

Towards a developmental folk linguistics. A study of Hungarian

Tamás Péter Szabó – Kinga Mátyus

{szabo.tamas.peter, matyus.kinga}@nytud.mta.hu

Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Sociolinguistics Symposium 19 – Berlin, Freie Universität – 24 August 2012

Aim of the project: to compare the metalinguistic practices of kindergarten and school children (grades 1–4) in ideology construction; to *try existing methods / develop new methods* to study the metalinguistic socialization

Theoretical background:

- Folk linguistics – a discourse approach (cf. Preston 2011)
- Proficiency in metadiscourses is part of narrative proficiency, thus metadiscursive practices are studied as narrative practices (Hutto 2008; Taylor 2012): “folk psychology [...] is a distinctive kind of narrative practice” (Hutto 2008: xi)
- Metalanguage: socially constructed, (self)reflective discourse on language – CA and DA tools (Laihonen 2008). It is mainly the topic that distinguishes metalanguage/metadiscourse from any other genres.
- Ideology: description or explanation of social practices with a legitimizing or illemitizing function (Potter–Edwards 2003)

School metalanguage

- Hungarian as a standard language culture (Milroy 2001; Kontra 2006)
- Children are exposed to a high amount of metalanguage (Berko Gleason 1992)
- Different practices can be found in the speech of kindergarten and school children
- School not only offers but also expects metadiscourses which are more versatile in topic and more elaborate: (1) special activities for shaping metadiscursive practices of children; (2) grammar classes: teachers’ explanations, teachers’ repair (Szabó 2012), learning different genres: written narratives, oral examination

Research questions

1. How does ideology construction develop in ages 4–10?
2. What differences can be found between the ideology construction practices of kindergarten and school children?

Materials

Corpus 1

- 6–10-year-old children from different elementary schools (in Budapest and other cities and villages), junior section
- 1-2 children and the interviewer
- 47 subjects, 12 hours of recording
- part of CHSM (Corpus of Hungarian School Metalanguage; Szabó 2012)

Corpus 2 (pilot study)

- 4;6–5;6-year-old children from 2 kindergartens in Budapest (an elite and a suburban one)
- 1 child and the interviewer
- 60 subjects, 28 hours of recording
- Part of the CESAR project (<http://cesar.nytud.hu>)

Interview outline (Szabó 2012)

Do you like talking (with friends, family, classmates)?

Do you talk a lot (with friends, family, classmates)?

Is there any difference between talking at school/kindergarten and talking at home?

Is there any difference between talking to children/adults?

Is there anything you can do/say at home/with friends but not at school/kindergarten (and vice versa)?

Have you ever been told you should not talk like that or should not say something?

Summary

	Kindergarten (C2)	School (C1)
Definition of occurring terms	examples (<i>silly, idiot</i>)	examples & quoted definitions
Answer types	narratives on punishment (authorities: parents, teachers, God) – ideologies on operant conditioning	decontextualized answers (context comes later if there is context at all; elicitation of examples is harder) & narratives on punishment
Base of argumentation, agency	prohibition of speech acts, e. g. express of disgust (as patient)	evaluation of variants with a prescriptive attitude (as agent) & prohibition of speech acts (as agent or patient)
Voicework? (Vygotsky 1978; Aro 2009)	referring to authorities in narratives (rare authority voice)	assimilation and quoting of authority voices & referring to authorities in narratives

References

- Aro, Mari 2009. *Speakers and Doers. Polyphony and Agency in Children's Beliefs about Language Learning*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Berko Gleason, Jean 1992. *Language Acquisition and Socialization*. Boston: Boston University.
- Hutto, Daniel D. 2008. *Folk Psychological Narratives. The Sociocultural Basis of Understanding Reasons*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press
- Kontra, Miklós 2006. Sustainable Linguicism. In: Frans Hinskens (ed.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp. 97–126.
- Laihonen, Petteri 2008. Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 668–693.
- Milroy, James 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 530–555.
- Potter, Jonathan–Derek Edwards 2003. Sociolinguistics, Cognitivism, and Discursive Psychology. *International Journal of English Studies* 1, 93–109.
- Preston, Dennis R. 2011. Methods in (applied) folk linguistics. Getting into the minds of the folk. *AILA Review* 24: 15–39.
- Szabó, Tamás Péter 2012. „Kirakunk táblákat, hogy csúnyán beszélni tilos”. *A javítás mint gyakorlat és mint téma diákok és tanáraiak metanyelvében* [‘Repair as communication practice – repair as discourse topic. A multi-faceted investigation of Hungarian school metalanguage’] Dunaszerdahely/Dunajská Streda (Slovakia): Gramma.
- Taylor, Talbot J. 2012. Understanding others and understanding language: how do children do it? *Language Sciences* 1–12.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. Mind in society. The development of higher forms of attention in childhood. In J. V. Wertsch (ed.), *The concept of activity on Soviet psychology*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe.