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BILINGUAL EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN THE FRAMES OF CROSSCULTURAL APPROACH

Abstract. Comparative studying of a monolinguist and bilingualism contains to the traditional understanding of what is a crucial problem of human development: submission of biological processes psychosocial, i.e., ability to subordinate consciously biologically induced behavior consciously directed activity. Some researchers with evidence show that in the period of the childhood information of conscious self-control the dialectics of communication with others and with itself is central. The process of differentiation and reintegration of a live organism transforms what in the childhood was the social regulated, interpersonal operations, changing their structure, functions, and maintenance in individual and adjustable intellectual operations, bringing in them personal coloring. L. Vygotsky claimed that language is central in this transformation, carrying out both interpersonal communicative function, and the self-regulating intrapersonal. L. Vygotsky also claimed that the language which is initially acquired by the child is not some tiny version of grammar which is independent of a context; instead this particular means of communication created by initial communications between parents and the child. In a child development language is an integral part of processes of differentiation and reintegration into new situational forms; the created forms include "others," "language for others," "themselves," "language for themselves," etc. Language is a process and a product. During joint activity between parents and the child, these phenomena gain unique sense and character in the image. Individual consciousness in the basis is, thus, a product of their joint activity, the structure of functions, contents which the indirect speech act.
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Bilingual education of children is a common goal for parents, educators and researchers. Parents and teachers “want to do it right” on the basis of practical necessity. Scientists also want to understand bilingualism from the standpoint of general principles of human development to complete theoretical bases. In this article the interests of three groups are being discussed based on the fruitful works by L. Vygotsky and A. Luria.

A comparative study of monolingualism and bilingualism contains a challenge for traditional understanding of what is the core task of human development. This is believed to be the subordination of biological processes to psychosocial ones which means an ability to deliberately subordinate biologically induced behavior to consciously directed activity. In philosophical literature consciously directed activity is referred to as “a will”, however in psychological literature it is defined as “a conscious self-regulation”. In our work we focus on a special definition.

A number of studies clearly show that during childhood the communication dialogue with others and with oneself is the core of conscious self-regulation [1-3]. The guide for this study is the fundamental law by Vygotsky which says all higher mental functions (speech, thinking, memory, perception, self-control and others) appear inter-psychically and in ontogeny process they are differentiated and reintegrated by
individual’s conscious activity, thus becoming intra-psychic phenomenon. The process of differentiation and reintegration of a living organism transforms from socially regulated and interpersonal operations of childhood period, changing their structure, functions and content into individually regulated mental operations of an adulthood, introducing personal coloring in them. L. Vygotsky argued that language is a core element in this transformation which performs both interpersonal communicative function and self-regulating intrapersonal functions. L. Vygotsky also argued that language initially assimilated by a child is not a miniature version of grammar that is independent of its context. But rather it is a special communication tool created through the initial connections between parents and their child.

Therefore, Vygotsky’s understanding of a language is based on the fact that it initially functions as an emotional, preverbal psychosocial image. In a child development a language is an integral part of differentiation and reintegration processes in new situations. Such new situations include the following forms as “others”, “language for others”, “myself”, “a language for myself” and so on. In this way a language is both a process and a product. In the course of parents-children joint activity these phenomena acquire a special meaning and image features. Therefore individual consciousness in its essence is the product of joint activity and the structure of functions and content which are mediated by a speech act [4].

Nevertheless being unstable linguistic means are always present in sensations and actions manifesting themselves precisely in these mutual ties. Parents always adapt them to the circumstances and overall development of a child and children adapt to them in order to understand what is happening around. Language “stands out” for a child and parents fixing their attention on this means of communication. This ontogenetically primary language acts as an interpersonal gesture communication which is fully functional before the process of differentiation and reintegration changes it into a means which plays both a social role (directed at others) and a personal role (self-directed). Ultimately, speech is a psychosocial means of communication and conscious self-regulation for all.

According to L. Vygotsky “personality” and “language” appear as interrelated parts of the same cognitive structures. They are not separate features of consciousness as rationalist thinkers have proclaimed. They cannot be described by the theory of social learning which treats them as a mirror image of initial social relations. As in the case of all higher mental functions, personality and language evolve from social relations but not as previous factor. Throughout its development language and personality are determined by both social environment and individuality. Consciousness is a perceived being and not a mechanical reflection of social data as such. In addition, according to Vygotsky, even in adulthood language and personality never completely differ. The nature of these phenomena is more evident in early stages of ontogenesis when it means to act. Nevertheless, speaking and acting remain interconnected parts of psychosocial unity even in adulthood although they acquire a certain functional autonomy in the process of normal development.

