PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS
Vol. 9, Nos. 1 & 2 (June and December 1978)

ON THE AUGMENTATION WITH ENGLISH OF THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF A FILIPINO CHILD IN HAWAII

SUSAN CHOU-ALLENDER
University of Hawaii

1.0. INTRODUCTION.

The object of this study is to examine samples of a child's spontaneous interaction with adults in a second language for evidence of his ability to assert control over these interactions. The analysis focuses on the development of the child's skills in the use of questions and summons items. These two types of utterances have an internal mechanism for generating talk by selecting the next speaker and obliging a response from him. By gradually becoming aware of this special mechanism, the child is able to utilize these utterance types in various contexts, thereby expanding his repertoire of communication skills. Attention is also focused on the factors which could account for the child's early success in the acquisition of communicative competence in his second language.

In this study, I have chosen to examine the developmental aspects of a child's questions mainly from the perspective of their functions in discourse. Dialogue, according to Halliday (1972), constitutes the second basic component of a child's linguistic system which must develop simultaneously with his grammar. A child learns how to speak by interacting with other members of his culture, including adults and peers. Initially, the child associates only one function, i.e., fulfilling a need, with each expression. Then he gradually learns that language has a communicative aspect as well as a pragmatic one; thus, he becomes capable of using his knowledge of grammar to initiate discourse and volunteer information.

There is a striking absence of documentation on the developmental process involving rules of interaction to cover the span between the child's initial introduction to the mysteries of discourse and his eventual mastery of adult interactional norms. As a step towards filling this gap, this study offers a descriptive account of one child's progress towards the mastery of certain of these interactional rules and his ability to use this expanding repertoire to control conversations.

A second feature of this study is its second language component. As a recent immigrant to Hawaii, my Filipino subject, John-John, was suddenly confronted with two new languages—Hawaiian Creole English and Standard English—in addition to Tagalog and Standard Filipino English spoken at home. He responded to this situation by rejecting his home languages and concentrating on the acquisition of both varieties of English used in his new community. This study explores some of the factors behind John-John's decision to become a passive bilingual and attempts to trace his response to the dual influences of HCE and SE.

The term, *Hawaiian Creole English* (HCE), refers to a continuum of non-standard varieties of English spoken in Hawaii which have varying degrees of distinctive syntactic, semantic, and phonological features from Standard English (SE). HCE is commonly referred to in Hawaii as 'pidgin'.

Standard Filipino English (SFE) is a term introduced by Llamzon (1969, as quoted in Forman 1973) to distinguish the English spoken by most educated Filipinos from

other varieties of English. Among some of its general features are a book-learned grammar, the infrequent and sometimes awkward use of idioms, and strong phonological differences carried over from Tagalog. One particularly outstanding feature of SFE is the frequent mixing of Tagalog and English expressions.

2.0. THE DATA.

2.1. BACKGROUND OF SUBJECT.

John-John (J) was born in a college town in the Philippines and lived there until the age of three years and eight months (3;8) when he arrived in Honolulu with his mother (P) and younger sister (N: 0;8) to join his father (D), a graduate student at the University of Hawaii. His mother recalled that at the time of his arrival, John-John did not speak English although he could communicate with ease in Tagalog (beyond baby talk, as she put it). By the time I made my first pilot tape on July 28, 1974, John-John (4;1) had switched to Hawaiian Creole English and stopped active usage of Tagalog.

In September 1974, John-John (4;3) started formal schooling at a pre-school in Honolulu. He enjoyed going to school as well as talking about school.

At school John-John was exposed to at least two varieties of English. While his Caucasian teacher-in-charge spoke Standard English, the teacher aides and the locally-born children mostly spoke Hawaiian Creole English.

2.2.THE RECORDINGS.

The main body of data consists of eight approximately 60-minute tapes of John-John's spontaneous interactions recorded every other week over a period of four months (February to May, 1975; ages 4;8 to 4;11). Most of the recording sessions were held in John-John's home on a Sunday afternoon with either one or both of his parents present. Unlike most other child language studies, however, the main interaction was between the child and myself, with the parent usually occupied with the younger child and the household chores or studies. One of the tapes (VI) was made at the University of Hawaii campus while I was looking after John-John for his parents. In addition to the eight regular tapes, I also included three pilot tapes (July 28, October 31, December 11, 1974; ages 4;1 to 4;6) made at intervals of two to three months during the previous year to supplement my data and expand the longitudinal scope of this study. The second and third of these exploratory tapes were recorded at the office of John-John's father on campus, while the first was made in his home.

In many of the sessions there was yet another person present with me, either my husband, Bruce (B), or another graduate student interested in child language, Merle (M), who also participated in the conversations. While they did not come specifically to act as observers and note-takers for me, their participation and comments contributed valuable insights regarding the child's ability to handle a variety of interactional situations. To make up for the absence of a back-up observer, I learned to describe contextual information into the tape recorder. I also recorded the general situation and my impressions of each session in a notebook immediately afterwards.

The recordings were all done on a Hitachi cassette recorder (TRQ-340) with a built-in condenser microphone. I carried it in a fitted shoulder bag to make it less conspicuous. Most of the time I laid it on the floor to one side of the living room or playroom because we did most of our activities on the floor. The tape recorder has a 'pause'

button which I used whenever John-John ran out of the room for long periods of time, when he made me read a story, or when the situation seemed too noisy or disorganized. Thus, the recordings were not always uninterrupted hour-long blocks of interaction. I wanted to make sure I got as much of his spontaneous speech as possible during each session. In retrospect, it would have been more useful to have left the tape running continuously for an hour because it would have given me more complete data on John-John's techniques for opening or resuming interactions.

2.3.THE TRANSCRIPTIONS.

The tapes were transcribed orthographically for all the participants, including John-John. I also used some notations suggested by Odo (1975) for Hawaiian English[1] in John-John's speech to emphasize certain shifts in style between Hawaiian Creole English and Standard English. One prevalent variation which I did not denote in my transcripts was the loose substitution of *d* for *the* in functor words, such as *da/the, dis/this, dat/that, wid/with.* This feature cannot be attributed solely to Hawaiian Creole English because it is also a common feature of Tagalog speakers of English, as evident in his mother's as well as my samples.

The tapes were numbered consecutively from I to VIII to cover the period from February 1 to May 11, 1975; the pilot tapes were designated as PI, PII, PIII. Table 1 gives a summary of the participants and context of each session. Within each tape, John-John's utterances were numbered consecutively by turn for purposes of easy identification. Thus, the notation PIII-21 preceding an example in this text identifies the sequence as excerpted from Pilot III, starting with John-John's twenty-first turn.

In this paper, a 'turn' is defined as an individual's utterance(s) bounded by the utterances of another speaker. A single turn may contain one or more grammatical units, from an 'mm-hm' to a string of sentences. It may also consist of a nonverbal signal, generally a nod or shake of the head, given in response to a question in place of a verbal answer. A turn may also accomplish more than one activity, such as may occur when the speaker addresses two different parties with separate messages without an intervening turn.

After transcribing each tape I attempted to segment the text into major speech events, and these were broken down further into topic sequences. There was considerable overlap of topics in many of the sequences, and the general absence of transition devices in the conversations often made it difficult to establish clear boundaries between topics. Nevertheless, this rough segmentation of each 60-minute transcript was useful in highlighting the patterns which emerged in the course of my interactions with John-John.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONS AND THE SUMMONS AS COMMUNICATIVE TECHNIQUES

Questions and summonses both belong to a special category of utterances called 'adjacency pairs' (Sacks et al. 1974) and, as such, have a number of features in common. Both are first components of the pair and require an answer to complete the sequence. Established convention obliges an addressee to acknowledge questions or summonses with a response. This mechanism makes these first components of a sequence effective as a means of generating talk or ensuring the continuation of talk by the selection of the next speaker (Sacks et al. 1974:716-718).

