

Comparing bilingual and monolingual language development

Lezárás dátuma: 2015.01.06.

Comparing bilingual and monolingual language development

Within the field of bilingual studies various definitions of bilingualism may be observed. They all share the feature that bilingual people tend to speak two languages. However, what might be important is when these people acquired these skills, how often and under what circumstances they use these skills, and if the acquisition of the two languages took place successively or simultaneously (Rampton, 1990). The paper intends to narrow down the vast number of definitions of bi-and multilingualism; the framework used in the paper considers bilingualism as a phenomenon which tends to have two languages, with simultaneous input, from a very early age. However, as many papers define a bilingual child differently, the thesis also tends to show studies in which the children were exposed to bilingual input from a very early age. The term “simultaneous” is challenged by Meisel (1989), proposing the term Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA). This also suggests that a chronological ranking cannot be made due to the fact that children are exposed simultaneously to the languages. In the framework of the thesis, these various languages are called alpha or beta.

The amount of input is also an important aspect since there is always going to be a difference between various speakers regarding language input as there is going to be a dominant and less dominant language (De Houwer, 2010). The term “very early age” is also questionable; as Navracsics (2004) agrees with Meisel (1989), the category the thesis is using when labeling bilingual children is the exposure from the age of one month. De Houwer (1995), however, claims that the age of one month is too broad, thus, saying that if the infant is exposed to the languages within the first week of life, it can be called a bilingual. She opted for this solution due to the staying in hospital in any Western countries, when the infant is staying with the mother, counts as a monolingual environment.

It is also important to mention that BFLA can happen in various contexts: in the cases discussed in the thesis, BFLA happens in a home environment, and it is advisable to start “teaching” at an early age (Navracsics, 2004). However, institutional language teaching has more point in a later period of life, for example, in a kindergarten. As Navracsics claims, this is obviously not as effective as BFLA from birth, and as Lengyel (1986) argues, it has its own methodology.

Another interesting aspect to look upon is the motivation when acquiring a language. This is obviously stronger in the case of a bilingual environment due to the fact there is a need to be able to communicate; and in this case, the communication itself is important, not the language (Navracsics, 2004).

The aim of this thesis is to provide an overview of simultaneous, or as Meisel (1989) suggested, BFLA bilingualism from birth to the age of two. The following section briefly presents the various stages of language development; without presenting these, discussing any bilingual implication is not possible. After the first section, the presentation of bilingual implications and literature of comparative studies follows.

The first ground-breaking study that has involved bilinguals with these circumstances was Jules Ranjat’s in 1913, which was later followed by Warner Leopold’s (as cited in de Houwer, 2010). Another work which might be important from the aspect of the development of each language is the influential yet heavily criticized work of Volterra and Taeschner, *The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children* (1978). The thesis also intends to discuss cognitive processes of the “one person, one language strategy” (Ranjat, 1913). Children who undergo bilingual language acquisition from birth are also believed to undergo the process of bilingual first language acquisition (Meisel, 2001).

Stages of language development

The language development of monolingual and bilingual children has some shared features. Language acquisition is shaped by various factors, such as biological features, sensing structures of the brain, social input and interpersonal relations. Communication, on the other hand, is bound together with various cognitive processes, e.g. sensing, remembering or behavior. Therefore, when using language, many other fields of the brain are activated. This is quite a complex process for a child: they have to learn various phonological components (recognizing and later on, articulating phonemes); semantic constituents meaning and use of words; syntactic components (both S and D structures); and pragmatics (using language in social interactions) (Cross, 1981).

