Development of Perspective in Narrative Texts
of Turkish-French Bilingual Children in France

Mehmet-Ali Akinci
Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage (UMR 5596 CNRS Université Lyon 2)

1. Introduction

This paper aims to characterize the development of perspective in narrative texts of Turkish-French bilingual children in France.

"Perspective taking depends on the point of view selected by the narrator to express his conceptualization of one particular event or situation. This is a function of the communicative intention of the narrator or the discourse context" (Jisa, 1997: 1). Thus, perspective is the point of view that the narrator adopts to present a given situation. In narratives, perspective is expressed by the choice of the narrator to describe one scene. According to Jisa (1997: 5), "these choices are affecting:
  - the allocations of nucleus roles,
  - the degree of the transitivity,
  - the choice of the topics,
  - the standpoint concerning the conceptualization of the event".
Following Fillmore (1977), the concept of the "*perspective on a scene*" serves to clarify the semantic and grammatical role of the participants in an event. For him, the scene -the event to express- is a complex entity, including the participants who are put in a relation with a predicate. To express this, the narrator makes a choice from the elements and the linguistic devices that he has, such as the lexis, and particularly the choice of the verb and the syntactic structure. Otherwise, we don't have to forget, as Fillmore (1977: 74) revealed that "languages, and lexical items, differ… in the options they present in taking particular perspectives on complex scenes". The narrator can adopt the perspective of different protagonists of the story, either the main character or the secondary character. Alternating the two perspectives requires that the child manipulate the semantic roles (agent or patient) of different characters which influence the thematic continuity established locally or globally (i.e. Berman, 1993; Clark, 1990; Comrie, 1981; DeLancey, 1987). Some studies (Karmiloff-Smith, 1981; Aksu-Koç, 1994; Berman & Slobin, 1994; Slobin, 1985) have shown that young children prefer to use the perspective of the main character, while older children combine perspectives of the main and secondary characters. To illustrate this, we refer to the example of the event "frapper" ('to beat') given by Jisa (1997:2). With this event, two "participant roles" (Croft, 1991) or

 "thematic roles" (Levelt, 1989) are possible: an agent and a patient one. At the lexical level, "frapper" ('to beat') can be compared to "recevoir (un coup)" ('to receive a blow') which only takes the thematic role of patient, and different perspectives can be envisaged with this verb. For this scene, the narrator can adopt:

   - **the perspective of the Agent**. The agent refers to the semantic role played by the arguments expressed by participant who is controlling the situation denoted by the predicate (Foley & Van Valin, 1984: 29). The agent is who is voluntarily and intentionally at the origin of the action and is affecting the patient (Levelt, 1989: 92). The perspective of the agent is taken when the action is described from the point of view of the agent:

(1) a.   Jeanne a frappé Pierre[1]

/Jeanne/have-PRES-3sg/beat-PP/Pierre/[2]
"Jeanne beat Pierre"

   b.   C'est Jeanne qui a frappé Pierre
/that/be-PRES-3sg/Jeanne/who/ have-PRES-3sg/beat-PP/Pierre/
"It is Jeanne who beat Pierre"

   As emphasized by Jisa (1997: 3), it is important not to confuse the semantic role of "agent" and the grammatical role of "subject". In these two examples mentioned above, the agent is also the subject of the verb. (1b) is the dislocated form of (1a). According to Levelt (1989: 91), the role of the agent appears clearly in causative events as CAUSE (CHARACTER, EVENT).
   - **the perspective of the Patient**. According to Foley & Valin (1984: 29) and Levelt (1989: 92), the patient is the character affected by the unintended action of the agent. According to Levelt "a patient can only figure in an ACTION, it is the animate entity (if any) subjected to the action". Taking the perspective of the patient, it is to describe an action from his/her point of view. All the examples below illustrate this perspective:

(2) a.   Pierre a reçu un coup de la part de Jeanne
/Pierre/ have-PRES-3sg/receive-PP/ART/blow/from/Jeanne/
"Pierre received a blow from Jeanne"

   b.   Pierre était frappé par Jeanne
/Pierre/be-PAST-3sg/ beat-PP/by/Jeanne/
"Pierre was beaten by Jeanne"

   c.   C'est Pierre que Jeanne a frappé
/that/be-PRES-3sg/Pierre/that/Jeanne/have-PRES-3sg /beat-PP/
"It is Pierre that Jeanne beat"

   d.   Pierre, Jeanne l'a frappé
/Pierre/Jeanne/him/ have-PRES-3sg/beat-PP/

"Pierre, Jeanne beat him"

 e. Pierre était frappé
   /Pierre/be-IMP-3sg/ beat-PP/
   "Pierre was beaten"

 Comparing (1a) to (2a), lexical choices are involved (*frapper* vs. *recevoir (un coup)* 'to beat *vs.* to receive a blow'). This choice obliges the narrator to change the perspective. (2b) uses a passive construction and (2c) a clitic version. These elements allow, with (1b), to topicalise an argument (Comrie, 1981; Foley & Van Valin, 1984; Keenan, 1985).

 - the perspective of the Actor. This perspective should not be confused with the perspective of the Agent. According to Levelt (1989: 91), the definition of ACTOR requires the notion of ACTION. For Levelt, the actor is the argument which is doing something. The actors may or may not be similar to agents. If the actor is not causing the event, it is not the agent. Here it is useful to distinguish between the notion of *theme* and *topic* (cf. Creissels, 1995: 230-232 Agentivity is determined by taking a number of criteria into account, such as the transitivity of the event, the degree of intentional control on the activity by the agent, or its degree of animacy.

