IJHS, e-ISSN 2597-4718, p-ISSN 2597-470X, Vol. 5, No. 2, March 2022, pp. 206-224

International Journal of Humanity Studies
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJHS
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND PARENTS' COMMUNICATIVE ACTS: THEIR IMPLICATIONS ON MODELS OF CHILD'S USE OF LANGUAGE

Rafael Ibe Santos
University of Asia and the Pacific
correspondence: rafael.santos@uap.asia
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v5i2.3951
received 8 December 2021; accepted 30 April 2022

Abstract
This case study investigated Halliday's models of child's use of language involving an English-Filipino bilingual boy and how he was influenced by certain demographic factors and parents' communicative acts. Data was from nine videos that captured the child's naturally occurring interactions involving his parents and family friends between the ages 2.6 and 4.10 within a span of almost three years. The multimethod approach was used in analyzing data, namely, qualitative frequency analysis and online interview for triangulation purposes. Five of the seven functions of language in children were demonstrated and appeared to have been influenced by ethnicity, age, gender, and parents' communicative acts and attitude but not by bilingualism as earlier predicted. More importantly, four nascent models were exhibited, suggesting that there could be more than seven language functions in children as previously posited by Halliday. The *esteem function, rescue function, corrective function, and asserting function*, reflective of models of child's use of language in Filipino and Asian contexts, were discovered and such typologies are proposed in this study. Findings have implications on bilingualism, language teaching, and language development theories.

Keywords: child, function/s, Halliday, language, model/s

Introduction
For young children, language is and has power, a tool to achieve what they desire in their day-to-day experience (Halliday, 2002, p. 53). Like a magic wand, it is tapped for their own advantage. In the words of Byrnes and Wasik (2009), "the most skilled and successful language users choose ways of communicating that accomplish their goals while also helping them maintain positive social relationships with others" (p. 37). According to O'Grady (2005), children can "talk effortlessly in [an] impossible language" (p. 1), and as early as age two, typically developing children demonstrate what they are capable of accomplishing in terms of language use. Halliday (2002) notes that the brain of a young child is a complex machine, able to construct a highly complex schema that constitutes,

guides, and governs the use of language. Not only is the child able to fully grasp what language is but can also internalize what it is for. He elaborates:

> The child knows what language is because he knows what language does. The determining elements in the young child's experience are the successful demands on language that he himself has made, the particular needs that have been satisfied by language for him. (p.50)

Two important arguments about language use in children are raised here. First, youngsters understand what constitutes the language that they were born in. Second, it is understood that language exists for a purpose, meaning it has certain functions, and it is these functions that they want to take advantage of.

The ability to use language is undergirded by Chomsky's theory of linguistic competence and performance. The competence-performance theory is similar to De Saussure's concepts of langue and parole, the first referring to the abstract systems and rules of language and the latter to application of language systems (Lukens-Bull & Zahn, 2018). Competence consists of a collection of linguistic systems to be mastered by the language learner, making the production of countless number of sentences possible. It ought to be exhibited via the articulation of language rules, an aptitude referred to as performance. Competence, therefore, is the built-in knowledge of language units while performance is the actualization of linguistic codes in concrete situations (Devitt, 2015).

Children's Goals and Intentions in Language Use

In 1978, Ann Carter (as cited in Hoft, 2014) published a seminal work on how developing young children use language and established what she called the systematic use of "'sound-gesture' combinations to express eight different communicative functions" (p.102). These are: (a) requesting help, (b) directing the listener's attention, and (c) expressing pleasure. Referring to them as "goals", Carter believed that a typical child uses different facets of a language to articulate his or her thoughts as well as needs and emotions (p. 19). The communicative strategies were listed as: (a) getting help in obtaining object, (b) drawing attention to object, (c) drawing attention to self, (d) getting or giving object, (e) getting help in changing situation, (f) getting help in removing object, and (g) expressing pleasure. Expounding on the list, Ninio (1995, as cited in Hoff, 2014), labels these strategies as "intentions" which are used to express the following: (a) agreeing/disagreeing with a proposition, (b) correcting an utterance, (c) asking a yes-no question, (d), requesting clarification utterance, (e) giving affirmative or negative answers to yes-no questions, (f) making a verbal move in telephone game/pick-a-boo game, (g) making object transfer, (h) marking completion of action and the falling of an object, and (i) exclaiming in disapproval, distress, surprise or enthusiasm. The first two intentions reflect children's capacity to make decisions, as well as showing of approval/disapproval, and expressing their opinions against something that is perceived as incorrect. The third and fourth intentions reveal the capacity of children to be actively engaged in conversation, knowing when and what to ask in order to comprehend utterances and supplying

answers to questions. The other intentions embody the child's feelings and emotions, both positive and negative.

Incidentally, Halliday also refers to "intentions" which represent both "material and intellectual needs" (p. 50). He posits that language use among children is not a matter of talking, but a matter of meaning. He argues:

> For the child, all language is doing something: in other words, it has meaning. It has meaning in a very broad sense including here a range of functions which the adult does not normally think of as meaningful…The child's awareness of language cannot be isolated from his awareness of language function…(p. 53).

Halliday's Models of Child's Use of Language

Based on his extensive pen and paper method of recording his son's communicative repertoire, Halliday concluded that young children use language for manipulation, ordering or commanding, establishing connections, showcasing their uniqueness, questioning, imagining, and articulating ideas. By the time a child reaches the age of 5, he or she is thought to have possessed and used these language functions in varying degrees. In their daily experiences, children observe that language could be used to regulate behavior, and soon they find themselves adopting the same practice, known as the regulatory model. They realize that through language instructions can be given and compliance demanded, thus, a tool for controlling or manipulating the environment. Manipulative tendencies do not always require complete utterances but can be expressed via "a noise in commanding tone", "a contextualized yell" or any other imperatives (p. 50). This function evolves, becoming more elaborate as "experience of the potentialities of language [increases]" (p. 51). To get along with others or establish connections with important persons in their lives, boys and girls perform the interactional model. Every young child, explains Halliday, is able to internalize language while actively listening and talking to others. The fourth function, known as the personal model, demonstrates individuality and uniqueness by way of expression of feelings, personal preferences, and attitudes.

