Migration processes in recent history have led to a growing interest in the study of bilingual development. Traditionally, there has been a clear bias in the orientation of scientific research concerning language development in ethnic communities towards the second language. In comparison with the large number of studies in the latter area, the number of studies on the acquisition of ethnic community languages has been extremely small. The biased orientation in research on language development in ethnic communities can be derived from studies in Northern America (Grosjean, 1986), Australia (Clyne, 1982) and Europe (Extra & Verhoeven, 1993). During the past decades there has been a shift from almost exclusive attention to the dominant language to a broader focus on first and second language development. In the present volume recent studies on bilingual development will be presented.

Theoretical perspectives on language acquisition

A fundamental problem of linguistics is to explain how a person can and does acquire knowledge of language. In the tradition of generative grammar an attempt has been made to solve the problem of language acquisition by studying the abstract principles in the complex syntax of adult grammar. In explaining language acquisition it is supposed that the language ability of human beings is constrained by a universal grammar. Such grammar is defined as a set of language-specific principles, based on some sort of language acquisition device: a neural mechanism tailored to the specific task of language acquisition. It is also assumed that language acquisition is a genetically transmitted process, and that the basic structures which make language acquisition possible are uniquely linguistic. As such, the neural substrats of linguistic ability are seen as independent from those structuring human cognitive ability.

There are several problems with the generative approach of language acquisition. First of all, the factor time is totally ignored. While explaining its apparent ease, rapidity and uniformity, language acquisition is seen as an instantaneous phenomenon, idealizing it to a situation in which the child has at his disposal all of the principles and parameters of universal grammar and all linguistic data necessary to
fix those parameters (cf. Hyams, 1986). As such, it is by no means clear how and in what order linguistic parameters are set, nor is it clear how apparent delays which characterize the developmental process can be explained. In order to understand the process of child language acquisition an interaction of maturational linguistic factors must be taken into account. With regard to maturation, it seems a reasonable claim that not all of the principles of universal grammar are available at the initial state. As has been proposed by Felix (1987), the emergence of grammatical principles most likely follows a maturational schedule. With respect to the lexicon, it can be assumed that there are certain grammatical developments which are dependent on the learning of lexical properties. Given the fact that lexical entries displaying such features as argument structure and subcategorization restrictions must be learned one-by-one, language acquisition can only be seen as a gradual and time-consuming process.

It can be assumed that the process of language acquisition must represent an interaction between principles of universal grammar and other cognitive functions. If there are no instantaneous linguistic principles underlying language acquisition, it can be questioned how in the course of time children acquire rules which relate syntactic forms and semantic functions. On the basis of an extensive series of cross-linguistic studies Slobin (1985) has proposed a set of universal operational principles for the construction of language. In their initial form these principles are believed to exist prior to the child’s experience with language. In the course of applying such principles to perceived speech and associated perception of objects and events, a basic child grammar will evolve, corresponding to the internal organization and storage of linguistic structures.

Recent studies of first language acquisition have made clear that, by the age of 4, children are in command of many of the grammatical principles and rules governing their language use (cf. Goodluck, 1986). However, several studies have provided evidence that, both at the level of competence and performance rules, language development goes on into later school years (Bowerman, 1979, 1982; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979, 1986). Later language development in children can be characterized by a growing command of discourse principles. Around age 5, developmental shifts take place from intra- to intersentential devices, from basic structures to additional functions and from contextualized to decontextualized abilities.

The study of bilingual development

The language patterns of children living in a multicultural and multilingual society can be quite diverse. Some children, brought up by parents bilingually, develop proficiency in two languages more or less simultaneously during their infant years. Most children, however, learn the two languages in a successive manner. They learn the ethnic community language in the home and the wider ethnic community, and gradually the second language enters into their lives through television, peer contact and occasionally through day-care. When they enter school, the language input
becomes almost exclusively L2. Children may take part in special second language instruction, but to a greater part they acquire the second language naturally, mainly through interaction with peers and teachers.

Given current theoretical perspectives, the process of bilingual development can at best be studied from an interdisciplinary point of view, combining insights from linguistic theory and developmental theory. From a formal linguistic point of view bilingual development can be defined as an 'instantaneous' process in an ideal situation in which the child has at his disposal all of the principles and parameters of universal grammar and two sets of input data necessary to fix those parameters. Given the obvious fact that languages are not acquired instantaneously, developmental theory must explain the various 'delays' which characterize both first and second language development and the apparent difficulties children encounter in sorting out the principles of two different languages.

