

# Advances in Turkish Linguistics

Edited by  
Semiramis Yağcıođlu  
Ayşen Cem Deđer

in cooperation with  
Özgün Koşaner  
Aytaç Çeltek



DOKUZ EYLÜL YAYINLARI

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Table Of Contents</b>	iii
<b>Foreword</b>	ix

## INDIVIDUAL / CO-AUTHORED PAPERS

### PHONOLOGY

<i>Phonological variation in informal Turkish</i> Özlem Albaş Vural	3
<i>A Turkish template</i> Ann Denwood	15
<i>Word-order, prosody and information structure in Turkish</i> Umut Özge	25
<i>A compositional approach to Turkish stress</i> Anthi Revithiadou, Hasan Kaili, Sofia Prokou, Marianna Tiliopoulou	37

### MORPHOLOGY

<i>Yaşlı maşlı ama dipdiri: Yarı-ikilemenin anlam-sözdizimi</i> Talat Akaslan	53
<i>The pragmatic/semantic and syntactic properties of -(y)All clauses in Turkish</i> Z. Ceyda Arslan-Kechriotis	65
<i>Turkish adverbial complementizer -ken and its interaction with tense, aspect, modality markers</i> Filiz Çetintaş Yıldırım	79

## SYNTAX & SEMANTICS

<i>Scalar Semantic Representation of aspectually variable verbs in Turkish</i> Yeşim Aksan	93
<i>Psych verbs and the experiencer in Turkish</i> Mustafa Aksan - Pınar İbe	107
<i>On the Turkish Controllee</i> Cem Bozşahin	121
<i>Grammatical cases and thematic roles in Turkish: Historical account</i> Mevlüt Erdem	137
<i>The semantics of artık vs. hâlâ as 'change of state' adverbs in Turkish</i> Mine Güven	151
<i>Control in Turkish non-finite complements</i> Geoffrey Haig - Szymon Slodowicz	165
<i>A contrastive study of the distribution of relative clauses in Turkish and English written texts</i> Celia Kerslake	179
<i>Identifying and assigning semantic categories of Turkish existential sentences via support vector learning</i> Aylin Koca	193
<i>Turkish direct object and subject cases as absolutes: Against a functionalist perspective of DOM and DSM</i> Jaklin Kornfilt	207
<i>Resumptive pronouns in Turkish</i> Hasan Mesut Meral	223
<i>Incorporation of agents in Turkish</i> Balkız Öztürk	235

<i>Topicalization in constructions with &lt;B&gt; gerunds</i> Claudia Römer	249
<i>Turkish copular possessive constructions</i> Mireille Tremblay-Hitay Yüksekler	255
<i>Participle –miş clauses in Turkish</i> Ümit Deniz Turan	265
<i>Irrealis modality and Discourse structure</i> Leyla Uzun, Zeynep Erk Emeksiz	279
<i>Analysis of Derivational Processes Concerning Related Sets of Verbs in Turkish</i> Nafi Yalçın	289
<i>The Syntactic Aspects of Noun Phrases in Turkish and the Problems Arising from the Representations of NPs</i> M. Ali Yavuz	305
<i>Agents and Passives</i> Hitay Yüksekler	315
<i>The unaccusative-unergative distinction in Turkish: An experimental investigation</i> Deniz Zeyrek, Cengiz Acartürk	325
<b>DISCOURSE &amp; PRAGMATICS</b>	
<i>-mi- 'nın sözcenin düzenlenişindeki rolü 4: (Sağ çıkma/ karşı konu)</i> Başak Alango	341
<i>Türkçe dilbilim metinlerinin kurgulanış biçimleri</i> Canan Şenöz Ayata	355
<i>Sözlü bütünçe incelemesi: Tekrarlar</i> Pola Aydınler	367
<i>The analysis of discourse particle zaten in relation to the Informational status of the utterances</i> Demet Corcu	379