In Hallidayan tradition, every normal child is intrinsically inquisitive, seeking explanations for things that they see or do not understand, an investigative function called heuristic model. Language can also be a viable instrument to create an imaginary realm, and this accounts for the imaginative model demonstrated through dramatic games like storytelling activities. This make-believe construction or reconstruction does not need to be confined to the sophisticated but may be as simple as "pure sound" or "rhythmic sequences of rhymes and chiming syllables" (p. 52). Encompassing all the other functions of the child's model of language is the representational model which is seen through the articulation of inner thoughts. More dominant in later years as the child matures, this function shows the child that there is more to language than merely achieving something or controlling others: it is a tool for one to be heard and understood. Throughout childhood, some or all these functions are employed by children to realize their goals.

Demographic Factors and Language Use and Development

Certain demographic considerations have been associated with language production. These factors include ethnicity/race, gender, bilingualism, and parents' communicative acts. The fourth variable encompasses parental activities, practices, intentions, communicative competence, parenting style, etc. that may result to or involve interactions with a child.

Ethnicity or race has been linked with how children develop and use language. For instance, studies have shown that African American children tend to demonstrate inferior language skills as compared to their white counterparts (Basit et al., 2014). Faitar (2011) also found that socioeconomic status of parents as well as their race impact their children's language performance. Gender also plays an important role in terms of verbal abilities, which become apparent at an early age (Barel & Tzischinsky, 2018). Girls are said to develop verbal skills faster than boys (Adani & Cepanec, 2019). Between ages 2 to 4, females demonstrate more pronounced non-verbal and verbal skills (Toivainen et al., 2017). A related study that determined preschoolers' fundamental motor skills proficiency found certain differences between the two sexes, but distinction is not consistent during such period (Kokštejn, Musálek, & Tufano, 2017).

Bilingualism also factors in when it comes to language skills (Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2012). It is also normal for bilingual children to possess one dominant language and one that is weaker (Van Dijk et al., 2021). Children who acquire two languages before age three are classified as early childhood bilinguals, while those who learn their L2 beyond that age are referred to as later childhood bilinguals (Kapa & Colombo, 2013). Others refer to these classifications as simultaneous and sequential bilingualism (Stoehr et al., 2018). In the former, acquisition of two languages takes place at the same rate while in the latter, learning of an L2 occurs at a later time. (Bird, Genesee, & Verhoeven, 2016). In terms of language dominance, bilinguals can be classified as either as balanced bilinguals' (both L1 and L2 having equal dominance) and unbalanced bilinguals' where either language is dominant (Tsui et al., 2019). A child may be categorized as bilingual even if he or she has not achieved fluency in the L2, known as incipient bilingualism (Ansah et al., 2017). Bilinguals tend to demonstrate linguistic and cognitive advantage compared to monolinguals (Blom, 2017). Across all ages, bilinguals are thought to demonstrate executive control compared to monolinguals (Kousaie et al., 2014).

Majority of Filipinos are either multilingual or bilingual (Ledesma & Morris, 2011; Wattimena & Manara, 2016) because they get exposed to or acquire multiple languages because of the existence of multiple languages in the Philippines (Dimaculangan, 2018; Dita, 2009; Unsworth, 2013). Residents of Metro Manila, for example, may speak English aside from Filipino, the national language. Inhabitants in the northern or southern parts of the Philippines have their own mother tongues besides the two official languages (Tupas, 2015). Some parents coming from middle to upper classes especially in urban centers tend to introduce English to their growing children, hence, becoming their first language. As they interact outside the home and in school, children may acquire Filipino which is the most widely spoken language in the archipelagic nation spoken by at least 28 million (Tanaka et al., 2014). Alternatively, children with Filipino as their

L1 are forced to learn the language by being sent to English-only schools (Dawe, 2014)

Children's language skills are said to be affected by their parents' behaviors. Madigan (2015) and colleagues have found that responsive parenting helps facilitate language development. This is seen through the level of sensitivity to the overall needs of children (Wade, 2018), and particularly obvious among boys (Barnett, 2012). Manifestations of sensitive parenting are mothers' warmth, affection, and pleasure when interacting with the child (Brophy-Herb et al., 2012; Madigan et al., 2019). Sensitive or responsive parenting involves giving attention to verbalizations and initiations from the child as well as communicative activities (Madigan et al., 2019). Use of emotion words, desire words, assertions, and cognitive words also aid in language development (Brophy-Herb et al., 2012). All these, occurring within the context of social relations, constitute language input that facilitate language competence (Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006). Additionally, parents' self-efficacy, which relates to their emotional and communicative competences, has positive impact on children's language development (Albarran & Reich, 2013). Similarly, maternal social support when children are young is beneficial for early language development (Chang, 2017).

Method

The focus of this case study is a young boy who was exposed to English as his first language (L1). Based on the video recordings, the parents had intended to ground the child in this language although he is slowly being introduced to select expressions in Filipino, his emergent L2. The boy is considered as incipient bilingual, able to communicate through his L1 but not in his L2. In this case study, the utterances of the subject between the age of 2.10 and 4.6 years old were examined to determine Halliday's child's models of language use. A descriptive study, this work attempted to correlate the demonstration of the models with four demographic factors namely, ethnicity, age, gender, and type of bilingualism, and parents' communicative acts. Other possible factors that could influence language use in young children were not the concern of this study.

Sources of data are nine videos recorded in a span of three years from October 30, 2018, to June 5, 2020, each lasting between less than a minute to more than three minutes. Containing the child's interactions with parents and family friends, the recordings represented both regular and special socializations, all occurring in a natural environment. The utterances were captured via smartphones when the child. The recordings were done to document what the parents perceived as milestones in his life. Some of the videos have been made available on Instagram and YouTube and were supplied to the researcher upon request. The child is a son of a minister in his early 30s and an event organizer-host mother who engages in a lot of communicative functions as part of her job. The subject spoke only English since every member of the family communicated to him in the language, although the mother has started introducing him to some Filipino words through children's stories in the vernacular.

