
MAR: Ana. Las niñas van a bailar hoy.  [Ana. The girls are going to dance today.]
NOE: Mira. Mira.  [Look. Look.]
NOE: La, la, la. Lo, Lo, Lo!  (Singing.)

Later in the same play session the girls have decided that this will be a show in which they will take turns singing songs.

Example 77

ANI: ¿Quién canta primero?  [Who sings first?]
MAR: Buenos días.  [Good morning.]
ANI: ¿Qué vas a cantar?  [What are you going to sing?]

At this point Noemí takes the microphone but begins to make grunts and blow into the microphone. When everyone laughs she continues to do this, then begins humming
loudly into the microphone and singing in shrieks. For the remainder of this play session she continues to make these noises into the microphone and to scream periodically as the other girls produce sentences.

**Example 78**

ANI: Me llamo Ana Ramos y yo vivo en una casa. [My name is Ana Ramos and I live in a house.]

MAR: Mírame [Look at me.]

ANI: Es que es muy chiquito para ti. [It is too small for you.]

NOE: (Runs in circles and screams)

ANI: Vi a dos Margaritas, feas, feas, feas. Una vez vi a un perro que estaba en la casa y estaba afuera jugando con dos gatos y el gato estaba corriendo y el perro estaba corriendo y el gato y el perro no lo agarré… y después y después el perro y el gato fueron para Milwaukkee no más caminando con el bebé nada más caminando con el bebé.

[ I saw two Margaritas, ugly, ugly, ugly. One time I saw a dog that was in the house and he was outside playing with two cats and the cat was running and the dog was running and the cat and the dog did not catch it… and later and later the dog and the cat went to Milwaukee just walking with the baby, just walking with the baby.]

NOE: (Unintelligible screaming by Noemí).

In addition to screaming Noemí also bursts out in loud fits of laughter. In the following example Noemí and Margarita are acting out a story as Ana narrates it. Noemí is playing the role of Erika, a princess character from a recent Barbie Pegasus movie.

**Example 79**

ANI: Sí. Y después venían Margarita y Erika y se hablaban. Vecinas y después Margarita se fue a comprar pan y después la otra mañana vinieron y Margarita fue a comprar pan y se miraron.

[Yes. And later Margarita and Erika were talking to each other. Neighbors and later Margarita went to buy bread and the other morning they went and Margarita went to buy bread and they saw each other.]
(Margarita and Noemí act this out as she narrates it. Then Noemí falls down laughing.)

After this point they all begin laughing so hard that Ana’s speech can not be understood. Later in the same play session Ana attempts to dictate lines to Noemí, but instead of producing the dictated lines Noemí once again begins to scream and make noises.

**Example 80**

ANI: Y tú te venías acá a comprar corn.

[And you were coming here to buy corn.]

ANI: Y ves a Margarita, va y después le dices hola.

[And you see Margarita, she passes by and later you tell her hello.]

NOE: (Takes the microphone and makes screaming noises.)

The noises that Noemí makes are not words but unintelligible screams and blowing noises.

In order to participate in the conversation, Noemí often produces the Spanish phonological realization of English words. In the next example she pronounces Cinderella with a Spanish accent as the girls begin to decide what they are going to play that night.

**Example 81**

MAR: No más me quito mi, esta chamarra y ya. [I just need to take off this sweater and I’ll be ready.]

NOE: Cinderella. (Spanish pronunciation.)

NOE: Cin-de-rella. (Singing) (Spanish pronunciation)

ANI: A ver ella. [Let’s see her.]

Later in the same play session she begins to sing the word Barbie with Spanish pronunciation.

**Example 82**

MAR: Ésta es de la muñeca de ella. [This is her doll.]

ANI: No puedo ver. [I can’t see.]

NOE: Barbie Barbie Barbie Barbie Bar Bar Bar. [barbi] [barbi] [barbi] [barbi] [bar] [bar] [bar]

NOE: Barbie Barbie Bar Bar Barbie Barbie.
In both of these examples Noemí uses the Spanish phonetic realization to pronounce the names of these objects or characters that are very familiar to her in English.

Noemí switches to English to fill in a word when she does not know the Spanish word or concept. In the following example she does not produce the equivalent of the word “grown up” in Spanish:

**Example 83**

NOE: Métete. [Get in.]

ANG: No, tú eres niña. Debes de estar dormida. [No, you are a little girl. You should be asleep.]

NOE: No, yo soy la grown up. [No, I am the grown up.]

ANG: Yo soy la mamá. Tú debes de estar dormida. [I am the mother. You should be asleep.]

NOE: O, sí. [Oh, yes.]

Noemí’s playmates also switch to English to express words they do not know in Spanish or when there is not an existing Spanish equivalent:

**Example 84**

ANG: Ay, amigas vamos a tener un sleepover acá. [Oh friends, we are going to have a sleepover here.]

ROS: Hoy no puedo esperar a mis amigas. [Oh, today I can’t wait on my friends.]

ANG: Vamos a ver muchas novelas. [We’re going to see a lot of soap operas.]

NOE: Yo voy a tener un sleepover acá. [No, I’m going to have a sleepover here.]

ANG: Ustedes tienen que venir acá porque está acá. [You all have to come here because it is here.]

ANG: Acá está el sleepover Noemí, acá. [Here is the sleepover, Noemí, here.]

NOE: Yo sé. [I know.]
Attempting to express feeling left out when the girls arrange the sleepover, Noemí tries to tell the girls she does not think she is invited but does not know the word in Spanish.

**Example 85**

ANG: Dijiste que (ella) podía dormir arriba.

[You said that she could sleep up there.]

NOE: ¡Yo no estoy invited!

[I am not invited.]

ANG: Sí estás invitada.

[Yes, you are invited.]

In this case her peers supply the missing word and understand what it is that she is trying to say.

Repeating words that have just been said is another strategy that Noemí uses to participate in conversations.

**Example 86**

ROS: Extraño a estas dos niñas.  [I miss those these two girls.]

ROS: Eran muy, eran gemelas.  [The were very, they were twins.]

NOE: Gemelas, gemelas.  [Twins, twins.]

ROS: Gemelas que vuelen.  [Twins that fly.]

ANG: Ya volé.  [I already flew.]

NOE: Una gemela, ¡Piiiing!  [A twin, Ping!]

This example shows Noemí using the word provided by Rosalinda twice and then with a sound effect.

In addition to repeating words, Noemí also repeats entire phrases or sentences. During the seventh play session an imaginary monster becomes part of the action. In the following example Noemí repeats what her playmate has just said, sometimes modifying her sentences slightly, and repeating them multiple times.

**Example 87**

ANG: Mira, hermana, ya se fue el monstro.  [Look, sister, the monster has already gone.]

NOE: ¡Ay!  [Oh!]

NOE: ¡El monstro!  [The monster!]
ANG: ¡Ya el monstro ya se fue!    
[The monster already left!]

NOE: ¡El monstro se fue!    
[The monster left!]

ANG: ¡Vamos, hermana!    
[Let’s go sister!]

NOE: Sí, ¡vamos hermana!    
[Yes, let’s go sister!]

ANG: Es un monstro, ¡vete!    
[It’s a monster! Move it!]

NOE: ¡Vete!    
[Move it!]

NOE: ¡Vete!    
[Move it!]

NOE: ¡Vete!    
[Move it!]

ANG: Ven, vamos a escaparnos.    
[Come on, we are going to escape.]

NOE: Sí, escapamos.    
[Yes, let’s escape.]

ROS: Escaparon.    
[They escaped.]

The following example shows how Noemí repeats words spoken by her playmates to produce speech to enter the dialogue even when words are not dictated to her:

**Example 88**

ANG: Pretende que estás durmiendo y entró un caballo que era muy salvaje, y el caballo…

[Pretend that you are sleeping and a horse came in that was very savage, and the horse…]

NOE: ¡Ay! ¡El caballo!

[Oh! The horse!]

Here, Noemí takes the cue and immediately begins to pretend that she is shocked to wake up and see a horse in her room in the middle of the night.

Not only does Noemí repeat the words that others have said but she also repeats her own words and phrases. The following example is taken from a play scene in which the girls were pretending that a family of dolls and horses was going on a vacation and the car they are using slams into the wall.

**Example 89**

MAR: La bebé, se churró. Oh. No tengo mi mona.

[The baby, she hurt herself. Oh. I don’t have my doll.]

MAR: Y los caballos.

[And the horses.]
NOE: ¡Un acidente!
[An accident!]
NOE: ¡Un acidente!
[An accident!]
NOE: ¡Un acidente!
[An accident!]
MAR: El hombre del carro no sabe manejar.
[The man in the car does not know how to drive.]

In the next example, Noemí tries to take over the pushing of the car, repeating that she would like to put her dolls inside.

**Example 90**

NOE: Quiero montar en ese.  [I want to ride in that one.]
NOE: Quiero montar.    [I want to ride.]
NOE: ¿No puedo?     [Can’t I?]
MAR:        (No response.)
NOE: ¿No puedo?     [Can’t I?]
MAR: Hmmmm.
NOE: ¿No puedo?     [Can’t I?]
MAR: Sí puedes, pero primero usa el que tiene ella. [Yes but first you have to use the one she has.]
MAR: Mira allá hay unos caballos.    [Look there are some horses.]
NOE: Esta mona.    [This doll.]

Multiple requests are made for the car by Noemí; however, her playmate avoids giving it to her by not answering, suggesting that she use the car that the other playmate has, and then by distracting her with other horses. Finally Noemí finds a doll to play with and stops making that request. In example 91 the girls are performing a show in which they are all going to be models. Noemí would prefer to be a princess than a model and repeatedly seeks acknowledgement for this request from Ana.

**Example 91**

ROS: Hola señores y señoras. Esta noche la siguiente modelo.
[Hello Ladies and Gentlemen. Tonight the next model.]
NOE: Hola, yo soy la princesa.
     [Hi, I am the princess.]
NOE: Y yo bailo.
     [And I dance.]
ROS: ¿Tu bailas qué?
     [What do you dance?]
ROS: ¿Merengue?
     [Merengue?]  
NOE: Yo soy la princesa.
     [I am the princess.]
NOE: ¡Yo soy la princesa!
     [I am the princess!]
ROS: Señores y Señoras.
     [Gentlemen and Ladies.]
NOE: Yo soy la princesa .
     [I am the princess.]
NOE: Y bailo.
     [And I dance.]
ANG: Ahora les presento a la tercera modela.
     [Now I present the third model to you.]
ANG: Es… ¡Ana Barbara!
     [It is… Ana Barbara!]
NOE: Yo soy la…
     [I am the…]

Noemí’s declaration of being a princess is not acknowledged by her peers throughout this exchange despite the fact that she repeats it over and over again.

The following examples show Noemí repeating utterances more than once. This example comes from a scene in which her playmate is taking on the role of the older sister and must leave her in the mean teacher’s classroom at school.

**Example 92**

ANG: Hermana, ¿tienes miedo?  [Sister, are you afraid?]
NOE: Sí.  [Yes.]
ANG: Mira yo estoy aquí.  [Look I am here.]
NOE: No te vayas.  [Don’t go.]
NOE: No te vayas.  [Don’t go.]

Noemí often uses the formulaic expression “ir + a + infinitive” to try to get playmates to initiate an activity or to attempt to begin a new drama. In the following example she tries to convince Ana and Margarita to pretend like they are Fairytopias. Fairytopia dolls are a particular type of Barbie doll (with wings) that came out in December of 2004.

**Example 93**

NOE: Vamos a play Fairy, Fairitopia.  [Let’s play Fairytopia, Fairytopia.]
ANI: ¿que hacemos?  [What are we doing?]
NOE: jugar Fairitopia.  [Play Fairytopia.]
ANI: ¿dónde están las monas de Faritopia?  [Where are the Fairytopia dolls?]
NOE: No, we’re gonna fly around like this and be Fairytopias. (English.)
REB: Pués muestrale a ella.  [Well, show her.]
MAR: ¿Tienes una amiga para esta mona?  [Do you have a friend for this doll?]
REB: No sé, voy a buscar.  [I don’t know, I’ll look.]
NOE: Vamos.  [Come on.]
NOE: Vamos!  [Come on!]
NOE: Vamos a jugar Fairitopia.  [We’re going to play Fairytopia.]
ANI: Sí, sí.  [Okay, Okay.]
MAR: ¿Qué es?  [What is it?]
NOE: Vamos a jugar Fairitopia.  [We’re going to play Fairytopia.]
MAR: Ahorita.  [Now.]
REB: Pero es que tienes que decirles qué hacer.  [But you have to tell them what to do.]
REB: Es que son hadas.  [They are fairies.]
NOE: vamos a jugar faritopia.  [We’re going to play Fairytopia.]
NOE: Yo dandelion y tú eres… um… the blue one.  [I dandelion and you are… um… the blue one.]
REB: ¿Cómo se dice? [How do you say that?]
NOE: el azul, yo… [The blue, I…]
ANI: ¿Tenemos que volar o algo? [Do we have to fly or something?]
NOE: Sí. Tienen que volar. [Yes. You have to fly.]
ANI: Ahorita. [Right now.]

(Noemí is already pretending to fly around.)
ANI: Ok, ya estoy lista para jugar. [Okay, I am ready to play now.]
MAR: Espérate ahorita. [Wait a minute.]
ANI: Yo ya estoy lista para jugar. [I am ready to play now.]
MAR: OK, es todo. [Okay, that’s everything.]
MAR: Ok, estoy lista. [Okay, I am ready.]
NOE: Nobody will play Fairytopia for a long while! (Speaks in English.)
MAR: Podemos jugar al escondite. [We can play hide and go seek.]
ANI: Vamos a quitar esto. [Let’s take this off.]
NOE: Fairitopia! [Fairytopia!]

MAR: ¿Qué vamos a jugar? ¿Qué vamos a jugar? [What are we going to play?] (Everyone is flying all over the room)
NOE: Vamos a jugar faritopia. [We are going to play Fairytopia.]
ANI: Margarita, quita esto. Margarita quita esta cosa. [Margarita, take this off. Margarita take this thing off.]
NOE: Faritopia, vamos a jugar, vamos a jugar algo. [Fairytopia, we are going to play, we are going to play something.]
NOE: Faritopia, faritopia. [Fairytopia, Fairytopia.]
NOE: Faritopia. [Fairytopia.]

(Continues to sing this over and over)
MAR: Yo puedo. [I can.]
ANI: Podemos hacer esto. [We can do this.]
NOE: Fa-ri-topia. [Fairytopia.]

