Michelle Gerber

"But Opa, I want to kümmer mich um die snails" – Navigieren plurilingualer Interaktionen

Die Studie erforscht, wie ein simultan mehrsprachig aufwachsendes Kind im Vorschulalter Erwachsenen-Kind-Interaktionen navigiert, und konzentriert sich dabei auf die Mikroebene des individuellen sprachlichen Ressourcenmanagements in situ. Ergründet wird, wie das Kind durch „languaging" in mehrsprachigen Kontexten innerhalb der Familie Bedeutung konstruiert und vermittelt. Mittels der konversationsanalytischen Methode der sequentiellen Analyse wird seine sprachliche Ressourcenwahl in videografierten, transkribierten Interaktionen untersucht. Die Datenanalyse zeigt, dass das Kind in Abhängigkeit der pragmatischen Erfordernisse der Kommunikationssituation, seines sprachlichen Wissens und seines wachsenden soziolinguistischen Bewusstseins die sprachlichen Ressourcen identifiziert, die sich zur Verwirklichung seiner kommunikativen Ziele am besten eignen.

Schlagwörter: Languaging, Agency, Plurilingualismus, Mehrsprachenerwerb, Interaktion

"But Opa, I want to kümmer mich um die snails" – Navigating plurilingual interactions

The present study examines how a preschool-age multiple language learner navigates adult-child-interactions focusing on the micro-level of individual linguistic resource management in situ. It addresses the research question of how this child constructs and conveys meaning through "languaging" in familial plurilingual communication contexts. The conversation analysis method of sequential analysis is used to examine the child`s linguistic choices in videotaped, transcribed interactions. Data analysis reveals that the child identifies the linguistic resources best suited to achieve her communicative objectives as a function of the pragmatic needs of the communicative situation, her linguistic knowledge and her growing sociolinguistic awareness.

Keywords: Languaging, agency, plurilingualism, plurilingual language acquisition, interaction

1 Theoretical framework

The experience of multiple language exposure and use from birth affects plurilingual children´s language behavior, i.e. their languaging (= using language resources at their exposal), in a myriad of ways (see de Houwer 2009, 46-47, 145; Wei & García 2014, 10). In the course of simultaneous contact with and acquisition of two or more languages and the associated disproportionality of monoglot language encounters compared to children growing up monolingually, the linguistic knowledge of children with bi- and plurilingual first language acquisition (BFLA[1]) tends to develop asymmetrically and at times asynchronously,

---

[1] Following de Houwer, the abbreviations BFLA and MFLA are used to refer to children with bi- and plurilingual and with monolingual first language acquisition respectively (see 2009, 4).

i.e. at different speeds (see Tracy 2020, 189-190, 196; Unsworth 2016, 103-104, 110). Contrary to an idealized notion of linguistically identical competence in two or more languages, simultaneous bi- and plurilingualism cannot be equated with double or multiple individual language proficiency because "a single person does not lead two lives" (de Houwer 2009, 310) (see Tracy 2014, 31). As the linguistic input is spread across two or more languages, BFLAs are exposed to an uneven distribution of opportunities in life, „sich in jeder seiner Sprachen mit entsprechenden Themenbereichen zu beschäftigen" (to deal with various subject areas in each of their languages) (Keim & Tracy 2006, 226) (see de Houwer 2009, 194-195, 310; Tracy 2020, 189; Unsworth 2016; 103-104).

1.1   Languaging and plurilingual competence

BFLAs develop useful strategies to navigate this dynamic state of a constantly changing disequilibrium of plurilinguistic know-how when languaging to construct and negotiate meaning in social interaction (see Coste, Moore & Zarate 2009, 19-20; de Houwer 2009, 242). As Pennycook puts it, favoring the notion of "language as doing" (2010, 2) means to view language as a practice, "as an activity rather than a structure, as something we do" by selecting appropriate resources from our semiotic repertoire to tailor our messages to specific audiences in specific contexts (see LaScotte & Tarone 2019, 96; García 2018, 47). Languaging both structures, and is structured by the social space in which communicative acts are embedded, rendering it a dynamic, open-ended process (see Wei & García 2014, 8). Thus, adopting the term 'languaging' highlights BFLAs´ agentive potential in interacting with the world lingually to gain knowledge and to express their own ideas (see ibid.,8-10; Wei 2018, 17).

According to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), the term 'plurilingual competence' encompasses the full extent of plurilinguistic know-how of individual users/learners[2], its dynamic development and their increasing ability "to select and deploy" (García & Wei 2018, 2) the appropriate linguistic features from their repertoires to satisfy various contexts, audiences, and communicative intentions (see North & Piccardo 2016, 29-30; García 2018, 42; Council of Europe 2001, 4, 168). Starting from a social-interactive perspective on language learning and use, the CEFR advocates an action-oriented notion of communication regarding us/ls primarily as social agents performing various social-communicative tasks in a fashion that suits both their own objectives as well as the contextual conditions and constraints of a given situation (see North & Piccardo 2016, 5; Council of Europe 2001, 9). This approach recognizes that language mode along with the associated linguistic decision-making and adaptive behavior arise out of the (perceived) needs and pragmatic conditions of communicative situations. It allows BFLAs to slip into different linguistic identities (mono-, bi-, pluri-, translingual or learner) within the same conversation depending on their (changing) position on this situational continuum (see Moore & Gajo 2009, 141; de Houwer 2009, 46-47, 145; Montanari & Panagiotopoulou 2019, 29). By further expanding this view to include a "sociosemiotic" perspective on communicative lan-

---

[2] U/I is used to abbreviate language user/learner (plural: Us/ls).

guage competence (Halliday 1978, 108), it becomes evident that managing social interactions successfully involves not only an individual`s overall language knowledge but moreover adequate semiotic (incl. linguistic) choices among numerous "meaning-potentials of various semiotic resources" (Pinnow 2011, 384). Thus, it involves a speaker´s agency, i.e. "the capacity to act in the world" (Larsen-Freeman 2019, 62) and to language effectively and creatively (see García 2018, 47).

1.2   Languaging and agency

Following Ahearn´s provisional definition, "agency refers to the socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (2001, 112) or more specifically, to the individual capacity to choose how to act and construct knowledge (whether to participate in a situation and with which linguistic means) depending on the perceived contextual affordances of a given context (see Duran 2014, 74; Larsen-Freeman 2019, 62-63, 72-73). Agency is thus relational as it is "always related to the affordances in the context" (Larsen-Freeman 2019, 65) and emerges out of individuals´ interactive engagement with their material and social world (see Piccardo 2017, 9). Affordance can be conceived of as opportunities for action available to individuals situated in specific social structures at a particular time (see ibid., 4). However, individuals´ capacity to act upon the possibilities afforded by a certain social context is largely contingent on their perception of the personal scope for action as „affordances only exist insofar as they can be detected" (ibid., 4) (see Mercer 2012, 43; Larsen-Freeman, Driver, Gao & Mercer 2021, 16). Hence, an individual`s achievement of agency is not only socioculturally mediated but also intrapersonally developing dynamically out of the interplay of available "economic, cultural, and social resources within a particular ecology" (Biesta & Tedder 2007, 137) and characteristics of the individual in terms of mental and physical development and subjective experiences (see Larsen-Freeman 2019, 65; Mercer 2012, 42-43).

