

Reduced Bilingual Input in Later Born Children: Receptive Bilingual Acquisition

Laurel Diane Kamada

This is the third report up to this point (Kamada, 1995b, 1998a) on an ongoing research on bilingual acquisition in Japan based on 46 individual case studies from 23 bilingual families (see also Kamada, 1995c, 1997) conducted over the last six years. This paper deals with factors contributing to the disparity in bilingual proficiency in siblings of the same family, manifested as reduced second language proficiency in the later born child resulting in receptive bilingual acquisition where we might expect productive bilingualism. Manaster, et. al. (1998) researched the role of birth order on acculturation of Japanese Americans. They determined that firstborns were more likely than later borns to read and speak their minority language (ML), Japanese. This is concordant with findings in this report. The following influencing factors on the bilingual acquisition of the later born child will be examined in this paper: 1.) shifts in time and priority, 2.) sibling influence, 3.) schooling, home tutoring and overseas residence. Also, specific to some of the families, two other conditions found to influence receptive bilingualism will be examined: 1.) bi-cultural families with one Japanese parent coupled with a ML speaking father, as opposed to families with a ML speaking mother (in all of the cases referred to in this report, the ML was English), and 2.) bi-cultural families where the ML speaking parent is bilingual (with a high second language proficiency in the majority language-Japanese) as opposed to families with a ML speaking parent who is monolingual in the ML.

Five pairs of siblings, selected from the above mentioned 46 case studies, will be examined in detail as they particularly revealed discrepancies in second language proficiency as a result of birth order. However, of even more concern than birth order alone, this paper attempts to examine factors involved in receptive bilingual development (defined below), especially in families where we might expect better results as already evidenced in other family members, including not only older siblings, but also bilingual parents. The later born children from these five families included three cases

of receptive bilinguals and two cases of monolinguals. (It should be noted that the proficiency levels of the cases reported in this paper are based on the data collected at the time of interview and that as bilingual development is a dynamic process, the present state of proficiency is likely to have changed. This issue will be taken up in another report of the longitudinal changes over time of individual subjects.) The names of subjects have been omitted in this report and instead have been referred to only as numbers and letters. All of the five families had two siblings each, totalling ten cases as shown in Figure One.

Figure One: Details of Older/Younger Sibling Cases from Five Families

Family# (Minority language [ML*] parent)	Older sibling	Younger sibling
	(gender: M/F) [age: years; months]	
1. (<i>Japanese / American [bi-cultural], balanced bilingual mother</i>)		
	#1a (F) [13;0] Returnee-Attriter/ML Receptive+	#1b (M) [7;8] Monolingual (Japanese)
2. (<i>New Zealander, balanced bilingual father</i>)		
	#2a (M) [9;5] Returnee-Attriter/ML Receptive+	#2b (M) [3;6] Monolingual (Japanese)
3. (<i>American, balanced bilingual mother</i>)		
	#3a (F) [12;0] ML Receptive+/Occasionally productive	#3b (F) [9;9] ML Receptive
4. (<i>British father [step-father to 4a]</i>)		
	#4a (F) [16;6] ML Receptive+/Occasionally productive	#4b (M) [7;7] ML Receptive
5. (<i>American father</i>)		
	#5a (F) [10;3] ML Receptive+/Occasionally productive	#5b (F) [6;6] ML Receptive

*In all of the above case the minority language [ML] was English.

All of the cases were producing the majority language (Japanese) at peer level.
This chart indicates the degree of proficiency of their ML.

These ten cases were all children of "bicultural" families, where a "bicultural" child is defined as having one Japanese parent and one parent from another culture who spoke a ML as their first language. In one of the families (#1.), the ML speaking parent, the mother, was herself raised in Japan in a bicultural family (with an American father and a Japanese mother) and was a balanced bilingual. In two other families (#2, and #3), the ML speaking parent (a father and a mother, respectively) became bilingual by virtue of being born and raised in Japan by two ML speaking foreigner parents of missionary families. In the remaining two families (#4 and #5), the ML speaking parents were both fathers, now long time residents, who came to Japan as monolingual

adults and whose Japanese proficiency had been slowly progressing over time--that is to say, at the time of the birth of their second child, their Japanese language proficiency had increased considerably since the time of when the first child was little when both fathers were virtually monolingual. (More specifically, in family #4, Case #4a was a step-daughter to the father who began speaking English to the child regularly from the age of three; Case #4b was the biological child of the father who received ML input from birth).