Placing language into psychosocial dynamics between parents and a child, Vygotsky also avoided the popular but naive view of language as a culture transmitter which is independent of psychosocial realities. Language is a tool for practical solution of certain tasks. And this idea is most clearly traced in the bilingual process of raising children. But first let us place the issue of bilingualism in theoretical and research context returning to the works of Vygotsky and Luria.

When language is equated with grammar and grammar is equated with communication as some parents and teachers do it means that they misunderstand the process-productive nature of language. Although the development of such entities as “syntax” and “phonetics” is of theoretical importance especially for teachers of linguistics and grammar, an approach that understands language from the viewpoint of various pragmatic roles that it plays is more acceptable for our purposes. This functional approach is very popular today [5, 6] because it allows to trace both thinking formation and language communicative roles simultaneously as dynamically related processes. Traditionally, language and personality were studied as unrelated entities. According to A. Luria and other modern scholars, language, personality and interpersonal relations constitute a single unity. The main thing, according to A. Luria’s point of view, is that communication tools acquisition, including gestures, vocabulary, syntax, discursive strategy and psychosocial values provides a person with an opportunity to become a speaking, thinking and self-regulating personality who is able to communicate through external speech with others and with himself. The gradual acquisition and ability to manage communicative means of social environment enables a child to consciously regulate his external and internal cognitive actions in the end. It is not grammar acquisition
but rather the mastery of functional or pragmatic roles that language plays, provides a child with an opportunity to transform himself into a self-controlled personality.

A. Luria's research suggests that child's ability development to displace biological actions by conscious self-regulation depends on mastering various functions that language does. Two main points should be noted especially. Firstly, A. Luria does not refer to mastery of linguistic functions as mature speech literacy. He means perfect mastering of basic cognitive infrastructure that occurs when using a specific instrument called a language. The process of acquiring basic cognitive infrastructure occurs as a sequence of steps from joint parent-child regulations to its self-improvement. The ability of a child to consciously use this cognitive system does not mean that he has already mastered all the language capabilities. This means that since a child can now control basic cognitive infrastructure, that is a mental structure underlying it, he is able to consciously play an active role in mastering knowledge about things properties. Mastering cognitive infrastructure allows a child to consciously understand things for himself.

Another important assumption by A. Luria is that mature forms of cognitive development are “dependent” on mastering various roles that a language plays. According to A. Luria, normal cognitive growth is dependent on parents' awareness which with the help of communication tools such as verbal, gestural, tactile, leads a child through well-defined areas of immediate development. Refusal to use psychosocial context of this kind leads to a slow acquisition of basic cognitive infrastructure. Because of communication lack between parents and children these days which leads to limited mastering of basic infrastructure, cognitive future of such children becomes predictable but in a rather gloomy light.

In order to thoroughly study self-regulation nature the studies of children with developmental delays is supplemented, especially those who acquire two languages at birth and have a well-developed communicative orientation. According to some researchers [8, 9], bilingualism leads to negative or neutral consequences in cognitive development. Other researchers suggest that bilingualistic means of speech are cognitively developing. The central issue of this study is to elicit positivity, neutrality or negativity of bilingual education influence on child’s cognitive development. In order to answer this question the description of roles by A. Luria should be considered. These functions are played by language in the development of child’s cognitive activity.

Four basic functions of language. Although there are hundreds of pragmatic functions of a language used by adults in various psychosocial contexts, in this work we are only interested in its cognitive-developing function. According to A. Luria (1959) there are four fundamental functions of a language and their acquisition generates cognitive infrastructure which carries out conscious self-control over all higher mental processes. In the course of their acquisition the following functions are distinguished:

1. Communicative function which allows a person to mediate reality with other people or with himself. The acquisition of this function provides an opportunity to convey their communicative intentions and to be understandable by others.

2. Reference function which allows a person to use various semiotic signs to attract his or someone else's attention to this phenomenon. The acquisition of this function gives him the opportunity to understand those objects, ideas, feelings, opinions that can be defined by words, gestures, discursive style, cultural customs, a whole series of semiotic forms and many others.

3. Generalizing function which allows a person to abstract, interpret, conceptualize and classify his experience. The acquisition of this function provides him with an opportunity to realize his past experience to interpret the current situation and generalize it in new situations.

4. Self-regulating function which allows a person to consciously control his cognitive processes. The acquisition of this function enables an individual to plan his present and future activities, make a speech for himself and others, get involved into an internal dialogue with a goal of self-regulation.