In this extended dialogue Noemí repeatedly uses this expression to try to establish a joint play session. When her playmates do not eagerly begin to play this, she repeats this phrase along with the subject of what she would like to play again. Suggestions of other
topics of play are countered by Noemí with this formulaic expression until finally the girls all begin playing.

In a different example Noemí repeatedly suggests that she and her friends dance. At the very beginning of her first play session with Ana and Margarita, Noemí is singing and dancing alone when her father tries to get her to begin playing with the other girls.

**Example 94**

JUA: Noemí ¿no vas a jugar con las niñas?  
[Noemí, aren’t you going to play with the girls?]

NOE: Vamos a bailar. (Dances around the room)  
[We are going to dance.]

NOE: Vamos a bailar.  
[We are going to dance.]

ANI: Tú Margarita. Vete a bailar.  
[You, Margarita. Go dance.]

NOE: ¡A bailar!  
[Dance!]

ANI: Pon música.  
[Put on music.]

NOE: Vamos a bailar. Vamos a bailar.  
[Let’s dance. Let’s dance.]

The other girls do not want to dance, but do respond to her questions by suggesting that each other be the first to dance with Noemí. They compromise by playing music on the electronic keyboard and Noemí dances with her dolls.

In another play session Noemí uses the third person form of the verb jugar to suggest that her friends play dolls.

**Example 95**

NOE: ¡Jugamos con las muñecas!  
[Let’s play with dolls!]

ANG: Ok, las nuestras están cayéndose.  
[Okay, ours are falling.]

NOE: ¡Ay!  
[Uh-oh!]

This causes a switch from the previous theme of play which was a fashion show in which the girls were just beginning to dress up.

*Language play.*

Throughout the play sessions Noemí uses rhyme, music and language play to gain entrance to the conversations, to take the floor, or to produce sentences that are more elaborate. In the next example Noemí and the girls are dressing up for a fashion show and describing their outfits.

**Example 96**
ANI: Hermana, me compré un vestido super bonito.
   [Sister, I bought myself a super pretty dress.]
ANI: Me voy a cambiar.
   [I’m going to change.]
ANI: Mira me compré esta falda y éste.
   [Look I bought this skirt and this.]
ANI: Para quitarme los tacones.
   [To take off my high heels.]
NOE: ¡Yo estoy la muñeca, buneca, nubeca, bun, sun!
   [ I am the doll, nonsense rhyming words.]
MAR: xxx
NOE: ichoacho.
   (Non-word.)
In the next section the girl take a break from playing and have something to drink.
Noemí states that she would like a strawberry drink:

**Example 97**

NOE: Yo quiero fresa por favor.  [I want strawberry please.]
ANG: Fresa para Noemí.  [Strawberry for Noemí.]
NOE: Yo soy la fresa princesa.  [I am the strawberry princess.]
NOE: ¡Yo soy la fresa princesa!  [I am the strawberry princess!]

After hearing the rhyme in fresa princesa, Noemí repeats this declaration again.

*Creative language use.*

During the eighth play session Noemí states that she has made a pie. Building on the word *mariposa* that she has recently incorporated into her vocabulary, she states that she has made a butterfly pie.

**Example 98**

NOE: I made something.  (Speaks in English.)
ANI: ¿Qué hiciste?  [What did you make?]
NOE: ¡Un pay!  [A pie.]
ANI: ¿Un pay de que?  [What kind of pie?]
NOE: Un pay de mariposa.  [Butterfly pie.]
ANI: Un pay de mariposa! [Butterfly pie!]

Later in the same play session, Noemí comes up with strange dishes once again when she is asked which dishes she will be preparing.

**Example 99**

ANI: Noemí, ¿qué vamos a comer en tu fiesta?
[Noemí what are we going to eat at your party?]

NOE: Pantalones.
[Pants.]

NOE: Ratones también.
[Rats, too.]

ANI: ¿Ratones fritos o ratones hervidos?
[Fried rats or boiled rats?]

NOE: Fritos, no they are alive!
[Fried, *no they are alive!*

MAR: Uh, ¡ratones vivos!
[Yuk, Live rats!]

NOE: Hah, Vivos no.
[Hah, not alive.]

MAR: ¡Yuk, ratones vivos!
[Yuk, live rats!]

**Coping Strategies**

In the next section selections of dialogue in which Noemí develops coping strategies are presented. Examples of coping strategies identified include declaring the existence of English play episodes, bargaining for the use of English, or refusing to attempt to participate in Spanish. The following example comes from a play session with Margarita and Ana after she has finally gotten them to begin to pretend that they are Faritopias. Once she has established the theme of play, Noemí attempts to switch into English to carry it out.

**Example 100**

NOE: Help! Help! Faritopias!
[Help! Help! Fairytopias.]
REB: Diles en español.
    [Tell them in Spanish.]
NOE: I know but we’re still playing Faritopia.
    [ I know, but we’re still playing Fairytopia.]
NOE: Rebecca, Rebecca but how about if we play the first part in English.
    (Speaks in English.)
REB: Pero ellas no van a entender.
    (But they are not going to understand.)
NOE: No but they understand some. What I mean is that we’re gonna do this much in English. (Making a sign with her hands)
    (Speaks in English.)
REB: No they don’t understand.
    (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Please Rebecca! (Keeps screaming)
    (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Please!
    (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Please!
    (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Please!
    (Speaks in English.)
REB: Pués, habla en inglés si tienes que hablar en inglés pero ellas no te van a entender y te van a contestar en español.
    [Well, speak in English if you have to speak in English, but they are not going to understand and they are going to answer in Spanish.]
NOE: Please!
    (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Ok! I’ll play all by myself! (Runs away)
    (Speaks in English.)
When her assertion that the girls can understand English is unconfirmed by her mother, Noemí runs from the room in frustration. In just a minute Noemí returns to the room and again tries to speak to the girls in English.

**Example 101**

NOE: On the count of three I’m gonna throw this box over my head.

MAR: No entendemos. [We don’t understand.]

ANI: ¿Qué dice? [What is she saying?]

Margarita and Ana follows the researcher’s lead and asserts that they do not understand what Noemí is saying when she speaks in English. In the following example three girls had just spent four turns helping Noemí to express one of her thoughts in Spanish which she had originally expressed in English:

**Example 102**

NOE: Es muy alto.

[It is very tall.]

NOE: I’m playing in English!

(Speaking in English!)

REB: Pero ¿por qué? Ellas no te entienden si juegas en inglés.

[But why? They don’t understand you if you play in English.]

(Silence)


[And Erika is playing well. And she plays very well. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.]

MAR: ¿Quién quiere hacer la música?

[Who wants to make the music?]

(No response)

MAR: Vamos a hacer una canción. (No response)

[We are going to play a song?]

NOE: Oh! My baby, my precious baby!

(Speaks in English.)

After declaring herself to be playing in English, Noemí ceases attempts to break into the conversation. The next three turns she takes are all in English. Later as her mother tries to
guide her back into playing in Spanish, Noemí reasserts herself continuing to declare that her play session is in English: Margarita refers to Noemí as Erika in the previous example as she pretends to be that Barbie Princess.

**Example 103**

NOE: Margaritaman! Margaritaman!  
(Calling Margarita a funny adapted name.)

REB: How would you say this in Spanish, Noemí?  
(Speaks in English.)

NOE: I know but I’m playing in English.  
(Speaks in English.)

REB: Ellas no te entienden si les hablas en inglés.  
(They don’t understand you if you speak in English.)

NOE: I know, but I wanna play in English.  
(Speaks in English.)

At this point Noemí addresses her dolls in English instead of attempting to participate in the play scenario that Margarita and Ana are having. When she does decide to play along she persists in only speaking in English:

**Example 104**

NOE: Wait for me, wait for me! I’m gonna put on my seatbelt.  
(Speaks in English.)

NOE: Hey don’t forget me! (Others laugh.)  
(Speaks in English.)

MAR: Alguien puede ir aquí. Las grandotas se pueden ir acá.  
[Someone can go here. The big ones can go here.]

MAR: Yo creo que vamos a tardar un poquitico.  
[I think we are going to be a little slow.]

NOE: I got some food for the road. The kids might like this!  
(Speaks in English.)

In the fifth play session Noemí even declares that she does not know Spanish when prompted by her mother to speak Spanish.

NOE: Are we gonna do something else with our hands?  
(Speaks in English.)
REB: En español, por favor. [In Spanish, please.]
NOE: No sé español. [I don’t know Spanish.]
REB: Sí, sabes español. [Yes you do know Spanish.]

The preceding examples have all come from play sessions two through five. In later sessions Noemí attributes her use of English to simply forgetting to use Spanish.

**Example 104b**

ROS: We got to start again. (Speaks in English.)
NOE: Yeah, let’s start again. (Speaks in English.)
JUA: Tienen que hablar en español. [You have to speak in Spanish.]
NOE: Oh, I forgot. (Speaks in English.)
JUA: Ayer estaban jugando bien. Noemí, mira. [Yesterday you were playing well. Noemí, look.]

**Supporting Examples**

Additional examples showing the emergence of present tense verbs in Noemí’s productive language are presented in this section. The next example shows Noemí’s incorporation of the regular -ar verb “necesitar” (to need) into her productive language abilities.

**Example 105**

REB: Mira, hay un vestido mexicano. Puede ser una.. [Look there’s a Mexican dress. You could be a..]
NOE: Mexicano de México. [Mexican from Mexico.]
ANI: OK. [Okay.]
NOE: Si necesitas. [If you need to.]

In this example Noemí tries to convey they message that there is a dress available for Anita, if she needs one. In the following example, Noemí uses the third person plural (nosotros/we) form of the irregular verb “ir” (to go) to suggest that they change storylines.
Example 106

ROS: Y llevaron la comida a la fiesta. Mucha gente se fue allá a la fiesta y yo también fui allá.
[And they took the food to the party. Many people went there to the party and I went, too.]

NOE: Vamos a otra historia.
[Let’s start a new story.]

ROS: Sí, como un día dos niñas estaban caminando por el forest y puis se encontraron con una culebra y corrieron, corrieron.
[Yes, like one day two girls were running through the forest and well they came upon a snake and they ran, ran.]

Her suggestion is incorporated into the play session as the plot changes and the girls begin pretending to run from a snake. The following example shows Noemí’s use of the irregular verb “querer” (to want) in its first person singular (I/ yo) form.

Example 107

ROS: Señora, ¿hay algo para tomar?   [Señora, is there something to drink?]

NOE: ¡Yo quiero strawberry!    [I want strawberry!]

REB: No sé si hay de fresa pero hay de naranja.  [I don’t know if there is strawberry but there is orange juice.]

In this example Noemí uses this verb to say what she likes to drink. The next example shows Noemí using the first person plural (nosotros/ we) form of the verb “hacer” (to do or make).

Example 108

ROS: Hola, mi nombre es Rubi,  [Hello, my name is Rubi.]

ROS: Yo soy la que salva a todas las niñas y les ayudo a hacer comida.  [I am the one that saves all the little girls and I help them to make food.]

ANG: ¿Nos puede hacer comida para llevar a la iglesia, por favor?  [Can you help us make food to take to the church, please?]
NOE: Gracias. Gracias.
[Thanks. Thanks.]
[Sister, Sister, Sister, Noemí.]
NOE: ¿Hmmm?
ANG: ¿Lista para preparar la comida?
[Are you ready to make the food?]
NOE: Sí. Hacemos la comida.
[Yes, let’s make the food.]
NOE: Yo sé, no tengo comida.
[I know, I don’t have food.]
ANG: Ven, ven hermana.
[Come on, come on sister.]
The verb “hacer” (to make) has been used in a previous turn in the play session by Angelina to ask her pretend mother to help them make food. Noemí uses the provided infinitive in the present tense to state that they will make the food.

The following example shows Noemí using the third person singular form of the verb “estar” (to be). She uses this verb to give the location of their “stuff”.

**Example 109**

ANG: Ven hermana, hay más.
[Come on sister, there’s more.]
NOE: ¿Qué? Yum, yum, yum.
[What? Yum, Yum, Yum.]
ANG: ¿Dónde estabas?
[Where were you?]
NOE: No sé.
[I don’t know.]
[Its cold. Its very cold here.]
NOE: Aquí está la stuff.
[Here is the stuff.]
She also uses the first person singular (yo/I) form to state that she does not know where she has been when she is questioned by her strict mother. In the next example, Noemí uses the first person plural (nosotros/we) form to affirm the fact that she and her pretend sister are escaping:

**Example 110**

ANG: ¡Ven, vamos a escaparnos!
[Come on, we’re going to escape!]

NOE: Sí, escapamos.
[Okay, we escape.]

ROS: Escaparon.
[They escaped.]

ANG: Necesitamos escaparnos y hacer un fuego.
[We need to escape and make a fire.]

In the next turn, Rosalinda affirms that they did escape and they continue on their journey escaping and planning to build a fire.

The following example shows Noemí using the present tense third person singular of the verb “ir” to give instructions about where something should go.

**Example 111**

MAR: ¿Cómo se hace?  [How do you do it?]

NOE: Va aquí.    [It goes here.]

MAR: Sacas esto. [Take that out.]

NOE: Put it right there. (Speaks in English.)

NOE: Va aquí.    [It goes here.]

The next example contains a discussion in which Margarita, Anita, and Noemí are trying to decide who will play with which toy. After listening to Anita and Margarita discuss which part of the play set would belong to whom, Noemí uses the present tense of the verb “querer” (to want) to state that she would like a pony:

**Example 112**

MAR: ¿Quién quiere ese perro?  [Who wants that dog?]

ANI: Ésta es la parte de Erika.  [This is Erika’s part.]

MAR: Mi parte es acá.  [My part is here.]
ANI: No, ésta es tu parte. [No this is your part.]
REB: Ella está en la mitad. [She’s in the middle.]
MAR: Yo encontré unos perritos. [I found some dogs.]
NOE: Quiero un poni. [I want a horse.]

The next example shows Noemí using the first person (yo/I) form of the irregular verb “ser” (to be) to identify herself as the little one.

**Example 113**

ANG: ¿Por qué le dijiste que no era su mama? [Why did you tell her that you weren’t her mother?]
ANG: No te va a creer. [She’s not going to believe you.]
ROS: Yo soy tu propia hermana. [But I’m your own sister.]
NOE: ¡Pero! [But!]
NOE: Yo soy la chiquita. [I’m the little one.]

Rosalinda has previously used the same form of the verb in a previous turn establishing the role that she is going to play as Noemí and Angelina’s sister. The next example shows her use of the third person singular form of the same verb:

**Example 114**

ANG: Y después, te moriste. [And later, you died.]
NOE: ¡Mira ésta! [Look at this!]
NOE: Ésta es muy buena. [It is very good.]

