

VOCABULARY ACQUISITION IN BILINGUAL CHILDREN AS A LINK BETWEEN LINGUISTIC AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Marinel Negru, MA⁹⁴
Teacher Training Faculty, Belgrade

Abstract: *From the linguistic and general cognitive development raises the question of whether the language development bilingvala similar to that of monolingual children, or whether simultaneous exposure to two languages in addition to affecting the characteristics of the development, the way bilingvali analyze language, the development of additional skills and general intellectual development of the child. In this paper, the acquisition of language in bilingvala from the standpoint of the lexical and general intellectual development of a child due to the fact that the governing skill semantic information increases with age. In the first part of the review of the various models of the mental lexicon bilingvala analyzed the prediction of a single or two separate lexical systems. Then, comparing the research related to the asymmetry in lexical processing of information among bilingual children and the differences in the adoption of different types of words, and the similarity in shape versus semantic closeness, pointed to the benefits of research are described, as well as errors that occur a result of generalization of results research. In accordance with the conclusions, always keeping in mind the difference between surface fluency and cognitive development, in the end, the paper offers suggestions for the organization of bilingual education when it comes to vocabulary acquisition and derived general conclusions about the most important factors that affect achievement in language learning in bilingual children.*

Keywords: *bilingualism, cognitive development, mental lexicon; teaching*

⁹⁴ anastasianegru@yahoo.com

Introduction

How is the process of language development is very complex, and many of the same approaches to the study, in this paper, I looked at the adoption of the language by relying on bilingual connection with the general intellectual development of the child, due to the fact that learning and development are inextricably linked. I am doing research on the adoption of limited vocabulary that is closely linked to the general intellectual development of the child, given that, as noted Vygotsky, skill rule semantic information increases with age and that "the adoption of any new words is just beginning its development process."

In the first part of the paper is to analyze the structure of the mental lexicon bilingual, as well as the assumption of the existence of one or two separate linguistic systems, and then by comparing several studies related to the asymmetry in lexical processing, try to point out the advantages and disadvantages of some research as well as the misconceptions that may arise as a result of generalization of results. Looking at the cognitive development theory in the mental lexicon will linger on the model insists on the distinction between lexical and semantic information processing, which will be correlated with different kinds or types of words.

There are a number of studies showing that bilingual children do better than monolinguals on tests that measure different aspects of cognitive and language development, such as the tendency to observe and analyze different aspects of language, a kind of metalinguistic awareness, sensitivity to feedback and nonverbal communication. As an advantage bilingual emphasizes pragmatic competence is developed based on a series of socio-psychological factors that significantly determine the choice of language that is often used as a marker of identity and as a mark of belonging to a group. Much of what has been done based on the study of individual cases of children: children who are the most frequent, at least in the early studies, the children of linguists in situations where parents are encouraged and there was no danger that the language of the first thrust.

Many studies have focused on the effects of simultaneous bilingualism. So Bijalstok (Bialystok, 2006: 138) assumes that there may be uneven cognitive development, difficulties in school, social maladjustment, underreport to any language group. However, many of the misconceptions that we observed in early studies of bilingualism, as well as in studies of other linguistic factors, consequences and generalizations are false comparisons and generalizations derived from certain research results. Generalized results of a study group and destined to the other, especially in connection with the search for the best method by which one will be multilingual. In assessing the competence bilingual should bear in mind the distinction between surface fluency and cognitive skills in between these two aspects of child development