The analysis of children's bilingual development at school age will primarily focus on the children's organizing processes over spans of connected utterances. Narratives, in their broader sense, can be taken as relevant exponents of extended discourse. It can be examined how children in this age range learn to master cohesive devices for anchoring discourse structure in narrative comprehension and production, and under what conditions and with what grammatical constraints processes of transfer do occur. The study of bilingual development at school age need not be confined to oral language data. Given the fact that, starting at age 7, the school curriculum is highly devoted to reading and writing, data on emerging literacy can be explored as well.

In the study of bilingual development the following research questions can be addressed:

1. How are first and second language systems built up in the course of time?
2. Under what conditions and with what lexical and syntactic rules do processes of transfer and code-switching occur?
3. In what way does the language input shape the child's grammar?

The first question is concerned with the developmental process itself. It may be investigated how the two language systems get differentiated and developed over time. The second question goes into both functional and structural properties of processes of language transfer and code-switching. The final question concerns the role of language input. In order to investigate the role of language input, an inventory can be made of the interactional patterns the children take part in. It can be determined what language is used under which circumstances by and towards the children. The assumption underlying the final question is that the child may learn directly from positive evidence in the input, as has been proposed by Pinker (1984). The input may influence the process of bilingual development in two ways. First, the structural properties of each language may influence the perception and the cognitive processing of language elements. Second, the specific input which is selected will determine the range of linguistic parameters to be acquired.
With regard to the patterns of language development in bilingual children, it is still unclear what sort of operating principles children use. We have no clear insight into the conditions under which processes of language transfer occur. Previous studies on later bilingual development were limited insofar that the languages under consideration were highly related (cf. Grosjean, 1982; McLaughlin, 1985; Romaine, 1989). In order to be able to further explore the role of structural properties of languages, we need more research, especially on children’s data in typologically distant language pairs.

**Linguistic domains**

In the study of bilingual development a number of linguistic domains can be taken into account. Cross-linguistic attention may be given to typological differences between the languages under consideration in each of these domains. Without the pretention of being exhaustive, a number of domains that can be considered relevant for the study of bilingual development will be reviewed. These domains have proved to be highly significant in a large body of cross-linguistic studies on language acquisition in both children (cf. Slobin, 1985) and adults (cf. Perdue, 1993).

**Clause structure**

Within current linguistic theories universal grammar is defined as a parameterized system. A set of universal principles is presupposed, at least some of which are associated with parameters, expressing the limited range of variation that languages exhibit as regards these principles. Bilingual acquisition gives an interesting test of the idea that children come to language learning equipped with a universal grammar which is then modified on exposure to the environment. The ultimate question is how universal principles will lead to mastery of two separate grammars and what the role of environmental factors is in this process. In the analysis of clause structure a distinction can be made between core and peripheral or marked properties of the languages under consideration. As has been shown in work on first language acquisition, children start out with basic sentential phrase structures along with core complements through a principle of canonical mapping (Slobin, 1985; Hyams, 1988). Later on they sort out those aspects of complementation which are peripheral. It is also assumed that the distinction between core and peripheral properties will give better insight into the acquisition of inflectional morphology. On the basis of earlier research (Slobin & Bever, 1982), it can be hypothesized that inflections will be easier learned in languages where inflection is a core property than in languages where inflection is a peripheral property.

Gradually, children learn to use complex syntactic devices, such as relativization and clause linking. Following Comrie (1976) and Keenan & Comrie (1977) a relative clause can be defined as 'any syntactic device specifying a set of objects in two steps: a larger step is specified, called the domain of relativization, and then
restricted to some subset of which a certain sentence, the restrictive sentence, is true. The domain of relativization is expressed in surface by the head NP, and the restrictive sentence by the restricting clause’. From a typological point of view, a distinction can be made between external and internal relatives, with the head NP outside and inside the restricting clause respectively. External relatives can further be divided in postnominal and prenominal relatives. Keenan (1985) has shown that there is a general tendency across languages to favour postnominal as opposed to prenominal relative clauses. Postnominal relative clauses are almost uniquely attested in verb-initial languages, and they are most productive in verb-medial languages. In verb-final languages prenominal relative clauses are usually most productive. However, in the latter type of languages postnominal and internal relative clauses often are dominant.