Questions are less restricted than summonses in terms of occurrence and function in a conversation. They may occur anywhere in the conversation. If a question

occurs at the beginning of an exchange, it may function at the same time as a summons. A question may also be used at strategic junctions in the conversation to initiate topic change, repair digression, prolong talk or handle competitive talk, as will be illustrated by John-John's data. Questions which terminate a conversation are generally rhetorical and used for effect. There were no occurrences of this latter type of questions in John-John's data.

There is considerable evidence in the data that John-John's learning process involves the progressive mastery of small routines which then serve to build up his stock of responses and techniques for handling discourse. The emergence in his speech samples of the question as a technique for conversational control, for example, seems to coincide with his mastery of the questioner's role in the 'naming game'. The first part of this section describes John-John's gradual mastery of the game, followed by illustrations of his use of the question as an interactional tool. The second part gives a description of his acquisition of the summons device, which is also associated with another favorite routine—the ceremony of presenting his new toys, drawings, etc. This routine gave him the occasion to evolve various styles of summoning attention, utilizing first one and then a variety of devices to suit the situation.

3.1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTION DEVICE

The Naming Game. The 'naming game' is the familiar adult-child routine wherein both parties look through a book together, with the adult asking 'what's this?' as he/she points to a picture and the child naming the object. This game was a favorite activity of John-John's during the early sessions, and it occurred in four tapes—PII, I, II, III.

The initial routine which evolved as we leafed through the pages of the animal picture book in PII consisted basically of: S asks about a picture—J answers—S acknowledges the answer, usually by repetition, and then asks the next question. During the entire sequence John-John asked only three questions ('what's this?'), each time inquiring about some apparently unfamiliar object. Only on one of these occasions did he answer his own question, and this was about a nonentity figure used as space-filler:

(1) PII-255
J: . . . Whas this?
S: Whas that?
J: Monster. (giggles)
S: Monster, yeah. That's Kikaida?
J: No. That's monster.

[Kikaida is the hero of a popular television show in Hawaii.]

When he wanted to talk about an object I had left out, instead of mentioning it directly, John-John would make me ask him about it:

(2) PII-189
J: . . . No you- you no this one. (whiny tone)
S: What is that?
J: Fish! (emphatic)

This strategy indicates that John-John's main delight in the game was to practice his vocabulary and his newly-acquired ability to count. He liked being asked questions because it gave him a chance to show that he knew the correct answers. Although he seldom volunteered unsolicited comments in this session, he exercised control over topic selection by ignoring questions about uninteresting objects and by interrupting prolonged discussion with the demand to 'turn the page'.

Tapes I and II were recorded six months later (4;7), and the routine which charac-

terized the naming game reveals an important development in the child's role. While the focus of the game remained essentially the same, i.e., the naming of objects by the child, there was a move on his part toward greater initiative and independence. John-John no longer waited to be asked; he pointed the objects out himself and volunteered their names. A breakdown of the book sequences in Tapes I and II shows that John-John initiated 62 naming turns, with the use of 17 attention-getting devices, such as 'look' and 'I color this', in contrast to 17 naming or question turns initiated by the adults present (S, P, B).

(3) I-6
J: I color this.
S: Whas that?
J: Candle.

(4) I-38
J: Piano.
S: Piano.
J: Puppy. (turns page)
Pumpkin. Peacock. (turns page)
Feather. Green.(turns page)
Rabbit.

While John-John had attained some degree of independence, his participation in the game was still limited in the sense that he could not yet assume the adult role as dispenser of questions. Throughout both sequences, only three questions were initiated by John-John, and again he seemed in earnest about learning the proper labels for the items in question.

(5) II-335
J: What a—(1.4 sec. pause)—*w*?
S: w?
B: What-
J: Clock.
S: That's a watch.

Tape III focused almost entirely on the naming game and marked the child's mastery of the routine. At this point he showed that he had learned how to ask 'known-answer questions' (Labov 1970), i.e., questions the answers to which he already knew. About half of the questions he asked during this session were about objects already familiar to him, as shown by the fact that he was happy to answer his own questions when given the chance:

(6) III-71
J: Tell me whas this.
S: You know what that is.
J: Bus.
S: Bus.
J: Taxi.
S: Did you ride the bus before?
J: Yeah-taxi.
S: Mm-hm.

Because he already knew the answer, John-John must have had some other motive for asking the question. Indications are that he had somehow realized the 'trick' to adult questions—that it is, in fact, part of the game to ask obvious questions and that these questions can be used to enhance the flow of conversation. Of the 25 questions by John-John in this tape which can be interpreted as conversationally motivated, two were asked to initiate topic change, eight to initiate the resumption of the game after digres-

sions, and the rest to carry on a topic in the spirit of the game. Having learned how to take over the adult role, John-John now had the ability to switch roles at will. Thus, the book routine really became a game for him:

(7) III-247

J: Whas this?
M: Plums. | Plums.
S: | Plums.
J: One, two. Two plums.
S: This one?
J: This first.(giggling)
S: This first. (loud)
J: This first. (even louder)
M: (laughs)
J: This aft– | This one is after.
S: | Okay what's that?
M: | Can't you tell?
J: | Corn. Corn.

In fact, John-John became so playful and confident with the routine that he initiated a new level–sound play:

(8) III-283

S: What's that?
J: < kang >
S: Hmmm?
J: < kang-goo >
S: Kang? Kang what?
J: < kang-goo >
S: Kang? Kanggoo? Kangaroo! (laughs)
J: [kang-goo] (loud)
S: Kangaroo. (matches his volume)
J: < kang-goo > (even louder, giggly)
[5 more turns on kangaroo banter]
J: Look. One-one daddy–rabbit king! (loud)
S: One daddy rabbit king– O, what's that?
Your good friend–
J: < bud-da >
S: Buddha?
M: (laughs)
J: < hug-a-bud-da > (giggles)
S: Who's huggabuddha?
J: This *tabachoy*. (laughs) ('stout')
S: *Tabachoy*
M: *Tabachoy?*
S: Stout. (to M) What's *tabachoy*? (to J)
J: Got big stomach.

After Tape III John-John lost interest in picture books and moved on to story books. It is interesting to note that in his initial efforts at tackling this new task, he fell back to the earlier routine of simply naming the pictures. However, he quickly gained the ability to render a rote recitation of the text. At first his recitation was fuzzy and discontinuous, but it improved to an accurate memorization of the complete text.

John-John's mastery of the adult role in the naming game is significant because it marks the emergence of a new potential for using language to manipulate not just

the game but conversations in general. Halliday maintains that in dialogue a child 'learns to adopt, accept and assign linguistic roles, and thus to measure linguistic success in linguistic terms' (1972:32). In the naming game, as in all other discourse, John-John's initial role was that of responder. By gradually moving into the role of questioner, he, at the same time, assumed the power to assign roles. Thus, Example (7) can be seen as a negotiation between John-John and myself essentially over roles rather than mere topic.

Functions of John-John's Questions. Throughout the data John-John had questions directed at acquiring new information concerning objects and persons in his environment, e.g., 'What's this?', 'Who's the Easter bunny?', 'Where's Auntie Merle's house?' ('mathetic function' of Halliday 1972). He also had questions which were indirect demands for some action, e.g., 'Mommy, where's my walkie-talkie?', 'Can you make a Christmas tree?', 'How you read it? —Read it!' ('pragmatic function' of Halliday 1972).