As to linguistic agency, us/ls need to take the interactional circumstances, contexts, and objectives of real-world language use into account when collaboratively constructing meaning in the social world (see Council of Europe 2001, 9; Piccardo & North 2022, 30). Judging the adequacy of semiotic resources for various social contexts, taking concrete (linguistic) actions in pursuit of one´s desired communicative aims, monitoring and if necessary adjusting one´s own communicative choices[3] continuously requires individuals to draw on this knowledge tactically (see Piccardo & North 2022, 30; LaScotte & Tarone 2019, 97). Thus, the emergence of linguistic agency is closely related to the development of pragmatic competence (see Council of Europe 2020, 9-10, 13). It involves both us`/ls` interactional use of linguistic means to realize certain speech intentions by means of grammatical structures, wording as well as pronunciation (pragmalinguistics) and their knowledge of the social conditions, rules and constraints governing (appropriate and acceptable) language use in interactions (sociopragmatics) (see Pinnow 2011, 384; Timpe Laughlin, Wain & Schmidgall 2015, 2, 6-8, 10).

---

[3] Adjustment of language mode and (dis)regard for sociocultural norms

Us´/ls´ capacity to act in acquiring and/or learning and using their various linguistic resources is further "temporally embedded" (Emirbayer & Mische 1998, 963) and accordingly mediated by their "history in person" (Duran 2014, 74), i.e. their accumulated past and current experiences of co-constructing meanings in social interactions with particular others in particular spaces (see Larsen-Freeman 2019, 66; Mercer 2012, 57). In this regard, it is important to conceive of space (part of context) as "an active, agentive aspect of communication" (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck 2005, 203). In keeping with Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck (2005), each social space "does something to people when it comes to communicating" (203), as it is hardly ever void of sociocultural norms and expectations of what is deemed proper and normal (see Piccardo & North 2022, 30; Duran 2014, 77). For instance, in terms of language use, social spaces frame the way in which individuals contribute to interactions and select features from their repertoire in the service of goal-directed communicative behavior (see Duran 2014, 75). Spaces may (de)legitimize or convey the (un)desirability of certain language practices and assign "differential value and function to individuals' multilingual repertoires" (Miller 2012, 445) thereby potentially denying individuals certain affordances, limiting their ability to express themselves and negating hybrid identifications (see Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck 2005, 211, 213; Piccardo & North 2022, 30). Conversely, spaces embracing individuals´ plurilingual capacities as desirable, legitimate and valued expand rather than restrict individuals´ linguistic scope for action, facilitating their perception and exploitation of the "latent potential" of social spaces (Mercer 2012, 43) (see ibid., 5, 9; García 2018, 47), i.e. "the vast array of affordances that are available to the agent" (Piccardo 2017, 4).

1.3   Languaging and plurilingual spaces

By and large, agency should be understood not as an attribute or power of us/ls but rather as an achievement by individuals actively engaging with the opportunities different structural environments afford or deny to optimize the conditions for their own learning (see Biesta & Tedder 2007, 136; Larsen-Freeman 2019, 62, 73). While Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck (2005) contend that individuals´ communicative actions are primarily dependent on "what the environment, as structured determinations and interactional emergence, enables and disables them to employ", Wei (2011) argues in favor of plurilingual u/l self-empowerment (213). Following Wei, plurilingual spaces, also termed 'translanguaging[4] spaces' (TS), are above all "interactionally created by the individual through strategic use" of the semiotic resources available to them (see 1234). Thus, TS are not only plurilingual spaces designed to welcome and facilitate a translingual mode of communication including inter- and intrasentential[5] TL, but are moreover spaces created precisely by individuals themselves actively choosing to engage in TL "[r]ecognizing that they have the agency to

---

[4] 'Translanguaging' (TL) comprises BFLAs` dynamic translingual practices transcending "the boundaries between named languages, language varieties, and language and other semiotic systems" (Wei 2018, 9).

[5] Intersentential (ITE) TL occurs between sentences and typically consists of hybrid use of semiotic resources at sentence, phrasal, or discourse boundaries, while intrasentential (ITA) TL occurs within a sentence with hybrid use of semiotic features within the same sentence.

assert their own identities" (Darvin & Norton 2015, 47) (see Wei 2018, 23). Their (self-perceived) growing plurilingual competence empowers them and activates their agency to dynamically shape interactive situations (see Duran 2014, 74, 81; Piccardo 2017, 11). By allowing for ample opportunity to explore one`s environment as well as for strategic mobilization of and experimentation with one`s semiotic means, plurilingual spaces create conditions conducive to purposeful, creative and critical meaning-making (see Piccardo 2017, 9; García & Wei 2018, 2).

When considering the language resources one brings to bear on the semiotic complexity of social interactions, leveraging one´s linguistic means creatively and critically can manifest itself as follows: I. a. 1) by appropriating the words of others, slightly altering them or arming them with one`s own intentions (see Dufva & Aro 2014, 38, 42), 2) by adapting to or deviating from an interlocutor`s language practice to signal either identification with or dissociation from that interlocutor in terms of linguistic identity (see LaScotte & Tarone 2019, 97), 3) through strategic TL for "transformative impact" (Emirbayer & Mische 1998, 1003) thereby emphasizing or expanding the meaning potential of the resources used (see Larsen-Freeman 2019, 72; Montanari & Panagiotopoulou 2019, 30), and 4) by carefully selecting the appropriate linguistic resources in context and adapting them to the „Erfordernisse der jeweiligen Grammatik" (= the requirements of the respective grammar) (Tracy 2014, 25), in particular with regard to the morpho-syntactic principles of the corresponding language systems involved (Wei 2018, 12; Montanari & Panagiotopoulou 2019, 40, 22, 64). Successful implementation of these communicative strategies requires both fundamental knowledge of the contextually appropriate use of plurilinguistic resources as well as sociolinguistic awareness (or pragmatic differentiation[6]) on the part of the u/l (see Wei 2011, 374; Cheung, Mak, Luo & Xiao 2010, 191; Tare & Gelman 2010, 1-2). The latter is operationalized as us`/ls` ability to adjust their languaging in sensitivity to the involved interlocutors and their respective language proficiency (see Cheung, Mak, Luo & Xiao 2010, 191; Barac, Bialystok, Castro & Sanchez 2014, 21).

As a monolingual lens would tend to portray instances of TL as error-ridden or deviant rather than as examples of linguistic innovation, it is crucial to break with the deficit-oriented notion of double semilingualism[7] which is based on the long-standing practice of measuring plurilingual competence against the monolingual norm as a „valuable yardstick" (Franceschini 2011, 350) (see Wei 2011, 370). What constitutes an error from a strictly monolingual perspective, may in fact testify to a u`s/l`s strategic linguistic choices, willingness to take linguistic risks and creative linguistic processes, particularly since the transgression of norms can be construed as a sign of creativity (see Larsen-Freeman 2019, 72; Piccardo 2017, 8, 10). As Larsen-Freeman and Cameron point out, precisely these instances of hybrid language use "where systems are stretched, where conventional rules are not upheld, where a point of criticality is reached" (2008, 102) allow for the emergence of new forms

---

[6] Tare and Gelman define pragmatic differentiation "as bilingual children's ability to use their two languages appropriately with interlocutors who speak different languages" (2010, 1-2).