Definitions of Bilingualism

Numerous recent texts on fundamental bilingualism have devoted full sections to reviews of research on the types of definitions, descriptions and degrees of bilingualism considered (Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Hoffman, 1991; Romaine, 1989; Williams & Snipper, 1990). As yet, however, a unified definition of bilingualism to satisfy all fields of bilingualism, has not been agreed upon as bilingualism is not a static state, but an ever-changing dynamic which has proven very difficult to delineate with its various competencies, functions and identifications. Thus, it should not be surprising that an early stage of second language acquisition in which the target language is not yet produced orally by the subject should be all the more difficult to demarcate. The ability to comprehend and break down the meaning of a second language, but the incapacity to produce the language orally in most communication situations is the issue of this report.

At one extreme, a very strict and early 1936 definition of bilingualism, offered by Bloomfield (1933), defines a bilingual as a person having native-speaker like control of two languages. At the other extreme, some of the looser definitions of bilingualism, offered by Haugen (1953) and Diebold (1964), have allowed for broader definitions of bilingualism to include the initial states of becoming bilingual, what Diebold calls "incipient bilingualism." Romaine (1989) comments on Diebold's definition, ". . . He leaves open the question of the absolute minimal proficiency required in order to be bilingual and allows for the fact that a person may be bilingual to some degree, yet not be able to produce complete, meaningful utterances. A person might, for example, have no productive control over a language, but be able to understand utterances in it (10)."

While many bilingual researchers do not allow the definition of bilingualism to include a person's total lack of productive verbal proficiency in one of the languages even with comprehension of both, several terms have become commonplace in order to explain this state. The most commonly used term for this state is "passive bilingualism"

although it has not been specifically defined. I feel a more preferable term to use is "receptive bilingualism" which ascribes a meaning to include the dynamic state of the developing inter-language in which the subject actively receives input. The term "passive" is felt to be an inaccurate term to describe this very active process.

Even though a receptive bilingual is unable to produce the second language, according to D. I. Slobin (1979), a very active process occurs in the parsing of sentences, storing of meaning and purging memory of actual sentences and words when processing speech comprehension. What remains in the child's memory is not the actual words; the child is remembering meanings, concepts and roles (Kamada, 1998b). Slobin states, "listeners. . . [are] people who are actively segmenting speech into clauses as it passes. They use syntactic and semantic cues to anticipate the end of a clause, and exert special mental effort to 'wrap up' each clause as it comes to an end. What happens to each clause after the work of short-term memory has been completed--that is, after its structure and meaning have been determined? Psycholinguistic research suggests that once a clause has been decoded, its exact wording becomes less and less accessible to memory (1979: 41)." Examination of this process reveals the inaccuracy of referring to this as a passive process.

The father of family #5 used Slobin's (1979) descriptions to characterize the comprehension of his receptive bilingual younger daughter as follows: "When she receptively hears English she is actively processing the meaning, discarding the words in the process and is able to understand and even to communicate understanding, but unable to re-form the words correctly to produce it (Kamada, 1998b)."

The Later born child

The following several factors were felt to significantly contribute to the reduction of English input resulting in impairment of productive bilingual acquisition in later born children as compared with first born or only children. While none of these older sibling cases were balanced bilinguals, all of them were able to produce the ML some of the time. This is in contrast to their younger siblings who were either Japanese monolinguals (#1b,#2b) or receptive in the ML with no observed ability to produce the ML or with only very little ML production, all cases at levels considerably lower than their elder sibling.

Shifts in time, priority, place of residence

A major factor contributing to diminished English input in later born children was less available opportunity and priority of parents by the time of their birth. The quality English time with the ML parent that the older child received while small, the second-born child did not receive in all of the above case families. Parents are younger when their first child is born and they usually have more vitality, fewer responsibilities and fewer financial restraints compared with situations when later born children join the family.

Leopold (1949), famous for his extremely detailed, voluminous and pioneering longitudinal case-study analysis of his first daughter's, Hildegard's, bilingual acquisition, had much less to say about the language acquisition of his second daughter, Karla, who at age five was still a receptive bilingual. Leopold (1949) wrote that Karla's German (the ML) was tremendously narrow and she tended to use some German words in English sentences when speaking to her father which he saw as a kind of appeasement to his style of conversing. Her spoken German was limited to bits and pieces here and there--a few words and infrequent brief sentences. However, it is encouraging to note that his daughter was later able to shift from this "passive" state, as Leopold refers to it, to productive bilingualism when at the age of 19 she visited Germany where she was able to convert her "passive" knowledge of the language into active use. Leopold expressed marvel that her extended early imprinted beginnings, although receptive in her situation, could affirm itself later productively (Leopold, 1957) (See also Romaine, 1989:173; Hakuta, 1986: 45-48).