Aside from these types of questions, there was an increasing number of utterances, also in the form of questions, which performed special functions within the conversation in addition to whatever meaning they expressed. For example, John-John used the question form as a device for summoning attention prior to initiating a topic:

(9) I-281
J: You like see? You like see? (whispers)
S: I like to see what? (whispers)
J: Close your eyes. (whispers)
Aunt-Uncle Bruce, close your eyes, too.
Uncle— (interrupts B-P conversation)
P: No o- ah- Uncle Bruce will not be friendly to you.
You're always excluding Uncle Bruce. That's not good, hm?
S: What's that?
J: My notes! (presents his weekly lunch menu)
[J's lunch program becomes the new topic for a reunified conversation involving J, S, P, B]

He also used questions at transition points in the conversation to directly introduce a new topic or repair digression:

(10) PI-82
J: You know Mark? He go- he- this- this not—
this not broken, yeah?
S: Yeah, it's not.
J: Not.
S: Why? Mark said it's broken?
J: Not. He said broken my car because- he said- not-
I said to Mark this not broken/ my car/ I said.

During the naming game in Tape III, many of John-John's questions were aimed at re-focusing attention on the book after I had succeeded in diverting talk away from what I felt, at that time, to be a conversationally-constricting routine.

John-John's consistent use of questions as a device for directing the flow of topics indicates an understanding on his part of the special mechanism of question utterances as a first part of a paired sequence. In the following example he successfully negotiated an abrupt topic shift by obliging me to answer an irrelevant question, thereby breaking my previous train of thought. By answering his question, I was also forced to give implicit assent (whether real or not) to the topic shift.

(11) V-385
S: Did you go to the market yesterday?
J: No-ooo.
S: What did you do yesterday?

J: I wen just play play play play! (shouting at end) (wen play = played')
S: Play with what?
J: Why you never- go– why you never go in my house s- Saturday? (never go = 'didn't go')
S: You want me to come Saturday?
J: Yeah.
S: Okay. Why?
J: Cause I know what you gonna do.
S: What will we do when I come here Saturday?
J: Who- give the Easter bunny?

It must be noted that while John-John capitalized on the adult conventions governing paired sequences to manipulate my responses, he himself ignored the obligations imposed on him by my questions (my third and sixth in the sequence above). Indications are that John-John had not acquired the sense of obligation to conform to adult conventions simultaneously with his realization of the workings of these norms. In the later tapes, he tended to supply a perfunctory 'yeah" in similar situations, not so much to express assent, but in order to preserve structural order as well as to grab the floor so that he could initiate his own question or summons:

(12) V-438
S: Will you come home with me? Will you come home with me?
J: Yeah. I going show you something.(whispers)
S: What?
J: Close your eyes, okay . . .

[J managed to postpone my leave-taking by introducing a new topic.]

In situations of competitive talk or when threatened with loss of attention, John-John often relied on questions to regain the focus of attention. For example:

(13) [J and S were playing peek-a-boo, but S was diverted because N started fussing]

PIII-251
J: I can see you. (giggling)
N: (fusses)
S: What you want, Ningning?
N: *Dede–dede–* (fusses). ('milk bottle'– baby talk in Tagalog)
S: *Dede*? Okay.
J: Why– it's turning? (referring to tape rec.)
S: It's turning? O, you talk ***naman.*** I thought you like to talk. ('come on')

John-John's curiosity about the tape recorder always made me nervous and put me on the defensive. He undoubtedly realized this and sometimes used it as a technique to regain my attention (as in the above example) or to liven up a boring session. On the other hand, I had learned how to capitalize on his rivalry with his sister as a quick way to recapture his wandering attention or force him into a more active role in the conversation.

John-John also relied on the question device as a strategy for dealing with situations of conflict. He realized that the person in the role of questioner had the prerogative of picking the topic. Thus, when he found a topic undesirable, he subverted it by assuming the role of agressive interrogator, as in:

(14) VI-419
S: Let's talk Tagalog– Okay?

J: No I don-
S: *Marunong ka*-? ('do you know how?')
J: No!
S: *Ha, marunong ka*? ('hm, do you know how?')
J: No! What's this? (referring to light switch)
S: *Ilaw.* ('light')
J: For?
S: *'yan, o.* ('that one')
S: *Ay, hindi pala. Iyan ang ilaw.* ('Oops, no. That is the light.')
J: This one?
S: You wanna turn that on? That's for the toaster.
J: Is hot?

In the above sequence I had to give up my attempt to coax John-John into speaking Tagalog because I was too harassed by his volley of questions, accompanied by his manipulations on the light switches. (Note, however, that while John-John refused to produce any Tagalog, he revealed some Tagalog competency in terms of successful comprehension.) When I failed to quiet him down, I gave up and decided that it was time for us to leave. Again John-John resorted to the question device, this time as a delaying tactic:

(15) VI-434
S: Let's go down *na,* John-John. Your daddy might look for you. ('already')
J: Whach this? ('what's this?')
S: Okay, we'll go– That's for the tea.
J: For?
S: Tea.
J: That's for the tea for?
: [4 more turns on the teapot]
S: Yeah, okay? Let's go down *na.*
J: Why this not go- No, I like watch TV.
: [15 turns: argument over the TV]
J: Where you put this? What- what- you put on? This one? The down? (turns TV on)
[break in tape]
J: . . . I like eat.
S: Okay, you can sit on me.
J: Hm? What's he doing?
S: Let me throw the paper in the garbage can.
J: What's this? This is your ball pen?
S: Yup.
J: Why this is your ball pen?
Why only half? (shifts attention to cookie)
: [2 turns while J eats]
J: Whas that?
S: What?
J: Why– I- I like was- the plants.
S: You like to what?
J: Wash the plant.

By this time John-John was groping for topics to ask about and shortly afterwards,

when I threatened to give him a bath along with the plants, he finally agreed to leave.

Even in the earliest pilot tape there is some evidence of John-John's use of the question form as an attention-getting device. However, it is from Tape III onwards that there is strong evidence for a more complex and diversified use of questions—not only as inquiries but, at the same time, as devices for initiating topic change, prolonging talk, or negotiating over interactional control. It seems more than a coincidence that this expansion in the versatility of his questions emerges soon after John-John mastered the questioner's role in the book routine. I would like to speculate that John-John absorbed the technique he had learned from this one routine into his system and used it as a basis for formulating a more generalized pattern of application.

3.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUMMONS DEVISE

An examination of the pilot tapes reveals that the verbal summons as a transition device between topics was not yet a stable part of John-John's system before age 4;5 (PIII). His efforts to initiate talk consisted of a direct plunge into his topic of interest. This topic, however, was not always obvious to the other parties. Therefore, there were many communication gaps in the early conversations.

(16) [J and S were driving toy cars on the living room floor, with other toys scattered around]

PI-30 S: The little car.
J: Yeah, Brrmm-mmm.
I can shoot, *o.* (leaves his car and picks up a new toy)
(o = 'see')
S: Let me see.

In the above sequence, for instance, the transition between the two activities was perceptible to me only because there were props to cue me in, e.g., John-John picked up the new toy to signal a new topic. In the second and third pilot sessions, John-John was away from home and did not have the objects he wanted to tell me about on hand. Therefore, he was less successful in introducing these objects into the conversation and had to try several times before he could make me understand:

(17) PIII-3
S: What are you drawing? (pause)
Hm? (pause—8 seconds)
Hm, what are you drawing?
J: I got Rainbowman shirt now. And Rainbowman.
I got Christmas tree.
S: Still big, huh. It's loose. (referring to his new cap)
[20 turns on his cap, tow-truck, the tape recorder]
J: xxxx have nice house.
S: What's that?
J: I've to wear this last night.
S: You have to wear that last night? (puzzled)
J: Yeah.
S: Why?
J: I get my Rainbowman shirt.
S: Oh.
J: I get my Rainbowman, too.
S: Who gave you your Rainbowman shirt?
J: The Santa Claus

[Rainbowman is another popular TV hero in Hawaii.]

The first occurrences of explicit summons devices are recorded in Pilot III. John-John used a summons once to introduce a topic ('Look at the clock over there.' PIII-137); another time to solicit admiration for a drawing ('Look. Look, Auntie Cora– look- look. A Christmas tree.' PIII-89); and a third time to regain my attention in a situation of competitive talk (repeats 'look' with increasing volume until I stopped my other conversation to acknowledge his summons, PIII-225).