First language acquisition, communication and speech production are all a processes which develop both linearly and by surges, and are bound both successively and irreversibly to various stages of development. These stages are universal, typical of all children – are not related to geographical territories, languages and types of languages or cultures – but have their individual times of beginning, duration and modification. One stage can go into another successively or simultaneously or without any sign (Kenesei, 2004.) The acquisition of a single language is quite an effort for a monolingual; however, those infants in a bilingual environment face a much bigger challenge (Kovács, 2014). The criterion of both mono-and bilingual acquisition lies within the process of linguistic stimuli. Naturally, due to their unique situation, only bilinguals hear two different languages. If bilingual children are not able at an early age to discriminate between the two languages as two separate systems, some lags are likely to appear, and language acquisition appears to be an impossible task. However, according to bilingual literature, these arrears are quite rare or do not exist at all (Genesee et al, 1995; Petitto et al. 2001). There is a high probability that infants have the skills of monitoring and discriminating various language inputs. One of these mechanisms might be

the skill of the automatic discrimination of their two languages (Abercrombie, 1967; Pike, 1945; Ramus & Mehler, 1999). Studies show that infants are able to discriminate languages by their prosodic features or by their distribution of vowels and consonants (Nazzi et al, 1998; Ramus et al, 2000). Ramus and Mehler (1999) developed a technique to study adults, and their languages; they resynthesized and studied the role of various acoustic features (phonotactics, syllables and intonation) when discriminating two languages. Their results show that rhythm has an important role in how French- speaking adults discriminated between delexicalized English and Japanese sentences which preserved their rhythms only.

Preverbal phase

As a fetus, the child is bombarded with sounds and rhythms, which are vital from the point of view of intonation. It is known that language acquisition starts at the age of 24 to 28 weeks in the womb due to the development of the hearing of the fetus (Lengyel, 1981). The womb is the scene of various interactions and preverbal communication. The fetus is able to distinguish various feelings from the prosody of the mother's speech; it has a nervous system, and also cognition (is able to remember, to dream or to learn.) Therefore, the fetus is competent at various fields (Andrek, 1997.)

One of these fields was researched by Gervain et al. (2008), showing that parts of the human brain which are specialized in language processing are active at the time of birth. Gervain et al (2008) have shown that the left hemisphere of newborns tends to show increased activity in the case of hearing speech forward as opposed to speech heard backward, just like adult participants. The role of intonation samples appears in the field of production as well; Mampe et al.'s study has shown that out of 60 babies of monolingual German and French environments tended to produce either a cry started on a high pitch and stressed (as in German intonation), or in a crescendo way (as in French speech intonation).

This may show that infants from the time of 3 to 5 days (this was the age of the participants) tend to have a native language of crying as well (2009). Moreover, infants are shown to be able to distinguish between functional and thematic categories by their acoustic features (Gervain & Mehler, 2010).

Between their birth and their first birthday the development of babies is significant in three fields: producing sounds, perception of speech and interaction (Crystal, 2003). The relationship of mother and child begins with tactile contact and continues with the system of sounds and motions and the process of solution of signs. Language development, with regard to the perception of sounds is closely related to non-verbal communication. Communication is shaped by continuous practice, experience and learning which formulates behavior, adaptability and language competence. These signs come from the behavior of both sides and influence each other (Sugárné, 2001.) As this process involves at least two people it is also called a dyadic process (Eveloff, 1971.)

Infants use a universal form of self-expression regardless of the language spoken around them. Their signs of crying, facial expression, and gestures express the infant's temporary feelings, and at the same time, are the forerunners of language development. On the one hand, the first couple of weeks are dominated by biological sounds, these are also called reflex or vegetative sounds since these are strictly related to the babies' physical and psychical status. On the other, from the second week on it can be observed that expressive language has appeared through crying because of hunger, discomfort, boredom or pain (Gósy, 2005). This communication from the baby means the baby's contribution towards future communication. This inception of initiation of the child leads later on to the social smile (Eveloff, 1971). This period is about listening and perceiving language by its intonation, prosody and phonology. This process of a monolingual infant is conducted as one and only language which is spoken around her, meaning that no matter what language input the infant