skills do not necessarily have a high correlation. Moreover, they are separated in their native language at a fairly early stage, so that the surface-fluent rapidly evolving opportunity and reach a certain level at the age of five to six years. It is assumed that the same type of differentiation between the surface and cognitive development in learning a second language. Just because someone fluent in a foreign language in concrete situations every-day does not say much about his ability to use language as a cognitive tool in situations where high cognitive demands of contextual details do not help much. Accordingly, placing the child in the school environment at a time when there is still no government in another language well enough to make it equally with native speakers used in situations with high cognitive demands, it could have a negative effect on their development and school achievement. Due to the lack of input material is understandable that the child gets less information than the one that listens to their mother tongue. Listening to a foreign language requires intense attention and may result in the child frustrating situation when it can resort to the strategy of psychological absence and begin to ignore the lessons. All this leads to lower test scores and, therefore, before we talk about positive and negative post-dicama bilingualism on cognitive development and prior to any assessment of language competence bilingvala should take into account the age and general intellectual development, as well as mastery of mate- monoembryonic pregnancy.

From the linguistic point of view it is interesting to question whether bilingual individuals possess a single integrated language system or two separate systems, ie the way the stored information. Theory of a code (Geneese & Nicoladis 2006: 328) assumes that bilingvali have a language system that is different from the monolingual system. Walter and Tišner (Volterra & Taeschner) give najeksplicitniju formulation and interpretation of the hypothesis of the existence of a single language system. They distinguish three phases of development: the first stage of a child has one lexical system which includes words of both languages, the language development resembles monolingvala development, 2) the child distinguishes two lexical systems, but applies the same syntactic rules in both languages, and 3) in the final stage child speaks two languages, and different from the lexical and syntactic point of view with. When we talk about the theory of a code, it is not clear how common characteristics should possess two languages to be able to say to make a system. Dealer (Diller, by: Kangas, 1981) states that there are two languages Grammatically sufficiently resemble each other in order to merge, and the same applies to the lexicon, while Kangas describing two unrelated languages believes that the speakers have a practical grammar and two lexicons, because grammatical and phonetic structure eventually became almost identical.

Research shows (Geneese & Nicoladis 2006: 342) that bilingual children utter their first word at the same age as monolingual, about 12-13 months, and that the vocabulary similar to that of monolingual children. Adoption of new words in monolingual is guided by the principles of mutual exclusion under the assumption that a new word refers to a new term reference. Children would rather be attributed to a new word but a new concept known as object which fulfills the lexical gap. Therefore we can conclude that the adoption of translation equivalents in bilingual children significantly violated the principle of mutual exclusion and that could serve as proof to us that these children acquire two languages separate lexical systems. It was also observed (Geneese & Nicoladis 2006: 331) that young bilingual syntactic properties of the language used to better understand and convey them to a second language, as well as the mixing of words that are essential to a functional level as a function of chief sentence with the word *ma-* not having the functional importance of a better knowledge of the language, but never vice versa. This data could favor the already mentioned Kangasovoj hypothesis that implies the existence of a grammatical and lexical two systems.

Mixing code is closely related to situational characteristics: issue of context, source, topic and purpose of the conversation. Pan (1995: 320) concludes that children often move from a local to cross the English (the language of wider communication) than the parents, and it is assumed that this code change associated with different identities, because children tend to retain the dominant language of communication. So, we can say that bilingual children face the same communication challenges as well as by monolingual seek to achieve the production target language understandable to others, to explain the precise meaning of a particular word or expression, or to use language in a socially appropriate manner. The main feature of bilingual communication ability is the proper choice with different interlocutors. On the other hand, it is possible that because of the different inputs kids can adopt different vocabulary in these languages. Even if we assume that the dictionary bilingual in both its language dictionaries monolingual smaller than one language, we must admit that it has bilingual wider field of choice but monolingual and that the sum of linguistic units at its disposal exceeds the aggregate amount available monolingual. Which brings us back to the question of the existence of two linguistic systems and storage input. Batia and Ritchie (Ritchie & Bhatia, 2008: 38) stated that the studies generally found that three-stage model of language development bilingual has considerable shortcomings in the methodological and empirical level. In its turn, the hypothesis of the existence of two systems hard to separate the children and the lexical and grammatical system is already in the second year