The nine recordings were deemed sufficient in ascertaining how language was used since they represented unique situations wherein the subject is on an interactive mode, according to O'Grady, (2005), who recommends documentation when a child is expressive and actively engages with others. The capturing of the

nine videos coincides with O'Grady's advice since they are not limited to "just one setting or...one conversational partner" (p. 201). Following the transcriptions, the data was analyzed using descriptive method to determine the models demonstrated and how they correlated with four demographic factors. Frequency analysis was used in classifying utterances based on Halliday's functions of language in children. Select demographic factors such the communicative practices of the parents were correlated with his language use. Results were triangulated with an online interview with the parents, conducted via Messenger chat to determine the role of parental communicative acts and habits.

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How were the Hallidayan models of child's use of language demonstrated by the boy?
2. How are demographic factors and parents' communicative acts correlated with language use in the child?

Findings and Discussion

This paper looked at how an incipient bilingual boy used English (L1) and Filipino (his emerging L2) in his interactions with his father (JPK) and mother (KK). In this section, the Hallidayan models of child's use of language are presented through multiple productions of morphemes and more complicated lexical combinations such as phrases, clauses, and sentences, as well as non-verbal forms of communication.

Demonstration of Models of Child's Use of Language

The first video is a short conversation while the mother and the child were aboard their vehicle on their way to a Disney event when the child was 2.10 years old. The parent attempts to rectify incorrect language productions of her son and takes advantage of the same for socialization. The utterances such as "Ah…ah-wana", "Mana", "Wana" of the boy are responses to the mother's promptings (6, 8, 10). This shows the use of the interactional function of language. In lines 7, 8, and 9, the default use of language is the interactional function, apparently because of the age of the child. Note that in these lines (except line 8), the boy does not initiate interactions but merely responds to prompts from the parents. Again, this is understandable because of the age of the child.

The second video is an interaction between the subject—aged 2.11 years old at the time of the recording—and his parents on their way to their resort cabin during a family trip south of Manila. Aboard a cart drawn by a water buffalo, the parents strike a conversation with their son, and responds with the words "Ethan", "Poknut", and "Cho-nut" (6, 11, & 13). Here, the interactional model is also exhibited. In line 15, he surprises his parents with the longer phrase, "Is eating" while pointing to the animal, demonstrating that he can make sense of the events around him, somehow reflecting an element of the personal function.

Video 3 is storytelling time, filmed when the subject was 3.1 years old. While the mother and son are reading a children's book, the boy reacts with mostly incomplete sentences and mono-syllabic short utterances such as "Yeah", "the track", "boul-der", "truck", and "the lookout" (6, 13, 17, 21, 34, & 37). Being a participant and an observer in this interaction, the child illustrates the interactional model. An explanation for very limited linguistic outputs from the child is his

focus on playtime rather than on the storytelling, aside of course from his age. Noticeable here is the progression of the child's use of language from the default interactional function to personal function, which is more pronounced, and this appears to be influenced by his age.

The fourth video is also a reading time. The goal, according to the mother in an online interview, is to introduce Tagalog (Filipino) lexicon. In line 5, the child, who was 3 years old at the time of the filming, articulates the phrase, "Wagon, mama", reflecting the interactional and instrumental functions. Based on the video, the child is not demanding but merely expressive of a desire to have his toy, which the mother sidelines and focuses on the task at hand. This appears to be a variant of instrumental model without the intent to control or manipulate. Having difficulty learning a new language, the boy resorts to his comic ways which are also seen in the other videos. He acts and sounds funny by mimicking his mother albeit incorrectly, and when gently chided, he responds with laughter and made-up word combinations such as pata-poo-poo (17, 19 & 21), which appear to be an intentional distortion of "puto bumbong", a steamed rice delicacy available at Christmastime). When unable to deliver the right phonemes, the child resorts to comic ways and alters the words, again, to sound hilarious.

We see here the intentional use of phonological and morphological distortions to divert the adult's attention from his errors. It suggests that young children resort to diversionary tactics (such as mimicking, being funny, word distortion, etc.) to demonstrate another language use that Halliday did not find in his study. This is understandable since Halliday based his theory on his observations of his son Nigel up to the age of 18 months only (Thwaite, 2019). This technique found in the Filipino boy appears to reflect the diversionary function of child language as posited by Canadian psycholinguist Frank Smith (Thwaite, 2019). But unlike Smith's typology, the diversion employed in the case study is not an end to itself but a means to another function. It is possible that the boy engages in diversionary function to avoid correction or chastisement. Conversely, the child's ego appears to be affected whenever he is unable to produce the correct phonemes, hence, the distraction. The child's alterations and funny ways are apparently intended to steer away the focus from his childish blunders and highlight his other strengths or potentials.

The child is insinuating that beyond his phonological gaffes, he has other things to offer to the world, demonstrating what I will call the *esteem* model or "I am confident" and "I am an achiever" function which elicits affirmation from adults. The child distracts the mother in an attempt to direct her attention to his other ways of showcasing language performance and away from his perceived lack of linguistic competence (Ahearn, 2017). Because he cannot produce the compound "puto bumbong" correctly, the child offers the distorted but funny version "pata-poo-poo". Similarly, unable to utter another compound "sapin-sapin" and producing "pasin-pasin" instead, the boy concocts "sapin-dadu". Highlighted in this transcription is a non-Hallidayan function of language. I propose this to be reflective of the *esteem* function of child's use of language. For the boy, the *esteem* function is a matter of great importance. The video culminates with the praise, "Very good!" (44) from the mother. In this video, the child, who is a bit older, demonstrates two Hallidayan models and a new function, possibly Asian/Filipino child's use of language.