In the case of family #1, while the mother reported being more settled and having more time to actually plan her second child's language development than with the first child, other factors had more influence on the children's language development such as the place of residence when the children were young. The older child (#1a) was born in America with English as her first language. While the father remained temporarily behind to finish up studies, the mother and child (at age 3;7) returned to Japan. As the mother became busy with a new job, worried about how the child would adjust to a new life and began living with in-laws who could not understand English, it unfortunately became very difficult to continue using English at home. Soon total verbal attrition occurred and the once productive bilingual child soon lost her ability to produce English verbally, but the ability to comprehend most of what was being said remained. Born about a year and a half after the return to Japan, the second child, a son, was about two

when the mother started her own English school. Although monolingual at the time of the interview, he showed motivation and interest in English early. The grandmother reported how the boy would put his ear to the floor above the English school where his mother taught to listen to his mother's voice speaking English. However, the input was too little for a second language to develop and the boy remained monolingual in Japanese.

In family #2, as well, the older child was born into an English speaking home in Japan and then at an early age totally immersed in an English environment in New Zealand where the family remained for two years (from ages 1;6 to 3;6). Upon return to Japan, the child was conversing at peer level in English. For the first year back (until 4;6), the father tried to keep up speaking English with the son, until he finally gave up for a number of reasons (see "ML fathers versus ML mothers," below). As with the child above (#1a), Case #2a's English attrited quickly and he became a receptive bilingual. Later when the second child was born, again similar to the above family #1, the ML input at home had already ceased and the second child (2b) has always been monolingual in Japanese only.

In Family #3, while the older child was for the most part receptive in the ML, the mother stated that her daughter did produce language approximately 20% of the time. Although a mother's assessment of her child may not be a reliable measure, this was in contrast to the younger daughter who was evaluated as being receptive 95% of the time and only productive occasionally, about 5% of the time. Although this was a family with a ML mother (see "ML fathers versus ML mothers" below), the mother worked full time and did not spend a lot of time with the children at home, where instead the children were placed in the care of Japanese babysitters. The older child (12;0) had had four one month trips to USA while the younger (9;9) had had only two such trips. Both children spoke Japanese as their first language and did not produce English regularly until age six, similar to their bilingual mother who was raised by bilingual missionary parents in Japan. The mother ascribes a great deal of influence on the higher proficiency of the older child to personality, with the older child being very positive and outgoing and the younger child being very dependent and attention-seeking. However, perhaps an even larger influence on ML proficiency was the input in the older child who, at the time of the interview, was spending an hour weekly meeting with and reading English with a high school student of dual English/Japanese background--something which the younger child did not do.

By the time of the interview, the older daughter (16;6) of Family #4 had had four overseas stays (2 months at age three, 3 weeks at age seven, 3 weeks at age nine when she went alone on a homestay, and 8 months at age fourteen), whereas the younger boy (7;7) had had only two very short trips of ten days each and one longer trip of eight months from ages five to six. As mentioned above, the older child did not even receive consistent ML input from the step-father until age three, whereas the younger birth-son received ML input from the father from birth. In spite of this, while both children could be termed receptive bilinguals, the older child was heard to be productive in the presence of non-Japanese speaking peers. Again, although not a reliable measure, the parents assessed the older child's English productivity to be 50% of peer level native speaker and the younger son's to be only about 20%.

As was the case for families #1 and #2, the father of Case #5 reported that his second child's first words were all Japanese whereas the older child began speaking English first. The father of family #5 realized that in order to develop productive bilingualism in his second daughter he was required to exert more overt energies to teach and encourage her than with his first daughter where it seemed more like a natural process. Although the father had assumed that #5b's language development might follow #5a's since he has always used English with both children, when they made a trip to the USA when #5b was five, he found that she was not able to make a breakthrough. She relied on her older sister for translation while the American family often also turned to the older sibling to know what the younger child was saying.