Two months later when the regular taping sessions began, there was a remarkable increase in the number of the summons forms in John-John's speech. The child enjoyed showing off his new possessions and school achievements, and he usually introduced these presentations with such statements as: 'Look' , 'I color this' , ' You like see? ', ' You know ', 'I show you' , 'Watch' , 'Close your eyes' , 'I gon tell you' (see Examples 3 and 9). These openers generally succeeded in eliciting a responding inquiry from me which, in turn, gave him the right to bring up his choice of topic and obliged me to listen to him. It is this sequencing of turns which, according to Schegloff (1968), guarantees the effectiveness of the summons device in opening conversations.

Apart from the nine occasions when he used a direct summons utterance in the first regular session, John-John utilized two other strategies for introducing a topic. At three different times in the session, he used his mother as intermediary and mouthpiece, whispering to her and having her make the announcement to the rest of the group.

(18) I-136

J: And buy cereal– and buy some shirt-
S: And buy shirt?
B: What else you gonna buy? Sherbet?
J: (jumps up and runs to the stairs)
P: No-no-no. John-John. What will you do? What will you do?
J: (runs to P and whispers)
P: Ah, no-no-no-no-no. *Hu*! He's going to show *daw* the T-shirts *na binili ko kahapon.* ('he says that he's going to show the T-shirts which I bought yesterday')
J: And Ningning, too.
S: Oh.
B: Oh.
J: (runs up to get the shirts)

John-John's whispering may have been a sign that he still considered *B* and me as 'outsiders' during this visit, or a trace of Filipino modesty may have made him hesitate to show off too directly to visitors. On the other hand, John-John may have whispered to his mother because he wanted to keep his intention as a surprise for us, or it may have been his way of asking his mother for permission to bring down his new clothes. He did not use this technique of speaking through his mother again in subsequent sessions.[2]

His other technique was nonverbal. He merely held up his new pair of slippers and looked at me expectantly. I, of course, quickly took notice and asked if they were new. This technique of showing without an accompanying attention-getting utterance occurred only once in Tape I, but it closely resembled the nonverbal technique he used extensively in the later sessions.

Tapes II through IV reveal a similar pattern in the use of the summons technique. John-John relied primarily on variations of the summons utterances ennumerated above to call attention to whatever object he wanted to present. In Tape IV alone, there were 94 occurrences of the utterrance 'look' , usually in the context of a book or drawing

activity. Usually, during an ongoing activity, when John-John wanted to call attention to something new, he omitted the summons and commented directly on the object, generally naming it. Should he fail to receive attention, he repeated his comment until it was acknowledged. Only rarely did he introduce a new activity by immediately starting to play or by simply handing me the toy without comment. As mentioned earlier, there are a number of sequences whose openings are inconclusive due to my over-zealous use of the 'pause' button on the tape recorder.

In the last two tapes, the nonverbal technique assumes a new prominence. Unlike previously, John-John did not simply produce the object without ceremony or warning. He now built in an element of expectation and suspense by observing a dramatic pause while hiding his 'surprise' behind his back. To make sure that his receivers would take note of his meaningful silence, he was careful to pick quiet moments or times when attention was focused on him. He ignored all other comments/questions and responded only when asked to show what he held behind him. This technique of relying on the absence of talk to draw attention worked very successfully. It presumably operated on the instinct of parents to take notice (in alarm or with suspicion) when a child suddenly disappears from view or falls strangely quiet.

In situations where the adults in the room were engaged in their own lively conversation and were less likely to take notice of his silent approach, John-John relied on his well-practiced use of the verbal summons. He also retained the direct summons as a technique for recapturing the limelight when threatened with loss of attention by the encroachment of Ninging:

(19)
N: 'Auntie Susan. Look.'
P: Look. (laughs)
S: What's that?
N: 'Mommy. Daddy. This one.'
P: Daddy bought this one.
N: 'This one. Daddy.'
J: Auntie Perle [*sic*] and Auntie Susan, close your eyes– you better close your eyes.
S: Okay.
J: I [gon put] something.

In highly competitive situations, John-John started to use a combination of summons techniques. In the following example, he coupled a term of direct address with a question item to interrupt and end an ongoing conversation which excluded him:

(20) [S, P, M were talking about a picnic; J gets up on a chair and reaches for his balloon.]

VIII-120
P: John-John, come on!
S: O, you wanna play with y- your own balloon, too.
J: Mommy, whatch the name of this?
P: I don't know.
J: Look. (pointing to the ad on the balloon)
P: Payless. (N talking in background)
J: Payless. Given by this– you know the- the- lady wen hold– was holding plenny balloon ah– my mommy wen- we wen ask.
[talk shifts to balloons]

These developments which emerge toward the close of this study (4;10-4;11) strongly indicate that John-John had considerably expanded his repertoire of summons

devices and that he had achieved the ability to discriminate in their use according to the demands of the situation. When he had optimum attention, he knew that he could nonverbally manipulate the adult co-participant to initiate questions about his topic. Thus, he reserved the use of a direct summons utterance only for situations of competitive talk when he felt the need to assert himself more strongly.

The development of the summons technique illustrates some general similarities between the acquisition process of interactional rules and the acquisition of syntax. Initially, the device did not occur at all in the child's usage, indicating that it was not part of his communicative repertoire. When it made its first appearances in his speech, its use was tentative, unstable, and unpredictable. Once he absorbed it into his repertoire, however, John-John used the device enthusiastically, even to the point of over-extending its function. Summonses, in particular, were easy to learn because the structure of these items consisted simply of stock phrases which did not entail any structural analysis. John-John tended to use these utterance types not only as means of securing attention but also as grammatical shortcuts serving the function of entire conversations (Examples 23 and 24 in the next section illustrate this point). Gradually, the child learned that there were certain restrictions governing the use of these special utterance items. He also learned to recognize and predict the contexts in which these items could be used with optimum success. Thus, he moved from an over-generalized application of the technique to a more discriminate use of it.

As in the case of the development of questions, the expansion of the summons device seems to have occurred within the restricted situation of a routine. Somehow, John-John must have associated me and my visits with a number of activities and topics which, no matter how carefully I tried to avoid them, invariably came up during the session. Through the frequent repetition of these activities, certain parameters of the interaction became fixed and defined within each activity, thus resulting in the creation of 'routines'. Under such controlled situations John-John may have found a context conducive to experimenting with new linguistic forms. While it would be presumptuous to claim that these routines were the only factors responsible for the development of questions and summonses in John-John's system, it is, nonetheless, significant that the controlled use of these devices first became apparent in these clearly defined situations.

Although John-John's successful use of questions and summonses revealed his awareness of the mechanism underlying these utterance types, he had not attained full mastery of the norms governing their usage. Mastery of interactional norms consists, not only of the ability to apply the techniques in conversation, but also of the faithful compliance with the reciprocal obligations attendant on their use. This latter aspect was far from stable in John-John's system, as evidenced by his selective submission to these obligations. Unlike adults who are bound by convention to answer questions or to avoid issuing a summons while another speaker has the floor, John-John complied with the norms only when they did not interfere with his interests. Thus, the developmental stages traced herein only describe a phase of his acquisition process

4. FACTORS AFFECTING SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

4.1. INTERNAL MOTIVATION

A tape made of John-John several months before his departure from the Philippines showed him to be a voluble child, fluent in Tagalog. He had few false starts and instances of stammering, fairly accurate comprehension based on appropriate responses to his mother's statements, and the beginnings of verb inflection.[3] He also used some English

words in his spontaneous speech, such as:

(21) *kulay* red, *ha* ('colored red, please')
bibili ako ng new shoes ('I am going to buy new shoes')
source: tape borrowed from J's father]

When I first met him in March 1974 at a social gathering, he was eager but unable to interact on his own with the other guests (mostly non-Filipino adults) because of the language barrier. His mother or I had to serve as his English coach or interpreter. Significantly, John-John had to undertake the entire initiative of reaching across the barrier. The norm was to speak English, and none of the guests made any effort to learn Tagalog. I have no knowledge of how John-John communicated with his peers in a play situation when there were no interpreters, but it seems reasonable to expect that, again, he had to make all the adjustments.