In clause linking, complex sentences are being formed in which two or more predications are combined. From a comparative point of view, two types of complex sentence structures can be distinguished: ‘co-ranking structures’ and ‘chaining structures’ (Longacre, 1985). Co-ranking structures, such as those found in typical Indo-European languages, may consist of several verbs of the same rank. A chaining structure, on the other hand, typically ends in a dominating verb of a fuller structure than any of the preceding verbs. The dominating verb is usually known as the final verb, the preceding verbs as medial verbs.

From a syntactic point of view, the acquisition of complex sentences involves insight in the layered structure of clauses and in the concepts of embeddedness and dependence. Given the fact that children start out linking clauses before all operators are understood, it can be expected that the linkage of sub-clausal units will precede the linkage of full clauses. Furthermore, it can be hypothesized that the linkage of autonomous clauses is conceptually simpler than the linkage of clauses with one clause being embedded. Studies conducted by Bowerman (1979) and Goodluck & Tavakolian (1982) give positive evidence for such claims.

The attempts so far to relate typological differences to sentence processing difficulties underscore the need for cross-linguistic studies on the acquisition of clause structure and clause linking. It can be investigated in what order the various types of grammatical relations in simple and complex clauses are acquired. Moreover, it can be explored to what extent there is evidence for language transfer in children’s syntactic devices.

**Lexicon and word formation**

Linguistic competence generally includes a lexicon of well-established words and a repertoire of word formation devices for extending the basic lexicon. New meanings can be expressed with forms which fit the word formation options of that particular language. Basically, two types of word formation devices can be distinguished. On the one hand, stem modification or derivation in which a single base is related to a form which is altered in some way. On the other hand, compounding in which a set of two or more independent bases are combined in some way. Anderson (1985) has
stressed the fact that there is a good deal of idiosyncrasy in word formation devices in different languages, and that in any single language word formation rules are quite diverse in terms of input classes and semantic and syntactic relations involved.

In the process of language acquisition, children must learn the diversity of options for coining words in the languages under consideration. In a number of studies the acquisition of word formation devices has been investigated. For such diverse languages as English (Clark, 1981; Clark, Hecht & Mulford, 1986) and Hebrew (Berman & Sagi, 1982; Walden, 1982), it was found that children at an early age start coining words in order to fill lexical gaps. Gradually, children give up some of their early innovative coinages in favour of words established in the lexicon of adult language users. Clark has claimed that at least three general principles govern the course of acquisition of word formation rules. The first principle is semantic transparency stating that known elements with one-to-one matches of meaning and form are most transparent for constructing and interpreting new words. The second principle is regularization saying that children will use the same device everywhere to mark the same meaning. The third principle is productivity predicting that those word formation devices used most often by adults are preferred in children’s language for constructing new word forms. Clark (1982, 1983) stressed the importance of cross-linguistic evidence on the structure and use of word formation devices in different types of languages.

The study of lexical development can be elaborated by taking two languages into account, especially in case the two languages are typologically unrelated. First of all, the development of lexical variety and word formation devices in both languages can be explored. With respect to word formation processes a distinction can be made between conventionalized forms and lexical innovations. A major question is to find out what general mechanisms underlie the choice and construction of word forms in L1 and L2. At the same time it can be explored to what extent the processes of lexical development in the two languages interact. Incorporation of lexemes of one language in the other language are then to be analysed.

Reference to entities

In the domain of reference to entities a range of topics can be studied. Two phenomena deserve special interest: pronominal reference and the distinction between definite and indefinite reference.

Languages greatly vary in their conceptual notions and linguistic devices for pronominal reference to entities. There is an optional set of subject, object and possessive pronouns marking role (first/second/third) and number (singular/plural). There is the possibility of gender, status and dual distinction. In various languages demonstratives can be used to refer to entities. In discourse, either pro drop or pronominalization can be seen as the unmarked coding for topic continuity. Moreover, there can be very different markers for indefinite and definite expressions.

In pronominal reference the deictic and anaphoric use of pronouns is under concern. First and second person pronouns usually only function deictically, where-
as third person pronouns allow both deictic and anaphoric use. From studies on first language acquisition (cf. Wales, 1986), it has become clear that children start using pronouns deictically at an early age. First and second person pronouns, referring to the domain of joint speaker-hearer attention, are acquired first. Third person pronouns which require gestural support are acquired later. Deictic devices often enter crucially into children’s conversational discourse. Karmiloff-Smith (1979) has shown that there is a progression across age in the discourse functions that the same linguistic form may have. Only gradually children learn the crucial constraints in their use of anaphoric expressions.