Sibling influence

Another factor often inhibiting language input in later born children is the influence of having a sibling around from birth. One of the main outcomes of this situation is the question of the language of use between siblings. M. Yamamoto (1987) reported that ML used as the language of communication between siblings in Japan was a significant factor contributing to productive bilingual acquisition. It was shown in an earlier report of case studies (Kamada, 1998a) that when the older child had already started attending some form of Japanese schooling or had had other play situations outside of the home with other children, it was likely that he/she would have become accustomed to using the majority language, Japanese, in play with other children and would naturally begin to use that language with a non-verbal infant sibling or cousin from the start, even when one or both parents consistently used the ML in the home.

This was especially apparent if the ML speaker was the father and the Japanese speaking parent was the mother (see "ML fathers versus ML mothers," below).

Often when a second child is born, the two siblings will spend a lot of time playing together among themselves instead of having the exclusive ML time with a parent that the first child had had. In family # 5, the older child's dominant language from birth to four years of age was English with occasional Japanese mixed in. However, the father specifically reported that the older sister began playing with her younger sister from birth using Japanese, resulting in Japanese being produced as the younger child's first language. Unlike with the older sibling, to whom the father had considerably more time to play with before the age of three, the second child received much less quality time from her father for ML input. As was the case in all of these five families, the language of use between the siblings was the majority language (Japanese) from the start.

Input of ML schooling and home tutoring

Not only did home tutoring in the ML have a tremendous influence on second language acquisition, but also schooling choices outside of the home tremendously impacted bilingual acquisition. The influence of conscious efforts to improve the linguistic input by exposing the child to specific learning environments was seen to diminish with the second child due to a number of reasons. Often by the time a second child came along, there were more financial restraints on the family compared to when there was only one child.

The older children in Families #1 and #2 were returnees who had resided overseas to the point of acquiring the ML to peer or near-peer level before returning to Japan to suffer total attrition. In both of these families the younger siblings did not have this total immersion period, missing out on the experience of passing through a productive ML phase. While the resulting bilingual proficiency of both the older and younger sibling may appear as receptive bilingualism, I feel there are tremendous differences in the ML proficiency of the two, especially regarding comprehension and potential for future productive bilingualism. (This is an area which will require further testing to reliably validate in future research.)

In family #5, the younger daughter's schooling was far simpler than that of her older sister's. Whereas the younger child only attended a single Japanese kindergarten without other ML instruction, her older sister had the input of many ML rich learning environments from birth to six years old. She had attended an international preschool

from age three during which time the parents prepped her with home English input, as they had been considering a total international education. The mother had taught the elder child English daily at home before they made the decision not to continue with the international school after one year in attendance due to the extra burden of travel time and expense which by the birth of the second child became unfeasible. Another event in the older child's upbringing that the father considered extremely significant was when the English-only-speaking grandmother came over to care for her for four weeks before and after her sister's birth while her mother was hospitalized. On top of all of this extra input which was never allotted for the later born child (5b), the older child also was given private English lessons once weekly for several years to compensate for being pulled out of the international school.

Other Factors Contributing to Receptive Bilingualism

ML fathers versus ML mothers

Out of these five families, three had ML fathers (#2, #4 and #5) and two had ML mothers (#1 and #3), of which both ML mothers worked busy full-time schedules. In other reports of these case studies (Kamada, 1994; 1995a; 1995b; 1997; 1998a), it was reported that in balanced comparative studies of ML fathers and ML mothers, generally the children of ML mothers tended to have higher ML proficiencies than those of ML fathers.

In a study of two balanced families (Kamada, 1994; 1995a) comparing the children of the ML father of Family #2 above with the children of his sister, an ML mother, it was found that while the language proficiency of the two children of the ML father of Family #2 resulted in receptive bilingualism and monolingualism, the child of his sister reached the level of balanced productive bilingualism by age three and a half. The sister was similar to the brother on many factors as follows: raised bilingually in Japan by missionary parents, married to a Japanese spouse, same education level, and presently raising a family in the same Japanese small northern town. (The sister's family was not specifically included as a sixth case family reviewed in this report due to the fact that at the time of the interview the family had only one child, without a younger sibling.) From this study of paternal/maternal ML input on children, it was found that fathers tended to take a more easy-going attitude in not wanting to force language "unnaturally" on their child. Especially in cases where men were, themselves, able to

acquire ML languages later in life after puberty, they did not feel so impassioned later as fathers in ensuring that their child must learn the ML from early childhood.