Video 5 is family bonding time at a swimming pool. Recorded in this clip are short but complete sentences. The interactional model is obvious in this case. The question, "How about me?" (6) communicates a desire to imitate what the boy's father is doing, that is, spouting water with his hands. Categorizing this expression according to the remaining Hallidayan lenses in terms of functions of language is problematic since it does not seem to fit any of them. At first glance, we may assume that it demonstrates an element of the interactional function, but a deeper analysis will show that the child wants his dad to teach him how to squirt water using his hands. The statement is also not reflective of the personal model because the subject has no particular capability or talent to showcase. We can sense a wish to be like his father or to perform an activity that adults can do. More than a case of idolizing his father, the boy is displaying another function that Halliday may not have accounted for. Although partly reflective of the instrumental function, it is not in any way controlling or manipulative. In fact, the child is requesting assistance from his parent. At the very least, this may be a variant of the regulatory model—sans the manipulation—and I call it the "Teach me" function or the *supporting* model wherein the child communicates a need for adult assistance in performing an activity.

In line 12, the boy reacts with, "Not funny, papa!" when his father splashes water at him. Based on Chomskyan orientation, these linguistic codes could have been produced independently by him, or if Vygotsky is right, this could have been absorbed from his environment (Akhmetova, Chelnokova, & Morozova, 2017). We see a sharing of an idea which has some elements of the interactional and representational models. However, examined closely, the remark expresses rebuke in a lighter tone, thus, the statement deserves another label. Indicating correction, the child projects to the father that the splashing of water was unwelcome and even wrong. This may be referred to as the *corrective* or *judgmental* model. In this situation, more complicated or novel models are demonstrated.

In the sixth video, the subject is with his mother in the home of family friends, unwrapping egg-shaped presents as part of the Easter celebration while engaged in conversation with the adults. The boy, now 4.4 years old, does not seem to be distracted by the activity. While occupied with the presents, the boy actively interacts as shown below:

Boy: To crack an egg…
KK: So what are you doing?
Boy: Cracking the egg…
KK: And then…
Boy: And then, you can crack an egg and crumble it in the eggs. No! (unwrapping Easter egg)

The mother and son are into a snappy and lively question-and-answer discourse. The boy provides straightforward answers, showing his deep involvement in both the dialogue and the activity. This is further shown by the next lines:

KK: So what are we gonna do with those eggs?
Boy: Keep it.

KK: Keep it and?
Boy: The baby… the baby scramble.

The dialogue depicts the child as an active participant and as an observer in a social interaction, reflecting the interactional model. No other models were observed, apparently because the video is short.

In video 7, the boy is seen crying uncontrollably and is upset to the point that he resorts to wailing as the father attends to his concern. He uses words and cries to express what he wants. In the interaction, the boy, now 4.5 years old, articulates that he misses doing exercises. Although the boy does not directly make demands, his statement, "I miss exercise" can be interpreted as, "Let us/me have exercise or I will keep crying". This scenario showcases personal and interactional models. When asked how many hip openers he wanted, the child is explicit and with emphasis declares, "Fifty!" The boy is able to communicate what he wants or demands through the use of language while crying and wailing at the same time (lines 13,14, and 17). By resorting to loud cries as a way to control an adult, the child shows the instrumental model. Manipulation or control can be subtle and not necessarily expressed through a "full dress imperative" which is observed in the recording (p. 50). In the same scenario, the boy articulates his frustrations, and he does so by wailing at the same time, reflecting the representational model. In this context, the child demonstrates four models of language use.

The eighth video is a recording of a child learning Filipino, the boy's emerging L2, through the art of reading. The mother, using a children's Filipino book, assists the latter in recalling previously learned lexical items in the vernacular. The reading session takes place by the kitchen table, and both are seated. Part of the dialogue goes:

KK: Okay, anong mga nakasampay, ___ (name of the boy is called)? May?
[Okay, what is hung, ___ (boy's child)? Those are…]
Boy: [unintelligible] … at medyas. […and socks.]
KK: May… butas… [There is…a hole]
Boy: Butas…[hole]
KK: Na…na…[in…in the]
Boy: Bayong. [native shopping bag.]
KK: Bayong. [native shopping bag.]

In this segment, participation is at its peak and the child maintains a high level of excitement as demonstrated by his ecstatic tone throughout the interaction, an example of interactional model. Similarly, the boy manifests his enjoyment in the activity by constantly laughing and making appropriate gestures (e.g. pointing at the broom when reading about the word). The following lines indicate the pleasure being exhibited by the child during the interaction via reading:

Boy: Haring… bundok! [celebratory or excitedly] [King…mountain!]
KK: May haring… [The king…]
Boy: Soldier [laughs]!

Not only does the boy actively participate, but he also engages with exuberance, giggling, and laughing as he performs oral sentence completion. The following dialog adds to the role of the child as a participant (being a listener and reader) and as a communicator, all of which reveal his amusement. Note specifically the first line which shows the child amused, apparently by the picture of a monkey, which was being talked about, or by his own mistake, giggling as he expresses agreement to the mother's subtle correction.

Boy: wehenga, unggoy. [right, monkey.] (agrees; giggles)
KK: Papel…[Paper]
Boy: Vinta. [Muslim boat]
KK: na Vinta [Muslim boat]. Ito ay matibay na… [This is a sturdy…]
Boy: Walis! [Broom!] (points to a broom in the kitchen)
KK: Ito ay bagong… [This is a new…]
Boy: Xylophone.

The fifth line documents a gesture made by the child, pointing to an object, apparently a broom in the kitchen (though not captured in the video) when he says, "Walis!" or broom in Filipino. The action is performed with glee. The remaining lines in the mother-child conversation culminate in the emphatic delivery of the word "Filipino!", referring to the local alphabets that are illustrated in the book. The lines read:

KK: Makulay na… [A colorful…]
Boy: Yo-yo! (points up) Upstairs.
KK: Unan na… [A pillow that is…]
Boy: Zebra.
KK: Wow! Iyan ay ang alpabetong…[These are the alphabets in…]
Boy: Filipino!