A. Luria discovered that when a child first uses a communicative function and finds out that certain intentions can be transferred to others, he starts communicating through cries and gestures, eventually using a whole set of semiotic means. But a child does not use communicative function independently from other functions. Instead, a child at this age uses a primitive, undifferentiated system that is closely related to external social experience use. This means this is related to whom he communicates, to a voice intonation, to gestures, to a child’s acting place, to the context of message, to his emotional dynamics of a psychosocial image. A. Luria notes that the main language functions are acquired similarly to any other
higher mental functions. Thus they must be differentiated from primitive unity and reintegrated into a mature unity [10].

In order to facilitate this process, parents and other educators should involve a child of pre-verbal age into a world of touches, sounds and gestures which doesn’t have any original separation of functions. The main concern for parents and educators should be upbringing of a mature, self-regulating system where basic functions, while remaining parts of the whole, are simultaneously clearly differentiated, developing child’s conscious use of each function independently. A. Luria notes that there is continuity in transition process from immature to mature state with invariance of initial features arising at each stage of its evolution.

**Characteristics of four main stages of self-regulation.** The heuristic thrust of A. Luria’s research is expressed in a following proposition that transition of cognitive control from external social experience (i.e. verbal instructions from adults) to internal psychological control (i.e. voluntary control through self-instruction) is a necessary condition for all higher cognitive processes.

Based on ethnographic studies, clinical observations and control experiments, A. Luria describes four stages of transition from an externally controlled system to a self-regulating system. Each new stage is associated with strengthening of conscious control over language functions. He suggests the main age parameters of normal mastery of each stage and describes their characteristics with a great accuracy in the following manner:

1. At the age of 10-24 months old the reference and communicative function is more developed than generalizing and self-regulating. Simple instructions encourage a child to take an appropriate action. An automatically preset action outweighs the effect of opposing verbal instructions. If there is a short period of time between instruction and its execution then a memory trace to verbal instructions tends to be erased.

2. At the age of 30-36 months old an active manipulation of communicative and reference functions and some use of generalizing and controlling functions are being developed. A large degree of general conscious control can inhibit motor activity although by adults’ encouragement a child starts responding appropriately to an indication that is semantically more complex than mere motivation. A verbal-indicative role in this case is fulfilled not by one word but by connections and synthesis of words entering into utterance sphere.

3. At the age of 40-54 months old a child controls his communicative and reference functions and is able to generalize rather complicated semantic and logical problems with the help of a self-dialogue provided that it occurs aloud. At the same time, a silent self-dialogue leads to arbitrary self-directed behavior.

4. At the age of 60-84 months old a child completely differentiates and reintegrates all four language functions enabling conscious self-regulation. A child can now be productively involved into a silent self-dialogue and is able to silently plan and anticipate future actions. His behavior is now consistent with his self-dialogue aloud and inside.

**Discovery A. Luria.** A. Luria’s discovery suggests that communicative and reference functions acquisition, leading ultimately to meaningful speech development, occurs faster than child’s self-control development over their own motor apparatus. Therefore, it is easier to a toddler to respond verbally to an instruction than to consciously perform a simple motor action. And at the same time it’s important for parents and teachers because the faster communicative and reference functions development is, the faster general cognitive control is achieved. By writing down verbal instructions of an adult to a child and the children’s answers, A. Luria checked his assumptions and received the following results:

1. A child on his first development stage which is at the age of approximately one, the reference function is manifested almost on a par with the communicative function. A young toddler discovers that things have names and that they can be referenced from his communication with his parents. Although a child knows object names which are lying on the floor in front of him, however, when an adult asks to give him a certain object, this child doesn’t fetch the right object but the one closest or the one that grasps his attention. Although the adult’s instruction causes motor action, the result is likely to be arbitrary. In another experiment of this type, a child was given a rubber ball with the indication “to squeeze it whenever light is lit” and “stop compressing when the light is off”. At the first stage, a child who once started to squeeze does not pay attention to the light any further and it is quite difficult for an experimenter to make him stop even when the light is off.
At the first action stage a child can be directed by an adult but the results are likely to be unpredictable. According to A. Luria, this is because a child at this stage does not have internal controls. Self-regulation through verbal means, although observed in a latent form at this early stage, nevertheless manifests itself in a clearly defined form starting from 4th stage. Cognitive control at this stage is inter-psyche.