In the preceding example Noemí ignores Angelina saying that Noemí has died, and directs her attention to something she is looking at, stating that it is very good.

The following example shows Noemí’s use of the verb “estar” for descriptive purposes as well as her use of the third person singular form of the verb “tener” (to have).

**Example 115**

NOE: Tiene musica también. [It has music, too.]
MAR: El árbol está bien chulo. [The tree is very pretty.]
NOE: Sí, está bonito. [Yes, it is pretty.]
Margarita declares that the tree is very cute and Noemí adds to her statement saying that it is pretty. Next, Noemí uses the first person singular (yo/I) form of the irregular verb “poder” (to be) to state that she can’t do another show:

Example 116
ANI: Ok, ¿listas? [Okay, ready?]
MAR: ¡Sí! [Yes!]
NOE: ¡Está enferma! ¡Está enferma! [She is sick, she is sick!]
ANI: Mira, OK. Vamos a hacer por aca otro show. [Ok, we’re going to make another show here.]
NOE: Holy! No! No puedo. [Holy! No! I can’t.]

In the next example, Noemí uses the first person singular (yo/I) form of the verb “ser” (to be) to claim the role of the teacher.

Example 117
ANI: Vamos a jugar escuela. [We’re going to play school.]
NOE: Soy la profesora! [I’m the teacher!]
ANI: Soy la profesora. [I’m the teacher!]
ANI: Vamos a leer un libro. [We’re going to read a book.]

Anita also claims the teacher’s role in this example and produces an additional term in which she indirectly claims the role by making statements a teacher would make in that situation.

The following example gives evidence of Noemí’s incorporation of the imperfect tense into her productive language. In this case, Rosalinda was questioning the girls about where they had been while playing the role of the strict mother.

Example 118
ROS: No me abrieron la puerta. [You did not open the door for me.]
ANG: ¿Qué puerta? [What door?]
ROS: ¿Dónde estaban? [Where were you?]
NOE: Estábamos volando. [We were flying.]
ANG: Es que fuimos al world. [We went out in the world.]
These additional examples have been provided to support statements made in chapter 5 by providing additional evidence and related examples of Noemí’s use of conjugated verbs in oral communication during the play sessions.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of data related to this study in order to investigate ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child presently dominant in one language is able to expand communicative competence in the weaker language though interaction with other children. Dates, times of recordings and participants in the play sessions were described in this chapter. In addition supplementary information about their families and backgrounds was given. Data was presented detailing Noemí’s participation in each of the play sessions including the percent of utterances produced, the percent of turns she took, and the number of words produced in each section. An analysis of the percent of her production that occurred in Spanish was also presented. Examples were given that illustrated ways in which Noemí’s playmates guided her linguistic production so that she could express her thoughts and participate in play sessions. The content of each play session was also given in this chapter. Examples were given of ways in which dramatizations that occurred during play sessions serves as linguistic scaffolds as peers aid other groups members to produce language in order to be able to create additional dialogue and develop the unfolding plot. Examples showed interactions in which Noemí incorporated new linguistic functions into her repertoire and developed the ability to participate in conversations and dialogues. This chapter also presented examples of the playmates collectively narrating stories and of Noemí beginning to set the scenes for new stories and take multiple turns in their narration. The last section of this chapter dealt with the strategies Noemí used to be able to participate in these play sessions. It also dealt with ways in which Noemí attempted to cope psychologically during the sessions.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study investigated ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child with English dominance was able to expand communicative competence in Spanish through interaction with other children in pretend play. The study was framed in Vygotskian sociocultural theory with the assumption that development occurs first on a social plane and then is internalized. Vygotsky (1966) claims that play is the main source of development in the preschool years as while children engage in play they are able to accomplish things that are beyond the realm of their current abilities. This study focused on identifying ways in which one child developed her abilities to engage in extended dialogue, her ability to participate in conversations, and her ability to create narratives or monologues through play with peers who were more proficient in Spanish. Strategies this child used in order to participate were identified as well.

In order to create an immersion context, the researcher and her family moved to a Hispanic trailer park in rural South Georgia. Play sessions were held in or around the family’s trailer with two sets of playmates. These girls, the daughters of Mexican migrant workers, ranged in age from 5 to 9 years old and used their native language, Spanish, for all daily interactions except when they attended school in local school systems. Play sessions were audio and video recorded and verbal interactions were transcribed according to the CHAT transcription system and analysis was conducted using the computerized language analysis system CLAN (MacWhinney, 2000). Noemí’s participation was analyzed through the CLAN command MLT which computes mean length of turn for all speakers by providing numerical data on each speaker’s number of words, turns and utterances. The percentage of turns, words, and utterances Noemí produced were calculated from this data. Familiarization with the data occurred as the researcher reviewed tapes, videos and transcripts and identified preliminary themes and issues that emerged. The CLAN system was then used again to index, sort and map data so that relevant examples could be identified, associated and presented in the previous chapter.

A summary of the findings is presented in this chapter along with implications for implications for childhood bilingual development. The chapter ends with
recommendations for future research in pretend play and language development.

Specifically this study addressed the following questions:

1. How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?

2. How are a) the ability to engage in extended dialogue, b) the ability to participate in conversations, and c) the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?

3. What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language?

Expansion of Communicative Competence

The following section will address research question #1: “How does a simultaneously bilingual child who is presently dominant in one language, expand communicative competence in the weaker language through interaction with older children in a pretend play setting?” In order to answer this question, play sessions were created between Noemí, a four-year-old simultaneous bilingual presently dominant in English, and two groups of Mexican children who are native speakers of Spanish and whose home language is Spanish. These children were placed in situations in which they were able to spontaneously create play situations.

Language production is a necessary part of play, especially for play that takes place among two or more individuals (Corsaro, 2003). Children who are less linguistically capable will be forced to produce language beyond their current abilities in order to participate in play sessions with more capable peers. Peers engaged in play can help each other produce language to construct play sessions collectively as novices are enabled by more capable peers to accomplish tasks they would not be able to carry out alone (Kasper & Rose, 2001). Child interactions in this study were studied from a microgenetic perspective that allowed observation of emerging abilities on a moment by moment basis while learners were engaged in play (Block, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2001; Lantolf, 2003).
Over the five week period the children engaged in sociodramatic play or play in which the children embody the characters they create and role play actions performed by the characters (Corsaro, 2005). This sociodramatic play afforded Noemí the opportunity to experience peer cultures and to use and develop communicative skills, two functions of sociodramatic play articulated by Corsaro (2005). Analysis revealed that playmates were able to scaffold Noemí’s linguistic production and her participation to aid in her development of communicative competence. Scaffolding techniques to be discussed in the following section include collaborative construction of utterances, providing direct translations, asking leading questions, and explicit correction of mistakes through modeling. The following section also presents evidence of playmate’s awareness of the roles they are taking in assisting Noemí to learn to use Spanish. Techniques peers employed to scaffold participation included dictation of words, providing allotted time for verbal participation in the interaction. Structuring Noemí’s participation in this way led to her repeating words or phrases that were not cued or modifying sentences provided for repetition until she finally begins to take the floor without being cued. A discussion of Noemí’s increase in participation and simultaneous increase of use of Spanish over the course of the play sessions is also included in the following section.

Scaffolding

Scaffolding occurs when a more skilled participant works someone who is less skilled to co-construct new knowledge that the learner will eventually appropriate (Block, 2001; Lantolf 2000; McCafferty, 2002). Data presented in chapter 4 have shown how Noemí’s playmates work collectively to help her express herself in Spanish so she can help enact dialogues and participate in dramatizations. During play sessions Noemí’s playmates scaffold her linguistic production so that they can complete the task at hand. McCafferty (2002) gives four areas of potential transformation related to the Zone of Proximal Development including transformation of the learner’s capacity to perform similar activities in the future, invention of new tools and modification those already in the learner’s repertoire, transformation of the actual activity and transformation of the social group. Through collective dialogues in play sessions, Noemí’s capacity to perform similar activities in the future is developed (McCafferty, 2002).

Scaffolding of Linguistic Production
Examples presented in chapter 4 show Noemí’s playmates are aware that their job is to help Noemí develop her ability to speak Spanish, a fact stated explicitly (Example 1) or implied through remarks made to Noemí about speaking Spanish (Example 7). This awareness results in peers who work collectively to help Noemí express a thought or take on an assigned role. Scaffolding techniques identified as being used by Noemí’s playmates in these play sessions include collaborative construction of utterances, providing direct translations, asking leading questions, and explicit correction of mistakes through modeling.

In initial play sessions, such as those presented in examples 3, 4, 22 and 52 of the previous chapter, Noemí’s playmates work collaboratively with the researcher to supply Noemí with missing vocabulary or grammatical constructions that she can incorporate into a sentence to express what she was originally trying to say. The following example also shows the researcher referring Noemí to her peers for assistance in finding out how to say a word she is unfamiliar with in Spanish:

**Example 119**

NOE: La princesa buena con la magic stick.

[The good princess with the magic stick.]

REB: Pregúntales como se dice esto en español.

[Ask them how to say this in Spanish.]

ROS: Palo mágico. [Magic Stick.]

NOE: Yo tengo un palejo. [I have a palejo.]

ROS: Palo. [Stick.]

NOE: Palo mágico. [Magic stick.]

In this example Rosalinda gives Noemí the word “palo” (stick) when the researcher directs Noemí to obtain it from her. When Noemí produces the form incorrectly, her peer supplies it again. Later Noemí’s peers employ this technique on their own, without the participation of the researcher. The following example shows Angelina and Rosalinda providing Noemí with the phrase “Muchos poderes” (Many powers):

**Example 120:**

NOE: Yo tengo a lot of powers

[I have a lot of powers.]
ANG: Y tú, y ustedes dicen que Rosalinda me quiere.
    [And you, and you all say that Rosalinda loves me.]
ROS: Muchos poderes, Noemí.
    [Many powers, Noemí.]
ROS: Se dice.
    [You say.]
NOE: Muchos poderes… yo puedo volar.
    [Many powers… I can fly.]

At the end of the exchange in the example presented above, Noemí is able to make a statement and elaborate on what her powers are. Related example 70 reveals Rosalinda assisting Noemí in producing the Spanish equivalent of the word spoon so that she can offer her playmates a spoon for their cake. In the next example, Anita directs Noemí to produce her question in Spanish before she will answer it:

**Example 121:**

NOE: Do ya’ll sleep in the same room? (Speaks in English.)
ANI: ¿Cómo? (What?)
NOE: ¿Duermen en la misma habitación? [Do you sleep in the same room?]
ANI: Sí. [Yes.]

With more experience the playmates develop additional scaffolding techniques for assisting Noemí in gaining linguistic production as they provide her with direct Spanish translations (Example 5) of her original English sentences or ask her for the Spanish equivalent of what she has just said in English (Example 6). In the following example, Noemí obviously does not know the word for snow:

**Example 122:**

NOE: Let’s play snow. (Speaks in English.)
ANG: No entiendo, en español. [I don’t understand, use Spanish.]
NOE: Jugamos.… [Let’s play…]
ANG: Nieve. [Snow]
NOE: Jugamos nieve. [We’ll play snow.]
First her playmate asks her to re-produce her last utterance in Spanish, they she guides her back to the verb phrase she was originally attempting to use. Noemí’s peers also ask leading questions such as “¿qué más?” the Spanish of “what else” or other questions that require her to produce more language (Example 3b). Anita asks Noemí to further explain what she means in the following excerpt from play session eleven:

**Example 123**

ANI: Jugamos que somos cocineras.
[Let’s pretend to be cooks.]
NOE: Tu eres la…la… la persona.
[You are the…the…the…person.]
ANI: ¿Quién?
[Who?]
NOE: La persona, la persona, que tiene la comida.
[The person, the person who has the food.]

Later in the same play session, Anita asks Noemí questions requiring her to produce language:

**Example 124:**

ANI: Vamos a hacer la comida. ¿Qué tipo te gusta comer?
[We’re going to make food. What do you like to eat?]
NOE: uh… pastel.
[Um, cake.]
ANI: Ah, bien, y qué vas a tomar?
[Okay, fine, and what are you going to drink?]
NOE: No sé, ¿Sprite?
[I don’t know, Sprite?]

Noemí’s peers also explicitly correct grammar mistakes as Noemí makes in conversation (Example 8) by modeling correct form. After corrections are suggested they may be incorporated into future conversations (McCafferty, 2002). An additional
example occurs as Noemí uses command forms to try to gain her playmates attention (Example 59). When she addresses the two with the singular command form of the verb *mirar* to tell them to “look” she is corrected by one of her peers with the plural command form of the verb. In attempting to correct her speech, Noemí chooses a form that is incorrect. When she received no positive feedback on this form, she switched back to the singular form. She is then corrected again by her playmate and repeats the form she is given. Examples from subsequent play sessions reveal Noemí using the third person plural command form with different verbs to gain the attention of both of her playmates (Example 60). In the following example, Noemí’s peers correct the gender agreement between the adjective “linda” (pretty) and the noun “mariposa” (butterfly):

**Example 125**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROS:</th>
<th>Mi mariposa linda.</th>
<th>[My pretty butterfly.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOE:</td>
<td>Mi mariposa lindo.</td>
<td>[My pretty butterfly.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS:</td>
<td>Es mariposa linda.</td>
<td>[Its pretty butterfly.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS:</td>
<td>¿Quién vive aquí?</td>
<td>[Who lives here?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE:</td>
<td>La Mariposa.</td>
<td>[The butterfly.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rosalinda’s correction of agreement is incorporated into Noemí’s later turn. Example 9 is another example of explicit correction as Anita models the correct form of the subject pronoun “yo” (I).

*Scaffolding of Participation*

Sociodramatic play affords younger or less skilled participants the opportunity to imitate and interact with peers (Goodwin, 1990; Paugh 2005). Dialogues created as part of the play sessions presented in Table 3 provide opportunities for all group members to interact collectively to tell a story and could be described as *multitiered scaffolding* where at least three participants take turns leading to the accomplishment of a task (Cumming-Potvin, 2003). Examples 10, 11, 12 and 13 presented in chapter 4 showed Noemí’s playmates dictating lines for her to say. These were lines that needed to be articulated by Noemí’s character in the story so that the plot could continue to be developed. Each of the three examples is cued by the phrase *Tu dijiste* (You said) and then the necessary phrase (Examples 10, 11, 12, and 13). Through these dictated lines Noemí’s playmates are not only scaffolding her ability to use linguistic structures but also providing her with
allotted time to participate verbally in the interaction. Other linguistic cues include the phrase “di lo” (say it, Examples 35, 72), “dices” (you say, Example 73), and “dijeron” (you all said, Example 69).