[7] The term "double semilingualism" constitutes a deficit perspective on BFLA´s language competence in their languages implying they may never be "fully" proficient in either (Keim & Tracy 2006, 225).

(see Piccardo 2017, 10; Wei 2018, 23). However, they do not adhere to the normative expectations of a monolingual mindset (see Wei 2011, 374; Piccardo 2017, 9-10).

2   The present study

2.1   Research question

The present study examines how a preschool-age multiple language learner (CH) navigates adult-child[8] interactions focusing on the micro-level of her linguistic resource management in situ. As successful navigation involves adequate use of one`s meaning-making features the study addresses the research question of how CH constructs and conveys meaning through "languaging" in familial plurilingual contexts (García & Wei 2018, 3). A stronger focus on the "how" rather than the "why" of translingual interaction can make visible what CH accomplishes with her individual resources instead of insisting on identifying reasons for her translingual behavior. Pursuing the latter while simultaneously relying too heavily on interaction-external aspects may mislead analysts to assign arbitrary meaning to translingual contributions (Wei 2002, 166-167).

2.2   Method

According to the principles of conversation analysis, the how (and why) of languaging cannot be determined separately from the conversational context in which it takes place (see Hitzler & Messmer 2011, 308). Insight of how languaging develops thus requires a reconstruction of the sequential organization of communicative messages, patterns and features, including the use of semiotic resources, by means of which interactants signal intended actions and recognition of these to one another to achieve joint understanding (see Eberle 2007, 149; Hitzler & Messmer 2011, 308; Deppermann 2008, 49-50). Hence, extracts of the videographed sequences of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction are reconstructed by means of detailed transcription using the Transana software in accordance with the GAT 2 transcription system (Selting et al. 2009; Deppermann 2008, 25). The transcription conventions are illustrated in figure 1.

---

[8] CH: Age 3-4; Adults: Ages 35-75

Sequential structure	
[ ] [ ]	Overlapping and simultaneous speech
=	A turn following immediately after a previous turn, without pause
Pauses	
(.)	Micropause
(-), (--), (---)	Short, medium-length, long pause (0.25 to 1.0 seconds)
(2.0)	Estimated pause, for pauses longer than 1.0 seconds
Other segmental conventions	
Und_äh Auf_er Treppe (statt auf der Treppe)	Slurs within units (as if two words were shortened to become one word)
:, ::, :::	Stretching of sounds, lenghtening, according to duration
äh, öh, etc.	Delay signals, so-called "filled pauses"
Ich habe geda/	Aborted statement
Laughter	
haha hehe hihi	Production of specific sounds of laughter
((laughs, ca 2 sec.))	Description of laughter, specification of duration
Reception signals	
hm, ja, nein, nee	One-syllabic signals
Hm_hm, ja_a, nei_ein, nee_e	Two-syllabic signals
O?ow	With glottalization
Pitch movement at the end of a segment	
?	High rising
,	rising
-	Constant/ unchanging
;	Falling
.	Low falling
Emphasis	
akZENT	Primary/ Main emphasis
akzEnt	Secundary emphasis
ak!ZENT!	Particularly strong emphasis
Noticeable changes in pitch	
↑	upwards
↓	downwards
Changes in pitch register	
<<t> >	Low pitch sound
<<h> >	High pitch sound
Changes in volume and speaking speed	
<<f> >	Forte, loud
<<ff> >	Fortissimo, very loud
<<p> >	Piano,quiet
<<pp> >	Piano, very quiet
<<all> >	Allegro, fast
<<len> >	Lento, slow
<<cresc> >	Crescendo, getting louder
<<dim> >	Diminuendo, getting quieter
<<acc> >	Accelerando, getting fast
<<rall> >	Rallentando, getting slower
In- and exhaling	
.h, .hh, .hhh	Inhaling, according to duration
h, hh, hhh	Exhaling, according to duration
Other conventions	
geht_s don_t let_s	cliticization
I ce eh	Instances of abbreviation and spelling out loud are written out in full/ broken down into speech syllables dissolved
((hustet)) ((laughs))	Comments: Paralinguistic, nonverbal actions, events and body language (gestures and facial expressions)
<<hustend> > <<coughing> >	Paralinguistic and nonverbal actions and events accompanying speech
<<erstaunt> > <<astonished> >	Interpretive commentary
(such)	Presumed wording
al(s)o	Presumed sound or syllable
(unverständlich, ca. 2 Sek.)	Incomprehensible passages in the transcript, specification of duration
*	Description of relevant nonverbal actions of interactant A
#	Description of relevant nonverbal actions of interactant B
→	An arrow on the left-hand side of a segment indicates a specific phenomenon within a transcript that is of immediate interest.

Fig. 1: Transcription conventions

The conversation analysis method of sequential analysis is used to examine the interactants` conversation management including their linguistic choices and other details constituting meaning, such as nonverbal cues, pauses in speech, overlaps, prosody and body language (see Eberle 2007, 151; Wei 2002, 163, 176). After all, the construction of social reality is based on reciprocal, interrelated action and is thus an interactional achievement based on a continuous process of analysis by those involved (see Deppermann 2008, 79-80). Likewise, the meaning of TL is co-constructed and as such "emerges as a consequence of bilingual participants' contextualization work" (Wei 2002, 167).

2.3   The child`s languaging environment

CH is raised plurilingually with German, English and Dutch in Germany in a multigenerational household comprising her parents NI (BFLA German, English) and KL (MFLA Dutch) as well as her grandparents LI (MFLA German) and AL (MFLA English). Other immediate family members include her grandparents WI and PE (both MFLA Dutch) residing in the Netherlands, and her aunts MI and JU (both BFLA German, English), with MI living across from CH, and JU living in the United States. CH´s parents do not follow a strict OPOL (one parent one language) or BPBL (both parents both languages) strategy but rather mix and match linguistic resources when addressing CH as the communicative situation demands deploying English, German and Dutch features at times. That being said, CH still receives predominantly Dutch input from KL and German from NI. KL and NI communicate with one another mostly in English with the occasional use of German and Dutch resources. AL addresses CH, his daughters NI, MI and JU and KL exclusively in English, while using mostly German resources to communicate with LI. Conversely, LI interacts with CH solely in German, whereas WI remains exclusively in Dutch. PE mostly speaks Dutch with CH with the occasional use of English. MI and JU interact with CH using both English and German means.

Above all, it should be noted that CH experiences her family members languaging competently and flexibly across language boundaries, drawing on the appropriate resources of their respective repertoire depending on the conditions within a sociocultural context. Her family environment embraces translingual interaction and with it all linguistic capital as desirable, valued and legitimate.

2.4   Data

Two data samples (A & B) are selected from a data set of 300 videotaped recordings[9] of routine interactions within two related[10] plurilingual families (fam. 1, child CH: German, English, Dutch; fam. 2, three children[11]: German, English). A and B were selected from interactions within family 1.

Recording A: „I want to kümmer mich um die snails" ((0:00:00.0 – 0:06:17.6))

---

[9] Part of a long-term study

[10] The mothers NI and JU are sisters. JU and her children live in the USA.