The emotion as conveyed by the boy suggests not just elation but also satisfaction with the activity, perhaps partly because of the funny-sounding words unfamiliar to him. In all this, the child showcases the interactional model, demonstrating how much he values and enjoy such interaction. As the boy exhibits comical actions and making himself sound funny, he appears to demonstrate his uniqueness, a reflection of the personal model. He does this when he points to a broom and the location of a yoyo upstairs (by pointing up)- again with a funny face and gestures. Many instances in the exchange showcase the boy's propensity to act comically while at the same time spotlights his wit. The boy's words and actions are a show of a sense of pride in a positive sense, somewhat reflective of the personal function, but not fully. I will return to this shortly. As far as the funny personality of the boy, it appears that children find pleasure in showcasing who they are especially in comfortable situations like the home.

I also reiterate the *esteem* model or "I am confident" or "I am achiever" function, which reveals more than just identity, individuality, uniqueness, ideas, and intentions. I theorize that this use of language in (Filipino) children may be connected to the psychological need to be affirmed, classified under esteem needs

popularized by Maslow (Lester, 2013). Reflecting a higher need, this expression of a desire to be valued and accepted is related to self-respect or self-esteem. The former reflects individuals' regard to their standing while the latter refers to their confidence and satisfaction in themselves. Self-esteem, which is ego-driven, is classified into two types. The first is experienced when a person is accorded respect and affirmation or some form of acknowledgment. The second emanates from a person's own assessment of himself or herself. This kind of esteem is shown through independence and self-confidence (Pinquart & Gerke, 2019). In the case of the subject, it was clear that there was no intention to receive something or to be attended to, a common goal in communicative repertoire of young kids (Hoft, 2014). The boy was simply enjoying an activity while exhibiting the *esteem model*. I posit that children, at least Filipino kids, use language as an instrument to highlight their important place in the family and community, and they do so by articulating confidence, achievement, etc. We see here a showcase of child power, that children are as capable and confident as adults. At the very least, this is a call from children to be recognized as smart individuals or co-equal with adults.

In the same video, the imaginative model is also evident as shown by the words "meow" and "corn dog". Note the lines below (47-55):

KK: May… maliksing…[There is…a nimble…]
Boy: Kuting! [Kitten!] Meow!
KK: May kumpol na…[A bunch of…]
Boy: Osan… ng chick-leta! [clock of the bike!]
KK: Ng… lansones! [longkong]
Boy: Lansones-si!
KK: May mais na…[Corn that is…]
Boy: Corn dog?
KK: No, it's not corn dog. Mais na nilaga. [Boiled corn.]

After giving the correct answer, which is "kitten", the youngster pairs it with the appropriate sound that is associated with the cat, and he does so without prompting. This shows the boy's sense of imagination, instantly recalling the sound associated with the feline. In line 54, the child produces the phrase "corn dog", a combination of a real corn and a child's delight of the same name which contains no corn at all, but a hotdog fried in a batter. The production of such word further reveals the child's imagination. In this video, four child's models of language use were observed including the new *esteem* function.

The ninth and last video, which is an interaction between the boy and his parents, is replete with utterances that reveal the boy's affinity with his mother. The recording begins with an announcement from the child, "Mama, to be love life with me" (line 5) followed by a question from the father, "Who will you like to hold hands with forever?", providing context to the child's declaration. The interaction continues with the following lines (7 and 10):

Boy: Mama, love life.
JPK: [Laughs]
KK (Mother): Only?

Boy: Only Mama.

In line 7, his earlier pronouncement is repeated, which captures his feelings for his mother, and affirmed in line 10 with a two-word response to an inquiry about the certainty of the boy's remark. The reply is direct, and it is backed with both the promise and an assertion, "I miss you, Mamaaaa!" (line 16). This signifies the subject's effort to prove the sincerity of his statements, thus, the emphatic declaration. Despite its short duration, the video captured four ways by which the boy used language. First, the personal model is demonstrated as shown by his personal preferences and feelings while also producing words that reveal his identity—that he possesses love or is capable of loving. Second, since the utterances reflect the child's thoughts and feelings about his mother, which also unpack certain "content" or "propositions" (Halliday, 2002, p. 50), representational model is seen. The utterances reveal the child's conception of an ideal female partner in life, thus the phrase "to be love life with me". Furthermore, the concept of boy-girl relationship or even marriage, apparently observed from his parents, are conveyed. The child's desire to interact or connect with significant people in his life indicates the interactional function. Fourth, the imaginative model was reflected as the child envisioned a future life with a female as represented by the mother. Although he did not engage in the typical storytelling activities of make-believes, he nevertheless demonstrated such function through the surprising expression "love life" which was mentioned twice. Halliday explains that this function need not be sophisticatedly communicated. Again, four models are demonstrated in this recording.

Child's Models of Language Use, Demographic Factors, and Parents' Role

This study analyzed nine video recordings of a Manila-based child whose L1 is English and whose use of Filipino was just emerging. Five out of the seven Hallidayan language models were displayed: instrumental, interactional, personal, representational, and imaginative. More functions were observed in the last two videos where the child was more mature. Crying and wailing which are forms of manipulation demonstrated the instrumental model. The data is replete with examples that showcase the child's talents, skills, preferences, attitude, identity, and uniqueness which showed the personal model. In terms of the interactional model, the boy was an active participant in activities while actively engaged in conversations within those realms. The child asserted his place in the family and in the world, showing the representational model which allowed him to impart his propositions and important ideas. The imaginative model was seen but rather in uniquely "boyish ways". In place of typical narratives, the child produced animal sounds, offered a substitute lexicon for an object in a funny way, and seemed to act out expressions.