<i>Transitivity and preferred clause structure in Turkish spoken discourse</i> Ayşen Cem Değer, Özge Cengiz	389
<i>Türkçe’de yüklem ardına konumlama türlerinden “onarım” ve “açıklama”</i> Ömer Demircan	399
<i>On the NSR and Focus projection in Turkish</i> Selçuk İşsever	421
<i>Anaphora in Turkish spoken discourse</i> Lütfiye Oktar, Aytaç Çeltek	437
<b>LANGUAGE ACQUISITION</b>	
<i>Phoneme Acquisition in Turkish: Are There Language-Specific Differences?</i> Pınar Ege	457
<i>The Use of Discourse Markers in Adult and Child Turkish Oral Narratives: Şey, Yani and İşte</i> Reyhan Furman, Aslı Özyürek	467
<i>Children’s scope of indefinite objects and negation</i> Nihan Ketrez	481
<b>NEUROLINGUISTICS</b>	
<i>Çokdillilerde afazi</i> Gülmira Sadiyeva	495
<b>SOCIOLINGUISTICS</b>	
<i>Interpersonal Dimension of Humor in Everyday Talk of Turkish Friendship Groups</i> Bilgen Erdem	509
<i>Regional Sterotypes And Language Attitudes</i> Meryem Şen	525

## ***Bilingualism***

*Literacy development in Turkish context: The case of the written texts of bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers* 547  
M.Ali Akıncı, Dilara Koçbaş

*The Intonation of Wh-question in Cypriot Turkish Dialect: Evidence of Language Contact* 563  
Nazmiye Çelebi

*Language dominance and preference among Turkish students in Western Europe* 575  
Kutlay Yağmur

## ***Language and Gender***

*Do Turkish males and females use different apologies for different types of offence?* 595  
Çiler Hatipoğlu

*Covert Evasive Action: Interactional Style of Turkish Women in Interviews On Sexual And Health Issues* 613  
Neslihan Kansı-Yetkiner

*Hedging strategies in Turkish media discourse: Are they gender indexical?* 623  
Semiramis Yağcıoğlu, Songül Ercan

## **TURKIC**

*Case and agreement in reduced versus full relative clauses in Turkic Languages* 643  
Gülşat Aygen

*Toward a new linguistic approach to “Karamanlı” texts* 655  
Matthias Kappler

*Syntactic borrowings of Azerbaijanian and Qashqay in Iran* 669  
Yuu Kuribayashi

## POSTERS

<i>“Bu-Şu” Sözcüklerinin Yazımsal ve Yazımsal olmayan Metinlerde Kullanımı</i> Asuman Ağaçasapan	683
<i>Duration of Turkish vowels revisited</i> Ebru Arısoy, Mine Nakipoğlu Demiralp, Hazım K. Ekenel, H. Mesut Meral, A. Sumru Özsoy, Ömer Şayli, Oytun Türk, Beste Can Yolcu	691
<i>An Abstract Linguistic Description Model to Communicate Gender Stereotypes</i> Nazlı Baykal, Meryem Şen	703
<i>Ağızlar eski kelimeler kaynağı gibi</i> Kubra Kuliyeva	713
Subject Index	725
Author Index	731

# **Literacy Development In Turkish Context: The Case Of The Written Texts Of Bilingual And Monolingual Children And Teenagers**

*Mehmet-Ali Akıncı & Dilara Koçbaşı*

## **1. Introduction**

In every society literacy carries a power status and is perceived as enhancing economic, social and political opportunities for the individual (Street, 1993; Datta, 2000). “Where language minority members are relatively powerless and under privileged, literacy is often regarded as a major key to self-advancement as well as community group and individual empowerment” (Baker, 2001: 320). Beyond the ability to read and write, literate activities are defined in terms of the ability to produce decontextualized and internally coherent texts of different genres (Aksu-Koç, to appear). As Hickmann et al. (1996) indicates producing a text requires three factors that determine what a speaker must simultaneously manage: (a) the linguistic characteristics of the language, (b) the general constraints of the human cognitive system, and (c) the specific constraints related to the production of a written text (Hickmann et al., 1996: 591). Following the studies that focus on the developmental relationship between text production abilities and literacy practices (Berman & Verhoeven, 2002; Aksu-Koç, to appear), this paper explores the relationship between bilingualism, errors, and literacy development by providing evidence for the ways errors develop and show the progressive mastery of Turkish acquired by Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers living in the Turkish immigrant community in France and monolingual Turkish children and teenagers in Turkey.