In subsequent play sessions Noemí’s method of contribution evolves to repetition of words or phrases that are not cued (Example 14) to modification and variation of sentences that she is told to repeat (Example 15). Through these interactions Noemí is learning to take conversational turns and begins to take turns which are originally dictated to her and eventually constructed on her own. In establishing cues for when Noemí is to participate, her peers have turned the dialogue within the play session into a type of ritualized play in which Noemí begins participating after receiving a specific cue (Garvey, 1984). Such structured experience eventually leads her to be able to gain the floor and later take turns without being told to do so. This is in accordance with Garvey’s (1984) assumption that turn taking routines developed in peer play are eventually integrated into a child’s linguistic interactions.

The data shown in Table 6 provide evidence of Noemí’s increasing participation in the conversation as her percent of the total utterances in the conversation rises over the eleven play sessions. Her percent of the total number of turns per play session also rises over time. Although there is some rise and fall regarding her percent of total words per play session, her general trend is an increase in the percentage of total words she produces. In the final play session, Noemí produces 41% of all utterances, 38% of all turns and 37% of all words.

Further analysis of the turns Noemí took revealed that her use of Spanish increased over the course of the eleven play sessions. In order to find out how much Spanish Noemí actually spoke, her conversational turns were analyzed and classified as being Spanish, English, or Mixed. In the first play session only 41% of her turns were considered to be Spanish. The percentage of Spanish turns rose and fell in the next four play sessions, leveling off and finally consistently ranging from 80 to 84% in the last three sessions. Examining this data along with the participation data reveals that Noemí was not only speaking more, but more of the speech she produced was Spanish.

*Experiencing Peer Culture*
Noemí was also able to participate in the culture of her peers as the themes of play were based on events related to their personal experiences or to the lives members of their subculture (McCafferty, 2002; Rojas-Cortez, 2000). Play session topics included buying items at the market such as supplies and food, particularly corn. The market was not the only place that shopping was done, as there was a session in which they pretended to buy and sell items at the flea market. *La Wal-Mart* is a place frequently mentioned whenever discussion arose in pretend play about where bargains or good values could be found, or where someone pretended to buy something. Both sets of girls created fashion shows in which they dressed up as models and presented themselves to an imaginary audience prefacing the presentation with “Buenas noches, señores y señoras…” (Good evening Gentlemen and Ladies.” Playing with dolls included pretending that the dolls were going on a long trip to Texas, something that both sets of girls have done. A frequent theme of play had to do with being separated from family members and having to experience harsh conditions, lack of shelter, hunger and cruelty. An additional theme that reoccurred among both sets of girls in play was that of an older sister taking care of and protecting a younger sister, or sets of sisters that have to stick together as they fend for themselves. In one play session with Angelina and Rosalinda, they pretend that their parents have had to leave them because of a hurricane and have been put in jail in a place far away. In order to provide food for themselves and the benevolent old woman, they must cut crops with imaginary machetes. Noemí also takes part in this activity, whacking at bushes with an imaginary machete. In another scene Angelina plays they older sister who repeatedly protects her younger sister when she is afraid. The younger sister is afraid at night when it is dark and at school when she has to be left alone in the mean teacher’s class. She is also afraid of the strict mother who often scolds the girls.

Play sessions with Ana and Margarita also contain themes of abandonment, something they have experienced first hand with their mother’s return to Mexico last year and subsequent disappearance. In one play session they pretend to receive a note from their father who has died, telling the older sister to be sure to take care of the younger two sisters, played by Noemí and Anita. This study supports the assumption that in pretend play children enact themes present in the adult world in everyday life (McCafferty, 2002). The claim that socio-dramatic play episodes related to experiences from children’s
own lives are important for socio-emotional development (Corsaro, 2005). In this study for example, the girls dealt with the subject of abandonment by creating pretend play situations in which older sisters protected younger sisters and even engaging the help of super heroes, robots, and magical powers. Rosalinda based play scenarios on superheroes presented on television in Mexico and the United States, sometimes having characters from *Teen Titans, Silver Hawk* and the Mexican show *El Chapulín Colorado*.

Noemí accepts these themes of play, even when she does not understand why something like that could happen. In example 42 in which Noemí and Angelina are pretending that their parents have disappeared and they are left alone, Noemí questions the reasoning behind this scenario by asking “¿Por qué mi mamá y papá no está aquí?” (Why aren’t my mother and father here?). When the girls tell her that they have just gone somewhere else, she continues to ask why. Her continued questioning produce a more complete explanation by Rosalinda: “Por eso, tu mamá y tu papá tuvieron que ir a otro lugar muy feo a causa del huracán y una gente los metieron en el cárcel” (Because, your mom and dad had to go to a very ugly place because of the hurricane and some mean people put them in jail). Within the migrant community this could be a real occurrence, and Noemí is being exposed to this reality through this dramatization.

Noemí shows evidence of understanding that activities discussed with her playmates could be based on reality or could just be pretend. The following example is taken from a scene in which Anita is the hostess of a fashion show in which Margarita and Noemí are pretending to be models:

**Example 126:**

ANI: Aquí tenemos a Noemí. [Here we have Noemí]
ANI: ¿De dónde vienen tus cosas? [Where are your things from?]
NOE: De la… [From…]
ANI: ¿Walmart? [Walmart?]
NOE: No, sé, the real thing or pretend? [I don’t know, the real thing or pretend?]
ANI: Pretend. (Speaks in English)
NOE: De la Walmart. [From Walmart.]
The previous example shows Noemí’s willingness to go along with invented themes of narration even when they are not true. The clothing she was wearing was a Mexican traditional dress purchased in Guadalajara.

Noemí also accepted the pretend preparation of foods she had not previously experienced, going along with the idea of preparing the Mexican dish “mole”, and even stating that it was delicious. In a separate play session, however, Anita decides to pretend that she will be preparing a big meal for Christmas, but Noemí and Margarita will not because they are poor. Noemí replies by questioning why someone would not have food:

**Example 127**

ANI: No van a preparar nada.

[They aren’t going to prepare anything.]

NOE: ¿Por qué?

[Why?]

ANI: Porque no tienen comida, son pobres.

[Because they don’t have food, they are poor.]

MAR: ¡No! Vamos a preparar algo bien rico, una pizza o una sopa o algo.

[No! We’ll make something very good, pizza, soup or something.]

ANI: No, son pobres.

[No, you are poor.]

NOE: ¿No tengo comida? ¿por qué?

[I don’t have food? Why?]

REB: ¿No están preparando una cena grande?

[You aren’t making a big dinner?]

ANI: Yo grande, pero ellas no porque no tienen comida suficiente.

[Me, a big one, but not for them because they don’t have enough food.]

NOE: Yo pequeñita.

[Me a little one.]

After Noemí questions why someone would not have food, her mother steps in what could be seen as an attempt to shelter her daughter from the experience of having to be poor by nudging Anita to agree that everyone will make a big meal. When Anita rejects
the change of theme and declares that the other two still don’t have enough food. Noemí goes along as she attempts to state that she will be preparing only a small meal.

An example not previously discussed, was the surprise with which the girls reacted when they heard Noemí address her mother by her first name.

**Example 128**

NOE: Rebecca, where's my apple juice?
(Speaks in English.)

REB: ¿Cuál quieres, jugo de manzana o de naranja?
[Which do you want, apple juice or orange?]

NOE: Rebecca. I want berry.
(Speaks in English.)

ROS: ¡No es Rebecca, es mamá!
[She’s not Rebecca, she’s mama!]

Noemí had begun to call her mother Rebecca the previous summer on a trip with the researcher and 45 students, all calling her Rebecca. She also hears the researcher referred to as Rebecca when they spend time at Noemí’s grandmother’s house and generally chooses this form of address unless they are at their own home in Tallahassee. This is a stark contrast to the formal manner in which they address their mother which is a reflection of the role of the mother within Hispanic culture.

Incorporation of Linguistic Functions into Speech

This section will address findings related to research question 2a: **How is the ability to engage in extended dialogue developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?**

In terms of communicative skills, Noemí was able to develop productive abilities related to the following linguistic functions: a) describing ongoing events in the present tense, b) discussing past events using the preterite tense, c) expressing wants and needs, d) discussing her likes and preferences, e) expressing her feelings, f) asking questions, g) describing objects or actions using adjectives and adverbs and h) using command forms to affect the behavior of peers. Finally Noemí’s expressions became more specific as she incorporated possessive adjectives, possessive pronouns, and direct and indirect object pronouns into her speech.
Use of verbs and verb phrases

In order to engage in extended dialogue, Noemí needed to develop the productive linguistic functions necessary to participate in conversation. A basic requirement for oral communication would be combining a subject and a verb to make a simple sentence. As shown in examples presented in chapter 4, Noemí begins to make simple statements using conjugated verbs in the present tense beginning with session 2. Although Noemí showed evidence of understanding present tense forms of verbs prior to the study, she did not produce them to form sentences. Verbs Noemí uses in the present tense over the course of the play session include “ser” (to be, Examples 3B, 52, 113, 114, 117) to describe her identity or the identities or roles played by others “ir” (to go, Example 106, 111) to suggest where something goes or to suggest an alternative activity, “tener” (to have, Example 108, 115), “querer” (to want, Examples 43, 47, 52, 70, 112), “hacer” (to do/make, Example 108, 115), “saber” (to know, Example, 108), “poder” (to be able to, Example 74, 75, 116) and “estar” (to be, Examples 23, 67, 85, 96, 109, 115, 116). These verbs are all irregular verbs but are basic verbs a speaker needs. Noemí produces utterances containing regular verbs such as necesitar (“to need”, Example 105), and escapar, (Example, 110) and entrar (“to enter”, Example, 72).

Noemí also uses verb phrases ir + a + infinitive, querer + infinitive and poder + infinitive in her speech over the course of the play sessions. The construction ir + a + infinitive to suggest group activities (Example 16, 84, 94), to state things she and the girls are going to do, or to make suggestions for activities. Querer + infinitive is used by Noemí to define what she wants to do, or to ask her playmates if they want to do something (Examples 17, 18, 19, 43, 75, 90). Poder + infinitive is the construction she uses to ask permission to do something (Example 18, 19, 60).

Each of these constructions has been modeled repeatedly in previous play sessions by Noemí’s playmates, with the construction ir + a + infinitive (a construction that is used to express what someone is going to do) being used four times in the first play session by Angelina and Rosalinda to discuss pending plans or potential play activities, querer + infinitive (to want to do something) being used three times in the first play session, and poder + infinitive (to be able to do something) being used seven times prior to Noemí’s production of an utterance containing this structure.
In the fourth play session when Noemí attempts to use the irregular verb “venir” (to come), a verb that had not been previously used, she marks the verb with the subject pronoun “yo” (I, Example 19). Although placing the subject pronoun in front of the first person verb is not required in Spanish because of the inflective nature of the form, in analyzing the speech of Noemí’s peers, the pronoun “yo” (I) was placed in front of the verb 17 times in the second play session and over 30 times in the third play session.

In a related example Noemí marks the infinitive of the verb “jugar” (to play) with the first person pronoun “yo” (I) as she responds to questions addressed to her in the preterite and the present tense (Example 20). This strategy extends to words Noemí does not know in Spanish as she places the first person pronoun “yo” (I) in front of the English verb *feed* (Example 21). In this example, Noemí is using the subject pronoun “yo” as a communicative tool to express her thoughts while she still is not using irregular present tense forms, past tense forms, and even with verbs with which she is not familiar with the Spanish equivalent.

The speech sample taken from before the study revealed no instances in which Noemí used the Spanish preterite to discuss past events. In the sixth play session Noemí begins to use the regular preterite to talk about things that have already happened (Examples 24, 25, 26). These examples illustrate Noemí’s use of the preterite to talk about things that she has found using the verb “encontrar” (to find). This verb has been found in the same tense and form in the speech of her playmates, twice in the third session and once in the fourth session. An additional example presented in chapter 4 is Noemí’s use of the question “¿Qué pasó?” (What happened) to ask her playmate what is wrong (Example 26). This question has been asked and answered multiple times in many of the play sessions (Example 27) prior to Noemí using it to try to find out the cause of Rosalinda’s pain.

Evidence of use of the imperfect tense (continuous past tense) is also found in Noemí’s speech in the tenth play session. In example 118, Noemí responds in the imperfect tense when Rosalinda questions her about where she and her sister have been using the imperfect form of the verb “estar” (to be).

An interesting phenomenon is Rosalinda and Angelina’s usage of the verb phrase *Necesitar + que + venir* to talk about something that someone needs to do (Examples 29
and 30) and Noemí’s use of this of variation in her productive speech during the play session (Example 31). In yet another play session Angelina uses the same construction to tell Chapulín, this time played by Rosalinda, that he needs to defend them:

**Example 129**

ANG: Chapulín! ¿No nos vas a defender?

[Chapulín, Aren’t you going to defend us?]

ANG: Pero Chapulín, ¡Tú nos necesitas que defender!

[But Chapulín, you need to defend us!]

In the next play session, Noemí incorporates this construction into her speech again as shown in the following example:

**Example 130**

ANG: Podemos ir allá a buscar comida.

[We could go there to look for food.]

NOE: Necesitamos que encontrar comida.

[We need to find food.]

ANG: No te preocupes hermana, siempre pasa así.

[Don’t worry sister it always happens like this.]

This structure varies from the standard form *Necesitar* + *infinitive* used to express needs that is taught in mainstream Spanish textbooks in the United States. Noemí only used this construction in play sessions with Rosalinda and Angelina, and the researcher has not noticed her use of this construction outside the play sessions with these two girls.

**Asking Questions**

An additional linguistic function needed to participate in extended dialogue is the ability to ask questions. Before beginning the study, Noemí often responded to questions but did not ask questions in Spanish. Noemí uses interrogatives to ask questions beginning with the question word “¿dónde?” (where) in the third session (Examples 32, 33 and 34).

This question word has been used by her playmates since the first session to ask for location of various objects. The interrogative “¿cómo?” (how) is also used by Noemí for the first time in the third session to question something her playmates have told her to do (Example 40). The interrogative “¿qué?” (what) is used by Noemí beginning in the
seventh session to identify what type of food will be served (Example 38). The seventh session is also when Noemí begins using the interrogative “¿por qué?” (why) to clarify roles that have been assigned to her or to clarify events that are happening within the drama the girls are enacting (Examples 41 and 42). She uses this interrogative repeatedly in the tenth session to request an explanation for why Rosalinda does not want to play with the doll dressed in blue:

**Example 131**

ROS: Oye, No yo no voy a tener la blue one.