In the space of five months John-John made a switch from Tagalog to English. When I made my first pilot tape in July (4;2), I could not cajole John-John into speaking Tagalog. In the light of his obvious difficulty, his persistence in avoiding what would have been an easier channel of communication indicated a conscious decision on his part to reject Tagalog as an alternative means of speech.

(22) PI-107
J: You know the blue green?
S: No. (puzzled)
J: I can do the blue green.
You know the point to the point?
S: No. (still puzzled)
J: I can do.
S: What's that? Show me.
J: Point to the point– (chants)
Hanap siya n- ng point– ('he looks for the point')
S: OKAY. *Tapos*? ('and then?')
J: *Tapos*– uhm– her father said- no more- he said- no more- no more getting point- he had- he had point!
S: (does not understand but laughs)

This example is one of the rare times when John-John slipped momentarily into Tagalog speech, but he quickly caught himself and refused to be baited into continuing in that language. He did not seem to have any inhibition about struggling along in broken English and showed no impatience when he was unable to communicate his ideas or understand what I was saying to him. This tolerance for vagueness undoubtedly helped him persevere in seeking interaction with others.

There was no occurrence of Tagalog-English code-switching in John-John's speech despite the fact that he was constantly exposed to this phenomenon in the speech of his parents and their immediate social contacts. It would have been an easy compromise for him to have combined his limited knowledge of both languages to facilitate communication at least with other Filipinos. The fact that he did not exercise this option raises the question whether it was a matter of personal choice or whether Filipino children as a rule did not learn code-switching until after they had learned the rudiments of Tagalog and/or English separately. The latter hypothesis must be ruled out, at least in John-John's case, because there is evidence that John-John himself had previously used some code-switching in his spontaneous speech while in the Philippines (see Example 21). It would seem then that John-John had made a deliberate choice not to resort to code-switching and that his rejection of Tagalog as an alternate means of communication was a total one. While he reacted very negatively to any effort on my part to get him to speak

Tagalog (see Example 14 as one of several instances), he accepted it in my speech and that of his parents.

This decision of John-John to avoid producing Tagalog altogether suggests that he had a fair amount of interaction with non-Tagalog sectors of the community from whom he felt pressure to conform by speaking the common language. The groups he spent most of his time with outside his home were his playmates and, to a lesser extent, the preschool staff. I have no knowledge as to whether John-John felt any of the stigma against Filipino immigrants in Hawaii and the extent to which this might have influenced his decision. But it is clear that none of his playmates, not even the children of other Tagalog couples in the family's immediate social circle, spoke Tagalog while at play. John-John valued his contact with his peers and wanted to be accepted by them. He must have realized, quite pragmatically, that learning their type of English would enable him to communicate effectively with them as well as with all other sectors of his new community, including the Tagalog speakers. This realization formed the basis for a strong internal motivation to acquire English. It constituted the first step toward maximizing his interactive potential within his new English-speaking community. Although at first his limited vocabulary and structure hampered his success at communication, his performance quickly improved as he acquired greater facility with the English language. The data from this study, in fact, show that John-John's strong motivation to exercise interactional control enabled him to devise techniques making use of limited grammatical forms within a wide range of contexts to perform a variety of functions.

In the summons technique, for instance, John-John utilized stock expressions which did not entail any complex grammatical processes. Once he discovered how convenient and, at the same time, effective the summons routines were as conversational tools, he resorted to them frequently. In the same way that young children tend to overgeneralize rules of grammar, he over-extended the function of summons items by trying to substitute them as an entire conversation rather than using them simply as openers. Schegloff (1968) establishes that one essential feature of the summons utterance was that it could not properly stand as the final exchange of a conversation. John-John came very close to violating this characteristic by the briefness of his comments following a summons.

(23) I-86
J: Look. Color this shirt.
B: You colored it?
J: And a barn.

(24) I-III
J: Look.
S: What are you doing?
J: E-xer-ci-sing (doing sit-ups, laughs)
S: Do you exercise in school?
J: Now gon have to put something in here. (picks up his walkie talkie)
S: What?

In the above examples, *B* and *S*, going by adult conventions, interpreted John-John's openers as an indication of his desire to develop a conversation around the topics specified and were jolted by his sudden shift in topic. One factor responsible for the frequent occurrences of this quick succession of topics, especially during the book routines of Tapes I and II, was John-John's limited control over English. The summons was one way he could get away with saying little and yet assert active control over the conversation. Subsequent tapes show an improvement in his ability to extend a conversation several

turns beyond the utterance of a summons:

(25) V-27

J: Look– yeah? (points to an old chair)
S: Yeah. (not sure what he meant)
J: Look.
S: Look what? Yeah- it's broken already.
J: Huh?
S: No good, huh.
J: That's our chair.
S: What happened? You sat on it, that's why it broke?
J: No. That's look. Somebody burn our chair.
S: Aha. Who burned your chair?
J: Somebody on that- that– see that- see that- see that– ahhh–
S: Which one?
J: See that yellow one?
S: Yeah.
J: Yellow door? Somebody wen [fight om] and burned.

The structure of John-John's questions also seems to be fairly limited by comparison to Standard English adult forms. John-John made frequent use of truncated questions (e.g., 'This?', 'Where? ', 'How bout you?', 'What color?') and simplified tag constructions (e.g., 'We will ride over here, no?', 'You take the blue, okay?', 'Many fish coming, yeah?'). His yes-no questions were marked principally by an intonation pattern described by Vanderslice and Pierson (1967:162) as starting as a 'high pitch level which lasts until just before the accented ultima or penult, on which there is low pitch with terminal steadying or slightrise'. Only two of his 56 yes-no questions revealed the appropriate subject-verb inversion: 'Can you make a Christmas tree?' (PII) and 'Can you hear, over?' (I, a learned walkie-talkie routine). There were no occurrences of the dummy item *do*; four of the modal *can*; and seven of the copula *be*, six of which were in contracted form.

His WH questions reflected three types of construction: preposing weak, preposing strong, and adult-like SE constructions. The 'preposing weak' category (Brown 1968) includes questions whose forms may have resulted from the telegraphic reduction of adult utterances, such as 'When [is] your birthday?', 'How [do] you open this? ', 'What [do] you want? '. The 'preposing strong' category (Brown 1968) includes preposed questions with auxiliaries or inflected verbs, such as 'Who's gonna be win in the contest?' 'Why this is your ballpen?', 'Why this don have picture in this side?'. Such constructions present strong evidence that the child actually preposes the WH word because this cannot be attributed to adult SE models. Brown (1968) notes that his subjects produced large numbers of preposing weak questions long before they started to produce the strong type. John-John's data reveal the occurrence of 51 preposing weak and 24 preposing strong questions. He also produced adult-like SE constructions: 'Who's that?', 'Where's your room?', 'The little fish said "where are you, mother", he said ' The term 'adult-like' is used because, while John-John displayed a consistency in his use of the contraction, he still most likely treated the *WH-interrogative + 's* construction as an unanalyzed unit. Indications are that he was just beginning to acquire the full forms of *be* and other auxiliaries at the end of this study.