This was found, however, not to be the case with most ML mothers. Following is a description of the above family #2 and his sister's child (Kamada, 1997), "It was with a passion and fervor upon realizing this danger [of the possibility of her child not acquiring the ML] that the mother totally changed courses of action. Perhaps it is a deep mother instinct in women which helps them overcome even the most challenging difficulties of language communication, often with much self-sacrifice made in ways that men are often either financially or socially unable to make. And perhaps it can also be said that this innate paternal drive to instill a father tongue in offspring is not nearly as strong as is the maternal desire to pass on the language of the mother tongue (7)."

In case #5, while the father hesitated at first with a nit-picky, fastidious approach to stimulate his daughter to produce English, the same was not the case with the mother even though she was Japanese (Refer to Kamada, 1997; 1998b). There are many situations where the father of #5 acknowledged that indeed, he was not nearly as particular as the children's mother, even when it came to correcting their English. For example, when the elder daughter were to say, "I'm eating sandwich", the father would let it go as close enough, whereas his wife would correct it "I'm eating a sandwich." In relating to their children, this same precise attention to detail was reported to be absent in the father of #2, but very fundamental in his sister (Kamada, 1997). Maybe it is just a gut feeling that mothers have; they will naturally grasp any and all means to nurture, along with all their child's other requirements, their language needs.

In the case of the father of family #4, although he always used English in the home with his children, his purpose in using English at home was not based on a linguistic policy, but rather because it was more comfortable for him to do so. He never insisted that his children respond to him in English though and a language relationship was developed early where the children would understand his English, but would respond in Japanese, resulting in receptive bilingualism for both children.

Parental bilinguality versus ML parental monolinguality

Reported elsewhere (Kamada,1997; 1998a; 1998b), another factor found to correlate with minimization of ML input was the bilinguality or attainment over time of bilinguality of a parent. A child from such a family was found to be at greater risk of not acquiring productive bilinguality compared to a child of a monolingual ML speaker.

Why would having a bilingual parent tend to inhibit the child from developing productive bilinguality? As the ML parent in a bicultural family in the foreign country gradually comes to improve his or her proficiency in the majority language (Japanese), there becomes less need for that parent to use only the ML at home. Children understand the degree of their parents' linguistic abilities and respond accordingly. Manaster, et. al. (1998) in their study of Japanese Americans write that while most Issei were deficient in English, the necessity arose for older Nisei (their children) to be able to communicate with their parents in Japanese, the ML, "Because the oldest child provided the bridge between American and Japanese culture, laterborn Nisei were not as likely as their older sibling(s) to assist their parents with the English language. . . . Laterborn children also looked to the older siblings for advice on how to negotiate in and adjust to white society as opposed to looking to their parents. . . (165)."

In the case of family #5, by the time the second child came along, conditions had changed from when her older sibling was small in which the father's ability to easily speak Japanese came to improve progressively over time. With the older child, the father had no choice but to speak English and to expect a reply in English. But by the time of the birth of the second child, the father was consciously trying to improve and use his Japanese. At this point it was no longer unnatural for him to use Japanese to express himself and if spoken to in Japanese, a Japanese reply was only natural. Thus when his second child struggled to communicate with the father and Japanese words and sentences emerged, the father often not only found himself allowing Japanese, but also using Japanese himself.

In family #1, #2, and #3 where the parents were already balanced bilinguals before the birth of the first child, the results were even more evident. In families #1 and #2, the older siblings were returnee children who had had overseas residence. During this period overseas, in the home, the ML parent used only English (the majority language in the country where they resided: in America for three-and-a-half-years and in New Zealand for two years, respectively). Later, upon return to Japan, the once productive elder siblings later became receptive bilinguals when the majority language shifted to Japanese and the family language adjusted accordingly. The fate was even worse for the younger siblings who never had had the overseas residence--they were never able to develop enough skills to be anything more than monolingual.

The bilingual mother of family #3, too, admitted that she often found herself unwilling to let go of communication between her daughters just for the sake of

linguistic development when they were better able to express their immediate and important feelings in Japanese instead of the ML. The result was receptive bilingualism, with only occasional productive second language use heard with the older daughter in situations where foreigners were present.

Preventing and Ameliorating the Problem with ML Literacy

All ten subjects were attending Japanese public schools at the time of the interviews. Although all of the parents tried in various ways to instil bilinguality in their children, some (as in Family #2) gave up and decided to leave the task to the school system to handle when the child was to enter English classes in middle school. What seemed to matter more, however, was the instruction that went on in the home prior to middle school.