## **2. Study of errors**

Errors were subject of many studies from a developmental perspective (Clark & Andersen, 1979; Clark, 1985; Ochs, 1985; Levelt, 1983; Karmiloff-Smith et al., 1993; Akıncı, to appear). Ochs (1985: 785) defines the error as a deviation from either a socially variable or a categorial norm and it warrants negative feed-back.

A qualitative but also quantitative study of errors in written texts can shed some light on the developmental process of the mastery of the literacy skills of both the bilingual and the monolingual children (Ochs, 1985). Indeed, the errors are indications of an incomplete knowledge of the considered domain;



therefore their analysis is a way to know the parts of the system which are not still completely automated (Clark, 1985; Bange & Kern, 1996). Hence, such a study on errors in a developmental perspective turned out to be relevant to our purposes, because differences appeared in the other domains; for example, we already observed a delay in spoken text production abilities of bilingual children compared to monolingual children which tends to disappear with age (Akıncı, 2001; Akıncı, Jisa & Kern, 2001). As in spoken texts, we can expect a similar developmental path in the productions of written texts of children across school grades. Such an observation in the development of spoken text leads us to our first prediction. Starting out from this theoretical background, our first prediction is that as far as the development of literacy is made in a progressive way, going from a stage where the child begins his acquisition until it reaches the target system (that of the adult), we predict a decrease with the age not only of the number of errors, but also of their variety. Secondly, the comparison of the Turkish-French bilingual subjects with those of monolingual Turkish children will inform us on specific errors of bilingual subjects because of their membership to a double linguistic system. Such a comparison and a kind of tracking of errors in text productions of children across ages and language groups also will reveal the effects of schooling in Home Language given in HLI (Home Language Instruction) classes on the text production abilities of bilingual children who belong to a double linguistic system. Our further prediction is that the education of Turkish given in HLI classes in France will have a diminishing effect on the difference between the errors made by bilinguals and those made by monolinguals along the development of literacy skills.

### **3. Method**

The conceptual and methodological basis for this study derived from an international research project on the development of text production abilities as a critical indicator of literacy across and beyond school ages (Berman & Verhoeven, 2002). Similarly, in our study, participants in three age groups (20 students from primary school, 20 from junior school and 20 from high school for each population) were asked to produce two types of text (personal narration and expository) in two modalities (spoken and written), amounting to two narratives and two expository discussions from each speaker. The texts were elicited from children in two successive sessions. In session I, participants were asked to tell and write a story about an incident of interpersonal conflict that they had experienced personally. In the following session, expository discussions were gathered, where participants

were asked to give a talk as if they are in front of their class, or write an essay or composition, discussing the issue of interpersonal conflict. All subjects produced both the narrative and expository texts in two modalities of speech and writing yielding a total of 4 texts per subject. Mode of presentation was balanced across the tasks, so that half of the subjects performed the spoken task first, and then produced a written text, while the other half started with the written text and continued with the spoken task. The sessions and the texts elicited in these sessions are depicted in Table 1.