is exposed to, metacommunication is more or less universal and the same in each language. This also requires complicated mechanisms of the brain (Kuhl, 2010). However, this challenge is doubled when two (or more) languages are added to the lexical and phonological inventory of the child since she does not simply have to memorize these she has to distinguish between the two (or more) languages. Since lexical information is hardly dominant in this period, the infant has to rely on pre-lexical cues: prosody, phonetic repertoire and phonetic constraints (Ramus & Mehler, 1999). The first help that the newborns use to distinguish between the two languages is rhythm. This might be viable with clearly different languages such as English, Japanese or Italian with various rhythmic beats (stress-timed, mora-timed or syllable timed respectively) (Nazzi, Bertoncini & Mehler 1998.). However, this is not the case with English and Dutch for example. Below the age of 5 months, infants are very much challenged to discriminate between these two languages since both languages are stress-timed (Nazzi, Jusczyk and Johnson, 2000). This lack of being able to differentiate between rhythmically similar languages is reported to disappear later on.

Infants in a bilingual environment may also hear two rhythmically similar languages such as Spanish and Catalan. Naturally, there are further differences between Catalan and Spanish: Catalan tends to contain more vowels and consonants as well; syllable stress is also different and has different phonotactic constraints. In order to learn both languages, infants have to differentiate between language inputs. In a situation like this it is expectable that the development may slow down due to lack of rhythmic difference which can be used as a cue by infants to create different linguistic representations. This deceleration cannot be expected, though, if the two languages are different in rhythm. Research studies show that infants, at a very early age of 4 months, become able to distinguish between two, rhythmically similar languages, probably using other kinds of differences (Kovács, 2014). This is made possible by the various differences apart from rhythm.

Another issue is the process of discriminating languages and handling them. The two sides regarding this issue are divided due to modularity issues (Navracsics, 2000). The first one of the argumental parties tend to say, assuming from the various mixed utterances of the child, that the bilingual infant is set to mix the two (or more) languages in a common mass initially, fusing the languages first and later on, differentiating between these (Volterra and Taeschner, 1978). According to them, there are three major phases of bilingual language development: first, the child tends to use one common lexicon, which is from the age of two years is divided, yet keeping the syntax fused; eventually, at the age of five, the two syntactical systems start functioning independently (Leopold 1939, Volterra and Taeschner, 1978). This hypothesis is called *fusion* in the literature of bilingualism (De Houwer, 2010).

On the other hand, *Separate Development Hypothesis* states that the phenomenon of a mixed lexicon cannot be explained by common a linguistic system, but by the lack of pragmatic or sociolinguistic knowledge. From birth, the infant is able to distinguish between the two languages; therefore, the two languages are able to develop completely separately (De Houwer, 2010). Navracsics's idea is that these separate or fused systems may be interpreted regarding the various levels of language: specific language levels are fused together meanwhile others are developing separately (Navracsics, 2000). Interestingly, both parties tend to use syntactic data in their explanations. Researchers of SDH say that the interferences regarding the syntax of the two languages clearly demonstrate separate linguistic systems: when producing an utterance from another system means that infants are able to discriminate (De Houwer, 2011). However, researchers believing in the fusion theory (as cited in De Houwer, 2011) state that as monolingual children do not use grammatical categories in the early phase of language acquisition, but rather use semantic-pragmatic strategies to communicate, bilinguals would act similarly.

Eventually, grammatical categories are set to develop from lexical- semantic knowledge (Volterra and Taeschner, 1978). If mixed utterances are the signs of a shared, fused linguistic system of common lexical and syntactic items (Vihman et al. 1985), this would imply various distractions and arrears. Surprisingly, these lags and distractions cannot be observed at bilinguals. What is more, children who hear their two languages at an approximately even rate are less likely to mix the two languages if their parents do not mix the two languages and thus, these children are able to discriminate between their two languages and are also able to handle them as separate systems (Genesee et al, 1995). These results show that language systems tend to develop independently of each other, in which infants are able to handle the two languages as separate systems. As a result, coordination of two the languages can be observed. However, those mechanisms which use this type of discrimination have not yet been studied thoroughly (Kovács, 2014). Naturally, similar acquisitional phases do not mean that there would be no difference between monolingual and bilingual acquisition since one tends to learn one, whereas the other tends to learn two languages. One of the differences may be that how infants with various languages process monolingual or bilingual input.