2. A child on his second development stage, where he uses more fully internalized communicative and reference functions, begins to distinguish between generalization and self-regulation and also acquires some self-regulation function. Such child, about three years old, is put in front of two light bulbs, red and green and he also holds a ball in his hands. This time a child is given an instruction “to squeeze when the red light comes out” and “do not squeeze when the green light comes out”. For a child on the second stage, the result is adequate only if an adult gives instructions. If a child instructs himself quietly or silently he squeezes the ball in response to both instructions “to squeeze” and “do not squeeze”. The very act of speaking leads to his motor systems activation which means that biology has yet to be subordinated to psychosocial control which is conscious self-regulation. On the one hand, it is easier for such a child to control his speech than to self-regulate his cognitive-motor system. On the other hand, the obvious reason for this, according to A. Luria, is that generalizing and self-regulating functions are not yet completely differentiated from the primitive system and reintegrated into a more mature system. Therefore, cognitive control at this stage is partly inter-psyche and partly intra-psyche.

3. A child on the third stage, at the age of about 4 years old, differentiates and reintegrates four basic functions. There is less contradiction between what will be done and what is done. External speech and behavior are now more consistent. Such child has a better control over his own cognitive processes. Nevertheless, it is important for parents and teachers especially who are inclined to silence a child who is always talking to himself, to keep in mind that a child involved into an external self-talk gives directions aloud, directing his own actions. Suppression of a child’s statements leads to arbitrary actions. Constant warnings like “stop talking to yourself” can lead to a delay in mastering conscious self-regulation[7]. The ability to consciously control one’s cognitive processes and actions represents a new direction of development within the system, even if self-regulation has not yet led to the development of internal speech. Compared with the second stage of development, the child, who is in the third stage, has already acquired a sufficiently conscious control.

4. A child on the fourth stage, approximately at the age of 6 years, the child responds appropriately to the instructions of others and to self-instruction. He can perform tasks of complex semantic and logical content, solving these problems through a silent dialogue. The tendency to conduct a self-dialogue aloud remains for several more years, but when it is necessary, he can solve problems silently. A. Luria describes such a child as having already mastered four language functions and creating his own personality.

The movement from the primitive undifferentiated system of cognition and communication to mature differentiated and integrated does not mean that a child is now mature in all respects or completely self-motivated. It only means that a child now has a cognitive infrastructure that allows him to consciously deal with the world of experience. Parents, educators, teachers of all kinds should still teach a child. A child in the fourth stage has a cognitive system that provides him with an opportunity to meet his teachers but they still need to carefully guide a child through his nearest development zone. And in the process of acquiring cognitive infrastructure and in subsequent education, educators should be aware of indirect nature of a child’s mental growth.

However, not all researchers accept the view by L. Vygotsky and A. Luria on the issues of language and consciousness. There are both obvious support [18, 21] and an obvious negation [8]. It is important to say that we are confident in the heuristic value of the theses and the research methods by L. Vygotsky and A. Luria.

**Principle of M. Grammont “one parent – one language”**. There are many ways of raising children’s bilingual ability such as learning a second language after mastering their mother tongue’s grammar structure as well as early diving or later immersion and many others. Each of these methods is rational and each of them is used by parents and teachers as well as by researchers everywhere. Excellent examples of this sometimes confusing content of the study can be found in works [10, 11]. Our attention is drawn to one type of bilingual experience when a child is brought up in the environment of two languages at the same time. There is a huge amount of researches devoted to the “one parent – one language” approach and at the same time to bilingual education of children. We consider the best works in this sphere.
It seems that a French linguist D. Ronier was the first one to describe linguistic results of this approach. In 1908, when his German-speaking wife was pregnant, they decided to educate their future child in Franco-German bilingualism. They received the following advice from their colleague M. Grammont who observed them and said “Do not teach a child anything. It is enough to talk to him in one of the languages he needs to learn as it becomes necessary. The point is that each language should be personified in different person. Thus you should always speak to him in French and his mother only in German and never change roles. Only in this case a child will start speaking in two languages without noticing it and without putting much effort” [12, 13].

This instruction was carried out by D. Ronier with precision. The results were exactly the same as predicted by M. Grammont. The child, his name was Louis, distinguished two languages by the age of two. For example, he checked words with French and German pronunciation until he could determine that “that’s how Papa says and this is how Mom says”. This testing period rarely lasted longer than a week. And as soon as the child distinguished one word from another he did not have any further doubts about their correct pronunciation.

In pronunciation the boy had the following achievements: at the age of 3 years 5 months, Louis accurately pronounced the phonemes of both languages. However, according to the monolingualistic French and German norms this is the lowest level of the norm. In his lexical development, as reported by D. Ronier, Louis had a great propensity for German probably because he communicated with his mother more. However, this imbalance existed for a short time. At the age of 3 years 8 months, Louis deliberately studied words and utterances in both languages simultaneously. If he knew a word or phrase in only one language, he was actively trying to find its equivalent in the other one. After this period, there was no longer any obvious confusion of two languages. Louis spoke both languages as native by the age of 3 years 10 months.