In the domain of anaphoric reference the developmental patterns of bound and free anaphora in children’s first and second language use, as distinguished in Chomsky’s (1981) binding theory, can be compared. In a variety of studies the acquisition of lexical anaphors and pronouns have been studied in languages such as English and Dutch. With respect to bound anaphors, a fast pattern of acquisition could be evidenced. It seems that syntactic knowledge of bound anaphora, as part of universal grammar, is guiding the development (Koster, 1988). Furthermore, it has become clear that the development of free anaphor resolution shows a much more irregular and slow development.

In a number of studies the acquisition of anaphoric reference was investigated in languages that are typologically very different from English. From a cross-linguistic point of view those languages which have binding principles that are distinct from English are of special interest, because these languages seem to challenge Chomsky’s claims (e.g., Hyams, 1988). More recently, the acquisition of anaphoric reference was explored in a bilingual context. On the basis of empirical data on L2 acquisition of anaphora among Japanese and Spanish learners of English, Flynn (1986) concluded a primacy of the head-initial/head-final parameter’s role.

In order to comprehend and use the contrast between definite and indefinite reference children must learn the rules for the establishment and maintenance of connected discourse. In the case a speaker does expect entities to be identifiable, noun phrases will be given the status of definite. However, as is shown by Karmiloff-Smith (1986), the basic referential markers in many languages are plurifunctional. In order to acquire the right distinctions for reference tracking children must learn to map the right forms and functions. Broeder (1991) studied the acquisition of pronominal reference to person by Turkish and Moroccan adult learners of Dutch. Derived from principles of input frequency, informational complexity, perceptual salience and first language use, he tested a series of predictions on order of acquisition. In cases of competition, the principle of perceptual salience was found to overrule the principle of input frequency and only in few cases first language influence could be evidenced in second language use.

In the study of bilingual development it can be examined how children learn to use the coding devices for pronominal reference and for the expression of definite vs. indefinite reference in their first and second language systems over time. It can also be determined to what extent there is evidence of transfer from the use of referential expressions in one language to the other language. Finally, in the study
of children’s construction of narratives it can be examined how children learn to use the coding devices for topic continuity in their first and second language systems over time. A distinction can be made between coding devices for the introduction, maintenance and shift of referents on the one hand, and devices for the expression of definite vs. indefinite reference on the other.

Reference to space

The study of reference to space focuses on the use of spatial concepts which are relevant to the expression of location or motion. According to Fillmore (1982: 37), the subject of spatial reference has three natural subtopics. First, systems of demonstratives can be studied so far as these are structured with reference to the location of the communicative act. Second, pre-or postpositional and adverbial devices for constructing locative expressions with an implicit reference to the location of the communicative act can be identified. Third, systems of motion verbs for whose interpretation reference to the communication act is necessary can be investigated. Motion verbs may differ in many respects: direction of the movement, type of movement, object of movement and origin or target of movement.

With respect to the acquisition of devices for spatial reference it can be hypothesized that both cognitive maturation and language-specific factors play a significant role. When referring to the location or motion of entities in space, languages may differ both in their use of spatial concepts and in the ways in which spatial concepts are encoded. Depending on how the sub-systems of spatial reference in a particular language are organized, the developmental sequences can be different. Johnston & Slobin (1979), following the development of seven basic locative relations in English, Italian, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish children, indeed found that both cognitive complexity and language-specific differences play a role in the rate and sequence of acquisition. The relevant language-specific differences they proposed were placement of adposition, lexical diversity, clarity of etymology, morphological complexity and homonymity.