[11] CH´s cousins

In A, CH (3 yrs., 10 mths. old) interacts with AL and MI in the backyard of her home. The recording starts out with AL and CH playing on the see-saw. AL's discovery of a snail on the underside of the see-saw sets a series of interactions in motion to search for and collect snails. Four extracts of recording A are examined in detail.

Recording B: „I did learn English" ((0:00:00.0 – 0:01:15.4))

In B, CH (4 yrs., 3 mths. old) interacts with AL, PE, MI, her parents and their Dutch friend DE while seated together at an outdoor event in Germany. The recording sets out with CH and DE discussing his potential presence at CH´s upcoming birthday party. AL then intervenes their exchange in Dutch to inquire about CH´s English language use. The recording ends with CH asking to sample food. B is examined in full (1-2B).

2.5   Data analysis

2.5.1   Recording A

```
        ORIGINAL                              ENGLISH TRANSLATION
025 CH: *And And And And <<p>And;>
        *AL bewegt die Wippe ruckartig hoch und   *AL pushes the see-saw up and down in
        wieder runter                         jerky movements
026     (0.9)
027 AL: WATer in hEre,
028     (1.1)
029 CH: ((lacht, ca. 1.0 Sek.))               ((laughs, ca. 1 second))
030     *WHY <<lachend>thAt:,>                 <<laughing>
        * AL lässt CH auf der Wippe wieder nach  *AL lowers the see-saw seat with CH back
        unten auf den Boden herunter          down to the ground
031 AL: <<all>i don_t KNOW;>
032     (0.9)
033     *there is a SNAIL in hEre tOo;
        *CH steht auf und geht zu AL          *CH gets up and approaches AL
034 MI: <<überrascht>↑whAt?>                   <<surprised>
035     *(1.1)
        *CH bückt sich, um unter den Sitz der  *CH bends down to look under the see-saw
        Wippe zu schauen                      seat
036 AL: *lOok;
        *AL nimmt die Schnecke von dem Sitz   *AL removes the snail from the seat
037 CH: *WHE:RE?
        *CH geht näher zu AL                  *CH moves closer to AL
038     (1.0)
039     *hm_hm;
        *AL übergibt CH die Schnecke          *AL hands the snail over to CH
040     (0.8)
041 AL: there is a SNAIL in thEre;
042 MI: AH::;=
043 CH: =*GUCK mA::l <<p>eine schildkrö/->    Look, a turt/ (=turtle)
         *CH zeigt MI die Schnecke            *CH shows the snail to MI
044     *(1.1)
        *CH geht zu den Blumentöpfen          *CH walks over to the plant pots
045 MI: ist die nO:ch (.) KLE:brig?           Is that one still slimy/ sticky
046     (1.4)
047     kannst die irgendwo daHIN tU:n,       (You) can put it somewhere over there
048     (2.2)
049     *ne ein neues zuHAUse gE:ben,          Give it a new home
        *CH legt die Schnecke neben die Töpfe  *CH places the snail next to the pots
050     (1.0)
051     *oKAY;
        *CH geht zurück zu AL nahe der Wippe  *CH walks back to Al near the see-saw
052     bA:ck to OPA;                         Back to grandpa
053     (1.1)
054 CH: ich hab die *IRgend/ Irgend[wo hier/,  I (put) it some/ somewhere here
                     *CH dreht sich zu MI und          *CH turns around to
        nochmal zu der Schnecke um            face/ look at MI and the snail once more
```

```
055 AL: [well that_s oKA:Y,
056     it will be ¯↑HA:Ppy thEre;
057 MI: *jA:;                              Yes
        *CH bückt sich nochmals zu der Schnecke  *CH bends over to look at the snail
058     (---)
059     dA passiert NIX;                  Nothing will happen
060     (1.9)
061     <<bestätigend>hM?>               <<affirmative>
062     (0.9)
063 CH: *ich kann schon ein SCHNEckenhaus  *I can already draw a snail house
        [mA::len;
        *CH geht wieder zur Wippe          *CH goes back to the see-saw
```

Fig. 2: Extract 1A: 0:00:24.9 – 0:01:09.4

AL moves CH upward on the see-saw in gradual increments, which is reflected in CH`s ver-balization of these jerky movements (025). CH then responds to AL´s discovery of a puddle of water on the empty see-saw seat with the reasonable question "why that". Similar to AL´s verb omission in his statement "water in here" (027)[12], CH expresses her inquiry with-out the conjugated verb "is"[13]. However, their utterances do not necessarily constitute grammatical errors but can simply be regarded as a prevalent phenomenon of conceptual and medial orality. Informal communicative exhanges as in the present example can natu-rally exhibit unevenness in syntax and fragmentary utterances characteristic of the lan-guage of proximity (see Koch & Oesterreicher 2022, 652, 655). According to Koch and Oes-terreicher, parameters such as spontaneity, emotionality, situational involvement and in-tensive cooperation affect the syntactic construction of speech contributions as in our ex-ample (see ibid, 655): Inquiring about the cause of the water accumulation allows CH to remain engaged in meaningful conversation with AL, while verbally accompanying AL´s movements (025), laughing extendedly (029) and expressing her question with giggles (030) can be construed as an indication of high spirits.

After providing the complementary second pair part of the adjacency pair (question/an-swer) (031), AL observes that there is a snail attached to the underside of the see-saw seat, which immediately attracts CH´s attention (Deppermann 2008, 68). Upon AL inviting her to "look" (036), CH expresses her need for further information concerning the snail`s where-abouts (037). Shortly thereafter, AL detaches the snail from the see-saw and hands it to CH, who then turns to MI with the intention of showing her AL´s discovery. Interestingly, CH initially refers to the snail as a turtle, which is understandable given the similar ratio of animal body to protective apparatus. However, she utters the word in a noticeably softer tone and ceases mid-verbalization producing merely "Schildkrö". CH´s indirect self-repair in 062 – proudly declaring her ability to draw a "Schneckenhaus" (snail shell) – attests to her reevaluation of her previously aborted statement.

CH´s linguistic choice to address AL (025, 030, 037) and subsequently MI (043, 054) is of particular significance as it constitutes ITE TL. Sequences 025-041 demonstrate that CH in-itially adapts her languaging to meet AL`s needs in terms of preferred language use as she deploys English features to communicate with AL, thereby mirroring his language mode. However, to approach MI, CH selects German resources. While one can argue that CH´s

---

[12] Without verb omission: Water IS in here/There IS water in here.