Of the five child's model of language use, the most prominent are the interactional and personal functions which were demonstrated six times. The second most prominent models are the representational and imaginative (each used two times), with the instrumental model being the least prominent having been used only once. Table below shows the models of child's use of language, their frequency of use, and their prominence.

Table 1. Functions of language, their frequency of use, and their prominence

Model of Child's Language Use	Frequency of Use	Prominence
Instrumental	once	least prominent
Interactional	six times	very prominent
Personal	six times	very prominent
Imaginative	twice	prominent
Representational	twice	prominent
Regulatory	not demonstrated	not applicable
Heuristic	not demonstrated	not applicable
Total	17 times	

Certain utterances in the data that did not correspond to Halliday's child's models of language use. A total of four language functions, unique to Philippine and Asian context, were uncovered. The boy exhibited what I call the *esteem* model, exhibited by insinuating his need for affirmation while showcasing achievement through his wit, hilarious sounds and behavior, and production of concocted/distorted phonemes. Such distortions, which are referred to as diversions (Thwaite, 2019), were intentional so that the attention would veer away from the child's errors and focus instead on his funny antics. Two more models were uncovered: the *rescue* model and *judgmental* model, the former reflective of the child's need to be assisted or taught a skill or the "help me" or "rescue me" function. This typology is proposed as it the scenario did not fit any of the Hallidayan functions, although one may argue that this is a variant of the regulatory function but without the manipulation. The child showed the *corrective* or *judgmental* model when he described a behavior of his father as unacceptable or unwelcome. This shows that young children use language not only to communicate thoughts but to rebuke or make judgments. Halliday has a vague classification called representational function, which can practically stand for almost everything a child utters. It is obvious that young children use language not simply to communicate inner thoughts but to rebuke or make judgments. Communication experts teach us that we communicate to express or inform, which reflects Halliday's representation model, and to persuade or convince which mirrors the instrumental function. When one analyzes a certain behavior or speech act and labels it as "not funny", the child is demonstrating language maturity and an ability to synthesize information, verbal or non-verbal. The *corrective* or *judgmental* function corresponds to Austin's concept of expressives, speech acts that are used to make assessment of psychological states or attitude (Ramayanti & Marlina, 2018). When the boy uttered, "Wagon, mama", he was expressing a desire but without pressure, a fusion of the instrumental and representational functions, but both fall short of accounting for the utterances. I propose another function which I call the *asserting* model, coming very close to the *judgmental* function that assesses information that the child perceives.

The imaginative model was uniquely demonstrated, however, it was not as obvious as predicted. The regulatory and heuristic models did not surface in the analysis. While the child attempted to control his father in a subtle way (video 8), he never manifested signs of regulation. Indications of inquisitiveness (the heuristic function) were not detected. There were no signs that the subject was

investigating the bigger world- something that relates to heuristic model. This is not surprising since, as Halliday argues, uses of languages do not develop simultaneously. In fact, some functions develop ahead of the others and vice-versa. There is a possibility that manifestations of certain models may not have been captured in the nine videos; thus, appearing to be untapped. The length of some of the recordings could have also missed some functions.

We now turn to certain demographic considerations and parenting factors in order to provide explanations for the use of language and the phenomena encountered. The obvious models as well as the novel assisting, esteem, asserting, and corrective functions appear to be linked to the language behaviors of Orientals like Filipinos. Also, the new functions of language that the child demonstrated may not have been accounted for by Halliday since his theorizing is of a western orientation. In this study, I examined the possible connection between language models and certain demographics of the boy, namely ethnicity, age, gender, and type of bilingualism in addition to his parents' communicative acts and attitude. Findings showed that besides ethnicity, the child's gender, age, and parents' communicative acts helped influence language development and use. Bilingualism did not appear to be a significant variable in terms of language models in the child.

Results also point to the role of race in the demonstration of the models of child's use of language and the display of previously unaccounted functions. Asian/Filipino kids may use language quite differently from European children as shown in this research. Basit et al. (2014) and Faitar (2011) have linked race with socioeconomic status (SES) and language production in children, one's ethnicity predicts language skills. In the case of the boy, his apparent advanced verbal skills were shaped and enhanced by both SES and ethnicity. Besides ethnicity, gender appeared to have influenced the demonstration of the models of language use in children. In his interactions, the boy seemed to differ from his parents, particularly the mother in terms of word choice. The mother pointed to a corn, but the boy saw a "corn dog", and for a bunch of local fruits, the boy perceived them as a clock. Experts believe that the language spoken by people reflect and shape their worldviews (Allard-Kropp, 2020), hence, in the case of the subject, his language use could have been influenced by who he is such as his gender. Although girls tend to develop language skills faster than boys, Etchell et al. (2018) believe that gender differences may be distinct only at certain developmental stages. Thus, demonstration of advance verbal skills is also possible among boys, and, as asserted earlier, this development could have been influenced by his ethnicity and parents' communicative acts and habits.

Age was a major factor in the language use of the boy. As he matured, he tended to showcase more models. In addition, novel models that seemed to be distinctly Filipino and Asian were shown when the child was between three and four years old. Experts agree and explain that children between ages 3 and 5 can engage in more complex conversations characterized by deep thoughts as well as feelings ("Language Development", 2021). It is also at this period when they become more inquisitive and try to make sense of their surroundings. Additionally, grammar and lexicon also expand and so their curiosity with other topics that were not of interest before. These provide support to the verbal skills

that the child in this study demonstrated, particularly his use of multiple models including the new ones that Halliday did not posit.

Language input, sensitivity, and other communicative acts of the parents seemed to have aided the subject in demonstrating somewhat language competence (Brophy-Herb et al., 2012; Madigan et al., 2019; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006). Young children not only learn a language but also become adept in using it so that they become expert as language users and as members of society. In the case of the boy in this study, there was an active participation from the parents particularly the mother. In all the videos, the mother was actively engaging the subject. Communication was intentional. In short, demonstrating the functions of language became a reality because the parents' communicative acts and attitude. In an online interview, the mother explained that that she and her husband spent almost equal time in dialoguing with the boy. She, in particular, took advantage of available moments for mother-child interactions, obviously to help the boy develop speech. Because both parents were involved in the communication enterprise, the father being a minister (which involves preaching and teaching) and the mother as an event organizer-host (which requires a lot of interactions with people) appeared to have influenced the use of language in the child. As such, both could be described as socially and communicatively competent.