[Listen, I’m not going to have the blue one.]

ANG: Pero la acostaba.

[But you were putting her to sleep.]

ROS: Sí, pero yo no sabía de quién era.

[Yeah, but I didn’t know whose she was.]

ROS: Pero no, la azul no es mía.

[But no, the blue one is not mine.]

NOE: ¿Por qué por qué por qué?


ANG: Pero la acostaba.

[But she was putting her to bed.]

ROS: Yo no sabía de quién era.

[I didn’t know whose she was.]

ANG: ¿Pero no querías dormir abajo?

[But don’t you want to sleep on the bottom bunk?]

NOE: ¿Por qué?

[Why?]

She also uses this question to request an explanation for the reason that her playmate’s mother did not let the, watch all of a movie:

**Example 132**

ROS: Una parte de la película que estabamos viendo ahorita mi mamá no nos dejó que lo miremos.

[One part of the movie that we were watching right now my mother didn’t let us see it.]
REB: ¿No?
    [No?]
NOE: Was it scary.
    (Speaks in English.)
ANG: Una parte de la película.
NOE: Por qué?
Noemí begins to use the interrogative “¿quién?” (who) in the eleventh play
session to define roles and to identify speakers (Examples 36 and 37). In addition to using
interrogatives to ask questions, Noemí begins to use verbs to formulate yes/no questions
(Example 43). In the following example Noemí uses the third person plural of the verb
“venir” (to come) to ask if many friends are coming to the pretend sleepover:

Example 133
ANG: Van a tener una sorpresa, Mi hermana también va a estar acá.
    [They’re going to have a surprise. My sister is also going to be here.]
NOE: ¿Vienen muchas amigas?
    [Are many friends coming?]
ANG: Una no más está aquí.
    [Only one is here.]
Noemí uses the second person singular of the verb “querer” (to want) in the last
session as she asks Margarita if she wants to play with a puzzle:

Example 134
NOE: ¿Quieres hacer el rompe…?
NOE: ¿Rebecca cómo se dice?
REB: ¿cómo?
NOE: El rompe, esta cosa que vamos a hacer.
REB: Rompecabezas.
ANI: ok, allí.

Describing in Detail
During the play sessions, Noemí begins to incorporate adjectives and adverbs into
her speech resulting in statements that increase in detail and are more elaborate
(Examples 44, 45, 46). Although occasional use of adjectives had arisen in Noemí’s
speech before the beginning of this study, the previously articulated adjectives were high frequency adjectives, and their use was sporadic and not incorporated into sentences before her participation in play during this study. For example, Noémí declares the traditional Mexican food known as “mole” they are preparing to be delicious:

**Example 135**

ROS: ¿Y el mole que me promitieron?  [And the mole you promised me?]
ANG: Está en la cocina.  [Its in the kitchen.]
ROS: A ver, lo quiero probar.  [Let’s see, I want to try it.]
NOE: El mole en la cocina es rico.  [The mole in the kitchen is delicious.]

The following example shows Noémí using the adjective “ninguna” (none) to express that the inhabitant of the pretend house they are passing is not a butterfly as she thought it was, but a wolf.

**Example 136**

ROS: ¿Quién vive aquí? [Who lives here?]
NOE: La Mariposa.  [The Butterfly.]
ANG: ¡Noemí! (Screams to warn Noemí)
    [Noemí!]
ANG: ¡Noemí! (Screams to warn Noemí)
    [Noemí]
NOE: ¡Esa no es ninguna mariposa!  [That is no butterfly!]
NOE: ¡Es el lobo!  [It’s the wolf!]
ANG: Vete.  [Get out of here!]

Adverbs “también” (also) and “tampoco” (either) also begin to appear in her speech clarifying the idea that she is trying to express. In Example 47, for example, when Rosalinda verbally claims a flower that is found lying on the ground, Noemi first states that she would also like a flower. In her next turn she clarifies that she would like that flower, too. A statement which is very different in meaning from that of the previous
turn. In the next example, Noemí questions why she should be left with the mean mother if her sister leaves and asserts that she will fly away, too:

**Example 137**

ANG: Yo fui y después… [I left and then…]
ROS: ¿Y tu hermana? [And your sister?]
ROS: ¿A quién se la vas a dejar? [Who are you going to leave her with?]
ANG: A ti. [You.]
NOE: ¡Ay! Y ¿por qué? [Ay! And why?]
NOE: Voy a volar también. [I’m going to fly too!]

The last session also contains an instance in which Noemí uses the adverb “también” (also) to define who will play what role in the Christmas program they are designing:

**Example 138**

NOE: Wanna play angel? (Speaks in English.)
ANI: Ok. [Okay.]
NOE: Voy a ser angelito y tú también. [I’m going to be a little angel and you are, too.]

MAR: ¿Un angelito? [A little angel?]

In the following related example Noemí uses the adverb “tampoco” (neither) to tell her mother that she can’t manage to get the Barbie doll’s pants on:

**Example 139**

NOE: Rebecca, Rebecca, I can't put these on. (Speaks in English.)
NOE: No puedo poner estos. [I can’t put these on.]
NOE: No puedo poner estos tampoco. [I can’t put these on either.]
REB: Noemí a que estas jugando? [Noemí what are you playing?]
NOE: Muñecas. [Dolls.]
Examples presented also show Noemí using possessive adjectives on other occasions to specify her ownership of certain objects or to direct her playmates' attention to something of hers (Examples 48 and 49). The following example shows Noemí using the possessive form “mi” (my) to claim her doll:

**Example 140**

ROS: ¿Quién dejó su muñeca, su muñeca aquí? [Who left, their doll, their doll here?]

NOE: ¡Mi muñeca! [My doll!]

She uses the same possessive pronoun to identify her stick she has been playing with and to state that she wants to take it with her.

ROS: ¿Podemos ir afuera a ir a los swings? [Can we go outside to the swings?]

REB: ¿Quieren? [Do you want to?]

REB: ¿Quieren ir a los swings? [Do you want to go to the swings?]

REB: ¿No van a tener frío? [You won’t be cold?]

ROS: No. [No.]

ROS: Vamos. [Let’s go.]

NOE: Si vamos. [Ok, Let’s go.]

NOE: Yo voy a llevar mi palo. [I’m going to take my stick.]

She also uses the possessive pronoun “mi” (my) to define her imaginary relationship with a playmate in the following session:

**Example 141**

NOE: Hola, Hola, Hola. [Hello, Hello, Hello.]

ROS: Hola ¿cómo estás? [Hello, how are you?]

NOE: Bien. [Fine.]

NOE: Oh mi sister, mi sister. [Oh my sister, my sister.]

ROS: Hermana. [Sister]

(Providing her with the Spanish word.)

NOE: Hermana, hermana. [Sister, sister.]

NOE: Oh no, ¡mi hermana! [Oh, no, my sister!]

In the example presented above Noemí pretends to see her long lost sister who has returned, whom she does not recognize at first. On one occasion she incorporates the use
of the possessive pronoun “mía” (mine) into her speech when asked by her friend where her doll is (Example 50). Noemí also incorporates prepositions and prepositional phrases into her speech Example 51 reveals Noemí’s use of the preposition “con” (with) as she tells her imaginary sister to go home with their mother.

In the additional supporting example, Noemí uses the same preposition to set up the next activity she wants the girls to do:

**Example 142**

NOE: Vamos a bailar con las… [Let’s dance with the…]
ANI: ¿Monas? [Dolls?]
NOE: um Muñecas. [Um, Dolls]
(Using another word for doll)
MAR: Yo voy primero. [I’m going first.]
ANI: Voy a buscar la otra. [I’m going to look for the other one.]
MAR: Alguien necesita jugar con la otra. [Someone needs to play with the other one.]
NOE: Vamos a bailar con las muñecas. [Let’s dance with the dolls.]

A related example shows Noemí giving incorporating the preposition “con” (with) into the instructions she is giving to Margarita about playing with a toy train:

**Example 143**

NOE: Hagan así, con la mesa. [Do this, with the table.]
ANI: ¿Qué es? ¿És un tren? [What is it? Is it a train?]
MAR: Oh, ¿puedo jugar con el tren? [Oh, can I play with the train?]

Another preposition that Noemí incorporates into her speech is “para” (for) as she states who things are for. The following example show her use of this preposition to specify that she would also like milk:

**Example 144**

ANI: No quieres tomar leche? [Don’t you want to drink milk?]
NOE: ¿Leche? no leche no. [Milk. No, milk, no.]
MAR: Sí leche para mí. [Yes milk for me.]
NOE: Okay, leche está bien. [Okay, milk is fine.]
NOE: Leche para mí también. [Milk for me, too.]
Describing Preferences

An additional linguistic function developed during these play sessions is Noemí’s ability to describe her preferences and to talk about her likes and dislikes. In Example 52 when questioned by her playmate about what she likes about Christmas, Noemí is able to produce a statement describing her favorite part of Christmas and then elaborating on this statement (Example 52). In another example presented in chapter 4 she states that she does not like the roaming Pit Bull dog and gives a statement explaining why (Example 53). A supporting example shows Noemí using the phrase “Me gusta” (I like) to express how she feels about Christmas music:

**Example 145**

NOE: Is this Christmas music?
NOE: ¿Es música de Navidad?
NOE: Me gusta música de Navidad.
ANI: ¿Por qué?
NOE: Porque…
ANI: ¿Tiene ritmo?
NOE: Si, tiene ritmo y Santa Claus viene.

In the previous example not only does Noemí state that she likes Christmas music but she also explains why when cued by Anita. The forms used to express her likes and dislikes are not extensive or varied, but there is evidence of her incorporation of “me gusta” (I like) into her productive speech, a function that was not evident in her oral communication before this study.

Participating in Conversation

The following section addresses findings related to research question 2b: “How is the ability to participate in conversations developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?” Data presented in Table 6 show Noemí’s increasing participation in conversations and dialogues occurring over time in play sessions. This section will discuss ways in which Noemí uses her playmates speech as a mediational tool to guide her own participation. Other participatory techniques that will be discussed include repetition of the speech of others, repetition of
her own utterances, asking playmates for direct translations, asking playmates for clarification, and using commands to gain attention in order to take the floor.

Through multitiered scaffolding Noemí increases her ability to contribute to dialogues and conversations (McCafferty, 2002). In order to be able to produce complete sentences Noemí uses her playmates’ speech as a mediational tool. Example 54 shows Rosalinda answer in a complete sentence when Angelina asks her name. When Angelina asks Noemí for the same information in the next turn, Noemí begins to tell her name and then stops in the middle of the word and incorporates the same structures used by Rosalinda into her statement in order to answer the question in a complete sentence. In example 75, Noemí uses the verb “dormir” (to sleep), a verb she has not used before, to talk express where she would like to sleep, incorporating the verb Angelina and Rosalinda have just used into her own grammatical construction.

In addition to incorporating linguistic structures or phrases (Example 64), Noemí also repeats single words or phrases uttered by her playmates, thus gaining entrance to the conversation (Example 56, 86). In the following example, Noemí uses the vocabulary word “prisionera” (prisoner) provided by Rosalinda to declare herself a prisoner as well:

**Example 146**

ROS: Te hace prisionera. [She takes you as a prisoner.]

NOE: Yo soy prisionera, también. [I am a prisoner, too.]

The following example shows Noemí taking a part of Angelina’s last utterance and repeating it in order to participate in the dramatization:

**Example 147**

ANG: No, no, está espiando. [No, no she is spying.]

NOE: Está espiando. [She is spying.]

ANG: Somos robots. [We are robots.]

ANG: Tienes que estar dormida. [You have to be asleep.]

ANG: Somos robots Noemí. [We are robots, Noemí.]

ANG: Podemos ver todo. [We can see everything.]

By repeating the phrase that Angelina has just said, Noemí shows evidence of understanding the role that Rosalinda is playing and its relation to her own role in the current dramatization.
At times Noemí maintains the floor by repeating her own utterances (Example 65, 97). Noemí also signals her participation in the play session and claims turns that might be hers is by simply stating “sí” (yes) after each of her playmate’s statements (Example 66). This is something that Noemí showed evidence of doing in her recorded conversations with her father in August, 2005. The following example shows Noemí answering his questions by using “sí” (yes) in order to respond:

**Example 148**

NOE: There's only a little bit coming out.  
(Speaks in English)

JUA: Solamente sale un poquito, ¿eh?  
[There’s only a little coming out, huh?]

NOE: Sí, could you get that flower that has some of those?  
[Yes, yes could you get that flower that has some of those?]

JUA: Está bonito el color de este flor, ¿no?  
[The color of this flower is pretty, right?]

NOE: Sí.  
[Yes.]

JUA: ¿Pero tienes otro color favorito?  
[But do you have another favorite color?]

NOE: Sí, Pink.  
[Yes, pink.]

JUA: Este lago es bien grande, ¿ah Noemi?  
[This lake is very big, right Noemí?]

NOE: Sí.  
[Yes]

In order to be able to express something that she does not know how to say in Spanish, Noemí asks her playmates or the researcher for assistance in the form of direct translation (Examples 62, 63). Command forms are also used to gain her playmates’ attention in order to take the floor. Example 57 shows Noemí using the informal command “mira” (look) to get Margarita’s attention while she is verbally setting the scene for a show the girls are about to undertake where they will dance with the dolls.
After shouting “¡Mira!” (look), it appears that Noemí does not know what to say next so she fills in with a musical interlude by singing *la, la, la, la la*. She then tries to begin to tell a story or initiate a dramatization starting with “Una historia de…” (A story about) before she is interrupted by Anita who begins a story about her sister. Other examples presented show Noemí using other commands to provoke verbal responses or request actions from her playmates (Examples 58 and 60).

**Constructing Narratives or Monologues**

An additional focus of the second research question was to examine ways in which Noemí developed her abilities to create narratives or monologues through pretend play. Research question 2c specifically asks: **“How is the ability to create narratives or monologues developed through pretend play in an immersion situation with Spanish speaking children?”** The present section explains how the stories acted out during play sessions could be considered collective narratives. Peer strategies used for including Noemí in story telling are presented. These include providing topics, appropriating turns, and elaborating on content in a way that models story structure. Techniques Noemí uses for engaging in collective narratives are also discussed. These techniques included acts out narrations of events given by others, repetition of dictated phrases, Adaptation of dictated lines by modification or elaboration, questioning plot development, elaborating on playmates suggestion, producing own lines based on developing plot, directing plot and defining roles through linguistic contributions.