[13] Why IS that?/Why`S that?

sudden modification in language choice in 043 results from a gap in or even a lack of linguistic knowledge in English, the following interaction sequences (043-063) between MI and CH suggest an alternative explanation. CH addresses MI directly, realizing her request in the imperative mood with German resources exclusively (043). Her ITA TL appears to be strategic and intentional for it allows her to target her aunt specifically when asking for attention. Thereupon, MI communicates with CH by phrasing her question (045) and her suggestion (047-049) in German, while transitioning into ITA TL once she mentions AL (052). Nevertheless, CH continues to deploy solely German resources to express her concern about finding a suitable home for the snail. She seeks approval from MI as reflected in her body language, which may also account for her linguistic choice.

```
        ORIGINAL                        ENGLISH TRANSLATION
073 AL: *dOn_t fA:ll O:FF;
        *AL beginnt die Wippe zu bewegen  *AL starts to move the see-saw
074     (--)
075 MI: hM::;
076 CH: YE_AH:;
077     (--)
078     BUT opA::?                        But grandpa
079 AL: whA:t?
080 CH: *I want to (--) kÜmmer mich um die  *I want to take care of the snails
        SNAI:ls;
        *CH steigt von der Wippe ab und läuft  *CH climbs off the see-saw and walks
        zu den Schnecken                       over to the snails
081 AL: you want to fInd a SNAI:L,
082     (--)
083 CH: yEah;
084     *(0.8)
        *CH läuft an eine andere Stelle    *CH walks to a different spot
085 MI: <<all>you knOw [where you !PUT! it->=
086 CH:               [ja-                 Yes
087 MI: =<<all>you can always go visIt it
        aGAIN> (-)[swEetie;
088 AL: [there_s mOre SNAILs over there;
089     (--)
090 CH: yEs (.) ich hab eine entDE::CKT;   Yes. I discovered one
091     *(0.9)
        *CH geht vor einem Busch in die Hocke  *CH squats down in front of a bush
092     <<p>hMm>
093     (1.3)
094     ↑whEre is there more [SNAILs?
095 AL:                      [<<all>i don_t
        knOw you have to LOOK;>
```

Fig. 3: Extract 2A: 0:01:21.6 – 0:01:43.9

In 2A, CH is back on the see-saw with AL in charge of up- and downward pushes. After acknowledging (076) AL´s precautionary comment (073), CH informs AL of her sudden desire to take care of the snails (078 & 080)[14]. The stretching of sounds (076 & 078) as well as the pause in between may be an indication of a brief inner conflict. Having reconsidered her options, CH adopts a change of plan, which may come as a surprise to AL, as they had just begun resuming their see-saw game. To this end, CH annunciates her volte-face with the accentuated conjunction "but" thereby not only signaling a concessive-adversative modification of intended action but also initiating ITA TL. The short pause after "I want to"

---

[14] The designation "Opa" (078) is of no particular importance as CH has formed the habit of using this term to refer to AL.

in 080 could testify either to the difficulty in retrieving the desired target word or to lexical indecision and careful deliberation of lexical selection, since the following gaps could have been appropriately filled by CH with a variety of linguistic resources[15]. However, regardless of the possible motives, her actual word choice – "but Opa I want to kümmer mich um die snails" – can be regarded as a token of strategic consideration and functionalization of resources. CH succeeds not only in fulfilling the intended semantic function but also in integrating the German reflexive, prepositional verb "sich kümmern um" into her "I want to"-construction in a (mostly) syntactically correct manner, along with producing the first-person singular of the reflexive pronoun ("mich") and properly implementing the preposition "um" followed by the object ("snails"). There are various possible explanations for why CH chooses to supply the first-person singular ("kümmer") of the German verb instead of the required infinitive form ("kümmern"). Having to choose from numerous coactivated and thus competing plurilinguistic resources, CH may have jumbled several options such as "Ich kümmer mich lieber" (= I´d rather take care) and "Ich will mich kümmern" (= I want to take care) rendering it a transfer-related occurrence. Alternatively, the inflectional morpheme "n" signifying the infinitive form of "kümmern" may be omitted on purpose as it would disrupt the phonetic flow pattern of the sentence[16].

AL complies with CH´s decision to concentrate on the snail hunt (081) and points out a potential location for a successful search (088). With the English affirmative response particle "yes" (090) CH ratifies AL´s suggested course of action, and proceeds with a series of ITE TL forming a new sentence with solely German resources followed by a question realized in English (094). In doing so, CH is able to lend particular emphasis to her latest snail discovery, not only with stressed and stretched pronunciation of the word "entdeckt" (090), but also by means of linguistic choice. While the subsequent syntactic construction of her inquiry in English in 094 is faulty[17], it is important to note that it mirrors AL´s faulty statement pattern in 088, and hence is indicative of CH´s strategy of appropriating AL´s word choice and sentence structure to phrase her own question. Besides, it should be borne in mind that such informal talk-in-interaction is naturally peppered with bumpy morpho-syntactic constructions characteristic of conceptual and medial orality.

```
    229 AL: *i knOw where there_s ↑mO:re snAils;
            *AL kippt den Topf wieder nach unten    *AL tips the plant pot back down
    230 CH: whA:t?
    231     (--)
    232 AL: I KNOW where there_s mOre ↑snAils;
    233 CH: *whE::re?
            *AL läuft in eine andere Richtung       *AL moves into a different direction
    234     (0.8)
  → 235     *aber <<f>!DON_T! trE:t da drAuf->       But don`t step on that
            *CH zeigt auf die Schnecken auf dem     *CH points at the snails on the ground
            Boden
  → 236     sonst LE:Ben die nicht mehr sonst       Otherwise they won`t live anymore,
            sind die tO:t;                          otherwise they`ll be dead
```

Fig. 4: Extract 3A: 0:04:00.5 – 0:04:08.0

---

[15] Engl.: Take care of, tend to, look after. Ger.: Pflegen, versorgen, aufpassen auf.

[16] "I want to kümmer mich" is easier to pronounce and more pleasant in sound compared to "kümmern mich".

[17] „There are/where are there more snails" would be grammatically correct.

Another instance of CH using plurilinguistic resources strategically as "attention-grabbers" (de Houwer 2009, 269) is shown above in 3A (235-236), and takes place at a later point in the interaction. In this example of ITA TL, CH voices her command noticeably louder with particular emphasis on the word "don´t" conspicuously sandwiched between German resources to express her concern for fatal consequences (236). By duplicating the syntactic element "sonst" to continue her sentence, CH is able to specify her previous statement semantically thereby adding further emphasis. Also, she correctly integrates the attention-grabbing resource "don`t" into the German syntax of the command construction, placing it in between the coordinating conjunction "aber" and the conjugated verb "tret".

```
            ORIGINAL                         ENGLISH TRANSLATION
180 AL: nO SNAILs?
181 CH: NO:;
182 AL: *hM oKAY;
        *AL kippt den Topf wieder nach unten  *AL tips the plant pot back down
183     then we shall kEep on LOOKing;
184     (---)
185 CH: *Under DE:N;                          Under this one
        *AL kippt den nächsten Topf           *AL lifts up the next plant pot
186 AL: Under *HE::RE,
            *CH bückt sich und schaut unter   *CH bends over and looks under the pot
        den Topf
187 CH: !NO:!;
188     Also no snAi:ls HE::RE;
189 AL: <<überrascht>Also nO?>               <<surprised>
190 CH: nO;
191     (--)
192 AL: *hM;
        *AL kippt den Topf wieder nach unten  *AL tips the plant pot back down
193 CH: [NO:PE;
194 MI: [((lacht, ca. 0.6 Sek.))             Laughs about 0.6 seconds
195     *(0.8)
        *CH geht zu dem nächsten Topf         *CH walks over to the next pot
196 CH: *let_s lOok under HE::RE;
        *CH versucht den Topf anzuheben       *CH tries to lift the pot
197 AL: lOok under thE:re [*oKA:Y;
                         *CH geht zur Seite   *CH moves to the side
198 CH:               [YUP;
199     OPA::?                                Grandpa
200 AL: whAt?
201 CH: yOu knO:w what *↑I_M gonna do?
                       *CH gräbt mit der      *CH uses the garden rake to dig
        Gartenrake in der Erde im Topf        in the pot
202 AL: <<all>WHAT are you gOnna dO?>
203     (1.2)
204     well THAT_s ni/-
205     *there_s a SNAI:L;
        *AL zeigt in den Topf                 *AL points to a spot in the pot
206     (---)
207 CH: *WHE::RE?
        *CH hebt die Gartenrake aus dem Topf  *CH lifts the garden rake out of the pot
208     *(1.6)
        *AL beugt sich über den Topf und greift  *AL bends over the pot and reaches into
        hinein                                it
209 AL: or is THAT,
210     nah THAT_s dIrt;
211     NOT a snAil.
212     (1.1)
213 CH: *wEiter [GRA:::ben;                   Keep digging
        *CH gräbt weiter in der Erde im Topf  *CH continues to dig in the soil
```