The sub-systems of spatial reference in various languages may differ considerably, both in underlying spatial concepts and in the form of the devices they include. In most Indo-European languages, there is a dyadic system of primary spatial deixis. Furthermore, locative relations are mainly encoded by means of prepositions and adverbs. These linguistic devices express such semantic relations as interior/exterior, region/contact, front/back, left/right, top/bottom and ‘between-ness’ or interposition. Besides, there are motion verbs expressing a change in the position of the agent or an object. Other languages, such as Turkish, have a three-step system of spatial deixis. Generally, distance contrasts are expressed as proximal, medial and distal. Turkish also has a basic system of case suffixes referring to goal (DAT), location (LOC), and source/path (ABL). There is also a complementary system for the indication of spatial relations which uses a group of nouns denoting places. These nouns enter into a postpositional construction which corresponds in function to a prepositional phrase in Indo-European languages.
In the study of bilingual development it can be explored how children learn to use the distance features of spatial deixis in their first and second language systems over time. Moreover, it can be investigated how the coding devices for the expression of spatial relations in the languages under consideration are developed. An important question is finally to what extent there is transfer from the use of spatial expressions in one language to the other language.

Reference to time

In exploring reference to time three fundamental categories of temporality in language can be distinguished: temporal relations, aspect and internal temporal features. Temporal relations refer to the location of events in relation to a given reference time. Aspect refers to the various perspectives that can be taken towards an event, e.g., perfective vs. imperfective. Internal temporal features refer to quasi-objective time characteristics of an event, such as durativity or transformativity.

With regard to first language acquisition, Weist (1986) has shown that the marking of temporal relations involves a sequence of four stages. The initial temporal system, situated in the here-and-now, does not make a distinction between event time and reference time at the time of speech. The second system is characterized by the child’s capacity to represent the event time prior to and subsequent to, or simultaneous with, the speech time. In the third stage of development the concept of reference time emerges. In the initial reference time system, however, event time is restricted to the reference time context. In the final stage, children are able to use a free reference system in which speech time, event time and reference time can represent three different points in time and can be related freely. The acquisition rate of aspect and internal temporal features is highly dependent on the manner in which these devices are coded in the surface structure of the target language (Slobin, 1985).

Tense and aspect oppositions in narratives not only function to locate events relative to the moment of speech, but also as an organizer of narrative structure. Schriftlin (1981) and Fleischman (1985) showed that the use of present tense to refer to past events (historical present) and past tense in narratives is alternated in a regular way. They concluded that the organization of narratives delimits the area in which the historical present can occur, and that various structural and functional constraints determine switches between the two tenses. Wallace (1982) has shown that present tense (vs. non-present) and perfective aspect (vs imperfective) supply the main points or the foreground in the narrative. Klein & Von Stutterheim (1985) proposed that the foreground in narratives is characterized by the conditions of topic and focus which constrain the temporal features of referential movement.

Given the substantial differences of temporal reference in different languages, the acquisition of linguistic devices for temporal reference in a bilingual context can be thought of as highly relevant. A basic question is to find out what operating principles underlie the synthetic and analytic devices for temporal marking at the
levels of utterance and discourse in either language and to what extent there is transfer from temporal devices in one language to the other language.

Empirical studies

There is a highly specific tradition of studies on early bilingualism. From reviews by Taeschner (1983: 5-18) and McLaughlin (1985: 72-98) it is clear that most of these studies show the following characteristics:

- single or multiple case studies,
- based on diaries kept by (one of) the parents on
- the simultaneous acquisition of
- two typologically related languages,
- one language being spoken by one parent, the other being the dominant language in the wider community,
- by children from a high socio-economic background.

A landmark in research on early bilingualism is the study of Leopold (1970). Leopold’s report was on the language development of his daughter Hildegard who was brought up according to the one person-one language strategy, speaking German to her father and English to her mother. It was found that during her first two years Hildegard did not succeed in keeping the two language systems apart. Her speech sounds were not differentiated by language while German and English words were mixed freely. By the end of the second year the phonological and grammatical systems of the two languages were slowly separated. From the age of two to five, there was an increasing influence of one language (English) over the other (German), because the contacts in the English-speaking environment greatly exceeded her contacts with German.

Volterra & Taeschner (1978) and Taeschner (1983) proposed a three-stage model of language development in bilingual children on the basis of data on two Italian-German speaking children. In stage 1, the child has a uniform lexical system lacking cross-language synonyms, with early mixed-language word combinations as a necessary concomitant. In stage 2, the child has two differentiated lexical systems from which more-word utterances are constructed. However, in this stage there is only one basic grammar in that the same syntactic rules are applied to utterances in either language. In stage 3, there is a differentiation of two grammatical systems. In this stage interference phenomena still occur, especially when the child needs to switch rapidly from one language to the other, or when the information given is usually expressed in the other language.