Narratives are broadly defined as conversations that retell past events (Blum-Kulka, Labov, 1972; Umiker-Sebok, 1979). As a form of extended discourse, narratives must be completed over several turns and narrators must use linguistic skills to relay their stories (Labov, 1972; Preece, 1992; Uchikoshi, 2005). Throughout the play sessions the children attempt to act out stories that could be considered collective narratives. The collaborative nature of narratives has been established in the literature including research on the manner in which family dinner time narratives are jointly constructed (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Erickson, 1988; Ochs, 1999). Through these narratives, more skilled peers work with Noemí to tell stories by providing the topics, appropriating turns to her, and elaborating on content in a way that models story structure (Preece, 1992). Previous
research has shown adults facilitating children’s narrative competence by employing similar strategies (Preece, 1992).

Noemí’s participation in collective dialogues begins with her acting out narrations of events given by others (Example 79). In the following example Noemí pretends to cry as her playmate/sister tells her they have no food because all the crops have frozen:

**Example 149**

ANG: Hace tanto frío que se congeló, se congeló la comida.

[It is so cold that the food froze, it froze.]

ANG: Ya no tenemos comida, no tenemos nada.

[Now we have no food, now we have nothing.]

NOE: Sí, ¡yo sé! (Crying)

[Yes, I know] (Pretends to cry.)

ANG: No llores hermana.

[Don’t cry sister.]  

In the seventh play session, she acts as if she were cutting crops with an imaginary machete as Rosalinda narrates how these two abandoned sisters must collect crops to feed themselves and an elderly lady. Her participation involves repetition of phrases that are dictated to her (Examples 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14) and evolves into participation in which she adapts lines dictated to her by modifying or elaborating on them in some way (Example 10, 11, 15, 72, 73). Examples presented in chapter 4 from sessions 9 and 10 show Noemi questioning suggested plot development (Example 68, 69), elaborating on playmates’ suggestions, producing her own lines based on the developing plot (Example 70), and directing the plot through her linguistic contributions (Example 67, 71 and 72). Example 73 shows Noemí actually disagreeing with her playmate about the use of a blanket by claiming that it is a blanket for a horse and not for Santa Claus. This declaration is accepted and changes the direction of the current narrative or dramatization.

In session nine, Noemí takes multiple turns to establish the setting where the dramatization/narrative will take place while refuting the set up declared by her playmate. In Example 74, Noemí takes four turns to articulate the setup of the current story declaring that the doll she is playing with will live in a certain house and sleep on a
certain bed despite her playmates’ attempts to claim that space for themselves. When Rosalinda responds by stating that she thinks it would be better for Noemí’s doll to sleep somewhere else, Noemí takes three turns to re-state the setting and affirm that she will not change her decision about where her doll will sleep (Example 75).

Noemí’s ability to engage in collective narration increased over the course of the play sessions. This development was the result of guided assistance by her peers in the telling of stories through dramatization. Noemí’s peers supplied topics and helped her gain the floor by providing explicit instructions on when she should contribute to the dialogue strategies, characteristics attributed to parents who aid children in developing narrative competence in previous research (Preece, 1992). Noemí’s playmates guide her linguistic production providing her with entire lines to say as she develops her repertoire of grammatical structures and vocabulary. A factor that could be considered an important scaffold as lack of vocabulary in the second language has been shown to be a limitation to production of narrations in the second language while proficiency is limited but that develops with increasing proficiency (Uchikoshi, 2005). Uchikoshi’s (2005) study showed English language learners at low levels of proficiency remaining silent during collective narrations or producing sentences in their first language while learners at increased proficiency levels were able to produce multiple turns to aid in plot development.

Strategies

Research Question #3: “What strategies does this particular child use to aid in communication as she develops communicative competence in the weaker language?” The present section will discuss identified strategies for linguistic participation and coping strategies employed as her use of English was restricted. Strategies for linguistic participation included humming, singing, grunting, blowing into the microphone, laughing and making unintelligible noises, insertion of English words, pronouncing English words or phrases in Spanish, repetition to gain the floor and participate, repetition for acknowledgement and language play.

Strategies for Communication

At each gathering Noemí attempted to express herself linguistically and to be included in the play session. She also had to manage feelings of frustration that arose
from being in a new environment and not being allowed to use her most developed language for expression.

Chapter 4 presented examples that detailed Noemí’s attempts to participate linguistically in play sessions. Examples from sessions 2 and 3 reveal her making noises into the microphone to gain attention. Examples 77, 78, and 79 reveal Noemí grunting, blowing, screaming, laughing and making unintelligible noises. Evidence of attempting to maintain control of the floor by singing or humming is presented in Example 76.

Other strategies for participation include phonetically realizing English words in Spanish (Examples 81 and 82). This technique for participation could be considered evidence that Noemí is aware of two phonological systems (Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999) and uses this knowledge in attempts to communicate and to be included in conversation. A strategy used by both Noemí and her peers is that of filling in with English words or phrases when unsure of the Spanish equivalent (Examples 83, 84, 85). This process, a type of intrasentential code-mixing, has been termed insertion by Muysken (2000) and is defined as placing items from one language into a structure from the other language. Termed “lexical borrowing” by Reyes and Ervin-Tripp (2002), the insertion of single words from a child’s additional language has been established as a strategy related to the development of bilingual competence. In given examples, playmates are not alternately mixing languages within sentences or conversation, but inserting words or phrases “from one language into a structure from the other language” when they are unaware of its equivalent in the other language (Muysken, 2000). This phenomenon has been established by some as a way of increasing opportunities for linguistic expression (Kramsch, 1998; Romaine, 1998, Muysken, 2000; Reyes & Ervin-Tripp, 2002).

Repetition has been established as a tool that Noemí employs for participation in conversations and dramatizations. Examples of her use of repetition of the words of others to gain the floor and multiple repetitions of phrases she has produced on her own reveal her engagement in conversations and her attempts to participate (Examples 56, 73, 75, 87, 88, 89). Noemí also uses repetition to demand acknowledgment by her peers as the setting is determined during play sessions. When Noemí’s friends do not answer her when she proposes a play activity, she repeats her request over multiple turns until acknowledgment is received (Examples 90, 91, 92, 93). Example 93 shows Noemí
attempt to establish the goal of the play session to be playing Fairytopia. Over the course of 40 turns between Noemí, Anita, Margarita and the researcher, Noemí repeats “Vamos a jugar Faritopia” (We are going to play Fairytopia) or a variation of this phrase 16 times as she seeks to establish and maintain this theme of play.

Language play has been established as an important component in the process of second language acquisition (Cazden 1976; Chuvovsky, 1963; Garvey, 1977; Iwamura, 1980; Jakobson, 1980; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 1976; Weir, 1962). Evidence has been presented to show Noemí’s play with sounds to create patterns of rhyme, rhythm, and meaning, practices with links to language learning established in literature related to language acquisition (Cook, 1997). Example 96 shows Noemí inventing words and rhythms and rhyming. Additional evidence of language play through invented rhymes is also found as Noemí declares herself the “Fresa Princesa” (Strawberry Princess) in Example 97 and suggests pantalones “pants” and ratones “rats” as items for an imaginary dinner she is preparing (Example 99). Noemí combines linguistic elements that might not go together in a playful way as she discusses making a pay de mariposa or “butterfly pie.”

Coping Strategies

In early sessions Noemí declares the existence of English play episodes, bargains for the use of English, or refuses to attempt to participate in Spanish (Examples 99, 100, and 101). A declaration of Spanish as the language of play within this context has not been enough to convince Noemí to choose to solely use Spanish in her play interactions. Although she is being forced to use Spanish in order to communicate with her peers, at times she refuses. Romaine (2000) declares that the language an individual used in communicative interaction is based on domain and attitudes about the language in question and is also related to specific situations and given participants in a conversation. In the case of Example 100, Noemí declares a Faritopia play session, a feat which requires thirteen turns on her part. Once the girls begin to act like Faritopias and use dialogue to play, Noemí wants to use English to continue the pretend play situation. She is leading this play session, as the girls do not know what Faritopias are or what they are supposed to do or say. In this case when reminded to speak in Spanish by her mother, she requests permission to allocate a portion of the play session to English saying, “Rebecca,
Rebecca, but how about if we play the first part in English.” She then makes hand motions to specify that the English session will not last long and claims that the girls do, in fact, understand English. At this point, Noemí becomes very upset as she repeatedly begs to use English for a small portion of the play session and then runs away in frustration only to return to once again and begin to speak to the girls in English. Example 101 provides evidence of Noemí’s playmates’ collaboration with the researcher as they claim that they do not understand English when she re-enters the room and speaks directly to them in English. Evidence of Noemí declaring play sessions for herself in English are presented in Examples 102 and 103. In example 104 Noemí directly states, in Spanish, that she can’t use it because she does not know how when cued by her mother to choose Spanish during the play session. The issue of forced language use will be discussed further in the limitations section of this chapter.

Examples of this sort are not found after play session 5. Noemí’s language choice seems to be associated with Linton’s (2004) Critical Mass model of bilingualism which proposes that a particular language is valuable based on its communicative value and when others nearby speak the same language. Through play with peers, Noemí gradually becomes accustomed to the idea that in order to communicate and play with the other girls, she will have to use the assigned language. This realization is difficult because Noemí receives mixed messages about how much English her playmates actually know. The fact that they understand Noemí’s English phrases and are able to provide her with direct translations and sometimes slip in an English word leads Noemí to question the idea that the girls really speak no English. After session five, when Noemí is reminded to speak Spanish by her father her reply is “Oh, I forgot” and not protesting or bargaining to use English (Example 104b).

**Maintaining Gains in Spanish Language Proficiency**

After moving out of the trailer park, Noemí has continued to play with both groups of girls and to interact with at least one of the two sets of girls on a weekly basis. Her interactions with her father have continued to be in Spanish, and she even chooses Spanish as a language in which to communicate with her mother, an occurrence that happens frequently even in the presence of Noemí’s English speaking grandparents. In fact it seems that Noemí has become aware of her ability to use both languages as a
resource to make statements more effectively (Romaine, 2001). Several weeks after the completion of the study she described a pair of boots that she did not like as being “cucaracha botas” (cockroach boots). Later in the day as she put on a cowboy hat to dress up as a horse trainer for school, she looked in the mirror and made the following statement, “Soy Mexicana, de México” (I am Mexican, from Mexico) singing the phrase repeatedly that she had originally made up to describe one of her playmates as they put on one of Noemí’s traditional Mexican dresses. She then followed with questions and statements in Spanish about where her horse was. Approximately a month and a half after the completion of the study we visited the circus. There was a Hispanic family seated beside us who had several children, two of which appeared to be around the same age as Ana and Margarita and had similar physical features. Noemí began to address them in Spanish as she attempted to play with them during the break between acts.

Implications

The results of this study have implications for parents who wish to provide their children with the opportunity to develop or maintain more than one language. Given that imaginative play lends itself to creation of fantastic events and stories through language (Corsaro, 2003) and that first language development has been linked to pretend play (Corsaro, 2003; Garvey, 1990; Vygotsky, 1967), play sessions conducted as part of this support the idea that sociodramatic or imaginative play is also conducive to development of an additional language (Bourne 2001; Riojas- Cortes, 2001) as this study required a receptively bilingual child to produce spoken language in order to participate in play. Sustained opportunities for play with peers who supposedly did not speak English forced a child resigned not to attempt to produce language in her weaker language to work collaboratively with her peers to express herself and participate in play. The finding that this receptively bilingual child was able to increase her ability to participate in conversations in her weaker language and expand the repertoire of linguistic functions she productively uses is widely applicable considering research finding that the majority children of immigrant parents in the United States generally become English dominant and do not develop or maintain productive language skills in their parent’s native languages (De Houwer, 2004; Romaine, 2000).
This study identified strategies that Noemí’s peers used to help her communicate in the weaker language. Although documenting whether or not Noemí continues to use linguistic elements that she used in collaboration with peers during the study falls outside the focus of this particular investigation, Vygotskian sociocultural theory assumes that working collaboratively with peers leads learners to higher levels of development (Ohta, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985). Playmates were able to work with Noemí within her Zone of Proximal development to lead her to an increased ability to function productively in Spanish (Block, 2001). Internalization of productive abilities occurred over the course of this study as linguistic participation first occurred through other regulation and moved toward self regulation (Block, 2001). Scaffolding techniques that emerged in this study such as collaborative construction of utterances, providing direct translations, asking leading questions, and explicit correction of mistakes through modeling could be explicitly taught to parents of bilingual who wish to develop or maintain their children’s productive skills in their native languages. Identified strategies for facilitating participation in conversations could also potentially be taught to parents desiring to find ways to increase their children’s participation in conversations in their weaker languages.

The importance of play in relation to the opportunity it can provide for sustained linguistic interaction has been confirmed in this study (Corsaro, 2003). Through this type of sustained interaction, on receptively bilingual child was able to increase her productive proficiency over a relatively short period of time. These findings can be applied to create informal play opportunities for bilingual children where time is allotted for play in each language. While the majority of research related to pretend play and second language learning has occurred within the context of a classroom (Bourne, 2001; Riojas-Cortez, 2000, 2001), this study provides evidence that when children engage in sociodramatic play, they are able to invent imaginative pretend scenarios that are conducive to language learning. Children, as well as parents, can be given instructions on strategies for linguistic scaffolding based on the findings of this study. In addition, children learning a second language can be given explicit linguistic and coping strategies identified in this study that can serve as tools as they seek to develop productive language abilities.
This qualitative case study sought to determine ways in which a receptively bilingual child is able to develop communicative competence in her weaker language through play in that language with peers. Although qualitative research does not seek to be statistically generalizable (Rossman and Rallis, 2003) findings from this study could be confirmed through additional studies of contextually similar cases of language development. Qualitative research, by nature, seeks to build theory through accounts of occurrences and surrounding circumstances (NSF, 2004). Related findings could be potentially used to establish developmental sequences for receptively bilingual children placed in similar intensive play situations for the purpose of developing their non-dominant language. Establishment of sequences of this type could lead to the design of instruments that more accurately assess productive abilities of bilingual children.

Limitations

The simulated immersion context in which this study took place was created so that Noemí would have the opportunity to participate in pretend play with older peers. This context however, was not naturally occurring, but highly manipulated by the researcher. The family was moved into an environment that was unfamiliar to them so that Noemí could play with Spanish speaking peers, however due to the reality of scheduling, work related obligations, and fears related to the migrant reality in the United States, play sessions did not just spontaneously occur as children went outside. In fact, the researcher had to bring another set of children from a trailer park across town in order to provide sufficient opportunity for play within the allotted time period.