**Table 1. Order of presentation across the tasks and groups**

	Session I	Session II	Number of subject
Order A	Narrative spoken / Narrative written	Expository spoken / Expository written	5 girls and 5 boys
Order B	Narrative written / Narrative spoken	Expository written / Expository spoken	5 girls and 5 boys

As mentioned before, at the end of the data collection phase, each subject ended up with 4 texts. These are oral narrative (ON), written narrative (WN), oral expository (OE) and written expository (WE) texts. All of the subjects produced narratives first and then came their expository texts. Only the mode of presentation was balanced across the four texts, that is half of the subjects yielded their spoken tasks first, after that they began writing what they told to the researcher. This spoken-first group formed Group A. At the same time, the other half of the subjects who are in Group B performed their tasks in written mode first.

In this paper, only the written texts produced by the subjects in both modalities will be discussed. Therefore, in the remaining part of this paper only the written texts will be discussed and all the analysis will be based on written texts of monolingual and bilingual children.

### 3.1. Research population

The research groups of bilingual and monolingual subjects were organized according to their school-grade level. The texts were elicited from one group of primary school children, one group of secondary school, and one group of high school students. Each group consists of at least 20 subjects. The following Table 2 gives the information about number and age of the bilingual informants in each group.

**Table 2. Age, number, mean age, range of the ages of Turkish-French bilingual informants**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	14		11		11		10		12		8	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	7	7	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	7	2 <sup>1</sup>	6
Mean age	10;09		11;01		12;08		13;00		16;08		17;03	
Range ages	09;07-11;11		10;10-11;08		12;07-13;04		12;07-13;09		15;00-18;09		15;08-18;09	

The bilingual informants for this study were selected from the Turkish immigrant community living in Rouen and Grenoble. In order to control for the gender factor, we included equal numbers of males and females. They are sons and daughters of the first generation immigrants in France all of whom were born there. They start to acquire French, which will become their dominant language, essentially at nursery school entering at around the age of 3 (Akinci, 2001).

To complete the study which aims to compare and contrast the developing written texts production of Turkish-French bilingual children, we collected cross-sectional data in Turkey in April 2003 from Turkish monolinguals in a little town of Turkey that matched the place of origin of the parents of the bilingual informants. Two schools in a district of Denizli were cooperated to this study. The monolingual subjects representing a low SES are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Age, number, mean age, range of the Turkish monolingual informants**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	11		12		10		12		10		10	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5
Mean age	11;00		10;09		12;08		12;10		15;03		15;09	
Range ages	10;04-11;07		10;05-11;07		12;06-13;04		12;05-13;04		13;10-15;11		15;05-16;11	

<sup>1</sup> Since this is a continuing research, we have not completed the data collection in the bilingual highschool group yet.

Before the data collection phase began, the background information of our subjects was collected with a kind of literacy questionnaire filled in by the child. With the help of that questionnaire, we tried to get information about the demographic variables and the literacy-related activities in and outside subjects' homes. The survey questionnaire included three sections on: background characteristics (demographic information), language use-choice (only for bilinguals), and literacy-related activities (watching TV, listening radio, using computer, reading newspapers and journals, reading books, using materials for homework, writing activities and extra-curricular activities).

Almost all of our bilingual children are from working class. Most of the fathers are working factory or unskilled workers; however 28.5% of them are free-lance masons. Most of the mothers are housewives; only 13.5% of them is unskilled workers (as cleaning lady).

Like other children whose native language is different than French, the children in our study acquired Turkish exclusively within the family up to the age of 7. From that age on, some of these children have the possibility of attending the HLI classes (Home Language Instruction) in France until the end of secondary school. In HLI classes the children are given the possibility of reading and writing in Turkish language. Children also learn Turkish history and geography in these classes. All of our subjects attend HLI classes.

### **3.2. Data elicitation and collection**

All subjects in France and in Turkey were given similar motivational instructions. At the very beginning, all the informants were told that they were recruited for an international project about the literacy skills of Turkish bilingual children living in Europe and Turkish monolingual children in Turkey. Three researchers were present during the data collection phase to help out the subjects. First, the subjects saw a short video film with no words before task elicitation. The film is three-minute long and it shows different kinds of problems depicted in a school setting. These scenes of interpersonal conflicts between people are categorized by Berman and Verhoeven (2002) in three groups: moral conflicts (cheating in an exam, and finding money somebody has dropped); social conflict (to exclude somebody in a class); and physical conflict (fighting in a school, and spilling water on somebody). The events in the film do not have any resolution or concluding part.