Another difference may be the size of the vocabulary; bilinguals, if counted one language only, tend to have a smaller vocabulary (Kovács, 2014). Moreover, apart from the size of the difference between the lexicon of monolinguals and bilinguals, it seems that monolinguals and bilinguals tend to reach various stages of language development in their native language(s) at the same times. This also shows that the process of language acquisition follows a similar pattern both at bilinguals and monolinguals even if the two languages belong to a completely different modality e.g. sign-language and French. These findings on how bilingual acquisition is similar to monolingual one, relates to the fact that bilingualism does not necessarily change the process of acquisition. However, even though the patterns are

quite similar, there are some crucial differences in the development of cognitive systems. The simultaneous acquisition of two languages is more likely to use more synapses of concentration, inhibitory and selection than monolingual acquisition does (Kovács, 2014). Simultaneously, the first utterances are set to be produced by the age of 3 months with random articulation, babbling or cooing. These phones of the child are produced regardless of the later native language(s) of the baby, therefore, universal.

The next phase, from the 8th to 10th months, which is called lallation by Eveloff (1971) as a “latter phase of babbling”; with features like repetition of certain phones e.g. da, ma, which, when repeated, can be heard as mama or dada, which may have no semantic information since it is purposelessly repeated through hours, yet interpreted by parents as speech. At the time between 9th to 10th months, the global understanding of spoken commands has begun; particularly when commands are accompanied by various gestures and tonal inflection. This means that the child, yet not able to articulate, is able to comprehend (McCarthy, 1966). By this time it can be also told that the child is able to differentiate self from the other facets and objects, together with its maturing nervous system, as an independent entity (Wanat, 1971).

These research studies show that infants who grow in a bilingual environment from birth are able to distinguish two languages prelexically; these surprisingly early abilities may play an important role in the fact that bilinguals later on do not produce any arrears compared to their monolingual counterparts, and that both populations are set to reach various language development phases (Pearson et al, 1993; Petitto et al, 2001). These results also question traditional approaches of pedagogy about bilingualism.

Single-word phase

The period between 12th month and 16th months can be called the period of passive speech which is immediately followed by the appearance of the first word. It can be universally said that only a part of the adult's speech is comprehended by the infant; the comprehension is mostly helped by outer sources, such as context, intonation or gestures. The analytical comprehension of understanding everything only comes later on. First forms of words tend to appear at approximately at the age of 10 to 12 months; the sensation of babbling can be observed until the time of 15 months (Eveloff, 1971). These forms have their semantic meaning, by holophrases, one-word sentences (De Houwer, 2010). The form of holophrases is related to the words of the child's native language(s) spoken by the adults, their function corresponds the meaning of adult language. These complex sensations might occur in the following ways: one of them is the mimesis of a word heard in the child's environment; the other is a babbled word-like utterance which is heard by the adult community as a morpheme

Children tend to use different types of words to form these one-word sentences. The choice of these utterances depends on how salient the child perceives the various sentences of adult language such as the context and the frequency (Slobin, 1985). In English, the earliest holophrases used are prepositions related to everyday verbs, e.g.: gone, up, more, off, down since these are the most salient words used by adults (Eveloff, 1971). Additionally, children begin using multiple-word sentences in the form of holophrases such as *Lemme see* (let me see) *Common* (come on) from adult expressions. This has been documented by Pine and Lieven (1993), who reported that almost every child uses these "frozen" utterances in their early speech (Kovács, 2014). Initially, the child is able only to repeat certain parts of various semantic utterances. Most of the time the beginnings of words are reconstructed e.g. ba for banán or mah for mouse. With some time they start imitating the number of syllables e.g. sūsű for fésű (brush), signaling the refinement of suprasegmental perception. As a result of dual storing, each semantic unit is related to two forms; on the one hand, they store their words

which are different from adult language. On the other, they store the “standard” version of adult language as well. The latter is preferred when recognizing and identifying, and later on excludes words different from adult language (Lengyel, 1981).