The very fact that Noemí’s peers knew in advance that they were participating in a study and the imposition and enforcement of the Spanish only rule on the part of the researcher is certain to have made an impact on the types of play that occurred. Although the playmates created their own themes of play which naturally unfolded, the types of play that were allowed to occur fell within certain boundaries established by the researcher. The study required types of play that were conducive to productive speech therefore the researcher discouraged the children from playing games or engaging in activities that did not encourage verbal communication. Anita, Margarita and Noemí really wanted to play hide and seek, however this type of activity was usually put off by the researcher as she suggested that they do that later. The girls interest in reading the
Spanish children’s books also had to be discouraged during play time resulting in the researcher moving all books out of Noemí’s room and sending them home with the children instead.

The brevity of the duration of the study could also be considered as a limitation. The duration, however, is part of the design of the study; is not a longitudinal examination of language development, but seeks to identify processes that occur in productive development in a child who is a receptive bilingual when there is frequent opportunity for extended play with peers. Previous studies of bilingual children have examined their language development over time (Deuchar and Quay, 2000; Dromi, 1987; Hernández-Piña, 1990; Kielhofer and Jonekeit, 1983; Leopold, 1947; Ronjat, 1913; Saunders, 1982, 1988; Smith, 1983, Taeschner, 1983; Tomasello, 1982). Investigations of bilingual development through play also present longitudinal studies of development in which the learner’s development is examined in shorter play sessions over an extended period of time (Bourne, 2001; Byun, 1993; Riojas-Cortez, 2001).

Although the data from eleven play sessions are presented as part of this study, the child whose language development was being examined participated in play with peers on more than these eleven occasions over the course of five weeks. As mentioned in chapter 4, the children’s play was not recorded at family gatherings which generally occurred on weekend evenings or on outings to local events or the amusement park.

The fact that the principle research subject is the child of the researcher could also be seen as a limitation of this study. However it has been previously established that parent linguists are often the most appropriate researchers to investigate child language development due to the amount of time they spend with the children and their detailed contextual understanding of the child’s background (de Villiers & de Villiers, 1979). Furthermore, there is an established history within the field of child language development of qualitative research, specifically case studies, being widely used within the field of linguistics, frequently by parent-linguists, to study child language development (Arnberg, 1981; Bergman, 1977; Brown, 1973; Burling, 1959; Caldas & Caron-Caldas, 2002; De Houwer, 1990; Döpke, 1992; Fantini,1976; Hakuta, 1976; Leopold, 1947; Mishina-Mori, 2002; Nicholadis, Mayberry & Genessee, 1999; Ravem, 1968; Ronjat, 1913; Saunders, 1988; Saville-Troike,1987; Scollon, 1976; Søndergard,
Another limitation to be considered is the lack of an exact instrument to define exactly what Noemí was able to produce before the study began. Neither of the two instruments considered in chapter 3 for establishing exactly what Noemí could produce in Spanish were ideal. The BVAT was not a chosen because it is normed for children 5 years old and above and is a tool used to establish language dominance. Of the three sections of the BVAT, the only section Noemí would have been able to do would be the vocabulary section considering that the concepts of synonyms, antonyms and analogies are not something that she has yet mastered in English. The FLOSEM was a more appropriate match because it allows a scorer to ascertain a learner’s ability to communicate in the language being learned. It is however, a test designed for students learning a second language—not specifically for receptive bilinguals developing their abilities to produce spoken language. The comprehension and communication categories on the Stanford FLOSEM Evaluation Matrix are somewhat irrelevant to the development of productive language in children who are receptive bilinguals, resulting in a scoring protocol that is not exactly appropriate. Because being a receptive bilingual implies some degree of comprehension as well as a phonological system in the weaker language that is native or near native, a receptive bilingual will likely place into the Early Production category even if they are not producing anything.

Although the FLOSEM is not an ideal instrument it does provide baseline data to establish what Noemí’s productive language skills were in Spanish before beginning play sessions. The comprehension and pronunciation categories on the FLOSEM do aid in establishing that Noemí is a receptive bilingual as they allow the evaluators to define how much she is already able to understand. The fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation categories do provide a way to establish her growth in these areas. The consideration of the researcher’s ratings, along with ratings given by an independent evaluator coupled with examples taken from transcripts from Noemí’s recorded verbal interactions with her father in August of 2005, provide a baseline against which to determine any gains in productive proficiency made over the course of the study.

Suggestions for Future Research

Extension of the Current Study
This research project provided a simultaneously bilingual child, whose Spanish language productive skills were lagging behind her receptive skills, the opportunity to develop her productive abilities in the language through play sessions. This study has shown one child’s increase in productive language proficiency through her participation in play sessions and her playmates’ abilities to scaffold learning experiences for her. Extended studies could reveal the incorporation of additional grammatical structures and linguistic functions into her speech. Future methodologies for studies extending the present study would include a more naturalistic setting in which the arrangement of play sessions could be more easily scheduled, hopefully during summer break when children have less obligations, so that the family could become more integrated into the community.

**Narrative development**

An attempt was made in this study to document ways in which a simultaneously bilingual child presently dominant in English was able to develop the ability to create narratives or monologues. This study revealed Noemí’s increasing ability to participate in collective narratives with playmates. These episodes, frequently dramatizations that tell a story, facilitate the development of narrative skills. Whereas, previous studies have focused on cross linguistic comparisons of narrative competence (Pearson, 2002; Uchikoshi, 2005), this study provides insight into ways in which the ability to narrate in the weaker language is actually developed. Strategies parents use to facilitate children’s ability to produce narratives were documented in use by Noemí’s peers as techniques they employed to engage Noemí in collective storytelling (Pellegrini & Galda, 1989; Preece, 1992). Although this study documented Noemí’s ability to engage in collective storytelling, and to produce multiple turns to establish spatiotemporal framing of narratives in this context, Noemí’s ability to engage in solo narration or the production of solo monologues was not explored. Additional research could be done to investigate whether or not the ability to create collective narratives in play sessions can be transferred to development of individual narrative competence.

**Studies of children with different contexts for bilingualism**

Noemí began this study with receptive language skills that she had developed through her experience as a simultaneous bilingual (Döpke, 1992; Grosjean, 1982).
Despite her English language dominance and her firm language choice of English at the beginning of the study, she had a foundation that allowed her to begin to produce Spanish relatively quickly once given the setting. Related case studies may extend to children who do not yet have receptive language skills, have not yet been exposed to a second language, and whose bilingualism will be developed sequentially (Scheffner Hammer et. al, 2004). Longer case studies of this type could be done to document the development of a second language through pretend play with peers in an intensive immersion setting over time.

**Socialization into a Speech Community through Pretend Play**

Children’s play reveals information about the culture in which they live (Saville-Troike, 1989). Although Noemí’s playmates create topics and themes for play that were based on their daily lives, the time and range of experiences while living in this community did not provide sufficient experiences to examine ways in which children are socialized into different roles and cultural norms through pretend play with other children. This study revealed hints of Noemí experiencing direct instruction on the part of her playmates about certain cultural norms related to their lives. Politeness forms such as the use of the formal form of address *Usted* versus the informal *tú* form were used by the girls to address their parents and other adults. Noemí did not begin to distinguish between the two forms although play sessions revealed her playmates incorporating both forms into their speech depending on the roles of the characters they were playing and their relationships to others. It is anticipated that with increasing linguistic proficiency, Noemí would have more time to invest in noticing subtle difference such as these and incorporating them into her Spanish while learning to function within certain cultural norms.

**Conclusion**

Creating play sessions within a simulated immersion setting in which Noemí could interact in play with other children gave her a need to produce her weaker language. Noemí’s home situation, before this study, was such that although her father consistently spoke only Spanish to her, she was well aware that both parents could understand her English responses. Noemí’s peers worked within her zone of proximal development, scaffolding her linguistic production in such a way that she was later able
to integrate linguistic functions into her own repertoire of productive skills (Block, 2001). This shift to the production of Spanish is in accordance with Döpke’s (1992) assertion that children will learn to produce language when they have a need to. Noemí’s productive language skills were lagging behind her ability to comprehend spoken Spanish when the play sessions began, and she was considered English dominant, a natural occurrence when an individual has difference in amounts of exposure to both languages (Döpke, 1992). This study affirms that language dominance is not a static entity and confirms the assertion that fluency in one language may progress or regress with a change in language environment (Döpke, 1992; Grosjean, 1982; Scheffner Hammer et. al., 2004). During this 5 week period, Noemí obviously did not throw the balance of dominance from Spanish to English, nor did her productive proficiency in Spanish come near to equaling her English proficiency over the course of the study. Her productive proficiency did increase based on the scores of her Spanish language proficiency based on the FLOSEM and as observed through documentation of her actual language production. Based on the ratings from evaluations conducted by the researcher and an independent evaluator, Noemí’s language proficiency moved up one level from the Speech Emergence level to Low Intermediate, making gains in the categories of fluency, vocabulary and grammar. These data confirm her increasing productive abilities in Spanish and her repertoire of associated linguistic functions.

It is anticipated that without continued use of the language, Noemí’s development of Spanish will stagnate and regress. A need to produce the language in everyday life must exist in order to maintain and avoid loosing the weaker language (Burling, 1959; Grosjean, 1982; Kessler, 1984; Schlyter, 1993). It is possible that now that Noemí’s productive abilities have developed to the point that attempting to use them does not cause extreme frustration, her parents can continue to build on the set of linguistic functions she is currently able to use. She will spend two months in Mexico this summer, once again changing linguistic context of her environment and necessitating her use of Spanish (Burling, 1959; Grosjean, 1982).

This study provided support for theories suggesting that play situations create contexts for cultural and linguistic learning, exploration and socialization (Goodwin, 1990; Paugh, 2005). Noemí’s playmates, who were more proficient in Spanish, created
opportunities for her to produce language and structured interactions in such a way that she was able to incorporate their vocabulary, linguistic structures and even interactional patterns into her own productive language. Kyrantis (2000, as cited in Paugh, 2005) states that during sociodramatic play children simultaneously (1) use, refine and expand a wide range of communicative skills; (2) collectively participate in and extend peer cultures and (3) appropriate features of and develop and orientation to wider adult cultures. Noemí’s linguistic skills were developed through shared activity as her peers provided guided assistance to aid in her participation in dialogues, conversation, games and storytelling. The knowledge they co-constructed with her through shared activity was sometimes incorporated into her linguistic repertoire and used in subsequent conversations (Block, 2001). With assistance and support provided by her peers, Noemí was able to produce language and participate in conversations in ways that were beyond her current productive abilities (Vygotsky, 1978). Through her interactions with her peers in sociodramatic play, Noemí gained the ability to participate in collective narratives by having the opportunity to tell or act out part of the story. Noemí contributed to the dialogues and dramatizations linguistically as stories are told by providing spatiotemporal and contextual information (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Uchikoshi, 2005), narrating events event or details, and even prefacing new stories with opening phrases such as “una historia de” (a story about). The results of this study reveal ways in which one receptively bilingual child was able to increase her productive communicative abilities over the course of a relatively short period of time.
APPENDIX A
Human Subjects Approval

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8633 - FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 10/10/2005

To: Rebecca Galeano
2109 Falling Leaf Lane
Valdosta, GA 31602

Dept.: MIDDLE AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Bilingual development through play

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 9/14/2005. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 9/13/2006 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. The principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Dr. Deborah Hasson
HSC No. 2005.692
Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Hasson in the Department of Multicultural Multilingual Education at Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to examine how children develop bilingual language abilities through play.

Your child's participation will involve playing with my daughter, Noemi, and speaking Spanish. I plan to record the children playing three to four times per week for four to six weeks. Your participation, as well as that of your child, in this study is voluntary. If you or your child choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The results of the research study may be published, but your child's name will not be used.

Although there may be no direct benefit to your child, the possible benefit of your child's participation is playing with other children.

If you have any questions concerning this research study or your child's participation in the study, please call me at (229)244-1237 or contact me by email at rgaleano@valdosta.edu. You can also contact my professor Dr. Deborah Hasson by phone at (850)644-2117 or by email at Hasson@coe.fsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Galeano

* * * * * * *

I give consent for my child ______________ to participate in the above study. I understand that the children will be tape recorded or videotaped by Rebecca Galeano. These tapes will be kept by the researcher in a locked filing cabinet. I understand that only the researcher will have access to these tapes and that they will destroyed by August 8, 2008.

Parent's Name: ________________________________

Parent's Signature ________________________________ (Date) __________________

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.
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If you have any questions concerning this research study or your child's participation in the study, please call me at (229)244-1237 or contact me by email at rgaleano@valdosta.edu. You can also contact my professor Dr. Deborah Hasson by phone at (850)644-2117 or by email at Hasson@coe.fsu.edu.
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Apreciados Padres,

Soy estudiante bajo la dirección de la profesora Hasson, en el Departamento de Educación de Lenguas y Culturas de la Universidad del Estado de la Florida, en Tallahassee, y estoy haciendo una investigación sobre el desarrollo del bilingüismo a través del juego.

Para participar en la investigación, su hija(o) va a jugar con mi hija, Noemí, usando el idioma español. Mi plan es grabar a los niños(os) de 3 a 4 veces por semana de 4 a 6 semanas. Su participación y la participación de su hijo(a) es voluntaria. Si Ud., o su hijo elige no participar no hay ninguna consecuencia. Podré publicar el estudio pero no usare los nombres de sus hijos.

No habrá ningún beneficio directo para su hijo (a) excepto que disfrutará el juego con otros niños.

Si Ud. Tiene alguna pregunta acerca de esta investigación o la participación de su hijo (a) me puede llamar al teléfono (229)244-1237 o contactarme por correo electrónico a rgaleano@valdosta.edu. También puede llamar a mi profesora, Dra. Deborah Hasson, al teléfono (850) 644-2117 o contactarla por correo electrónico a hasson@coe.fsu.edu.

Cordialmente,
Rebecca Galeano

**************

Le doy mi permiso para que mi hijo (a) ________________ participe en esta investigación. Entiendo que Rebecca Galeano va a grabar los juegos y conversaciones de los niños(en audio cassette y en video). Sólo Rebecca Galeano tiene acceso a las grabaciones y las va a guardar en una caja cerrada con llave y las borrará antes del 8 de agosto del 2008.

Nombre del padre o la madre _______________________

Firma ______________________ Fecha _____________

Si Ud. tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como sujeto participante en esta investigación, o si Ud. siente que ha sido puesto en una situación de peligro, usted puede contactar al Jefe del Comité de Investigaciones sobre Humanos, Consejo Institucional de Supervisiones, a través de la Vicepresidencia de Oficinas de Investigación al teléfono (850) 644 8633.
Apreciables Padres,

Soy estudiante bajo la dirección de la profesora Hasson, en el Departamento de Educación de Lenguas y Culturas de la Universidad del Estado de la Florida, en Tallahassee, y estoy haciendo una investigación sobre el desarrollo del bilingüismo a través del juego.

Para participar en la investigación, su hija(o) va a jugar con mi hija, Noemí, usando el idioma español. Mi plan es grabar a los niños(os) de 3 a 4 veces por semana de 4 a 6 semanas. Su participación y la participación de su hijo(a) es voluntaria. Si Ud., o su hijo elige no participar no hay ninguna consecuencia. Podré publicar el estudio pero no usaré los nombres de sus hijos.

No habrá ningún beneficio directo para su hijo (a) excepto que disfrutará el juego con otros niños.

Si Ud. tiene alguna pregunta acerca de esta investigación o la participación de su hijo (a) me puede llamar al teléfono (229)244-1237 o contactarme por correo electrónico a rgaleano@valdosta.edu. También puede llamar a mi profesora, Dra. Deborah Hasson, al teléfono (850) 644-2117 o contactarla por correo electrónico a hasson@coe.fsu.edu.

Cordialmente,

Rebecca Galeano

Le doy mi permiso para que mi hijo (a) ________________ participe en esta investigación. Entiendo que Rebecca Galeano va a grabar los juegos y conversaciones de los niños(os) en audio cassette y en video). Sólo Rebecca Galeano tiene acceso a las grabaciones y las va a guardar en una caja cerrada con llave y las borrará antes del 8 de agosto del 2008.

Nombre del padre o la madre __________________________

Firma ____________________ Fecha ____________

Si Ud. tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como sujeto participante en esta investigación, o si Ud. siente que ha sido puesto en una situación de peligro, usted puede contactar al Jefe del Comité de Investigaciones sobre Humanos, Consejo Institucional de Supervisiones, a través de la Vicepresidencia de Oficinas de Investigación al teléfono (850) 644 8633.
Apreciados Padres,

Soy estudiante bajo la dirección de la profesora Hasson, en el Departamento de Educación de Lenguas y Culturas de la Universidad del Estado de la Florida, en Tallahassee, y estoy haciendo una investigación sobre el desarrollo del bilingüismo a través del juego.

Para participar en la investigación, su hija(o) va a jugar con mi hija, Noemí, usando el idioma español. Mi plan es grabar a los niños (oas) de 3 a 4 veces por semana de 4 a 6 semanas. Su participación y la participación de su hijo(a) es voluntaria. Si Ud., o su hijo elige no participar no hay ninguna consecuencia. Podré publicar el estudio pero no usará los nombres de sus hijos.

No habrá ningún beneficio directo para su hijo (a) excepto que disfrutará el juego con otros niños.

Si Ud. tiene alguna pregunta acerca de esta investigación o la participación de su hijo (a) me puede llamar al teléfono (229)244-1237 o contactarme por correo electrónico a rgaleano@valdosta.edu. También puede llamar a mi profesora, Dra. Deborah Hasson, al teléfono (850) 644-2117 o contactarla por correo electrónico a hassoncoe.fsu.edu.

Cordialmente,

Rebecca Galeano

*************

Le doy mi permiso para que mi hijo (a) ___________ participe en esta investigación. Entiendo que Rebecca Galeano va a grabar los juegos y conversaciones de los niños (en audio cassette y en video). Sólo Rebecca Galeano tiene acceso a las grabaciones y las va a guardar en una caja cerrada con llave y las borrará antes del 8 de agosto del 2008.

Nombre del padre o la madre _______________________

Firma ____________________ Fecha _______________

Si Ud. tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como sujeto participante en esta investigación, o si Ud. siente que ha sido puesto en una situación de peligro, usted puede contactar al Jefe del Comité de Investigaciones sobre Humanos, Consejo Institucional de Supervisiones, a través de la Vicepresidencia de Oficinas de Investigación al teléfono (850) 644 8633.
## APPENDIX B

### Interchange Type Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Comforting</td>
<td>To comfort and express sympathy for misfortune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>Discussing clarification of action</td>
<td>To discuss clarification of hearer’s nonverbal communicative acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Discussing clarification of communication.</td>
<td>To discuss clarification of hearer’s ambiguous verbal communication or a confirmation of the speaker’s understanding of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW</td>
<td>Discussing the fantasy world</td>
<td>To hold a conversation within fantasy play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHA</td>
<td>Directing hearer’s attention</td>
<td>To achieve joint focus of attention by directing hearer’s attention to objects, persons and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Discussing hearer’s sentiments</td>
<td>To hold a conversation about hearer’s nonobservable thoughts and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJF</td>
<td>Discussing a joint focus of attention</td>
<td>To hold a conversation about hearer’s non-observable thoughts and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNP</td>
<td>Discussing the non-present</td>
<td>To hold a conversation about topics that are not observable in the environment, e.g. past and future events and actions, distant objects and persons, abstract matters (excluding inner states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRE</td>
<td>Discussing a recent event</td>
<td>To hold a conversation about immediately past actions and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP</td>
<td>Discussing the related to present</td>
<td>To discuss nonobservable attributes of objects or persons present in the environment or to discuss past or future events related to those referents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Discussing speaker’s sentiments</td>
<td>To hold a conversation about speaker’s non-observable thoughts and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRK</td>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>To express socially expected sentiments on specific occasions such as thanking, apologizing, or to mark some event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCS</td>
<td>Negotiate co-presence and separation</td>
<td>To manage a transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFA</td>
<td>Negotiating an activity in the future</td>
<td>To negotiate actions and activities in the far future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA</td>
<td>Negotiating immediate activity</td>
<td>To negotiate the initiation, continuation, ending and stopping of activities and acts; to direct hearer’s and speaker’s acts; to allocate roles, moves and turns in joint activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIN</td>
<td>Non-interactive speech</td>
<td>To engage in private speech or produce utterances not addressed to present hearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMA</td>
<td>Negotiate Mutual Attention</td>
<td>To establish mutual attentiveness and proximity or withdrawal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>Performing verbal moves</td>
<td>To perform moves in a game or other activity by uttering the appropriate verbal forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Negotiating possession of objects</td>
<td>To discuss who is the possessor of an object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Showing attentiveness</td>
<td>To demonstrate that the speaker is paying attention to the hearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXT</td>
<td>Reading written text</td>
<td>To read or recite written text aloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Unintelligible</td>
<td>To mark unintelligible utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOO</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
<td>To mark uninterpretable utterances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Illocutionary Force Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Answers calls; show attentiveness to communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Agree to carry out an act requested or proposed by other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Agree to do something for the last time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Call attention to hearer by name or substitute exclamations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Counter-suggestion; an indirect refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dare or challenge hearer to perform an action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Give in; accept other’s insistence or refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Give reason; justify a request for an action, refusal or prohibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Refuse to carry out an act or a request proposed by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Request, propose or suggest an action for hearer, or for hearer and speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Yes/No question or suggestion about hearer’s wishes and intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Signal to start performing an act, such as running or rolling a ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Warn of danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEECH ELICITATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Complete text, if so demanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Elicit onomatopoeic or animal sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Elicit intonation of a word or sentence by modeling or explicit command.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Elicit completion of a word or sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Elicit completion of a rote-learned word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Repeat or imitate other’s utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Complete statement or other utterance in compliance with request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Ask for permission to carry out act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Permit hearer to perform act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Prohibit/forbid/protest hearer’s performance of an act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>State intent to carry out act by a speaker; describe one’s own ongoing activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Threaten to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Create a new state of affairs by declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Declare a make believe reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Disagree with a declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YD</td>
<td>Agree to a declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Commiserate, express sympathy for hearer’s distress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Exclaim in distress, pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Express positive emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Express surprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Mark occurrence of event (thank, greet, apologize, congratulate, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Mark transfer of object to hearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XA</td>
<td>Exhibit attentiveness to hearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Agree with proposition or proposal expressed by previous speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Disagree with proposition expressed by previous speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Make a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Express a wish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Aggravated question, expression of disapproval by restating a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Answer in the affirmative to yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Answer in the negative to a yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Eliciting question (e.g., hmmm?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Intentionally nonsatisfying answer to question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Answer a question with a wh-question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QN</td>
<td>Ask a product question (wh-question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Refuse to answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Answer a wh-question with a statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Answer a limited-alternative question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Answer a limited-alternative yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YQ</td>
<td>Ask a yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Answer a question with a yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR</th>
<th>Perform verbal move in game.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Read or recite written text aloud.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB</th>
<th>Approve of appropriate behavior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Criticize or point out error in nonverbal act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Disapprove, scold, protest disruptive behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Exclaim in disapproval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Express enthusiasm for hearer’s performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Praise for motor acts, i.e. for nonverbal behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demands for clarification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Request to repeat utterance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Text Editing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Correct, provide correct verbal form in place of erroneous one.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Vocalizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YY</th>
<th>Make a word-like utterance without clear function.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OO</td>
<td>Make a word-like utterance without clear function. Unintelligible vocalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAINS</td>
<td>Tracks sequences of interactional codes across speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECK</td>
<td>Verifies the accuracy of CHAT conventions in files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP</td>
<td>Examines parent-child repetition and expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSTRNG</td>
<td>Changes words and characters in CHAT files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMNS</td>
<td>Reformats the transcripts into columnar form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBO</td>
<td>Searches for complex string patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCUR</td>
<td>Examines patterns of co-occurrence between words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATES</td>
<td>Uses the date and birthdate of the child to compute age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>Examines patterns of separation between speech act codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Computes the Developmental Sentence Score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLO</td>
<td>Reformats the file in simplified form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>Computes the frequencies of the words in a file or files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQMERG</td>
<td>Combines the outputs of various runs of FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>Finds the area of text that were marked with GEM markers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMFREQ</td>
<td>Computes frequencies for words inside gem markers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMLIST</td>
<td>Lists the pattern of gem markers in a file or files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEYMAP</td>
<td>Lists the frequencies of codes that follow a target code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWAL</td>
<td>Searches for word patterns and prints the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKEDATA</td>
<td>Converts data formats for CHAT files across platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKEMOD</td>
<td>Adds a <code>% MOD</code> line for the target SAMPA phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXWD</td>
<td>Finds the longest words in a file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>Computes the mean length of turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLU</td>
<td>Computes the mean length of utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD REP</td>
<td>Matches the child’s phonology to the parental model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>Inserts a new tier with part-of-speech codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONFREQ</td>
<td>Computes the frequency of phonemes in various positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>Probabilistic disambiguator for the <code>% mor</code> line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTLIST</td>
<td>Displays the patterns learned by POSTTRAIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTTRAIN</td>
<td>Trains the probabilistic network used by POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELY</td>
<td>Measures reliability across two transcriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALTIN</td>
<td>Converts SALT files to CHAT formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATFREQ</td>
<td>Formats the output of FREQ for statistical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTIN</td>
<td>Converts straight text to chat format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEDUR</td>
<td>Uses the numbers in sonic bullets to compute overlaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCD</td>
<td>Computes the VOCD lexical diversity measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDLEN</td>
<td>Computes the length of utterances in words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

Recording Equipment

Model of final design of recording system for the present study showing set up of wireless microphones, receiver and cassette recorder.
Original design of recording system consisting of three wireless collar microphones, three 900MHz wireless audio link transmitters, and three 900 MHz wireless receivers leading to cassette recorders.
## APPENDIX D
Data from MLT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>ANG</th>
<th>ROS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noemi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>3.899</td>
<td>6.125</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>3.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>ANI</th>
<th>MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>3.781</td>
<td>11.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>2.689</td>
<td>4.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>ANI</th>
<th>MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noemi</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>5.688</td>
<td>6.636</td>
<td>6.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>1.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>4.136</td>
<td>4.024</td>
<td>3.621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>ANI</th>
<th>MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>6.507</td>
<td>4.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>3.973</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>ANI</th>
<th>MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noemi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noemi</th>
<th>ANG</th>
<th>ROS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>8.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>5.339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noemi</th>
<th>ANI</th>
<th>MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterances</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over turns</td>
<td>4.917</td>
<td>5.425</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances over turns</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words over utterances</td>
<td>3.746</td>
<td>4.255</td>
<td>4.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Themes of Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Summary of Play Session Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Fairytopias.
TV show/ Fashion Show/ Models.
Cheerleader Princesses
La Cucaracha.

11/27/05
Noemí
Rosalinda
Angelinda
TV Fashion Show
Field workers who must stop coming to work because of a hurricane.
Cutting crops with pretend machetes.
Children abandoned by their parents.
Arrival of a dwarf.
Kind lady gives shelter to the girls who in exchange find and plant food for her.
Parents return and take the girls to live with them in New York.
Taking food to church.
Chapulin Colorado.
Preparing food.
An enemy/monster arrives the two sisters poison him by making him think he is eating honey when it’s poison.
Escaping from the monster.
Hiding and escaping from a tiger.
Dolls.

11/28/2005
Noemí
Anita
Margarita
Talking about Christmas.
Barbie/Princess Show.
Newscast about how Baribies and Princesses were dancing.
School.
Dolls.
Twins.
Children who have been abandoned by their mother and whose father left them a note before he died telling the older sister to take care of the younger two sisters.
Talking about Daisy and Ana being sisters.

12/2/2005
Noemí, Adri y Itzel
Dolls having a sleepover.
Playing outside on the swings.
House.
Escaping from the Pit Bull.
Strict mother with two daughters.
Cucaracha.
Savage Horse appears in the sleeping
girl’s room.
Convincing the strict mother to keep the horse.
Getting the baby horse as a gift.
Mother takes away the horse because the girls behave badly.

12/4/05 Noemí, Adri y Itzel
Playing spies.
Big Sister defending Little Sister.
Evil Person kidnaps the sleeping sisters.
Turning Invisible to escape.
An explosion occurs.
Magical twins escape.
Part robot/part human character that defends the girls. (Teen Titans)
Girls who have magical powers and fly at night.
Younger sister has to stay at home with mom.
Evil character who is secretly the twins mother.
Making mole for a special birthday dinner.
Finding a piñata for the birthday dinner.
Sending a boy away who has come to visit and telling him never to return.
Pretending that it is snowing.
Hiding and protecting the horse.

12/5/05 Noemí
Anita
Margarita
Being Angels in a Christmas Show.
Older and Younger sisters.
Restaurant.
Preparing a big meal.
A horse and a duck that lost their mothers.
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