The data collection phase began as dividing the subjects into two groups: Group A and Group B. The students in Group A were asked one by one to tell a story about a problem that they had experienced personally. As in Berman and Verhoeven's study (2002), they were clearly instructed not to describe the scenes in the video but to tell an event they experienced personally, and their elicitations were recorded to a minidisc. After they completed their elicitation, they were sent to another room to write down the same event that they told us. Once they completed their writings, they were asked to discuss the problems between people as they gave a talk in class. They were instructed not to tell a story but discuss the issue and state their ideas while they were recorded in a minidisc. In the same time with Group A, students in Group B did the same processes. The only difference between Group A and Group B was that students in Group B started with writing their personal experience narratives. They first wrote down and then told what they have written down. Again, the sessions of Group B began with the personal narratives and continued with expository texts.

The sessions were carried out on the same day, or with one day interval. At the end of each session, the subject has produced two texts, one is written and one is spoken. The narratives are on the same event which happened to them, and the expository texts discuss the same issue that is conflict between people. At the end of the data collection phase, each subject has 4 texts produced under the same instructions. Since this is a regular pencil-and-paper task, no additional skills were required such as using computers etc.

### 3.3. Coding procedures and results

In this paper, we will study errors in terms of quantity and type across school grades. Each type of error was coded in the following categories observed in each group. Firstly, we categorized the spelling errors in the texts of bilingual and monolingual subjects under the category of orthography. The following example (1) of orthographical error comes from the expository text of a bilingual student in primary school. A further example (2) belongs to a monolingual primary student.

(1) TB-P12B-WE<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Each subject was assigned a code. The first letters indicate the group; TB= Turkish-French bilingual, TM= Turkish monolingual. The letter following the group code indicates the child's school level: P= Primary school, S= Secondary school and H= High school. The number codes the student individually in a school group, then

- Token: terbiezidir  
 Target: terbiyesizdir  
 (2) TM-P08A-WN  
 Token: "Ben Tesekür edim."  
 Target: "Ben teşekkür ettim."

Our second category of errors is the influence of oral language. According to Tannen (1982a, 1982b), one characteristic of written texts is that written texts are more integrated than oral ones. Compared to written texts, oral texts possess the spurt-like nature of speech reflecting the unsteady nature of the thoughts. As a part of colloquial speech, we do not expect to find particles like "ya, yani, şey, falan, işte" which make the text more fragmented in written text. Therefore, we considered the presence of such items which are "empty language" in Lakoff's terms (1975) as a deviation from a categorial norm and included them in error categories. The example (3) of a monolingual secondary school child illustrates an example of the presence of such empty particles in written narratives. Moreover, the use of items which belong to specific dialectics is also categorized as a deviation from standard characteristics of written language which is expected to be written in the standard Turkish as given in the following example (4).

- (3) TM-S11A-WN  
 Token: "1 ay falan geçti"  
 (4) TM-H05A-WN  
 Token: "Adamlar taksiiyle geldiydiler."

Furthermore, the way people pronounce words influences their orthography. The errors like the following examples in (5) and (6) are also arranged as errors derived from oral language.