From a number of studies there is additional evidence that the separation of languages manifests itself by a decrease in mixed utterances (de Houwer, 1990; Redlinger & Park, 1980). Furthermore, Vihman (1982, 1985) showed that the differentiation of syntactic rules in an Estonian-English speaking child starts out
with universal rules that apply to both languages. Rules specific to either of the two languages were developed later on. However, Meisel (1986), studying the development of word order regularities and case markings in two French-German speaking children, found that the children were able to differentiate between grammatical properties of the two languages as soon as they began to use multiword utterances. From the beginning the children were able to make use of morphological means to encode syntactic functions.

In several recent studies the process of first and/or second language development of immigrant minority groups in Europe has been investigated. The informants form part of a first, second or third generation of immigrants who originally moved from rural sites in Mediterranean societies to industrialized areas in North-Western Europe. Unlike most of the previous work, the acquisition of typologically unrelated languages in these studies was examined by outside researchers in child or adult learners of a low socio-economic background, L1 being the ethnic community language, and L2 being the dominant language of the environment. In the vast majority of studies the primary focus was on second language development. Perdue (1993) gives a survey of the goals and outcomes of a cross-linguistic and longitudinal study, sponsored by the European Science Foundation, on second language acquisition by adult immigrants in France, Great Britain, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. The project focused on the acquisition of French, English, German, Dutch and Swedish by adult speakers of six different source languages. Major topics of analysis were word order principles at the levels of utterance structure and word-formation, the acquisition of spatial and temporal reference, and processes of achieving understanding and giving feedback in interaction. In only a limited number of studies the primary focus was on the acquisition of a specific ethnic community language, such as Arabic (De Ruiter, 1989), Finnish (Lainio, 1987), Italian (Fantini, 1985), Serbo-Croatian (Pavlinic, et al., 1988), Turkish (Boeschoten, 1990; Pfaff, 1991, 1993; Schaufeli, 1991; Verhoeven, 1991).

Previous studies on bilingual development give no reason to believe that the process of language acquisition in bilinguals and monolinguals is different in its basic features. The essential difference is that bilingual children are confronted with two sets of input and that they have the additional task of distinguishing the two language systems. However, the complex process of learning to separate two different languages is still poorly understood. It remains unclear what sort of operating principles children use while acquiring two languages at the same time. It is also unclear under what conditions processes of language transfer and code switching occur. Moreover, most of the studies that have been conducted so far were limited in their scope, given the fact that the languages under consideration were highly related. The analysis of learner data in two unrelated languages will offer new perspectives on the role of structural properties of these languages in the process of acquisition.
The present volume

In this volume empirical studies on bilingual development will be presented. In order to allow for cross-linguistic comparisons, a variety of language contact situations is taken into account and the typological distance between the language pairs under consideration varies widely. English is studied in contact with Dutch, Hungarian, Spanish and Turkish; apart form the American context of English-Spanish contact, English is not the dominant language of the environment. Turkish and/or Arabic are studied in contact with German, Dutch and French; apart from the Moroccan context of Arabic-French contact, Turkish and Arabic are used as minority languages in a European immigration context. The latter context also holds for the study on Finnish-Swedish and Italian-German contact.

The book is divided into two parts. Part 1 gives an overview of studies on early bilingual development. The focus of Part 2 is on bilingual development at school age and beyond.

Part 1: Early bilingual development

The first part of the book opens with a retrospective on the study of early bilingualism by Barry McLaughlin. In chapter 2, he summarizes research related to the following theoretical issues: the (supposed) effects of bilingual development, the notion of ‘semilingualism’, language mixing, rate of language development and the notion of a ‘critical period’ for second language learning.

In chapter 3, Annick de Houwer discusses the separate development hypothesis. On the basis of a case-study of a young Dutch-English bilingual child, she first of all focuses on morphosyntactic development, language choice, mixed utterances and metalinguistic awareness. On the basis of the available evidence for the separate development hypothesis, she suggests further ways to explore its validity.

In two subsequent chapters, the acquisition of Turkish in an immigrant setting is dealt with. In chapter 4, Hanneke van der Heijden and Ludo Verhoeven present first outcomes of a study on the early bilingual development of Turkish children in the Netherlands. Their analysis of both Turkish and Dutch language data focuses on the domains of clause structure, lexicon and reference to entities, space and time. In all domains of research the proficiency level in Turkish was higher than in Dutch. Evidence for language transfer turned out to be limited.