Implications

This study has implications bilingualism, language teaching, and language development theories. Regarding bilingualism, there are two important points to be made. First, acquiring more than two languages has become inevitable due to globalization. Even if growing children are not exposed to more knowledgeable individuals who speak a different language, there are countless external factors that can result to simultaneous, sequential, balanced or unbalanced, and incipient bilingualism. These factors include education and media such as the Internet. Second, while bilingualism is positively correlated with verbal and non-verbal skills and other cognitive functions, such cannot be true in all cases. Each child, as shown in this study is unique, and their language development and usage is dependent on their own unique circumstances at home and in their culture. Nevertheless, I do not discount the fact that since the subject here was just acquiring his L2, it was possible that such factor could have impacted his language skills at the time of the recording. It is possible that as the child gains more foothold in Filipino that he might be able to demonstrate more maturity in language use in the language and even in his L1.

Turning now to language teaching, it was obvious that language development is influenced greatly by parental involvement particularly by responsive, sensitive, and communicative mothers. Taking the time to interact with a typically growing child can stimulate responses in terms of language production, and parents will be surprised as to how much their offspring could demonstrate as they are talked to. Among preschoolers, communicative activities in the school environment can help enhance language development. This means employing routines and lessons that elicit child-child, child-teacher, and child-parent interactions will go a long way in achieving language skills.

In terms of theorizing, Filipino and Asian children demonstrate some unique models of child's use of language. They communicate to be esteemed or affirmed, to be assisted, to assert himself, and to correct. Although one may argue that these may be encompassed by the representational model, this particular function is just too broad, even vague to fully account for the uniqueness of Filipino or Asian children. The four typologies are more definite and descriptive of actual realities in models of child's use of language.

Conclusion

Halliday's models are a good starting point but may not be fully representative of all the possible functions of language in young children as shown in this video. The models are simply that—patterns or prototypes and may not entirely represent all reality. In the case of this research, it is clear that each child is unique, and that while the Hallidayan models assist in understanding language utilization, they may be found lacking to some extent. Halliday's context was European, and this study featured a Filipino male child in a bilingual context and whose parents demonstrated communicative acts and attitude. Ethnicity, gender, age, and parents' role seemed to have influenced the use of language models. Of the seven functions, five were evident, and these are the instrumental, interactional, personal, imaginative, and representational models. Obviously untapped were the regulatory and heuristic models. Of the five functions, the most prominent were the interactional and personal models. This shows that for young children, language is primarily for communication and for self-expression. It is a tool to achieve, accomplish, receive, and get. Four Filipino or Asian Models of child's use of language were observed, and these are the rescue, judgmental, esteem, and asserting functions. It can be inferred that these were not captured by Halliday in his participant observation study involving his son. A case study involving a female youngster can provide valuable data to validate the results of this research. Longer recordings and a greater number of videos (more than nine) are recommended in future studies of the same nature to arrive at more conclusive inferences. Alternatively, the investigation could be expanded to include another gender or involve more than two subjects and allow more interaction contexts to determine the functions of language among young kids. Finally, the same study could be applied with monolinguals and multilinguals as subjects.

References

Akhmetova, D. Z., Chelnokova, T. A., & Morozova, I. G. (2017). Theoretical and methodological basis of inclusive education in the researches of Russian scientists in the first quarter of 20th century (P. P. Blonsky, L. S. Vygotsky, v. P. Kaschenko, S. T. Shatsky). *International Education Studies*, *10*(2), 74-179.

Adani, S., & Cepanec, M. (2019). Sex differences in early communication development: behavioral and neurobiological indicators of more vulnerable communication system development in boys. *Croatian Medical Journal*, *60*(2), 141–149.

Ahearn, L. M. (2017). *Living language: An introduction to linguistic anthropology* (2nd ed). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Albarran, A., & Reich, H. M. (2013). Using baby books to increase new mothers' self-efficacy and improve toddler language development. *Infant and Child Development, 23*(4), 374-387. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.1832

Allard-Kropp, M. (2020). *Languages and worldview*. Open Educational Resources Collection 17. Retrieved on December 8, 2021, from: https://irl.umsl.edu/oer/17

Ansah, G. N., Anderson, J. A., Anamzoya, S. A., & Ohemeng, F. (2017). 'Bra, Sɛn, Yɛnkɔ... that is all I know in akan': How female migrants from rural north survive with minimum bilingualism in urban markets in Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Linguistics, 6*(1), 49-74. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjl.v6i1.69

Barel, E., & Tzischinsky, O. (2018). Age and sex differences in verbal and visuospatial abilities. *Advances in cognitive psychology*, *2*(14), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.5709/acp-0238-x

Barnett, M. A., Gustafsson, H., Deng, M., Mills-Koonce, W. R., & Cox, M. (2012). Bidirectional associations among sensitive parenting, language development, and social competence. *Infant and Child Development, 21* (4), 374-393. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.1750

Basit, T. N., Hughes, A., Iqbal, Z., & Cooper, J. (2014). The influence of socio-economic status and ethnicity on speech and language development. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 23*(1), 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2014.973838

Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Science, 16*(4), 240-250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.03.001

Bird, E. K., Genesee, F., & Verhoeven, L. (2016). Bilingualism in children with developmental disorders: A narrative review. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 63*, 1-14. doi https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2016.07.003

Blom, E., Boerma, T., Bosma, E., Cornips, L., & Everaert, E. (2017). Cognitive advantages of bilingual children in different sociolinguistic contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*(552), 1-12. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00552

Brophy-Herb, H. E., Stansbury, K., Bocknek, E., & Horodynski, M. A. (2012). Modeling maternal emotion-related socialization behaviors in a low-income sample: Relations with toddlers' self-regulation. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27*, 352–364. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.11.005

Byrnes, J. P., & Wasik, B. A. (2009). *Language and literacy development: What educators need to know*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Chang, Y. E. (2017). Pathways from mothers' early social support to children's language development at age 3. *Infant and Child Developmen*t, *26*(6), e2025. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2025

Dawe, C. (2014). Language governmentality in Philippine education policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 29*(1), 61-77.