Fig. 5: Extract 4A: 0:03:16.4 - 0:03:46.2

In 4A, AL and CH provide each other with suggestions as to where to search next. In response to CH´s translingual proposal to look "under den" (under this one) (185), AL repeats

her idea in a slightly altered fashion producing the monolingual utterance "under here" (186) thereby signaling acknowledgment of her instruction. Once again, CH succeeds in intertwining English and German morphosyntax and lexico-semantics by properly combining the English preposition "under" with the German demonstrative pronoun "den" in the accusative case to refer to a plant pot nearby. CH´s awareness of the fact that the German preposition "unter" requires a (pro)noun in the accusative case whenever directional movement is involved (when suggesting to look "under this one") seems to motivate her linguistic choice.

After unsuccessful search attempts reflected in the monolingual English mode exchange between CH and AL (187-198), CH wishes to demonstrate to AL her new strategy to find snails: Digging in the plant pot using a garden rake. She accompanies her action by a statement vocalized intonationally as a question with strong emphasis on herself ("I´m") as the protagonist. AL reacts at once by inquiring about her idea (202). However, this particular interactional sequence is temporarily suspended as the potential discovery of another snail in the plant pot is deemed more important (204-211). Afterwards, CH resumes her train of thought and initiates ITE TL by uttering "weiter graben" (213). Her comment does not appear to be addressed to anyone in particular, but rather represents a form of soliloquy, which she chooses to realize in German.

2.5.2 Recording B

```
       ORIGINAL                          ENGLISH TRANSLATION
001 DE: zal ik mOrgen OOK komen charlie?  Shall I come tomorrow too
002     <<p>ZAL ik mOrgen ook lAngs komen,> Shall I also drop by tomorrow
003     wat ZEG jE,                       What do you say
004 CH: will/ ↑JIJ mag Ook een nAchtje hier Will (you)/ you may also stay here one
        blijven;                          night
005     of *TWEE nAchtjes hier ↑blIjven?  Or stay *two nights
          *CH zeigt zwei Finger           *shows two fingers
006 NI: ((lacht, ca. 2.0 Sek.))           ((laughs, ca. 2.0 seconds))
007 DE: ik SLAAP in bObenheim,=           I sleep in Bobenheim
008     =dAn ga ik morgen weer met de Auto; Then I`ll go by car again tomorrow
009 CH: [okAY;                            Okay
010 WA: [((lacht, ca. 2.0 Sek.))          ((laughs, ca. 2.0 seconds))
011 CH: jE komt mOrgen weer met/-=        You will come again tomorrow by/
012 DE: =is dat GOED?                      Is that good
013 CH: JA (.) dAt is goed;               Yes that`s good
014 DE: Zal ik LAUra mEenemen?            Shall I bring Laura
015 CH: äh <<verschmitzt>NEE::;>          Äh <<mischievously>no>
016     ((die Anwesenden reagieren teils  ((those present react partly with
        lachend teils empört, ca. 3.5 Sek.)) laughter and partly with indignation))
017 DE: NEE?                              No
018 KL: <<t>ja!WE::L!>;                   Yes of course (German equivalent: Doch!)
019     laura mag OOK kOmen;              Laura may also come
020 PE: dat is nIet LIEF van jOu;         That is not nice of you
```

Fig. 6: Extract 1B: 0:00:00.0 – 0:00:34.8

In 1B, DE asks CH in Dutch whether he is welcome to attend her birthday party (005), revealing his eagerness to be invited by repeating his question slightly altered, in a quieter tone (006) and by hastily adding "what do you say?" (007). This is followed by an exchange between CH and DE in Dutch monolingual mode: Although DE´s turns (005-007) provoke a reply, CH begins her response with a verb characteristic of a counter-question (008) before initiating a self-repair within the segment to provide an explicit answer reflected in the falling intonation. She further expands her statement to include the offer of spending two

nights at her home. Upon DE specifying his plan involving prearranged overnight accommodation elsewhere and him traveling by car, CH reacts with approval (013). She subsequently begins to repeat DE´s idea addressing DE directly (015), but pauses mid-sentence as DE assumes his turn early to request her ratification of his proposal (016). CH in turn complies by echoing his utterance (017). However, to DE´s surprise (021), CH negates (019) his next request with a mischievous smile and tone (018). CH´s reaction (019) reflects her playful, cheeky nature as she revels in the attention such a response attracts.

```
        ORIGINAL                              ENGLISH TRANSLATION
021 AL: wait a minute WAIT a mInute,
022     whAt hAppened to your ENGlish anyway?
023 CH: ↑I DON_t know;
024     i DID lEarn English indeed,
025 AL: yEah you DID;
026     thAt_s true.
027 MI: [charLOTte wArum/,                    Charlotte why/
028 DE: [waarom ben je dan nederlands aan het Then why are you talking Dutch
        praten,=
029 MI: =jA:.                                 yes
030 CH: Ik WEET hEt.                          Because (implied) I know it
031 MI: charlOtte warum kriegt der Opa kein/ (-)  Charlotte why doesn`t your grandfather
        NIX von deinem trInken?               get to have a taste of your beverage
032     (2.0)
033 CH: Opa (.) *TRY it;
        *CH schiebt ihr Getränk zu AL         *CH pushes her beverage to AL
034 AL: shall I/ shAll i TRY it?
035 CH: yeah (.) yOu should TRY it.
036 AL: Okay.
037 MI: *dAs ist aber LIEB;                   Well that is nice
        *AL probiert das Getränk von CH und   *AL tries CH`s beverage by sipping from
        schlürft aus dem Röhrchen             the straw
038 AL: HmHM::::,
039 CH: isn_t it YUMmy?
040 AL: that was GOOD yUp that was good;
041     (2.0 Sek.)
042 AL: *THANK you mIss,
043     ((alle am Tisch unterhalten sich     ((Everyone at the table is chatting at
        querbeet, ca. 7.0 Sek.)              once, ca. 7 seconds))
        *CH schlürft ihr Getränk weiter und  *CH continues to sip her beverage and
        zuckelt die Limettenscheibe aus      drinks the juice from the slice of lime
044 CH: dArf ich *d/?                         May I *d/
        *CH schluckt kurz                     *CH swallows quickly
045     dArf ich *dAs proBIERen?             May I try *that
        *CH zeigt auf etwas am                *CH points to something on
        Essenstisch                           the table
046 NI: ja?A::;                              Yes/ yeah
047 PE: natUurlijk MUIS;                     Of course mouse (= term of endearment)
```

