Chapter 1 explains the background of this study. Today, the international/interethnic marriage has increased, and the children who acquire two languages simultaneously as their L1 have increased. Previous studies tend to focus on bilingualism of the children who are in the first language acquisition. So the lack is the language use of the next stage, preschool and school age children. Therefore, this study considers it from the syntactic, sociolinguistic, and educational aspects.

Chapter 2 describes the methodology of this study. The four families’ natural conversations were recorded at home in Vancouver for seven hours for analysis. The children were born and raised in Vancouver, the English speaking city. The four go to English elementary school and the two under school age stay home. The mothers are Japanese and their L1 is Japanese. The fathers are Canadian and their L1 is English. All parents adopt the “one parent-one language approach: OPOL” (Barron-Hauwaert, 2004).

Chapter 3 “Syntactic structure: Towards the elucidation of production of intrasentential code-switching” considers the syntactic aspects. An intrasentential code-switching (CS) is observed frequently when those who speak more than two languages talk to each other. Then, what kind of CS sentences those children construct?

CS has been studied since 1970s. In 1970s, it has been studied from selected grammatical aspects (ex. Pfaff, 1979). In 1980s, its syntactic structure started to be focused on. According to Poplack (1980), CS occurs at points where juxtaposition of two languages does not violate a syntactic rule of either language (Equivalence Constraint). This implies structural symmetry between the languages involved (Jacobson 1998), but contrary to this position, Joshi (1985) suggests structural asymmetry, one language supplying the main grammatical frame (Matrix Language: ML)
and the other some content elements (Embedded Language: EL). Based on Joshi (1985), Myers-Scotton (1992) proposes “the Matrix Language Frame model”, stating that word order is that of ML and that all system morphemes having grammatical relations external to their head constituent come from ML. Also, introduced is “EL Island”, where EL phrases are well-formed in EL. Later, referring to Levelt (1989), “the 4-M model” and “the Abstract level model (Myers-Scotton & Jake, 1995, 2001)” are proposed, which indicate the language processing how a speaker’s intention appears on the surface. As such, the previous studies have shown what a CS unit is and how these units are mixed to construct a CS sentence. However, why CS occurs and what is EL have not been answered. Therefore, we analyzed 1) to indicate CS features those bilingual children made, and 2) to consider why CS occurs.

As CS features of those bilingual children, we found out that 1) the proportion of CS sentences is only 4.1%; 2) the CS pattern is mostly ‘ML: Japanese, EL: English’, 3) EL occurs more than EL Island; 4) many of EL and EL Islands are noun or noun clause; 5) those nouns and noun clauses are semantically associated with EL language, such as nouns of EL cultures. These results explain why intrasentential CS occurs. Bilinguals do not have every word neutral to two languages. A word which is associated only with EL language appears on the surface even when a sentence is constructed with ML language. This results a code-switching sentence.

Chapter 4 “Language choice: Communication strategy with two languages” considers the sociolinguistic aspects. Bilinguals choose languages consciously and switch them during a conversation. Then, what kind of factors make the simultaneous bilingual children choose and switch languages?

Considering external utterance situations, bilinguals choose languages (Fishman, 1965). In family conversations where two languages are used, a speaker chooses languages according to whom a listener is (ex. Yamamoto, 2001). Besides, bilinguals switch languages during a conversation when an interlocutor speaks the same two languages. Previous studies have analyzed why they switch languages through the conversation analysis (ex. Grim, 2008). However, they have not analyzed preschool and school age children. Considering the lack of previous studies, we need to find out 1) factors which influence on their language choices (other than a listener), and 2) factors which influence on their code-switching.

First, we found out that our children chose languages according to a listener as well as other
conversation participants. Second, a code-switching occurs to maintain a coherency of a context and to strengthen conversational functions. As such, for a good communication with others, simultaneous bilingual children take advantage of two languages' competences.

Chapter 5 “Influences of family conversation patterns on minority language competences of children” considers the educational aspects. Even children started to learn two languages simultaneously, a minority language is generally behind. Besides, even in a similar environment, each child’s minority language competence develops differently. Then, what kind of factors at home influence those bilingual children’s minority language development?

For the parents having different L1, the one parent-one language approach (OPOL) is popular. To relate this approach to the children’s minority language development, the previous studies indicated that a minority-language-speaking-parent should talk to his/her child(ren) in the minority language (ex. Yamamoto, 2001; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004), and that the parent should teach the minority language to his/her child(ren) and make the minority language use environment (ex. Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 2004; Mishima, 1999). However, the previous studies have not examined children’s whole communicative activity. Also, they have not examined children’s utterances. Therefore, we analyzed how language use patterns at home are related to children’s minority language competence.

Based on the Japanese competence judged by their utterances as well as their school attendance, six children were grouped into three. The direct reception of Japanese is the same among those children, since all parents adapt OPOL. However, the indirect reception of Japanese is different, which seems to contribute to the minority language development: the school age children whose parents used Japanese regularly developed the Japanese competence more; the children whose mother and sibling used Japanese developed the Japanese competence more. Besides, though some mothers correct the children’s linguistic errors, no influences are observed on the Japanese competence.

To develop a minority language competence, for preschool children, OPOL is enough, especially when the parent who is always with children is a minority language speaker. However, for school age children, it is required that home be a minority language environment.

Finally, Chapter 6 “Conclusion” summarizes this study and shows the need to study on simultaneous bilingual children’s language use in their daily life and in the adolescence.