(3) a Jean voit Marie
   /Jean/see-PRES-3sg./Marie/
   "Jean sees Marie"

 b Jean frappe Marie
   /Jean/beat-PRES-3sg./Marie/
   "Jean beats Marie"

 c la dame a ouvert la porte
   /the/lady/have-PRES-3sg/open-PP/the/door/
   "the lady opened the door"

In the example (3a) *Jean* is the "experiencer" (Levelt, 1989; Van Valin, 1993) without volunteer control of his action. In (3b) *Jean* is prototypically the agent of the action: he is a human being who controls one punctual action with volition and provokes an effect on *Marie*, the patient (Hopper & Thompson, 1980). Finally in (3c) *la dame* ('the lady') is an animate participant who instigates an action under her control.

2. Developmental studies on perspective-taking

 Previous studies on this field (Karmiloff-Smith, 1981; Aksu-Koç, 1994; Slobin, 1985; Jisa & Kern, 1995; Idiata, 1998) have demonstrated that the young children (5-7 years old) will conform to the strategy of the thematic subject, that is equivalent to saying that he/she will express the whole events according to the

perspective of the main character of the story. Older children (8-10 years old) will juggle with perspectives, taking the perspective of one character and then shifting to another one, without expressing the status of this character. With the development of the narrative abilities with age, the children will use more complex and elaborated means to shift from one perspective to another.

In her study of perspective-taking by monolingual Turkish children in narratives, Aksu-Koç (1994) demonstrated the existence of the shift occurred with age from switching the perspective of the agent to that of the patient: the 5 year-old children adopt the perspective of the main character while the older subjects and the adults maintain the main character as a topic in the position of subject, with the role of the patient. Aksu-Koç (1994) has also noticed that the use of the causative forms decreases with age and, at the same time, the use of passive, reflexive forms and, to a lesser degree, the reciprocal forms increases.

In their study of the organization of the discourse in the narratives by the French monolingual children, Jisa & Kern (1995) have demonstrated that the young subjects reported the scenes from the perspective of the main character. These subjects have more difficulties with integrating the secondary characters in their narrative and consequently with establishing a relationship between the actions of the different characters. They also have difficulties with encoding the main character as a patient in the position of subject. The 7-year-olds narrate following the perspective of the main or secondary characters and they also begin to use the passive structure in order to attribute the status of patient to the thematic agent of the narrative (the main character). The 10-year-olds use more passive constructions. Thus, Jisa & Kern (1995) concluded that, with age, the children use a wide range of grammatical strategies to encode the main character as a patient.

We must be very cautious about this task, because the results could differ in another task. For example, some studies (Bowerman 1983; Marchman, Bates, Burkardt, & Good, 1991; Idiata, 1998), that have not been only based on pictures telling a story, but also on video pictures or fixed pictures without a context but with question and answers, have demonstrated that perspective-taking can change with context with the questions we ask the children. In this connection, Jisa & Kern (1995: 187) explained the lack of passive constructions in the narratives of the 5-year-olds by "their inability to use a more complex structure to construct a multilevel, multi-participant coherent monologue text in real time".

3. Questions and hypotheses

This paper compares the perspectives taken in the narrative texts produced by the bilingual children in order to address the following questions :

1. What are the perspectives chosen by the Turkish-French bilingual children in the two languages?

2. What are the linguistic forms used in each language to encode perspectives?

3. What are the strategies chosen in comparison to the Turkish and French monolingual children ?

The hypotheses are:

1. Young children will prefer to use the perspective of the main character (or of his companion) called the "thematic subject strategy" (Karmiloff-Smith, 1985) as the actor in the two languages, while older children combine perspectives of the main and secondary characters using complex linguistic structures in order to express it.

2. Our earlier study (Akinci, 1999) showed that Turkish becomes the weak language at the age of 5/6 and French the dominant language afterwards, hence we suppose that the perspective will differ according to the age in each language and to the fact that the bilingual children will be more mature in their expression of perspective in French than in Turkish.

3. Our previous work (Akinci, 1999) demonstrated that in most cases the differences between the bilingual and monolingual were not significant. For perspective-taking, we also expect no differences between the two populations.

4. Subjects and methodology

4.1. Subjects

4.1.1. Turkish-French bilinguals

Our sample is composed of 94 Turkish immigrant children born in France. Their ages vary from 5;0 to 9;11. The youngest attend nursery school while the oldest children are in their last year of primary school. Table 1 shows the number of bilingual subjects and their ages.

Table 1 *Age, number, mean age, range of the Turkish-French bilingual subjects*

Age group	5 years	6 years	7 years	8 years	9 years	10 years
Number subjects	N= 14	N= 14/15[3]	N=16	N= 17	N = 17	N = 15
Mean age	5;4	6;4	7;6	8;4	9;6	10;6
Range	5;00-5;11	6;00-6;11	7;00-7;11	8;00-8;10	9;00-9;11	10;00-10;11

Up to the age of 7, the children acquire Turkish exclusively within the family. From the age of 7, some of these children have the possibility of attending the LCO classes (Heritage Language and Culture), up to the end of secondary school. Only 38% of the subjects attend these classes. The children also have the possibility of practicing Turkish in religious instruction classes (58% of the subjects) or group activities (35%) organized by Turkish-speaking associations. French, which will become their dominant language, is acquired essentially at nursery school starting at the age of 2;6 or 3. Our investigation shows that among 77% of the parents report that Turkish is the exclusive

language at home. 68% of the children report that they speak French to one another.