- (5) Token: anlatıcam  
 Target: anlatacağım  
 (6) Token: vidiyoda  
 Target: videoda

Our further error category contains lexical errors. In this category, we included made-up words such as "anlatışım" and verbal constructions made

---

A or B after the number indicates the presentation group in each school levels. The final letters code modalities (W= Written texts, S= Spoken texts) and types (N= narrative texts and E= expository texts).

by using “yapmak” and “etmek” helping verbs. While writing in Turkish, our bilingual subjects make direct translations from French by using “yapmak/etmek” helping verbs. However, these types of constructions are also present in the writings of monolinguals. The following examples (7) and (8) from the data illustrate the various types:

- (7) TB-S11A-WE  
Token: “...Fransız okulunda controle yaptık”  
Target: “... Fransız okulunda sınav olduk”
- (8) TM-P01B-WN  
Token: “Benimle yardımlaşma yapmıyorlar.”  
Target: “Benimle yardımlaşmıyorlar.”

There are also errors in the texts of bilingual and monolingual subjects related with textual organization. What we mean by textual organization is the use of cohesive resources that form meaning relations within a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In Halliday and Hasan (1976), one of the most important cohesive resources is referential elements. Martin (2001) defines referential elements as resources for referring to an element whose identity is recoverable in the text. Most of our subjects did errors related with reference while constructing their written texts as one of the items which builds a cohesive tie lacks in the text. The following example of that kind comes from a monolingual 5<sup>th</sup> grader. In example (9), it is not clearly apparent in the whole text what demonstrative pronoun “bu” refers to.

- (9) TM-P03B-WE  
Token: “Ama Türkiye’deki okullarda bu mümkün olsaydı bence zarar verilmezdi.”

Our last error category involves errors made with case and voices suffixes<sup>3</sup>. Both bilingual and monolingual children have difficulties in case and voice endings in their written productions. For instance, some bilingual subjects use accusative case in passive constructions. It is also interesting to see that there are a number of case and voice errors in monolinguals’ texts as in the examples (10) and (11), again from a bilingual subject and a monolingual one.

---

<sup>3</sup> The ones that we listed in this section are the major error types that we observed in our data. There are also some errors that are not great in numbers under a category. We put these kinds of errors under the category of “others”.

- (10) TB-H13A-WN  
 Token: "Problem ayakkabılar olduğunu anladım"  
 problem shoe-PLURAL be-NOM-ACC understand-PAST-1SING  
 Target: "Problemin ayakkabılar olduğunu anladım"  
 problem-GEN shoe-PLURAL be-NOM-ACC understand-PAST-1SING
- (11) TM-P01B-WN  
 Token: "Ben ablam yazılarını bile yazıyorum."  
 I sister-POSS script-PLURAL-POSS-ACC even write-PROG-1SING  
 Target: "Ben ablamın yazılarını bile yazıyorum."  
 I sister-POSS-GEN script-PLURAL-POSS-ACC even write-ASPECT-1 SING

Based on the five error categories mentioned above, we coded errors encountered in the written narrative and expository texts of bilingual and monolingual subjects to make a comparison between the two populations. Texts lengths

Before presenting the overall results concerning errors across language groups (bilingual vs. monolingual) and across school grades, the length of the texts produced will be discussed. In this study, the unit of analysis is "the clause" for the linguistic analysis which is defined by Berman and Slobin (1994) as a unified predicate describing a single situation (an activity, event, or state). Tables (4) and (5) give the length with total number of clauses, mean number of clauses per subject for each group and the range of clauses.

**Table 4. Clause lengths of the informants per group for Turkish-French bilinguals in Turkish written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	14		11		11		10		12		8	
Text type	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.
Total clauses	117	104	63	80	99	83	131	91	216	209	191	115
Mean cl./subj.	8,4	7,4	5,7	7,3	9	7,5	13,1	9,1	18	17,5	24	14,5
Range clauses	3-15	3-20	2-11	5-13	4-21	5-13	2-24	3-25	8-33	9-27	12-46	5-32



**Table 5. Clause lengths of the informants per group for Turkish monolinguals in written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	11		12		10		12		10		10	
Text type	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.
Total clauses	126	163	198	213	182	138	276	340	279	386	372	381
Mean cl./subj.	11,5	14,6	16,5	17,8	18,2	13,8	23	28,3	27,9	38,6	37,2	38,1
Range clauses	4-21	6-29	11-31	7-38	11-32	4-35	10-40	12-48	14-40	22-69	12-56	22-66