By the end of the first year, the child tends to say such series of syllables and utterances which, in their intonation and stress, resemble to their native language(s); however, these hardly contain any meaningful word. This gobbledygook is called expressive jargon. Due to the fact that the content is not meaningful, whereas the context or the situation is, this period is also called situational speech (Gósy, 2000.)

The next phase is put around 18-24 months, in which speech production is spectacularly changed; in the case of girls it is somewhat sooner while boys tend to produce speech later. The explanation for this might lie in the different pace of development of the hippocampus, so that girls’ hippocampus is reported to grow faster (Bánréti, 2014). On the one hand, a vast increase can be observed in their vocabulary, regarding the active vocabulary and the passive as well, so that approximately ten new words are added to the vocabulary of the child each day by the age of five. The most dominant thematic categories used are nouns, yet there is a significant increase in the field of verbs and adjectives in communication. This is also a time for combining actively learned words, gradually from one-word sentences to “telegraph” speech, meaning that only basic words are arranged, yet in a meaningful order (Wanat, 1971). The child sticks morphemes together in a way that uses no suffixes or function words e.g. *dadasad- daddy’s sad getmilk- I would like to get milk*. As it can be seen, these utterances are slightly ungrammatical; however, this is the first spectacular step towards learning language, a combinatorically headed system of symbols (Bloom, 1994). With the intensified acquisition of grammatical forms flexional speech is formulated. Depending on the language, various functional categories such as prefixes, determiners or suffixes appear in order. The child is getting better to be able to comprehend, and moreover, to use more and

more complicated linguistic structures. The hierarchic order of learning is determined by the psychical- cognitive base, which applies the following principles (Gósy, 2005):

- the principle of cognitive priority (e.g. conditional can be understood when the child is able to comprehend the notion of condition);
- the principle of cognitive complication (more complex utterances appear later on in speech)
- the principle of disambiguity (the first suffixes learnt are those that have non-ambiguous semantic and syntactic function)
- the principle of frequency (frequently heard forms are fixed sooner)

After getting to know morphological rules the child is not applying frequently heard utterances, but tries to formulate linguistic forms according to various grammatical rules. This means that an overuse of rules appears (Mérei and Binét, 2007). Global understanding is exchanged for the strategy of keywords. The child comprehends one or some words from the context and is able to figure out the meaning of the other parts of communication (Gósy, 2005).

Implications of bilingualism on the developing cognitive system: Advantages and disadvantages

Behavioral and neurological studies in the last twenty years have given some answers to the questions about how an adult mind is able to cope with two languages. Yet, as how a developing cognitive system is able to master two languages is quite an open question. One possibility is that the cognitive system of a child might be overloaded which might cause slower processing of information and weaker performance (Kovács, 2014).

In case this theory was true, it would mean that there would be major lags and distractions. In some cases, adults tend to think that code switching is some kind of a sign of a major disturbance-. Nevertheless, this, as it is highlighted by Navracscics, might only be a sign of mixed language input and can be maintained, or removed with some strategies. At the beginning of the twentieth century, several bilingual researchers conducted such research studies in which they reported bilinguals to underperform monolinguals in English language tests. However, as Navracscics (2004) points it out in a summary of bilingual studies and tests, if any valid test was developed for bilinguals, they would be less likely to perform worse than their monolingual counterparts. These studies, which presented lacks were conducted in an environment in which the English language input (as an Alpha language [one of the two languages tested] was not sufficient and unbalanced. Moreover, the purpose of this study was to show that these Mexican migrants (about whom the study was conducted) as not as proficient as American monolinguals, and simultaneously, to decrease immigration to the States. Jespersen (1922, p.148.) had the results as follows:

It is, of course, an advantage for a child to be familiar with
Two languages : but without doubt the advantage may be, and
generally is, purchased too dear. First of all the child in question
hardly learns either of the two languages as perfectly as he would
have done if he had limited himself to one. It may seem, on the
surface, as if he talked just like a native, but he does not really
command the fine points of the language. Has any bilingual child
ever developed into a great artist in speech, a poet or orator ?