In chapter 5, Carol Pfaff considers the interplay of structural and pragmatic factors in Turkish and German discourse of preschool and early school age bilingual children attending a day-care centre in Berlin. The presented data reveal the effects of language dominance on both the choice of expressive devices and on the conversational strategies employed by the children in each of their languages.

In the next chapter, Özden Ekmeğiçi goes into the strategies conveyed in bilingual development of two native English-speaking preschool children in Turkey. She found the subject’s language choice to be a function of the language of the interlo-
cutor. Modification of talk, questioning and clarification turned out to be the most observed caretaker strategies. Typical learner strategies observed were shift to the native language, nonverbal feedback and the use of stereotype words.

The next study is on code-switching at an early age. In chapter 7, Ali Bentahila and Eirlys Davies report on the French-Arabic language varieties used by 4-5-year-old bilingual children in Morocco. They found code-switching to be a commonplace strategy of communication, apart from the use of Arabic or French. The Moroccan children showed a strong preference for phrasal and clausal switches as opposed to single-word switches.

The final study presented in Part 1 deals with the acquisition of early literacy in a bilingual child, living in Hungary. In chapter 8 Kathleen Wodala describes the reading acquisition in English and Hungarian between the age of 5 and 7. Particular attention is paid to the kinds of positive and negative transfer in the acquisition of reading skills.

Part 2: Bilingual development at school age and beyond

Part 2 of the volume opens with a contribution on sociolinguistic variables that determine the rate of first and second language development. In chapter 9, Kenji Hakuta and Lucinda Pease-Alvarez focus on patterns of language proficiency and language choice, and on language attitudes of bilingual Hispanic students in two Californian communities. Data were based on both observed and reported language behaviour. Evidence was found for increases in English proficiency and decreases in Spanish proficiency across groups, for a consistent shift towards English in the language choice of both the children and their parents, and for birth order effects on language choice.

In chapter 10, Jeroen Aarsseen, Petra Bos and Ludo Verhoeven describe a study in which the acquisition of complex syntax in Turkish and Moroccan children in the Netherlands is dealt with. They focus on the preliminary results of two experimental tasks. The first experiment investigates the development of bound and free anaphors in Turkish and Moroccan-Arabic as a first language and Dutch as a second language. The second one gives insight into relative clause comprehension, with respect to the grammatical roles of the constituents in the sentences and the linear arrangement of words in the same languages.

In the next chapter, Åke Viberg goes into bilingual development at school age of Finnish children in Sweden. Oral and written language data of students in the fourth and sixth grade of primary school were analysed. The focus of the analyses was on clause linking. Evidence could be found for age-related differences in the usage of sequential markers in the children's first and second language discourse.

In chapter 12, Anneli Schaufeli focuses on first language text cohesion in a Turkish-Dutch bilingual setting. She compared the structural properties of oral and written narratives of bilingual Turkish children living in the Netherlands with those of monolingual Turkish children living in Turkey.
In chapter 13, Aldo di Luzio deals with the temporal structure in L1 narratives of Italian migrant children in the age range of 8-12, living in Germany. He found that the temporal structures used by the children were regular and systematic, conforming to the mother tongue development of a monolingual native peer group in Italy. The differences between the two groups are related to different patterns of linguistic and cultural socialization.

In the two final studies interlingual processes in morphosyntactic development are explored. In chapter 14, Hendrik Boeschoten makes an attempt to account for L2 influence on L1 development in the case of Turkish children in the age range of 8-12, living in Germany. He concludes that the syntactic level found in the L1 data was not deeply affected by the children’s contact with German. Some impact from German was evidenced for surface word order. In addition, simplifications in the children’s use of Turkish could be found, both of a syntagmatic and paradigmatic nature.

In the final chapter, Peter Broeder, Guus Extra and Roeland van Hout try to find evidence for L1 influence on L2 development with reference to Turkish and Moroccan adults living in the Netherlands. They focus on word-formation devices used in (semi-) spontaneous speech. They found that the acquisition of composition devices precedes the acquisition of derivation devices. In using the former devices learners rely both on source-language related principles and on target-language related principles. Opposite word order principles in Turkish (head-final) versus Arabic (head-initial) emerge as source-language effects in the learners’ approaching of the target language norm.
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