of old age, by accessing the adoption of universal grammar and the basic differences between the two languages. They find that, unlike monolinguals who have a range of mutually understandable styles, bilinguals control styles of each individual language and possess tacit knowledge of linguistic separation of the two systems allowing them to activate or suppress the language effectively and accurately. It also shows a higher level of cognitive ability and skill in using both systems for the formulation of sentences and their connections. The process of language selection is not random, but it relies heavily on the pragmatic competence based on a series of sociolinguistic rules were adopted in language socialization. Markkanen's model explains the tendency bilinguals code switch. Bilinguals using Swahili as a symbol of local identity, while English is the unmarked choice, code of objectivity, neutrality, and commitment to the larger community.

We can discuss the different aspects of how the languages are highlighted. Mental lexicon bilinguals implies the existence of two levels of processing: conceptual and lexical. At the conceptual level semantic input information is treated as a single system regardless of the language of the input material. In any case, at some point of information must be obtained linguistic form, then bilingual is forced to choose between two different languages. This shared storage is conceptually linked with L1 and L2 lexical warehouses that are also interconnected. Thus is explained the functioning of the hierarchical model of the mental lexicon bilinguals. Researchers (Centowska, 2006, Kroll 1993, De Groot & Comijs, 1995) generally agree on the fact that the choice of time-it depends on the direction of information processing, ie. if processing is performed from L1 to L2 or vice versa.

Subtype of the hierarchical model is asymmetric model bilingual lexicon which is based on differences in the intensity of L1 and L2 conceptual links with a warehouse. According to this model, L2 connection is weaker because it is adopted later in life by learning a second language, but frequent use of it becomes stronger so that it comes to equalizing the two connections, in which case we speak of balanced Bilingual-Pellet.

References:

Bialy Trends in Cognitive Sciences

Cardona, M. (2001). *Il ruolo della memoria nell'apprendimento delle lingue. Una prospettiva glottodidattica*. Torino: UTET.

Centowska-Eckert, A. (2006). The Assymetry in Bilingual Lexical Processing: Conceptual/Lexical Processing Route and the Word Type Effect. U R. Slabakova, J.Rothman, P. Kempchinsky,

De Groot, A. M. B. (1993). Word type effect in bilingual processing tasks. Support for a mixed representational systems. U R. Schreuder, B. Weltens (ed.), *The bilingual Lexicon* (pp.56–70).

De Groot, A. M. B. & Comijs, H. (1995). Translation recognition and translation reduction: Comparing a new and an old tool in the study of bilingualism. *Language Learning*, 45, 3–18.

Geenese, F. & Nicoladis, E. (2006). Bilingual first language acquisition. E. Hoff & M. Shatz (ed.), *Handbook of Language Development* (pp. 324–342). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Hatch, E. & Brown. C. (1995). *Vocabulary, Semantics and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kollers, P. (1993). Bilingualism and Biculturalism. *American Journal of Psychology* 79, 357–376. 9. Kroll, J. F. & Sholl, A. (1992). Lexical and conceptual memory in fluent and non-fluent bilinguals. U R. J. Harris (ed.), *Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Kroll, J. F. (1993). Accessing conceptual representations for words in a second language. U R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (ed.), *The Bilingual Lexicon* (pp. 54–81). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 11.

Pan, B. A. (1995). Code negotiation in bilingual families: »My body starts speaking English«. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 16, 315–327.

Ritchie, C. W. & Bhatia, Tej K. (2008). Psycholinguistics. U B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (ed.), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 38-51). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Schelleter, C. (2002). Bilingual Children's Lexical Development: Factor Affecting the Acquisition of Nouns and Verbs and Their Translation Equivalents. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5, 93–107. 14.

Sorace, A. (2006). The more, the merrier: facts and beliefs about the bilingual mind. In S. Della Sala (ed.), *Tall Tales about the Mind and Brain: Separating Fact from Fiction* (pp.28–32)/