Secondly, the brain effort required to master two languages
instead of one certainly diminishes the child's power of learning
other things which might and ought to be learnt.

In Wales, similar results were found. Amidst the examination of intelligence of bilingual children of villages and towns, Saer (1924) arrived at the conclusion that village children have lower IQs than their urban counterparts. The case was, in reality, that urban children had much more opportunities to encounter the English language before school.

Morrison (1958) has shown that if the profession of the parents is taken into account – which might be regarded as an immediate signal of social status – there is no difference between these children. Another problem with these tests was that generally, these tests could be taken in the less dominant language of the testees (Navracsics, 2004).

This theory was held until the sixties, saying that monolinguals overtook bilinguals by approximately three years. Conjointly, it has become clear that the issue of bilingualism is an issue of politics. The Official Language Act in Canada made French and English equal. As a consequence, middle-class parents were preoccupied whether they should make the child learn two languages: is it harmful for them or beneficial? Peal and Lambert (1962) started a thorough research study. They compared ten-year-olds with the similar social backgrounds and language skills, therefore, only well-balanced bilinguals could qualify in the sampling. The result of the research study was that bilingual participants outperformed monolinguals in terms of verbal-and nonverbal communication, were superior at reorganizing visual patterns and symbol manipulation. This research has been further criticized by Macnamara (1966), saying that it is possible that Peal and Lambert chose originally extraordinarily talented children. However, as further studies explored, reporting the significant advantage due to bilinguals' solutions on various linguistic problems such as differentiation between meaning and form; this means that their metalinguistic abilities are better (Ben-Zeev, 1997 & Ianco Worall 1972). Bain and Yu (1980) tested 22-24 months old mono-and bilingual babies, and again in their ages of 46-48 months. The first testing did not bring any differences; however, the second tests made the bilinguals outperform their counterparts.

Another study of Bain is significant from the Ranjat's theory (1913) (One person, one language) (1976, as cited in Navracsics, 2004.). He tested 48 babies between the ages of 22-24 months with creating three groups: group "A", which contained 15 bilingual children, brought up by "One person, one language"; group "B", with 17 children of mixed input; and

group “C”, 16 monolingual children. The children were all given the same exercise: they had to find a certain object, navigated by their mothers. The best results were produced “A” (one person one language; 69.7 %), then came “C” (monolinguals 55.7%), and children with mixed input produced slightly worse with 55%. This clearly shows that *One person- one language* stimulates cognitive development in a more efficient way (Navracsics, 2004).

Hakuta and Diaz (1984) examined 300 Puerto Rican children with very poor social conditions who participated in bilingual education. Their results have shown that the rate of their bilingualism (how proficient their α language knowledge is) was in direct ratio with their nonverbal intelligence. As Hakuta and Diaz reasons, bilingualism and nonverbal intelligence are in strong correlation.

As Bialystok (1987) concludes, bilingual children are likely to outperform monolinguals in the following fields: first, they are better in highlighting certain words from sentences; second, they are able to either focus on the form or on the content of a word; third, bilinguals are better in abstraction (call various known objects using pseudonyms). Naturally, negative experience will always have a stronger effect on social opinion, however, as any politically independent research has pointed out, no lags and distractions have been observed whatsoever. This is getting recently further supported, for example, by Boschner (1996) and Bialystok-Hakuta (1994), saying that acquiring two languages does not tend to overburden the brain, what is more, may offer a higher level of cognitive flexibility and metalinguistic consciousness. According to Francis (1999), acquiring two languages, thus two grammatical patterns, implies a higher level of cognitive processes, promoting cognitive development.