The developmental forms of John-John's questions trace a pattern similar to that described for first language learners. His constructions fit the Klima-Bellugi (1969) characterization of Stages 2 and 3 as well as Brown's categories of preposed questions

(1968). There is no clear evidence of any direct interference from his first language. The main difference between Tagalog and English questions revolves around the structure of yes-no questions, where Tagalog questions use a question marker /*ba*/ and do not invert the subject and verb (Stockwell, undated). At the most, this latter feature may have reinforced the developmental tendency (Klima and Bellugi 1969) of the child to initially retain the subject-verb order of declarative sentences in his questions. Despite the common practice among Filipino speakers of adding the unit /*ba*/ to English questions, John-John never used this marker in his speech. This conclusion concurs with the assertion of Dulay and Burt (1973:10) that children learning English as a second language 'do not use their "first language habits" in the process of learning the syntax of their new language'.

While agreeing with Dulay and Burt's (1973) conclusion, however, I hesitate to identify this study too closely with their method of 'error analysis' because, although John-John's constructions may be considered immature in SE (i.e., errors), they also happen to be appropriate adult forms of HCE. While the WH-fronting movement occurs in HCE questions, there is generally an absence of the subject-verb inversion rule as well as the absence of *do*-support, copula support, and present tense inflections (Day 1973). Thus, John-John's constructions which were earlier classified as 'preposing weak' can likewise be classified as well-formed HCE questions. The overlap between J's developmental questions and HCE shows support for Ferguson's (1971, 1975) thesis regarding the similarity among the simplified varieties of 'baby talk', 'foreigner talk', and pidgins. Evidence to indicate that John-John was, in fact, speaking HCE is found in his use of the HCE questions intonation patterns (Vanderslice and Pierson 1967), HCE tag question markers (*yeah, no hun you know*[4]), HCE past (*wen*), negative (*no more, not*), and negative past (*never*) markers, and the HCE tense neutralization rule (Day 1973; e.g., 'Why for a long time you wen drive the car and then— the car- chug-chug- like jumping?' VII). In the Standard English Repetion Test (Day et al. 1974), John-John failed to repeat two question items while in the Hawaii Creole English Repetition Test (Day, Odo, Gallimore, Tharp, and Speidel 1975) he did not show any difficulty in repeating the Hawaiian Creole English versions of the same questions.

The most informative and revealing constructions in John-John's data are his 'unique' constructions, under the preposing strong category (Dulay and Burt, 1973, note that their study disregards this type of 'unique errors' but suggest that it may, in fact, prove to be the most interesting). Many of these constructions contain a unique combination of SE and HCE elements and reflect the child's attempts to accommodate new SE forms into his present linguistic system. An example from Tape VI illustrates this effort at self-correction: 'Why you never stay over there? Why you— why you no-was not there in your room?'. Starting out with an acceptable HCE construction, John-John struggles to rephrase the question in SE.

From Tape V onwards there seems to be a noticeable increase in the use of full auxiliary forms, which suggests a development towards SE. This progression by John-John along the HCE continuum towards SE could be the result of a natural process of development, with the child acquiring more complex syntactic structures after learning the simpler forms. The emergence of SE auxiliary forms in his speech was likely due to his exposure to the more decreolized systems within the HCE continuum, to SFE, and to SE. At the conclusion of this study John-John showed no evidence that he had lost the ability to speak HCE. Whether John-John would have given up the use of HCE as he acquired SE is now only a matter for speculation since he has left the HCE environment and moved to the U.S. mainland.

There are also 9 instances when John-John's mother expanded or translated his statements or helped him to form his remarks by asking leading questions:

(31) PI-66
J: Look at me – psshhh. (holds car up in air)
P: What's that?
J: That is – is clean – ing.
P: Are you cleaning the car? Is that the way? Is that the way to clean the car? You put it up. *Di ba* you use the jack? And turn and turn – and the car will go up like that and then you wash the car. *Di ba* that's the way? You have seen that . . . ('isn't it?')

(32) PII-161
S: This?
J: Penguin.
S: Penguin? Seal.
P: This is a seal.

John-John's mother undoubtedly realized, as did John-John himself, that in America English is the language of survival and that it was imperative for him to make the transition to this new language as quickly as possible. However, her sustained and constant effort to monitor her son's speech was due to more than just the factor of second language. During my first home visit in July 1974, when I expressed surprise at John-John's switch to English, his parents both sounded very confident in his ability to learn the language on his own and disowned any responsibility for his rapid progress. In fact, they teased him about his 'pidgin' accent and attributed it to peer influence. I also had a feeling that early in the study John-John's mother was simply anxious for her son to 'look good' in my report.

What in the long run proved a tremendous cause of worry for his parents, was his acquisition of HCE. They strongly disapproved of this variety of English, which they considered 'substandard'. They had very little social contact with local families who spoke Hawaiian English. They also had plans to move to the United States mainland in the near future (Summer 1975) and knew that Hawaiian English would not be a respected and viable channel of communication outside Hawaii. Thus, their initial amusement at John-John's speech patterns turned into alarm, and they seriously sought means of counteracting the linguistic influence of his peers. (They never expressed any concern or disapproval about the influence of school.) One such means was for them to express explicit disapproval of his immature SE syntax forms and provide him with the Standard (Filipino) English model. Their desire to prevent John-John from using HCE developed into an over-all concern over his language acquisition process, and they did not limit their corrections only to what they considered to be "pidgin" constructions.

Aside from her vigilance over John-John's syntax, his mother also paid attention to his acquisition of interactional rules. The main focus of her efforts during the period of my study was to teach John-John his obligations to respond when selected as next speaker in the course of conversation. She did this by overt verbal comment:

(33) L-294
S: Which is your favorite ap – uh – dessert?
P: What's your favorite dessert *daw*, John-John? ('she's asking'; marker for indirect quotes)
J: Applesauce.

(34) VII-26 P: *O*, come on, *anak*, they will talk to you *na*. ('oh'; 'child'; 'already')
S: *O*, what's that *naman*? (*naman*=marker for a sequenced utterance)
J: (holds a book but does not answer)
S: O, where did you go today? ('or')
P: Come on, answer!
J: Chip an Dale. (hands S the book)

(35) VII-129 S: Where did you learn your song, John-John?
J: (bouncing his balloon) Hhh – hhh – hhh.
P: John-John, Auntie Susan is talking to you.
S: Where did you learn your song?
J: In school.

or by a more indirect prompting with support questions:

(36) IV-308 S: Yeah. What do you want to be when you grow big?
P: What d'you want to be? John-John, what d'you want to be?
J: A driver.

(37) VII-160 S: *Ha*? How old will Ningning be? ('what?')
P: How old will Ningning be?
J: (illustrates with his fingers)
S: What's that?
P: What's that?
J: Two.

Notice that John-John's mother often used a combination of speaker-selects-next techniques to coax the child into answering the original question – a term of direct address, one or more questions, the Tagalog marker / *daw* /. Whenever he ignored a question, it was invariably because he had something else in mind. By repeating the questions of other speakers, therefore, *P* was not acting as mediator but was merely prodding an answer by interrupting the boy's concentration. Her success was usually contingent on the degree of his preoccupation with his own activities or schemes.

While John-John did not seem disturbed by the pauses caused by his failure to answer questions, the adult participants reacted with uneasiness. I developed a practice of asking a string of questions, either on the same topic or on a variety of topics (see Example 34), in the hope that John-John would respond to at least one of them. His mother tended to scold him outright, telling him to pay attention and answer questions. At times, she answered my questions herself to fill in the embarrassing gap. Cora (C), another Filipina who looked after Ningning in PIII and who was unfamiliar with my study, also reacted to John-John's silences by speaking through Ningning (that is, using baby talk) to answer my questions for John-John. This concurrence in the instinctive reactions of three Tagalog-speakers indicates that the speaker-selects-next mechanism of questions operates validly in conversations involving Tagalog speakers.[5] All three would most likely have felt the same discomfort were the conversation conducted in Tagalog. What the participating adults seemed to overlook was the fact that John-John actually

needed time not just to think of appropriate answers but also to formulate them into coherent structures. This process of formulating answers was particularly difficult for him during the pilot sessions, as seen from his innumerable false starts. In the later sessions John-John showed an awareness of the obligations imposed by questions but applied them to himself on an optional basis. This selective application of the norm could be an operation of the egocentric tendency (Piaget 1926) to impose his priorities upon all his interactions. It could also be a factor of knowing that he could get away with occasional violations of the norm.