Fig. 7: Extract 2B: 0:00:34.8 – 0:01:15.4

2B illustrates the interaction sequence immediately following 1B. Having just witnessed the Dutch exchange between CH and DE with no understanding of what has been said, AL inquires about CH´s English language use (025-026), triggering a series of ITE TL. While her English response (027-028) attests to her language competence, it also reveals her perplexity regarding AL´s question. The previous interaction with DE required her to use solely Dutch resources to communicate effectively providing little to no reason to showcase her English language knowledge. Her strong emphasis of the auxiliary verb "did", her rising intonation as well as her choice of the adverb "indeed" to affirm AL´s remark "your English" demonstrate that CH is well aware of having acquired skills in English. However, their use hinges on thorough assessment of the pragmatic conditions of a given situation. Rightly,

DE interjects to ask CH why she had previously communicated in Dutch (032), to which CH replies swiftly simply stating in Dutch "Ik weet het" (= I know it) (034). Although she does not use a causal conjunction her explicit emphasis of the word "weet" and her low falling intonation may signify causality synonymous with the notion of "doing" implying "knowing".

MI then proceeds to transition to an unrelated topic indirectly requesting CH to share her refreshment with AL by disguising her request as a question (035). After a short pause, CH invites AL to taste her beverage using the imperative mood (037) thereby indicating her acknowledgement of MI´s implied request. While MI chooses exclusively German resources to phrase her question, CH does not mirror MI´s language mode but selects English resources instead to address AL specifically. MI`s German comment on CH´s amicable behavior (041) does not dissuade CH from remaining in the English monolingual mode to continue her conversation with AL. By means of a negative question addressed to AL (043), CH intends to ask for confirmation of her own opinion. Afterwards, CH turns her attention to the crowd sharing food at the opposite side of the table consisting of her parents as well as LI, WA, BE and RO, the latter four being German monolinguals. Accordingly, CH poses her next question drawing on German resources (048-049) while simultaneously selecting the appropriate means to phrase her inquiry in a polite manner including the use of the modal verb "dürfen".

3 Discussion

Data analysis reveals that CH constructs and conveys meaning through "languaging" by identifying the linguistic resources best suited to achieve her communicative objectives as a function of the pragmatic needs of the situation, her linguistic knowledge and her sociolinguistic awareness. She uses language not only creatively, but also with critical consideration of both the perceived pragmatic conditions of the interaction (addressee, communicative tasks, common ground, etc.) and the morpho-syntactic principles pertaining to German, English and Dutch, which suggests a high level of plurilingual awareness (Montanari & Panagiotopoulou 2019, 22). No matter how chaotic the interaction due to multiple individuals contributing partly overlapping input in one or more languages, CH manages to gauge her interlocutors` language needs and preference, match their language mode accordingly, and effortlessly implement her knowledge of the system of rules and principles in each language. The latter strategy qualifies as what Gawlitzek-Maiwald and Tracy (1996) term bilingual "bootstrapping", for CH activates, bundles, and exploits her existing resources (lexical and structural knowledge in all languages) to produce constructive linguistic output (see 903, 920). Furthermore, CH´s (re)actions indicate quite sophisticated pragmatic skills as she deploys the proper resources to encode and decode speech actions (e.g. 2A 088-095) and deliberately selects either German, English, Dutch or a combination of features from her repertoire to meet the linguistic demands of her social environment (see Timpe Laughlin, Wain & Schmidgall 2015, 6). Navigating communicative interactions successfully thus requires her to draw on all her linguistic knowledge and experiences and on her perception of the interlocutors' linguistic capabilities thereby demonstrating her

emerging sociolinguistic awareness (see Council of Europe 2020, 123; Barac, Bialystok, Castro & Sanchez 2014, 708). For instance, CH`s awareness of AL´s capability to speak in and understand English and German manifests in 2A (090-094) as she makes use of ITE TL for semantic emphasis. Her ability to accommodate her language use to each interlocutor also enables CH to customize her languaging with the intention to address individuals exclusively.

Furthermore, CH´s agentive language behavior in recording A and B signals that she identifies as and wishes to be respected as a competent language user within the English-, the German- and the Dutch-speaking community. Hence, CH´s navigation of plurilingual interaction is also driven by her desire to be recognized as an individual belonging to a certain linguistic community, and thus "to deploy one's semiotic resources to position oneself as one would wish in a multilingual world" (see Larsen-Freeman 2019, 62), i.e. as an individual capable of exploiting her linguistic resources to match the language use of her interlocutors. Her ability and eagerness to continuously adjust her language mode to meet her interlocutors` linguistic capacity as well as her awareness of the plurilinguistic means she deploys can be interpreted as an indication of said desire (e.g. 2B, 027-049). Ultimately, CH´s heightened awareness of her immediate environment makes her receptive to the possibilities it affords and facilitates her capacity to harness multiple semiotic resources (see Piccardo 2017, 10; Wei & Garcia 2014, 16; Larsen-Freeman, Driver, Gao & Mercer 2021, 16). Her grasp of the social space in which she interacts – a space that values translingual practices as natural and legitimate forms of expression – empowers her to language effectively, creatively and efficiently through situated deployment of appropriate semiotic resources of her meaning-making repertoire (see García & Wei 2018, 1-2; Piccardo 2017, 9). Above all though, the TS is created by CH and her interlocutors´ agentive language behavior as they move comfortably and fluidly between and beyond languages (Wei 2018, 23).

This article features only two data samples from a larger data set of recordings and focuses on the linguistic agency including the choice of semiotic resources of one child (CH) in particular. While the present analysis of recordings A and B is exemplary of the translingual behavior of the four children in the long-term study, it does not aim to make any (conclusive) statements regarding CH`s linguistic development. Also, it does not consider how factors such as interactions between CH and her three BFLA cousins raised in the USA, significant changes in the linguistic environment, such as attending a monolingual daycare center, and language status (majority or minority) affect CH´s linguistic performance.

Regardless of whether meticulous attention is paid to an OPOL or BPBL strategy or to a mixture of both without a clear separation of languages, it is beneficial for BFLAs to witness and learn from their caregivers languaging adaptively in sensitivity to the pragmatic conditions of communicative situations (see Tracy 2014, 23; Scharff Rethfeldt 2020, 28). Ultimately, the goal is to develop plurilingual competence, i.e. the flexible, hybrid use of appropriate linguistic resources depending on the addressee, context and communicative action. As the analysis of CH´s languaging behavior shows, the key to achieving this does not lie in the rigorous application of one method, but rather in taking care to offer stimulating complex and authentic input in one or more languages and to act as a languaging role

model capable of flexible language mode alternation in a wide variety of interactive contexts with diverse mono- and plurilingual interlocutors (see Tracy 2014, 23, 26; Scharff Rethfeldt 2020, 28).

4 Literature

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and Agency. *Annu Rev Anthropol. 30*, 109-137. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109

Barac, R.; Bialystok, E.; Castro, D. & Sanchez, M. (2014). The Cognitive Development of Young Dual Language Learners: A Critical Review. *Early Child Res Q. 29(4)*, 699-714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.02.003

Biesta, G. & Tedder, M. (2007). Agency and learning in the lifecourse: Towards an ecological perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults 39(2)*, 132-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2007.11661545

Blommaert, J.; Collins, J. & Slembrouck, J. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication 25*, 197-21.

Cheung, H.; Mak, W. Y.; Luo, X. & Xiao, W. (2010). Sociolinguistic awareness and false belief in young Cantonese learners of English. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 107*, 188-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2010.05.001

Coste, D; Moore, D. & Zarate, G. (2009). Plurilingual and pluricultural competence. Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing.

Darvin, R. & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a Model of Investment in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 35*, 36-56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000191

de Houwer, A. (2009). Bilingual First Language Acquisition. Multilingual Matters.

Deppermann, A. (2008). Gespräche analysieren. Eine Einführung (4. Auflage). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Dufva, H. & Aro, M. (2014). Dialogical View on Language Learners' Agency: Connecting Intrapersonal with Interpersonal. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and Analyzing Agency in Second Language Learning: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (37-53). Multilingual Matters.

Duran, C. S. (2014). Theorizing young language learner agency through the lens of multilingual repertoires: A sociocultural perspective. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and Analyzing Agency in Second Language Learning: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (73-90). Multilingual Matters.

Eberle, T. (2007). Ethnomethodologie und Konversationsanalyse. In R. Schützeichel (Eds.), *Handbuch Wissenssoziologie und Wissensforschung* (139-160). Konstanz: UVK.

Emirbayer, M. and Mische, A. (1998). 'What is agency?'. *American Journal of Sociology 103(4)*, 962-1023.

Franceschini, R. (2011). Multilingualism and Multicompetence: A Conceptual View. *The Modern Language Journal, 95 (iii)*, 344-355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01202.x

García, O. (2018). Translanguaging, pedagogy and creativity. In J. Erfurt, E. Carporal, & A. Weirich (Eds.), *Éducation plurilingue et pratiques langagières: Hommage à Christine Hélot* (39-56). Peter Lang.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (1-7). Wiley.

Gawlitzek-Maiwald, I. & Tracy, R. (1996). Bilingual Bootstrapping. *Linguistics 34*, 901-926.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. University Park Press.

Hitzler, S. & Messmer, H. (2011). Konversationsanalyse. In G. Oelerich & H.-U. Otto (Eds.), *Empirische Forschung und Soziale Arbeit* (307-312). VS Verlag.

Keim, I. & Tracy, R. (2006). Mehrsprachigkeit und Migration. *Der Bürger im Staat 56(4)*, 222-227.

Koch, P. & Oesterreicher, W. (2022). In R. Klabunde, W. Mihatsch & S. Dipper (Eds.), *Linguistik im Sprachvergleich* (649-662). J.B. Metzler.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2019). On Language Learner Agency: A Complex Dynamic Systems Theory Perspective. *The Modern Language Journal 103*, 61-79. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12536

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Cameron, L. (2008). Research Methodology on Language Development from a Complex Systems Perspective. *The Modern Language Journal 92(ii)*, 200-213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00714.x

Larsen-Freeman, D., Driver, P., Gao, X., & Mercer, S. (2021). Learner Agency: Maximizing Learner Potential. Oxford University Press.

LaScotte, D. & Tarone, E. (2019). Heteroglossia and Constructed Dialogue in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal 103*, 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12533

Mercer, S. (2012). The Complexity of Learner Agency. *Apples. Journal of Applied Language Studies 6(2)*, 41-59. Retrieved from https://apples.journal.fi/article/view/97838

Miller, E. R. (2012). Agency, language learning, and multilingual spaces. *Multilingua 31*, 441-468. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2012-0020

Montanari, E. & Panagiotopoulou, J. (2019). Mehrsprachigkeit und Bildung in Kitas und Schulen. Eine Einführung. Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.

Moore, D. & Gajo, L. (2009). Introduction: French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance, and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism 6*, 137-153.

North, B. & Piccardo, E. (2016). Developing illustrative descriptors of aspects of mediation for the CEFR. Council of Europe Publishing.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Language as a Local Practice. Routledge.

Piccardo, E. (2017). Plurilingualism as a Catalyst for Creativity in Superdiverse Societies: A Systemic Analysis. *Front Psychol. 8(2169)*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02169

Piccardo, E. & North, B. (2022). Enriching the scope of language education. In B. North, E. Piccardo, T. Goodier, D. Fasoglio, R. Margonis-Pasinetti & B. Rüschoff (Eds.), *Enriching 21st-century language education. The CEFR Companion volume in practice* (27-48). Council of Europe Publishing.

Pinnow, R. (2011). "I've got an idea": A social semiotic perspective on agency in the second language classroom. *Linguistics and Education 22*, 383-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.09.002

Scharff Rethfeldt, W. (2020). Sprachförderung für ein- und mehrsprachige Kinder: Ein entwicklungsorientiertes Konzept (2. aktualisierte Auflage). Ernst Reinhardt Verlag.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J.R., Bergmann, P., Birkner, K., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Deppermann, A., Gilles, P., Günthner, S., Hartung, M., Kern, F., Mertzlufft, C., Meyer, C., Morek, M., Oberzaucher, F., Peters, J., Quasthoff, U.M., Schütte, W., Stukenbrock, A. & Uhmann, S. (2009). Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT 2). Gesprächsforschung 10, 353-402.

Tare, M. & Gelman, S. A. (2010). Can you say it another way? Cognitive factors in bilingual children's pragmatic language skills. *J Cogn Dev 11(2)*, 137-158. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248371003699951

Timpe Laughlin, V.; Wain, J. & Schmidgall, J. (2015). Defining and Operationalizing the Construct of Pragmatic Competence: Review and Recommendations. *ETS Research Report Series 2015(1)*, 1-43. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12053

Tracy, R. (2014). Mehrsprachigkeit: Vom Störfall zum Glücksfall. In M. Krifka, J. Błaszczak, A. Leßmöllmann, A. Meinunger, B. Stiebels, R. Tracy & H. Truckenbrodt (Eds.), *Das mehrsprachige Klassenzimmer* (13-33). Springer.

Tracy, R. (2020). Spracherwerb und Mehrsprachigkeit. In R. Braches-Chyrek, C. Röhner, H. Sünker, M. Hopf (Eds.), *Handbuch Frühe Kindheit* (2. aktualisierte & erweiterte Auflage) (187-200). Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Unsworth, S. (2016). 6. Quantity and Quality of Language Input in Bilingual Language Development. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism Across the Lifespan: Factors Moderating Language Proficiency* (103-122). De Gruyter.

Wei, L. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society 31*, 159-180. https://doi.org/10.1017.S0047404501020140

Wei, L. (2011). Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Multicompetence: Code- and Modeswitching by Minority Ethnic Children in Complementary Schools. *Modern Language Journal 95*, 370-384. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01209.x

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics 39(1)*, 9-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Wei, L. & García, O. (2014). Language, Languaging and Bilingualism. In L. Wei & O. García (Eds.), *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education* (5-18). Palgrave Macmillan.

Korrespondenzangaben

Michelle Gerber, M.A., RPTU Landau, Institut für Bildung im Kindes- und Jugendalter
Korrespondenz an: m.gerber@rptu.de