Devitt, A. J. (2015). Genre performances: John Swales' genre analysis and rhetorical-linguistic genre studies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 19*, 44-51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.05.008.

Dimaculangan, N. G. (2018). Another look into Philippine English: Towards users' awareness and celebration. *International Journal of Advance Research and Publications, 2*(8), 17-22.

Dita, S. (2009). The metalinguistic awareness of Filipino bilingual children. *Philippine ESL Journal, 3*, 6-24.

Etchell, A., Adhikari., A, Weinberg, L. S., Choo, A. L., Garnett, E. O., Chow, H. M., & Chang, S. (2018). A systematic literature review of sex differences in childhood language and brain development. *Neuropsychologia, 114*, 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.04.011.

Faitar, G. M. (2011). Socioeconomic status, ethnicity and the context of achievement in minority education. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies, 5*, 1-8.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). Relevant models of language. In Power, B.M. & Hubbard, R. S. (Eds.) *Language development: A reader for teachers* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hoft, E. (2014). *Language development* (5th ed.). California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Kapa, L. L., & Colombo, J. (2013). Attentional control in early and later bilingual children. *Cognitive Development, 28*, 233– 246. doi http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2013.01.011

Kokštejn, J., Musálek, M., & Tufano, J. J. (2017). Are sex differences in fundamental motor skills uniform throughout the entire preschool period? *PLoS One, 12*, e0176556. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0176556.

Kousaie, S., Sheppard, C., Lemieux, M., Monetta, L., & Taler, V. (2014). Executive function and bilingualism in young and older adults. *Frontiers in Behavioural Neuroscience, 8*(250), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00250

Language development in children: 0-8 years (2021). Raisingchildren.net.au. Retrieved from https://raisingchildren.net.au/babies/development/language-development/language-development-0-8

Ledesma, H. M. L., & Morris, R. D. (2011). Patterns of language preference among bilingual (Filipino–English) boys. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(1), 62-80. https://doi.org/10.1080/jBEB.v8.i1.pg62

Lester, D. (2013). Measuring maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Psychological Reports, 113*(1), 15–17. https://doi.org/10.2466/02.20.PR0.113x16z1

Lukens-Bull, R., & Zahn, K. A. (2018). The linguistic modeling of variation in islam: Constructing saussure's concepts of langue and parole to religious studies. *Walisongo: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan, 26*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.21580/WS.26.1.2088

Madigan, S., Prime, H., Graham, S. A., Rodrigues, M., Anderson, N., Khoury, J., & Jenkins, J. M. (2019). Parenting behavior and child language: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics, 144*(4), e20183556. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2018-3556

Madigan, S., Wade, M., Plamondon, A., Browne, D., & Jenkins, J. M. (2015). Birth weight variability and language development: Risk, resilience, and responsive parenting. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 40*(9), 869-77. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsv056

O'Grady, W. (2005). *How children learn language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pancsofar, N., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2006). Mother and father language input to young children: Contributions to later language development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*(6), 571-587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2006.08.003.

Pinquart, M., & Gerke, D. C. (2019). Associations of parenting styles with self-esteem in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child Family Studies,* 28, 2017–2035. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01417-5

Ramayanti, D., & Marlina, L. (2018). The analysis of types illocutionary acts in "Tangled" movie. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature, 7*(1), 27-34. https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v7i1.8800

Stoehr, A., Benders, T., Van Hell, J., & Fikkert, P. (2018). Heritage language exposure impacts voice onset time of Dutch–German simultaneous bilingual preschoolers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 21*(3), 598-617. doi:10.1017/S1366728917000116

Tanaka, N., O'Grady, W., Deen, K., Kim, C., Hattori, R., Bondoc, I. P. M., & Soriano, J. U. (2014). Acquisition of tagalog focus system. The 16th Annual International Conference of the Japanese Society for Language Sciences.

Thwaite, A. (2019). Halliday's view of child language learning: Has it been misinterpreted? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(5), 42-56.

Toivainen, T., Papageorgiou, K. A., Tosto, M. G., & Kovas, Y. (2017). Sex differences in non-verbal and verbal abilities in childhood and adolescence. *Intelligence, 64,* 81-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2017.07.007.

Tsui, R., Tong, X., & Chan, C. (2019). Impact of language dominance on phonetic transfer in Cantonese–English bilingual language switching. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 40*(1), 29-58. doi:10.1017/S0142716418000449

Tupas, R. (2015). The politics of 'p' and 'f': a linguistic history of 'nation-building' in the Philippines. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 36*(6), 587-597. doi:10.1080/01434632.2014.979831

Unsworth, S. (2013). Current issues in multilingual first language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33,* 21-50. doi:10.1017/S0267190513000044

Van Dijk, C., Van Wonderen, E., Koutamanis, E., Kootstra, G., Dijkstra, T., & Unsworth, S. (2021). Cross-linguistic influence in simultaneous and early sequential bilingual children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child Language, 48*(6), 1-33. doi:10.1017/S0305000921000337

Wade, M., Jenkins, J. M., Venkadasalam, V. P., Binnoon-Erez, N., & Ganea, P. A. (2018). The role of maternal responsiveness and linguistic input in pre-academic skill development: A longitudinal analysis of pathways. *Cognitive Development, 45,* 125–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2018.01.005

Wattimena, R. U., & Manara, C. (2016). Language use in shifting contexts: Two multilingual Filipinos' narratives of language and mobility. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching, 11*(2), 153-167