90.5% of the fathers are factory or unskilled workers; the other 9.5% are free-lance masons. All of the mothers are at home. 65% of the fathers quit their studies after primary school in Turkey, 27% completed secondary school. 8% of the fathers are illiterate. 62% of the mothers completed primary school in Turkey, 12% completed secondary school and 26% are illiterate.

4.1.2. Turkish Monolinguals

The monolingual subjects representing a low SES are showed in Table 2. We borrowed this group of monolingual Turkish children from Turkey from Aarssen (1996).

Table 2 Age, number, mean age, range of the monolingual Turkish subjects

Age group	5 years	7 years	9 years
Number subjects	20	20	20
Mean age	5;6	6;9	8;11
Range	5;1-5;11	6;7-7;8	8;7-9;7

In 1992, Aarssen collected these cross-sectional data in Turkey from three age groups (5-, 7- and 9-year-olds). To compete his study of Turkish-Dutch bilingual children Aarssen collected data from monolingual informants with a comparable socio-economic background. He recruited monolingual informants in rural areas of Turkey that matched the place of origin of the parents of his bilingual informants. Two schools in Tarsus in the district of Içel cooperated.

4.1.3. French monolinguals

Table 3 shows the number of French monolingual subjects and their ages. We borrowed this group from Kern (1997).

Table 3 Age, number, mean age, range of the monolingual French subjects

Age group	5 years	7 years	10 years
Number subjects	20	20	20
Mean age	05;05	07;05	10;08
Range	05;01-05;11	07;01-07;10	10;02-11;08

Among these French monolingual children, the 5-year-olds are at nursery school and the 7-10 year-olds attend primary school. These subjects live in Lyon and they are not grouped on the basis of socio-economic status. Sex or school results are not taken into account. All the informants' parents work and they have a middle class background. The majority of them reached baccalaureate, and some of them have a university background.

4.2. Methodology

4.2.1. Material and Procedure

Narrative texts were elicited in both Turkish and French using the picture book without words, *Frog, where are you?* (Mercer Mayer, 1969). This book, which contains 24 pictures, represents a typical children's story with a hero (the little boy and his dog), a problem (the boy has a pet frog which runs away) a set of actions which follow from the problem (the boy and the dog search for the missing frog), and a happy ending (the boy finds his frog, or gets another one in exchange).
The recordings were made during the school year of 1993-1994. The same procedures were followed for all age groups in the two languages. Each subject was interviewed individually, and s/he received the same instructions following Berman & Slobin (1994: 22). The Turkish-French bilingual children were given instructions in either language prior to each separate recording session. In order not to influence the subject and to allow him/her to retell the same story, two different researchers made the recordings for the two languages: a Turkish-French bilingual and a native speaker of Turkish. The interviews took place on different days. All bilingual subjects were first recorded in Turkish and then in French, but there was no particular motivation for recording Turkish first. As the time interval between the two interviews was one month for most of the children, we believe to have minimized the chance of any influence of the Turkish session on the French session.

A uniform format was applied across the sample in order to transcribe the texts. The basic unit of analysis is the *clause*, defined for this study as "any unit that contains a *unified* predicate. By *unified* we mean a predicate that expresses a *single* situation (activity, event or state), including finite and nonfinite verbs as well as predicate adjectives. In general clauses will be comprised of a single verbal element; however, infinitives and particles which functions as complements of modal or aspectual verbs are included with the matrix verb as single clause" (Berman & Slobin, 1986: 7).

4.2.2. The choice of these pictures

In order to answer the questions mentioned above and verify the validity of our hypotheses, two pictures (with three scenes) of the *Frog Story* were chosen: two scenes of Picture 8 (Scene I: The little boy falls off the tree when an owl flies away; Scene II: The dog is pursued by the bees) and one of Picture 11 (The deer is making the little boy and his dog fall in a clearing). Inasmuch as our interest concerns the manner in which the children have encoded the different available relations between the agent and the patient, the choice was justified by the fact that:
- the two pictures are composed of animate characters. The main character of the story, taken as a whole (the boy and/or the dog), are likely to become

affected patients, or to be subjected to the actions of the secondary characters (the bees and the deer) ;

- these pictures were also chosen by previous studies (Berman & Slobin, 1994; Aksu-Koç, 1994; Jisa & Kern, 1995; Aarssen, 1996; Idiata, 1998)[4]. It will be interesting to compare our results with those works, especially with the Turkish monolingual children of Istanbul with high SES (Aksu-Koç, 1994), and with French monolinguals (Jisa & Kern, 1995) ;

- the previous studies have showed that these two pictures yielded rich data at the level of available linguistic structures for the treatment of perspective (i.e. for the use of causative, passive, etc.).

It is useful to notice that in the second scene of Picture 8, where the dog is pursued by the bees, the dog is a secondary character compared to the boy. The consequence will be that the young children will not mention this scene, because of the "thematic subject strategy"; they will prefer to mention only the first scene. If they do that, they will probably choose the easiest of the perspectives, i.e. where the dog is the actor.

The scene of Picture 11 will appear more often in the texts because it is crucial for the continuation of the story: the fall of the little boy will lead towards the discovery of the hiding-place of the frogs.