In addition to pressuring John-John to answer questions, his mother also instructed him on the etiquette of entertaining 'his visitors' . She discouraged his tendency to turn to her for help, disapproved of his abrupt departures from the room, and scolded him for being over-familiar or disrespectful. When he was restless, her most effective means of discipline was her *kurot*, or pinch.[6] She also coached him in the use of proper routines attendant to specific social situations, e.g., apologizing, thanking someone for a present, serving coffee.

It is interesting to note that while John-John's mother paid careful attention to the prevention of gaps in the conversation, she did not reprimand the boy for causing overlap in the talk. There were innumerable occasions when John-John freely interrupted ongoing talk to call attention to himself, repeating his summons with increasing volume until he was successful. Only once in the data did his mother attempt to scold him for interrupting:

(38) VIII-53 [P and S were talking with N]

P: Where is mommy working? Auntie Susan is asking –
J: Mommy!
P: Where is mommy working?
S: Where does your mommy work, Ningning?
J: Mommy! Mama (low) – mommy! Mommy, look at the clock.
P: Auntie Susan is talking to –
M: What time is that?
P: What time is that, John-John?
J: Mommy, look at the clock.

And as can be seen, the attempt gives way to her concern for John-John to answer Merle's question. This observed priority of norms could reflect a cultural generality indicating that Tagalog speakers are more tolerant of overlap in conversations than (American) English speakers (Forman, personal communication). On the other hand, it could reflect a tolerance among adults in general (whether Tagalog or American) favoring overlap in conversations, particularly with children. Or, it could be an indication of the pattern of sequencing in the acquisition of interactional norms. Further studies are needed before the validity of these factors can be properly evaluated.

An important question to be raised regarding *P's* efforts at monitoring John-John's speech is whether they had any significant effect on the child's learning process. The fact that John-John could understand most of the syntactic corrections of his mother (except in the pilot sessions) shows that the SE norms she called his attention to were already part of his system although still unstable. There is no clear evidence in the data to indicate that his acquisition of these forms was due to her corrections.

However, one effect her supervision may have had was to give John-John an awareness of HCE and SE as separate codes. Clearly, the child was conscious of his mother's disapproval of HCE. While he used HCE extensively in his speech, he reacted very negatively to the Hawaii Creole English Repetition Test (HCERT, Day et al. 1975). His initial uneasiness and reluctance to respond to the HCERT items became even more pronounced when his mother entered the room midway through the test. In contrast, he was very cooperative during the Standard English Repetition Test (SERT, Day et al. 1974); he enjoyed the SERT so much that he insisted on repeating the 'game' in many of our subsequent meetings. On a number of occasions, John-John also corrected his own sentence constructions. These usually occurred in his mother's presence, suggesting perhaps that he was monitoring himself to meet with her approval. However, there are also some instances of self-correction in Tape VI, when we were in a neutral environment away from his parents, thus indicating that his move towards SE was not wholly undertaken for the sake of his mother.

5. SUMMARY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The first pilot tape, made five months after John-John's arrival in Hawaii, is replete with his false starts, stammerings, incomplete utterances, and over-dependence on stock phrases – evidence of his struggle with his new language. In this rather disjointed flow of unfinished topics, however, there were already strong indications of John-John's aggressive interest in controlling the interaction. This generalized interest in assuming an active role in conversations gradually became manifest in the consistent application of certain techniques for assigning roles during interactions. This paper focuses on two of the most apparent of these techniques – questions and summonses – and traces their development, incorporation into, and expansion within John-John's linguistic repertoire.

While these two utterance devices are discussed separately in this paper, it must be pointed out that in the actual process of development, there was a great deal of overlap. Questions occurred in all of the tapes; however, the use of ' known-answer questions ' (Labov 1970) did not emerge until Tape II. Summons items made their earliest appearance in PIII, occurred in great abundance from Tapes I to VI, and tapered off to a more discriminate use in Tapes VII and VIII. By age 4; 11 John-John demonstrated a clear understanding of the operations of questions and summonses as speaker-selects-next techniques as well as the ability to apply these techniques to achieve a multiplicity of discourse functions.

One feature of John-John's application of these conversational strategies is its apparent one-sideness. It would seem that the child used these general conventions in order to focus attention constantly on himself. This behavior could be interpreted as reflective of Piaget's (1926) conclusions that children below 7 years think and act egocentrically even when interacting with others. On the other hand, analyses of adult conversations reveal a similar tendency among adults to impose their own social roles and perspectives on the discussion, thereby creating a constant change of subtopics (Clancy 1972). Furthermore, studies of child-child interactions (Mueller 1972; Keenan 1974) have shown a social orientation among young children, contrary to Piaget's assertions. Thus, a second possible interpretation of John-John's behavior would be to consider his aggressiveness as his way of testing the limits of adult tolerance for his violations of discourse etiquette. Interactions, to be successful, must involve the process of assertion and mutual accommodation. Previous studies have shown that in adult-adult and child-child interactions, this negotiation of verbal exchange worked smoothly because of a basic

equality between parties. In John-John's case, however, the pattern of give-and-take between himself and his adult interlocutors was not clearly established, and his active self-assertions could have been his attempt to see how much he could get away with. As it turned out, he found a high level of leniency on the part of his adult speech partners (I, for one, was willing to give him a free hand in order not to compromise my simultaneous role as observer). Thus it was easy for him to maintain selective observance of his discourse obligations without any sanctions. Under more rigorous circumstances, as in peer interactions, when the demands for accommodation would have been made on him rather than in his favor, it is probable that John-John would have been more conscientious about his obligations. A further consideration to account for the jarring effect of John-John's seemingly aggressive behavior would be his lack of sophistication at masking his manipulative efforts through the use of appropriate adult transition devices.

A second facet which has been explored to some extent in this study but which still demands considerable attention in research is the cross-cultural dimension of interaction rules. Sacks et al (1974) and Schegloff (1968) suggest that their models for the sequencing of conversations have universal validity which can be proven by examining conversational data from other cultures. The results of this study indicate that there is concurrence between American English and Tagalog interactional rules, at least in governing the prevention of gap within question-answer and summons-answer sequences. On the other hand, there is evidence in the data indicating a tolerance among the adult Tagalog participants for overlap in the talk in terms of interruptions, particularly by the child. These observations could imply any one or more of several things: (1) Tagalog speakers are more sensitive to the prevention of gap (within paired sequences) than overlap, (2) Tagalog speakers tolerate interruptions more than American speakers, (3) Tagalog speakers expect their children to learn the interactional rules preventing gap prior to those preventing overlap, (4) adults in general are more tolerant of children's interruptions than their failure to answer questions or summonses.

At the moment I can only describe the observations from my particular case study. There are too many variables in this study to allow any conclusive generalizations. While the major participants were Tagalog native speakers, the interactions were conducted in English; there were occasional non-Tagalog participants, and the underlying interactional rules were probably a mixture of Tagalog and English conventions.[7] Moreover, while I use the term 'English', I actually refer to an interplay of several varieties of the language—Standard English, Hawaiian Creole English, and Standard Filipino English. Thus, the broader implications suggested by this study regarding the sequencing of interactional rules need to be confirmed by other less complicated case studies focused on the same questions.

There is a need, for instance, to establish whether there is a fixed ordering in the acquisition of grammatical forms. If so, what factors determine this sequencing? Is there an equivalent scale of complexity among interactional rules analogous to that governing grammatical processes? If so, what would this complexity be based upon? Then, there is a need to establish whether in fact the acquisition of interactional rules follows a universal pattern of sequencing or whether the ordering varies according to the priorities established by a particular culture.

Another interesting point to pursue in further research is the role of parental correction and supervision in the acquisition of interactional norms. John-John's second language situation and the influence of HCE caused his mother to exert a consistent effort to monitor his syntax as well as interactional behavior. Despite this concern, John-John managed to take advantage of the general permissiveness among the adult partici-

pants by selectively complying with the rules of interaction. Under normal circumstances do parents tend to ignore the immature interactional behavior of young children the same way they might overlook their immature syntactic constructions? If so, at what age do they expect a child to attain full mastery of interactional norms so that they are no longer willing to make allowances for his or her omissions?

In summary, this study establishes that by age 4;11 John-John had attained a systematic and diversified use of the speaker-selects-next technique, which enabled him to assert conversational control by assigning roles and demanding a response. He was able to achieve this control despite the use of fairly simple grammatical constructions. This study also establishes peer acceptance and maternal reinforcement as factors behind John-John's choice to concentrate on the acquisition of English, despite his exposure to a bilingual situation. John-John's success at attaining communicative competence in his second language underscores the effectiveness of the natural language learning process.

Table 1
Summary of the Tapes

Tape	Date	Age*	Setting	Participants**
PI	July 28, 1974	4;1.21	John-John's home	J, S, P, N
PII	October 31, 1974	4;4.24	Campus office of J's dad	J, S, P, N, (Dw)
PIII	December 11, 1974	4;6.4	Campus office of J's dad	J, S, C, N, (D)
I	February 1, 1975	4;7.24	John-John's home	J, S, B, P, N
II	February 17, 1975	4;8.10	John-John's home	J, S, B, N, (D)
III	March 2, 1975	4;8.23	John-John's home	J, S, M, P, N
IV	March 16, 1975	4;9.9	John-John's home	J, S, P, N, (D)
V	March 30, 1975	4;9.23	John-John's home	J, S, N, (P), (B)
VI	April 10, 1975	4;10.3	Campus garden, S's room	J, S
VII	April 27, 1975	4;10.20	John-John's home	J, S, M, P, N
VIII	May 11, 1975	4;11.4	John-John's home	J, S, M, P, N, (D)

*Age is given in years, months, days.
**Participants: J – John-John; S – Susan; P – J's mother; N – Ningning; B – Bruce; M – Merle; D – J's dad; Dw – Dwayne (visitor); C – Cora (Filipina graduate student).
( ) – individuals in parentheses were present only for a brief period during session.

Footnotes

[1]Hawaiian English (HE) is best regarded as a dialect of SE, much as New England English. HE should not be confused with HCE, which is a former creole currently decreolizing in the direction of and under the influence of SE.

[2]One other distinctive function of John-John's whispers, however, was as a means of expressing his alliances. He showed that he accepted me by sharing many conspiratorial whispers with me; he also showed hesitancy to accept *B* by whispering to exclude him.

[3]For instance, John-John used the reduplication of the root word to signify the imperfective tense. This is described by Bethel Oestman (undated) as the initial step in the emergence of verb inflections in the data of her three subjects.

[4]*No* and *huh/ha* are also typical SFE tag question markers.

[5]Forman (personal communication) observers a similar reaction among mothers in the Filipino (Ilokano) plantation community in Maunaloa on the island of Molokai, Hawaii.

[6]P rarely raised her voice in anger at *J.* When he disregarded her scoldings, she simply pinched him, usually in the upper arm, and he was immediately reduced to tears. Often, the threat "*Gusto mo ng kurot?*" ('do you want a pinch?') was sufficient to quiet him down. This typically Filipino practice is an efficient means of discipline, especially when around guests.

[7]These might be seen as an additional level of SFE mixing.

REFERENCES

BLOUNT, B.G. 1969. Acquisition of language by Luo children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

BROWN, ROGER. 1968. The development of wh-questions in child speech. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, Vol. 7, 279-290.

BROWN, ROGER, C. CAZDEN, and U. BELLUGI-KLIMA. 1968. The child's grammar from I to III. In: Bar-Adon, A., and W.F. Leopold, eds. 1971. Child Language: A Book of Readings, 382-412. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

BROWN, ROGER and CAMILLE HANLON. 1970. Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In: Hayes, John, ed. Cognition and the Development of Language, 11-53. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

CAZDEN, COURTNEY B. 1972. Child language and education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

CLANCY, PATRICIA. 1972. Analysis of a conversation. Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 14, No. 3, 78-86.

DAY, RICHARD R. 1973. Patterns of variation in copula and tense in the Hawaiian post-creole continuum. Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 5, No. 2. Honolulu: University of Hawaii. pp 1-165.

DAY, RICHARD R., STEPHEN T. BOGGS, ROLAND B. THARP, RONALD CALLIMORE, GISELA E. SPEIDEL. 1974. A standard English performance measure for young children: The Standard English Repetition Test (SERT). Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 6, No. 4. Honolulu: University of Hawaii pp 73-85.

DAY, RICHARD R., CAROL ODO, RONALD GALLIMORE, ROLAND B. THARP, and GISELA E. SPEIDEL. 1975.The Hawaii Creole English Repetion Test (HCERT): A Hawaii creole English performance measure. Technical Report No. 28. Kamehameha Early Education Program. Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

DULAY, HEIDE, and MARINA BURT. 1973. Errors and strategies in child language acquisition. Paper presented at 1973 TESOL Convention in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

FERGUSON, CHARLES A. 1971. Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins. In: Hymes, Dell, ed. Pidginization and creolization of languages, 141-150. London: Cambridge University Press.

FERGUSON, CHARLES A. 1973. Language problems of variation and repertoire. Daedalus, Vol. 102, No. 3, 37-46.

———. 1975 Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk. Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1-14.

FORMAN, MICHAEL L. 1973. Philippine languages in contact: Honolulu radio station K.I.S.A. Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 5, No. 10. Honolulu: University of Hawaii. pp 137-151.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. 1972. Learning how to mean. In: Lenneberg, Eric and Elizabeth Lenneberg, eds. 1973. Foundations of language development: A Multidisciplinary approach. UNESC/IBRO.

KEENAN, ELINOR. 1974. Conversational competence in children. Journal of Child Language, Vol. 1, No. 2, 163-183.

KERNAN, K.T. 1969. The acquisition of language by Samoan children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley

KLIMA, E.S. and URSULA BELLUGI. 1969. Syntactic regularities in the speech of children. In: Lyons, J, and R.J. Wales, eds. Psycholonguistic Papers: The Proceedings of the 1966 Edinburgh Conference, 183-208. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

LABOV, WILLIAM. 1970. Finding out about children's language. Working Papers in Communication, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1-30. Honolulu: University of Hawaii and Pacific Speech Association.

MUELLER, EDWARD. 1972. The maintenance of verbal exchanges between young children. Child Development, No. 43, 930-938.

OESTMAN, BETHEL I. 1973 Tagalog child language. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of California at Berkeley.

PIAGET, JEAN. 1926. The language and thought of the child. Cleveland, Ohio: World.

SACKS, HARVEY, EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF, and GAIL JEFFERSON. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, Vol. 50, No. 4, 696-735.

SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. American Anthropologist, Vol. 70, 1075-1095.

SLOBIN, DAN I. 1968. Questions of language development in cross-cultural perspective. Paper presented at the Symposium on Language Learning in Cross-cultural Perspective, at Michigan State University.

STOCKWELL, ROBERT P. n.d. A contrastive analysis of English and Tagalog, Parts I and II. Manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles.

STROSS, B. 1969. Language acquisition by Tenejapa Tzeltal children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

VANDERSLICE, RALPH, and LAURA SHUN PIERSON. 1967. Prosodic features of Hawaiian English. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 53, No. 2, 156-166.