These positive implications are explained by the faster development of the cognitive system, allowing children to learn new things faster and understand metacomponents of language. Further advantages of bilingualism were reported by Tiltone (1994), saying that

bilinguals have a greater linguistic sensitivity and are more able to see signs as abstract linguistic entities; by Cook (1992), highlighting that bilinguals have a higher level of analogic thinking. Moreover, as Karapestsas and Andreou (1999) pointed out, fluent English-Greek bilinguals had better results in creativity tests. Some years later, in 2010, as several recent studies (Bialystok, 2010) report, bilingual adults tend to have a smaller receptive vocabulary size of each language, compared to their monolingual counterparts. On picture naming tasks, bilinguals are reported to be less accurate (Gollan TH et al., 2007) and recognizing pictures took them more time (Byalistok, 2008). More time consuming were the verbal fluency tests as well: when having to name as many words as they could to make a phonological or semantic cue, they were slower than their monolingual counterparts (Ivanova & Costa, 2008). To conclude the difficulties, retrieving words takes more effort for bilingual adults. As there is no mention of infants and children, it can be said that in childhood, there is no difference in any communication skills of monolingual and bilingual children.

A holistic approach of bilingualism may lead to a more consistent and complete comparison regarding linguistic competence, speech production and language learning. When comparing, it might be important to highlight the typical features of a bilingual mind, such as (Navracsics, 2004) the structure of the bilingual language skills and linguistic competence; these system(s) activate in case when code switching occurs during interaction with other bilinguals; in other cases in which the bilingual interacts with monolinguals; or when linguistic and psycholinguistic processes are in progress during mixed speech production and perception. In cases of comparison of mono-and bilinguals, similarities in communication skills have to be highlighted as well. One of the important questions to be answered is if a well-balanced bilingual is able to communicate on the same level as a monolingual regarding both separately and fusing the two languages. Since bilinguals have the same communicational motivations as a monolingual, the only expectable answer is yes, as Navracsics (2004) states. As she pro-

ceeds, there is no difference regarding any kind of production-perception aspect; even if it seemed that code-switching tends to show the lack of any native language. As she concludes, new testing processes are needed to test not only the language structure and grammar, yet the communicational skills.

As Göncz summarized the opinion of society on bilingualism, (cited in Navracsics, 2004), acquiring two or more languages does not have a negative influence on the development of personality unless it is regarded as an undesirable goal and evaluated low; he child has to acquire procedural rules of two languages which would require much effort even with a single language, thus, it is respectable.

In contrast to these patterns, bilinguals tend to outperform monolinguals in the field of executive control at all ages. Executive control means a fusion of cognitive skills such as working memory, multitasking or switching attention and inhibition (Miyake, Friedman, Emerson, et al. 2000). These skills emerge late in development and said to decline early. These neuronal networks, located in the frontal lobes of the brain are responsible for high thinking and multi-tasking of the brain, forecast later academic achievements (Best JR, Miller & Naglieri 2011).

As a whole, bilingualism does not seem to have a bad effect on cognitive development as the research studies through the century-old literature of bilingualism reports. Any disadvantages reported may be caused by the exposure to mixed codes and utterances, or the insufficient input of the various language(s), or the late exposure of a language since they cause lags and seem less efficient than the dominant native language. Children do not tend to have any lags regarding their speech production due to their monolingual counterparts. Bilingualism, if conducted consistently, can enhance various communicational and metacommunicational skills of children.

References:

- Abercrombie, D. (1967). *Elements of general phonetics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Andrek, A. (1997). A kompetens magzat. In Gy. Hidas (Ed.), *A megtermékenyítéstől a társadalomig*. (pp. 9-21). Budapest, Hungary: Dinasztia Kiadó.
- Bánréti, Z. (2014). Korai kétnyelvűség és szociokognitív fejlődés. In Pléh Cs. & Lukács Á. (Eds) *Pszicholingvisztika 1-2* (pp.1166-1169). Budapest, Hungary :Akadémiai kiadó
- Bialystok, E. Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Language*, 16, (4), 240-250.
- Bloom, P. (1994): Recent controversies in the study of language acquisition. In. Gernsbacher, M. A. (ed.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*, (pp 741-749). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Crystal, D. (2010.) *Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (pp. 296-310). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, T.G. (1977). Mother's speech adjustments: The contribution of selected child listener variables. In P.S. Dale & D.Ingram (Eds) *Talking to children: language input and acquisition*. (pp.215-228). Baltimore, PA: University Park Press.
- De Houwer, A. (2005). Early bilingual acquisition: Focus on morphosyntax and the separate development hypothesis. In J.F. Kroll & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds.), *The Handbook of bilingualism*. (pp. 30-48). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Eveloff, H. H. (1971). Some cognitive and affective aspects of early language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 42,1895-1907.
- Genesse, F., & Nikoladis, E., & J.Paradis (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. *Journal of child language*. 22, 611-631.
- Gervain, J., & Macagno, F. & Cogoi, S., & Pena, M., and Mehler, J. (2008). The neonate brain detects speech structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105, 14222–14227.
- Gervain J.,& Mehler, J. (2010): Speech Perception and Language Acquisition in the First Year of Life. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 61, 191–218.
- Gósy, M. (2005). *Pszicholingvisztika*. (pp. 38-60). Budapest, Hungary: Orisis Kiadó.
- Kenesei, I. (2004). *A nyelv és a nyelvek*. (pp. 190-208). Budapest, Hungary: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kovács, Á.M. (2014). Korai kétnyelvűség és szociokognitív fejlődés. In Pléh Cs. & Lukács Á. (Eds) *Pszicholingvisztika 1-2* (pp. 551-574). Budapest, Hungary :Akadémiai kiadó
- Kuhl, P.K. (2010). Brain mechanisms in early language acquisition. *Neuron*, 67, 713-727.
- Lieven, E. & Pine, J. (1993.) In E.C. Clark (Ed). First language acquisition. (pp. 182-185). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lengyel, Zs. (1981) *A gyermeknyelv*. Budapest, Hungary: Gondolat Kiadó
- Mampe, B., & Friederici, A. D., & Cristophe, A., & Wermke, K. (2008). Newborns' cry melody is shaped by their native language. *Current Biology*, 19,1994-1997.

- Meisel, J. (2001). The simultaneous acquisition of two first languages. Early differentiation and subsequent development of grammars. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Trends in bilingual acquisition* (pp. 11–41). Amsterdam, The Netherlands :Benjamins.
- Mérei, F. & Binét, Á. (2006). *Gyermeklélektan*. Budapest, Hungary: Medicina Kiadó.
- Navracsics, J. (2008). *A kétnyelvű gyermek*. Budapest, Hungary: Corvina Kiadó.
- Nazzi, T., & Bertoncini, J., & Mehler, J. (1998.) Language discrimination by newborns: Towards the understanding of the role of rhythm. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Perception and Performance*, 24, 756-766.
- Petitto, L.A., & Katerelos, M., & Levy, B.G., & Gauna, K., & Tetreault, K., & Ferraro, V. Bilingual signed and spoken language acquisition from birth: Implications for the mechanisms underlying early bilingual language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 28, 453-496.
- Pike, K.L. (1945). *The Intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ramus, F., & Mehler, J. (1999). Language identification with suprasegmental cues: A study based on resynthesis. *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*. 105, 567-579.
- Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the “native” speaker: Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97-101.
- Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le développement du langage observe chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris:Champion.
- Serratrice, L. (2013). The bilingual child. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (2nd ed.) (pp. 87-108). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sebastian-Galles N. (2005). Phonology and bilingualism. In J.F. Kroll & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds.), *The Handbook of bilingualism*. (pp. 68-87). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, D. (1985). Crosslinguistic evidence for the language-making capacity. In D. I Slobin, (Ed.) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sugárné, K. J. (2001). *A "hangos" kommunikáció fejlődése és szerepe a korai szocializációban*. Budapest, Hungary: Scientia Humana Kiadó.

Volterra, V., & Taeschner T. (1978). The acquisition and development by bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 311-326.

Wanat, S.F. (1971). Language acquisition: Basic issues. *The Reading Teacher*, 25, 142-147.