4.2.3. Coding

For this study we adopted and modified the coding of Jisa & Kern (1995), who based their classification of perspective on Foley & Van Valin (1984). Our classification, with examples in Turkish and/or in French from the subjects' narratives, is made as follows:

1. No mention of the scene

(3) T10;09n 7   014[5]   sonra bi ağaca biniyo
/then/one/tree-DIR/climb-PROG-3sg/[6]
"then he climbs in a tree"

015   ve de bakıyo
/and/also/look-PROG-3sg/
"and also he is looking around"

016   orda mı
/there-LOC INT-3sg/
"if it [the frog] is there"

8   NO MENTION

9b   017   euh: euh: bağarıyor
           /euh/euh/cry-PROG-3sg/
           "euh euh he is crying"

Neither of the 2 scenes of Picture 8 are mentioned.

(4) F08;05h 8   016   les abeilles volent derrière le chien
                       /ART-PLU/bee-PLU/fly-PRES-3pl/behind/ART/dog/
                       "the bees are flying behind the dog"

Only the second scene of Picture 8 is mentioned.

2. The main character is ACTOR

(5) T06;07b 8   022   oğlan da düştü
                       /boy/DE/fall down-DP-3sg /
                       "and the boy fell down"

3. The secondary character is ACTOR

The secondary character can also be an ACTOR. The following example shows this case. We found this option only in French texts for the two scenes of Picture 8.

(6) F07;00a 8   020   et puis les abeilles sont parties
                      /and/then/ART-PLU/bee-PLU/be-PRES-3pl/go-PP/
                      "and then the bees are gone"

4. Both main and secondary characters are ACTORS

(7) F10;11d 8   030   euh y a un hibou
                       /euh/there/have-PRES-3sg/ART/owl/
                       "euh there is an owl"

             031   qui sort de son trou
                   /who/come out-PRES-3sg/of/POSS.3sg/hole/
                   "who is coming out of his hole"

             032   et le p'tit garçon tombe
                   /and/ART/little/boy/fall-PRES-3sg/
                   "and the little boy is falling"

5. The secondary character is AGENT (the main character is PATIENT) and the main character is ACTOR (or PATIENT /+TOPIC)

5a. The secondary character is AGENT (the main character is PATIENT) and the main character is ACTOR: **cause-consequence relation in two successive clauses.**

(8) T08;03m 8   029   ondan sona (köpek) arılar köpeği takip ediyor
/then-ABL/after/dog/bees-PLU/dog-ACC/follow-PROG-3sg/
"after that [the dog] the bees are following the dog"

030   hem de euh: köpek koşuyor
/either/DE/euh:/dog/run-PROG-3sg/
"and either euh: the dog is running"

5b. The main character is ACTOR and the secondary character AGENT: **consequence-cause relation in two successive clauses.**

(9) F10;08g 8   041   et il tombe
/and/he/fall-PRES-3sg/
"and he falls down"

042   [y a des abeilles qui:] y a le hibou
/there/have-PRES-3sg/ART-PLU/bee-PLU/ there/have-PRES-3sg/ART/owl/
"[there are some bees who] there is the owl"

043   qui a poussé
/who/have-PRES-3sg/push-PP/
"who pushed"

5c. The main character is ACTOR and the secondary character AGENT: **consequence-cause relation in two successive clauses connected with 'because'** (*parce que* in French and *çünkü* in Turkish).

(10) T09;07g 8   032   köpek de koşuyo
/dog/DE/run-PROG-3sg/
"and the dog is running"

033   **çünkü** arkasında arılar geliyo
/because/back-POSS-ABL/bees-PLU/come-PROG-3sg/
"because the bees are coming after him"

5d. The secondary character is AGENT and the main character is PATIENT **within a clause containing a causative verb.**

(11) T10;08j 11 041   o= geyik oğlanı düş**ür**dü
/bo=/deer/boy-ACC/fall-CAU-DP-3sg/
"the bo= the deer makes the boy fall down"

(12) F09;09l 11 066 le cerf fait tomber le petit garçon et le chien
/ART/deer/make-PRES-3sg/fall-INF/ART/little/boy/
and/ART/dog/
"the deer makes the little boy and the dog fall down"

5e. The secondary character is AGENT and the main character PATIENT + TOPIC: **the main character is the patient of the action of the secondary character in a passive construction.**

(13) F10;03e 8 026 le chien il est poursuivi par les abeilles
/ART/dog/it/be-PRES-3sg/follow-PP/by/ART-PLU/
bee-PLU/
"the dog it is followed by the bees"

5. Analyses and results

5.1. Perspective-taking in Turkish

5.1.1. Perspective-taking in Turkish of Turkish-French bilingual subjects

Table 4 shows the distribution of the different perspectives chosen for the three scenes by the Turkish-French bilingual children in Turkish.

Table 4 *Distribution of the different perspectives for the 3 scenes per age group in TURKISH for the Turkish-French bilinguals*

Age group Number of subj. x 3 scenes	5 years n=42	6 years n=42	7 years n=48	8 years n=51	9 years n=51	10 years n=45
1. No mention	5		6		2	6.5
2. Main ch. actor	**52.5**	**67**	**44.5**	**57**	35	31
3. Second. ch. actor						
4. Both M & S are actors	7	9.5	16.5	21.5	17.5	9
5. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (or patient)	35.5	23.5	33	21.5	**45.5**	**53.5**
5a. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (and/or patient)	12	2.5	8.5	4	2	4.5
5 b. M. ch. actor and S. ch. agent (2 clauses)	4.5	4.5	2		8	6.5
5c. M. ch. actor / S. ch. agent with *çünkü* 'because'			6		4	2.5
5d. S. ch. Agent / M. ch. patient (% of causatives)	19 (16.5)	16.5 (12)	16.5 (8.5)	17.5 (6)	31.5 (13.5)	40 (11)

As we can see, different strategies are variably distributed within the age groups, and we can observe the lack of Strategy 3 (the secondary character is

actor) in the Turkish texts of the bilingual subjects. The majority of the subjects aged 5 to 8 have described the 3 scenes with Strategy 2 (the main character is actor) without taking care of the role played by the secondary characters (the owl, the bees or also, the deer).