When interviewed, only the parents of families #3 and #5 were incorporating ML literacy instruction in the home, and the high-school-age older daughter of #4 had been receiving literacy instruction at school, now for the fifth year. This input appeared to have an advantageous effect when compared with the two monolinguals and two attriters of families #1 and #2 who, for the most part, did not receive ML literacy instruction (except for #1a who had just two months previously begun to attend middle school English classes). In a report of 42 cases (Kamada, 1998), it was concluded that ML literacy instruction in the home by parents served as an extremely important factor contributing to bilingual acquisition. It was summarized as follows:

Sixteen of the [42] cases received at least some ML literacy instruction from their parents. All of these maturing bi-literate subjects became either developing bilinguals or balanced bilinguals, with two borderline active bilinguals, elucidating the strength of the ML literacy training as an important component in the total picture of bilingual acquisition. Contrarily, out of the remaining 26 cases who did not receive ML literacy training at home, over half met with shortcomings, in which at the time of the interviews, six cases ended up as passive bilinguals who could not speak the ML, two cases mixed and switched codes frequently, and six other cases remained monolingual in Japanese only (44-45).

ML literacy instruction was revealed to contribute to productive ML skills in receptive bilingual children as well. Case #5b, while receptive for the most part, was

taught to read English and was presently (while still kindergarten age) progressing at the first grade level in English reading. It is significant to note that Case #5b's oral English reading was virtually her only English production. Reading contributed to her English comprehended vocabulary, although at this point she was still reluctant to try making sentences other than two- or three-word phrases or short sentences.

Many parents, also themselves not bilingual until adulthood don't feel a tremendous pressure to push productive bilingualism early. As with Leopold's younger daughter who remained receptive until adulthood when she made a trip to Germany where her ability to produce German proficiently quickly blossomed, parents of receptive bilinguals should take inspiration that such a switch is not unrealistic if the correct circumstances are provided. Receptive bilingualism does not have to be perceived as failure in bilingual development; contrarily it is part of the means of getting there, a stage along the way to becoming a productive bilingual at a later time for many. Often it is simply a shift of environment, need, the stimulation of motivation, or a new found friend that can ignite the beginnings of a process in which a person's long nurtured second language ceases to remain silent.

References

- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Diebold, A. R. (1964). Incipient bilingualism. In Hymes, D. Ed. *Language in Culture and Society*. NY: Harper and Row.
- Hakuta, K.(1986). *Mirror of Language: The debate on bilingualism*. NY: Basic Books.
- Hamers, J. & Blanc, M. (1989). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Reprinted in 1969, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.]
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
- Kamada, L. (1994). Part 1. Paternal vs. maternal non-native language influence on third generation residents. *Bilingual Japan*. 3:6, 11-13.
- Kamada, L. (1995a). Part 2. Paternal vs. maternal non-native language influence on third generation residents. *Bilingual Japan*. 4:1, 10-11.
- Kamada, L. (1995b). Report on bilingual family case studies in Japan: Significant factors affecting bilinguality. *Studies in the Humanities and Economics*. 30:3, 113-129.
- Kamada, L. (1995c). Bilingual family case studies, Vol. 1. 「ある家庭におけるバイリンガリズム , その 1」 *Monographs on bilingualism, No. 3*. Bilingualism National Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.
- Kamada, L. (1997). Bilingual family case studies, Vol. 2. 「ある家庭におけるバイリンガリズム , その 2」 *Monographs on bilingualism, No. 5*. Bilingualism National Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.

- Kamada, L. (1998a). Pursuing a bilingual education in Japan: Case studies report. *Studies in the Humanities and Economics*. 33:3, 23-47.
- Kamada, L. (1998b). (Part 3) Differing bilingual outcomes of two sisters: Nurture/nature factors resulting in receptive bilingualism. *Bilingual Japan*. Vol. 7, No. 5.
- Leopold, W. (1949). *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: A Linguist's Record. Volume 4: Diary from Age 2*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern U. Press.
- Manaster, G., Rhodes, C., Marcus, M., & Chan, J. (1998). The role of birth order in the acculturation of Japanese Americans. *Psychologia*, 41: 3, 155-170.
- Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. NY: Basil Blackwell.
- Slobin, D. I. (1979). *Psycholinguistics*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foreman and Co.
- Williams, J. D. & Snipper G. C. (1990). *Literacy and Bilingualism*. NY: Longman.
- Yamamoto, M. (1987). Significant factors for raising children bilingually in Japan. *The Language Teacher*. Vol. 11, No. 10, pp. 17-23.