D. Ronier’s observations were confirmed by numerous studies [4] and others. For example, in a classical study V. Leopold (1939-1949) observed his daughter Hildegard’s development who was brought up in German and English according to Grammont’s principle “one parent - one language”. An amazing discovery was made which is a weakening of the connection between phonetics of a word and its meaning. This phenomenon is rarely noticed in monolingualistic children of this age. From the age of 2 years 11 months Hildegard could tell the same story in both languages. Like Louis, by the age of 3 years 7 months Hildegard easily accepted new names for objects and events already known in one language and was actively looking for an equivalent in the other language. Another interesting results were carried out by Imedadze [14] who observed his daughter Natasha's language development, who was also brought up in two language environment Russian and Georgian according to M. Grammont’s principle. Natasha's achievements were similar to what happened to Louis and Hildegard. But some following differences were observed that the conscious search for equivalent words and phrases in another language that D. Ronie and V. Leopold observed in the third quarter of the third year, N. Imedadze stated in the first quarter of the third year. These differences are explained by the difference in a research criteria choice. Both linguists Ronnie and Leopold paid attention to linguistic criterion and a psychologist N. Imedadze looked into to cognitive criterion.

Notwithstanding the problem of criteria, from observations of Louis, Hildegard and Natasha when a child is brought up according to M. Grammont’s principle “one parent - one language” then following three conclusions can be drawn as follows 1) two languages are acquired in a similar manner and act as one; 2) there is no explicit confusion of these two languages at the level of ordinary usage when differentiation of primitive communicative system and reintegration into two different languages takes place and 3) from a very young age these children acquire a desire to use all possible functions of a language.

The process is identical for a “monolingual” and “bilingual” child. But, of course, the conditions of representation differ which create different self-regulating speech conventions. Ultimately, as Vygotsky argued, the use of language is an integral part of psychosocial context.

The tools structure used for internal self-dialogue remains an important research issue. However, we found that external self-dialogue in bilingual children is clearly differentiated into two different types of speaking at the third stage. This discovery suggests the dispute between D. Dornier, V. Leopold and M. Imedadze as to when the two languages are differentiated cannot be solved solely on the basis of linguistic observation results. Recognizing the difference between Asian and Indo-European languages
combinations used in this study it should be noted that the discontinuity and continuity of phonetic and syntactic development are similar to those found by D. Rognier, V. Leopold, M. Imadadze and others. However, regardless of age and gender differences we could not find among those bilingually educated children those who would clearly differentiate linguistic means into two types of communication with other people at stage 2 that is when others would direct self-regulation. We also did not find a single child who would have done this unconsciously while being at stage 3 that is when self-dialogue is aloud aimed at self-regulation. It follows that a more complete evaluation of these dynamics occurs due to consideration of a language as a process and a result.

The processes that facilitate cognitive development acceleration are described elsewhere. In this study, we found out that bilingual values are not negative or neutral. Rather in a development process they play a significant role as cognitive accelerators.
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КРОСС-КУЛЬТУРНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПОЛИЯЗЫЧНОГО ВОСПИТАНИЯ

Аннотация. Сравнительное изучение монолингвизма и билингвизма содержит вызов традиционному пониманию того, что является стержневой проблемой человеческого развития: подчинение биологических процессов психосоциальным, т.е. способность сознательно подчинять биологически побуждаемое поведение сознательно направленной деятельности. Ряд исследований с очевидностью показывает, что в период детства в становлении сознательной саморегуляции центральной является диалектика общения с другими и самим собой. Процесс дифференциации и реинтеграции живого организма трансформирует то, что в детстве было социально-регулированными, межличностными операциями, изменяя их структуру, функции и содержание в индивидуально-регулируемые умственные операции, внося в них личностную окраску. Л. Вygотский утверждал, что язык является центральным в этой трансформации, выполняя как межличностную коммуникативную функцию, так и саморегулирующую внутривидную. Л. Вygотский также утверждал, что язык, первоначально связанный с ребенка, не является некоторой миниатюрной версией грамматики, которая независима от контекста; скорее это специальное средство общения, созданное путем первоначальных связей между родителями и ребенком. В развитии ребенка язык является неотъемлемой частью процессов дифференциации и реинтеграции в новые ситуационные формы; сформированные формы включают "других", "язык для других", "себя", "язык для себя" и т.д. Язык является, таким образом, процессом, продуктом в ходе совместной деятельности между родителями и ребенком и приобретают особый смысл и характер в образе. Индивидуальное сознание в своей основе является, таким образом, продуктом их совместной деятельности, структуры функций, содержания, которые опосредованы речевым актом.
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