At the same time, Strategy 4 (both the main and the secondary characters as actor) increases for 5 to 8 years-old and then decreases for 9 to 10 years-old.

The use of this perspective is evidence that these subjects (aged 5 to 8) do not make a connection between the action of the main character (thematic agent) and the one of the secondary character (non-thematic agent). They just describe the events separately, most of the time sequentially.

The older subjects make this connection and they prefer Strategy 5 (the secondary character is agent -the main character patient- and the main character is actor -or patient /+topic). Thus, they express the non-thematic agent in the position of actor and the thematic agent in the position of patient.

Even though the use of the causative verb is less evident for the second scene of Picture 8 (where the bees are pursuing the dog), it becomes preferred with respect to the Picture 11, in which the deer makes the boy and the dog fall into the water. Example (14) illustrates this use :

(14) T09;05h 11 042   euh: hayvan küçük çocuğu düş**ür**üyor
/euh/animal/little/child-ACC/fall-CAU-PROG-3sg/
"euh the animal makes the little child fall down"

We think that this causative structure is preferred to the passive form because the passive is structurally more complex than the causative.

5.1.2. Perspective-taking in Turkish of Turkish monolingual subjects

Table 5 sums up the different perspectives adopted by the Turkish monolingual children.

Table 5 *Distribution of the different perspectives for the 3 scenes per age group in TURKISH by the Turkish monolinguals*

Age group Number of subject x 3 scenes	5 years n=60	7 years n=60	9 years n=60
1. No mention	13,5	5	1,5
2. Main ch. actor	**35**	38,5	26,5
3. Second. ch. actor		3,5	1,5
4. Both M & S are actors	16,5	6,5	16,5
5. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (or patient)	**35**	**46,5**	**53,5**
5a. S. ch. agent / M. ch. Actor (and/or patient)	6,5	6,5	13,5
5b. M. ch. actor and S. ch. agent (2 clauses)	1,5	3,5	3,5
5d. S. ch. agent / M. ch. patient (% of causative forms)	26,5 (10)	36,5 (20)	36,5 (8,5)

Comparison of the results of the bilingual subjects to those of the monolinguals reveals some differences in the treatment of perspective.

Even though more young monolingual subjects have not mentioned neither of the three scenes, the percentages of Strategy 2 (main character actor) and Strategy 5 (secondary character agent and the main character is actor or patient) are similar (35%), while for the bilingual subjects the first one (52.5%) dominates the second one (35.5%). Concerning Strategy 5, both populations have the same results. The t-test made on different strategies for the bilingual and monolingual 5-year-olds yields non significant results.

Concerning the 7-year-olds, the treatment is similar. If the bilingual has a preference for Strategy 2 and the monolingual for Strategy 5, the chi-2 test made for these two groups is non-significant: $X^2 = 5.43$, df =4, NS. It is the same for the 9 year-olds ($X^2 = 2.41$, df = 4, NS). But if we observe in detail Strategy 5, it becomes clear that 5c (the main character is actor and the secondary character agent in a consequence-cause relation in two successive clauses connected with *çünkü* 'because' in Turkish) is preferred to 5d (the secondary character agent and the main character is patient within a clause containing a causative verb) by the monolinguals. The bilingual 7 and 9 year-olds have a preference for the successive clauses with or without any connectors with the main character as actor while the monolingual adopt the strategy of the main character as patient within one clause, in which the secondary character is the agent.

On the next section, we will analyze the French texts and we will see if the results are similar to the Turkish texts or not.

5.2. Perspective-taking in FRENCH

5.2.1. Perspective-taking in French of Turkish-French bilingual subject

To encode the three scenes in French the bilingual children have chosen all the available perspectives. Table 6 illustrates the frequency of use of these strategies.

The table demonstrates the number of subjects who have chosen the first strategy (no mention) is the same in Turkish and French narratives. In most of the cases it is the picture of the 8th scene which the subjects avoid, while at the same time all mention the deer episode. In addition to the 5 year-old subjects, 6 subjects of the 10 year-old age group also avoided these episodes.

For the first three age groups (5, 6 and 7) the dominant strategy is to take the perspective of the main character as actor (Strategy 2). For the 8 to 10 age groups, the majority of the subjects prefer the perspective of the secondary character as agent.

Table 6 *Distribution of the different perspectives for the 3 scenes per age group in FRENCH for the Turkish-French bilinguals*

Age group Number of subj. x 3 scenes	5 years n=42	6 years n=45	7 years n=48	8 years n=51	9 years n=51	10 years n=45
1. No mention	7	2		2	2	6.5
2. Main ch. actor	**48**	**55.5**	**50**	29.5	13.5	31
3. Second. ch. actor		4.5	2	4	2	4.5
4. Both M & S are actors	14	13.5	12.5	19.5	23.5	6.5
5. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (or patient)	31	24.5	35.5	**45**	**59**	**51.5**
5a. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (and/or patient)	2.5	2.25	4	7.75	4	6.5
5 b. M. ch. actor and S. ch. agent (2 clauses)	9.5	2.25	8.5	7.75	6	4.5
5c. M. ch. actor / S. ch. agent with *çünkü* 'because'	2.5	2.25	4	4	6	2.25
5d. S. ch. agent / M. ch. patient (% of causatives)	16.5 (14)	17.75 (4.5)	19 (6.5)	25.5 (8)	43 (19.5)	36 (22)
5e. S. ch. agent / M. ch. patient+topic						2.25

Although the second strategy (the main character is actor) decreases with age (from 48% for the 5-year-olds to 13,5% for the 9 year-olds) the percentage increases again for the 10-year-olds. These results, which go against the developmental trajectory, can be explained by the fact that this age group mostly used this strategy to explain Picture 11. The examples show the two principal perspectives chosen by the 10-year-olds.

(15) F10;05b 11 039   après le garçon il tombe dans l'eau   (Strategy 2)
                      /after/ART/boy/he/fall-PRES-3sg/in/ART/water/
                      "then the boy he falls into the water"

(16) F10;11o 11 038   l'animal fait tomber l'enfant et le chien (Strategy 5)
                      /ART/animal/make-PRES-3sg/fall-INF/ART/child/
                      and/ART/dog/
                      "the animal makes the child and the dog fall down"

Strategy 3 (only the secondary character is mentioned as actor) exists only for French. In all cases, we observed that the use of this strategy concerns the first episode of Picture 8, where, the secondary character is the owl, for example:

(17) F08;02c 8   023   y a une chouette
                      /there/have-PRES-3sg/ART/owl/
                      "there is an owl"

024   qui sort
/who/go out-PRES-3sg/
"who is going out"

This perspective is not used frequently, which shows that the bilingual subjects don't construct a coherent narrative, as they don't integrate the main character in their reporting of all the scenes and of all the pictures.

Concerning Strategy 4 (both main and secondary characters are actors), table 6 shows that there is stability across the age groups, even though the 8 and 9 year-olds show a preference for it, as the following example of one 9 year-old bilingual text shows:

(18) F09;11p 8 024 le garçon est tombé
/ART/boy/be-PRES-3sg./fall-PP/
"the boy fell"

            025 y a un: hibou
/there/have-PRES-3sg/ART/owl/
  "there is an owl"

            026 qui est sorti dans un trou là
/who/be-PRES-3sg/go out-PP/ART/hole/there/
"who went out of the hole there"

Here, the subject is describing the result of the two actions of the two characters which are present on the picture, without linking the actions. According to the definitions of Slobin (1993: 345) and Berman & Slobin (1994: 517-528), we can in this case talk about "become-view".

Contrary to the previous perspectives, use of Strategy 5 (the secondary character is agent (the main character is patient) and the main character is actor (or patient/+topic)) increases with age. While it is not used by all young children (5 to 7 age group), the older children prefer to encode the events using this perspective. The details of this perspective show that the results are similar for the first three strategies (5a, 5b and 5c). The following examples illustrate the different perspectives observed in the French texts of the bilingual children:

(19) F09;03k 8 023 alors les abeilles poursuivirent le petit chien
/so/ART-PLU/bee-PLU/follow-PH-3pl/ART/little/
dog/
"so the bees followed the little dog"

            024 le chien courut
/ART/dog/run-PH-3sg/
"the dog ran"

            025 courut

/run-PH-3sg/

"(it) ran"

(20) F09;11q 11 041   et puis il (=le garçon) tombe dans l'eau

/and/then/he/fall-PRES-3sg/in/ART/water/

"and then he falls into the water"

042   [le] il le fait courir [le: le:] le cheval

/ART/it/him/make-PRES-3sg/run-INF/ART/ART/

ART/horse/

"[the] it makes him run [the the] the horse"

043   et puis il les fait tomber [dans l'eau] dans une rivière

/and/then/it/them/make-PRES-3sg/fall-INF/in/ART/

water/in/ART/river/

"and then it makes them fall [into the water] into the river"

(21) F10;00h 8 031   après le garçon il est tombé

/after/ART/boy/he/be-PRES-3sg/fall-PP/

"then the boy he has fallen"

032   *parce que* l'hibou il l'a fait tomber

/because/ART/owl/it/him/have-PRES-3sg/fall-INF/

"because the owl it made him fall"

In these three examples, the main character is always the patient. The event and its cause are both mentioned. The double perspective (ex. 20: main character actor and secondary character agent / main character patient) can be redundant, insofar as with the causative the result is inferred. That is why the subjects have the possibility to mention this relation within one clause. The majority did (Strategy 5d). They have chosen this perspective to encode Picture 11, making use of the causative forms. Otherwise, they used the transitive verb *jeter* 'to throw', as in the following example:

(22) F09;04f 11 049   après la renne *elle a jeté* par terre le chien et l'garçon

/after/ART/reindeer/she/have-PRES-3sg/throwPP/on/

ground/ART/dog/and/ART/boy/

"then the reindeer it threw on the ground the dog and the boy"

5.2.2. Perspective taking in French of French monolingual subjects

Table 7 highlights the percentages of use of the different perspectives adopted by the monolingual children.

Table 7 *Distribution of the different perspectives for the 3 scenes per age group in FRENCH by the French monolinguals*

Age group Number of subject x 3 scenes	5 years n=60	7 years n=60	10 years n=60
1. No mention	5		6.5
2. Main ch. actor	37	21.5	18.5
3. Second. ch. actor	6.5	1.5	11,5
4. Both M & S are actors	6.5	13.5	10
5. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (or patient)	**45**	**63.5**	**53.5**
5a. S. ch. agent / M. ch. actor (and/or patient)	1.5	13,5	10
5b. M. ch. actor and S. ch. agent (2 clauses)	5	3.5	3.5
5c. M. ch. actor and S. ch. agent with *parce que* 'because'	8.5	10	6.5
5d. S. ch. agent / M. ch. patient (% of causative forms)	30 (20)	30 (23.5)	18.5 (10)
5e. S. ch. agent / M. ch. patient+topic		6.5	15

It is clear that the majority of the French monolingual children have chosen *strategy 5*. The use of the perspective in which the main character is the actor decreases with age, from 37% at age 5 to 18.5% at age 10. This percentage is higher for the bilingual children. It means that the latter more often choose the perspective with the main character as actor than that with the secondary characters. The 5 and 10 year-old groups realize equal percentages for Strategies 3 (second character actor) and 4 (both the main and secondary character are actor), while the 7-year-olds have a preference for the latter. The difference between the monolingual and bilingual subjects concerns Strategy 5. This strategy is dominant for the monolingual children, specifically for the age group 8 to 10 in the bilingual group. Concerning the details of strategy 5, the results differ for the 5-year-olds for 5c and 5d: the monolinguals have encoded the events more often with these perspectives than the bilinguals, using more connected clauses with *parce que* 'because'. However, the differences are not significant ($X^2 = 6.41$, df =4, NS).

Concerning the results of the 7-year-olds, the bilingual subjects prefer Strategy 5b (main character actor and secondary character agent in two successive clauses without any connector), while the French monolinguals prefer Strategies 5a and 5c. The monolinguals start using Strategy 5e (secondary character agent and the main character patient+topic). The examples illustrate this use:

(23) FM07;01b 8 042   le chien était attaqué par les abeilles
                        /ART/dog/be-IMP-3sg/attack-PP/by/ART-PLU/bee-PLU/
                        "the dog was attacked by the bees"

  (24) FM07;02f 8 036   et puis le chien se fait poursuivre par les abeilles
                        /and/then/ART/dog/make-PRES-3sg/follow-INF/by/
                        ART-PLU/bee-PLU/
                        "and then the dog had the bees following him"

These forms are more frequent in age group 10 of the French monolinguals (15%) while we observed only one case for the bilingual children. On the other hand, if we only compare the results for Strategy 5, percentages of use are very close (53.5% for the monolinguals against 51.5% for the bilinguals). The difference is not significant (X^2 = 3.68, df = 4, NS.). But in the majority of cases, the bilinguals have chosen Strategy 5d where the monolinguals use the final two available perspectives (5d and 5e).

6. Conclusions

The hypotheses are confirmed for the three scenes of the two pictures. This study demonstrates that there is a change in the development of perspective-taking with age: younger children prefer the perspective of the main character as actor (Strategy 2) whereas older children prefer the perspective of the secondary character who becomes agent, with the main character encoded as either actor or patient (Strategy 5).

For the youngest children the subject of the clause is the actor. They also switch from one character to another in successive clauses describing the same scene without paying attention to the connection that exists between them. The possibility of choice becomes more evident for the older children: they clearly distinguish the syntactic position of subject from the semantic role of agent.

This study also demonstrates that the children change their strategies earlier in French (at 7 years of age) than in Turkish (at 8 years of age). This shows that French becomes the dominant language. We can explain this with the fact that Turkish-French bilingual children are insufficiently exposed to Turkish narrative discourse. They often begin to study Turkish only after the age of 7 and are not exposed to reading and literacy-related activities in their families.

Only one bilingual child used the passive construction in French, while monolingual Turkish (Aksu-Koç, 1994) or French (Jisa & Kern, 1995) children use such forms very often. However, when compared to the results for children of similar socio-economical background, the differences are not statistically significant.

Marchman *et al.* (1991) and Idiata (1998) have demonstrated that the task can influence the results concerning the choice of the passive construction in order to topicalise the patient, which is why we can not conclude that the bilingual subjects of this study are delayed in their use of the passive construction.

The perspective-taking can be related, for example, to the development of the ability to weave sentences together across discourse through the use of explicit connecting devices. Indeed our earlier research (Akinci, 1999; Akinci &

Jisa, to appear, forthcoming) have shown that the Turkish and French texts produced by the young children (5 and 6 year of age) are somewhat weaker in terms of clause linkage: they employ more juxtaposition compared to the monolingual children in both languages. However, the texts of the 9-10 year-olds are identical to those of the monolingual children. Thus, whereas bilingualism may not yet offering concrete advantages for young children, which can be related to extra-linguistic factors, it certainly becomes so for the 9-year-olds.

Endnotes

* I wish to thank my colleague Ad Backus (Tilburg University - The Netherlands) for his assistance with my English. Furthermore, I'm indebted to Jeroen Aarssen and Sophie Kern for allowing me to use their data.

1. The examples (1) and (2) for this event with different perspectives and the example (3) are from Jisa (1997: 2).

2. For French glosses, following abbreviations are used : PRES: present; IMP: imperfect; PH: past historic; INF: infinitive; PP: past participle; 3sg: 3rd person singular; 3pl: 3rd person plural; ART: article; PLU: plural; POSS: Possessive.

3. One 6-year-old refused to tell the story in Turkish.

4. It is important to emphasize here that not all of these studies chose exactly the same scenes. For example, Aksu-Koç (1994) and Aarssen (1996) have chosen Picture 4a, in which the dog falls from the window with the vase, and Picture 11, whereas Jisa & Kern (1995) have chosen Picture 6b, in which the boy is bitten by a mole, and, like us, the two scenes of Picture 8.

5. Each clause in the transcript is preceded by an ID code (here T10;09n 7 014), which identifies the language (T= Turkish, F= French, FM= French monolingual) the subject (10;09= the child aged 10 years and 9 months, d refers identifies the subject in his age group), the picture to which the utterance refers (7), and a clause number (014).

6. For Turkish glosses, following abbreviations are used: PROG: Progressive present; DP: Direct experience past; 3sg: 3rd person singular; DE: focus particle ('and, too, also'); ABL : Ablative; ACC: Accusative; DIR: Directive; GEN: Genitive; LOC: Locative; POSS: Possessive; CAU: causative; INT: interrogative.

References

Aarssen, J. (1996) Relating events in two languages : Acquisition of cohesive devices by Turkish-Dutch bilingual children at school age, Studies in Multilingualism 2, Tilburg University Press, Tilburg.

Akinci, M.-A. (1999) *Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans*, Ph.D. dissertation, Université Lumière Lyon 2.

Akinci, M.-A. & H. Jisa (to appear) "Development of Turkish Clause Linkage in the Narrative texts of Turkish-French bilingual children in France" in Goksel, A. & C. Kerslake (Eds) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.

Akinci, M.-A. & H. Jisa (forthcoming) "Développement de la narration en langue faible et forte : le cas des connecteurs", *AILE* (Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère).

Aksu-Koç, A.A. (1994) "Development of Linguistic Forms: Turkish" in R.A. Berman & D.I. Slobin (Eds) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*, L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 329-385.

Berman, R.A. (1993) "The development of language use: Expressing perspectives on a scene" in E. Dromi (Ed.) *Language and Cognition: A developmental perspective*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, 172-201.

Berman, R.A. & D.I. Slobin (1994) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*, L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

Berman, R.A. & D.I. Slobin (1986) *Frog story procedures in coding manual: Temporality in discourse*, Institute of Human Development, University of California at Berkeley.

Bowerman, M. (1983) "Hidden meaning: The role of the covert and conceptual structures in children's development of language" in D.R. Rogers & J.A. Sloboda (Eds) *The acquisition of symbolic skills*, Plenium, New York.

Clark, E.V. (1990) "Speaker perspective in language acquisition", *Linguistics* 28, 1201-1220.

Comrie, B. (1981) *Language universals and linguistic typology*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Creissels, D. (1995) *Eléments de syntaxe générale*, PUF, Paris.

Croft, W. (1991) *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations,* Chicago University Press, Chicago.

De Lancey, S. (1987) "Transitivity in grammar and cognition" in *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, S. Tomlin (Ed.) *Typological studies in Language*, J. Benjamins, Amsterdam, 53-68.

Fillmore, C. (1977) "Scenes-and-frames semantics: Linguistic structures processing", *Fundamental studies in computer science* 5, 55-81.

Foley, W.A. & R.D. Van Valin (1984) *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hopper, P.J. & Thompson, S.A. (1980) "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse", *Language* 56 (2), 251-299.

Idiata, F. (1998) *Universaux versus spécificités linguistiques dans l'acquisition du langage chez l'enfant : le cas de la langue isangu*, LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics n°34, München.

Jisa, H. (1997) "Aperçu sur la perspective". Paper presented at Séminaire de recherche GdR 0113, Beaume-lès-Aix, 14/17 March 97.

Jisa, H. & S. Kern, (1995) "Discourse organization in French children's narratives" in E. Clark, (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Child Language Research Forum*, Stanford University Press - CSLI Publications, Stanford, 177-188.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1985) "Language and cognitive process from a developmental perspective", *Language and Cognitive Processes* 1, 61-85.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1981) "The grammatical marking of thematic status in the development of language production" in W. Deutsch (Ed.) *The Child's construction of Language,* Academic Press, London, 121-147.

Keenan, E. (1985) "Passives in the world's languages" in T. Shopen (Ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*, *Vol. 1. Clause structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 243-282.

Kern, S. (1997) *Comment les enfants jonglent avec les contraintes communicationnelles, discursives et linguistiques dans la production d'une narration,* Ph.D. dissertation, Université Lumière-Lyon 2.

Levelt, W.J.M. (1989) *Speaking: From intention to articulation*, MIT Press, London.

Marchman, V.A., E. Bates, A. Burkardt, & A.B. Good. (1991) "Functional constraints of the acquisition of the passive : toward a model of the competence to perform", *First Language* 31, volume 11, 65-92.

Mayer, M. (1969) *Frog, where are you?,* Dial Books for Young Readers, New York.

Slobin, D.I. (1985) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, Vol. 1: Data; Vol. 2: Theoretical issues*, L. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ/London.

Slobin, D.I. (1993) "Passives and alternatives in children's narratives in English, Spanish, and Turkish" in B. Fox et P. Hopper (Eds) *Voice: Form and function*, J. Benjamins, Amsterdam, 341-364.

Van Valin, R.D. (1993) *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.