Tables (4) and (5) show that monolingual subjects produced longer texts than the bilingual group. However the differences in terms of text lengths are not statistically significant<sup>4</sup> for primary school children. Also the differences of expository text lengths produced by secondary graders in Group A are not statistically significant. As for both groups (A and B) of secondary and high school students the results are significant in both narrative and expository texts<sup>5</sup>. We can then conclude that monolingual subjects significantly have longer texts than the bilinguals when they get older. In table 4, we see that for bilinguals the only students that produce longer texts than the others are high school children. When we look at the range of clauses produced by both populations, again interpersonal differences becomes important. For example, in the expository texts of the last group one student produced 32 clauses out of 115. Table 5 shows that monolinguals produced longer texts than bilinguals and there is a continuing development in text production abilities in Turkish monolinguals. However such a development is not observed until high school among bilinguals.

<sup>4</sup> The values of these tests were accepted as significant for  $p < 0.05$ .

<sup>5</sup> ANOVA tests results for "Total Clause Lengths" are: Secondary school; Group A Length WN:  $F(1,18) = 9.57, p < .0062$ ; Group B Length WN:  $F(1,20) = 7.47, p < .0128$ ; Length WE:  $F(1,20) = 24.85, p < .0001$ ; High school; Group A Length WN:  $F(1,20) = 5.70, p < .0269$ ; Length WE:  $F(1,20) = 20.03, p < .0002$ ; Group B Length WN:  $F(1,16) = 4.98, p < .0402$ ; Length WE:  $F(1,16) = 16.33, p < .0009$ .

#### 4. Quantitative analysis of errors

**Table 6. Total number of sentence level errors per age group for Turkish-French bilinguals in Turkish written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	14		11		11		10		12		8	
Text type	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.
Total errors	215	217	186	191	231	196	148	161	217	221	130	77
Mean no. of errors by subj.	15.3	15.5	16.9	17.3	21	17.8	14.8	16.1	18	18.4	16.2	9.6
Range errors	2-49	7-39	2-34	7-30	14-59	5-57	6-27	3-37	1-52	7-94	2-28	2-23

**Table 7. Total number of sentence level errors per age group for Turkish monolinguals in written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	11		12		10		12		10		10	
Text type	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.
Total errors	64	126	103	69	64	52	116	128	96	160	115	100
Mean no. of errors by subj.	5,8	11.4	8,5	5,8	6,4	5,2	9,6	10,6	9,6	16	11,5	10
Range errors	0-12	9-74	2-18	1-14	3-14	1-9	1-18	2-22	4-13	5-25	3-36	4-21

The results in Table 6 and 7 do not confirm our first prediction concerning the decrease of errors with age. As we observe in Table 6, the mean number of errors of bilingual subjects is nearly constant, except the last group of high school bilingual children. We can also see that mean number of errors of monolinguals are constant but there are some exceptions to this statement in Table 7. Range of errors observed in both populations (bilingual and monolingual) shows some interpersonal differences. For example, errors range from 9 to 74 in Group A primary school children's expository texts in monolingual group. Considering the fact that total number of errors in this

group is 126, more than half of the total errors were produced by one subject with 74 errors.

When we compare the total number of errors between monolingual and bilingual populations, we find out that the differences are statistically significant for primary school children, except for the expository texts produced in Group B. The differences are also significant for both texts of the secondary school children in group A. As for secondary school students in group B and for both language groups at high school<sup>6</sup>, however, the results are not significant. Even if their clause lengths are shorter than monolinguals', primary school bilingual students are doing more error than the monolinguals meaning that they are on the way of learning to write in Turkish.

### 5. Qualitative analysis of errors

In this section, percentage of errors of each category mentioned before will be presented for bilingual and monolingual groups, respectively.

**Table 8. Percentage of errors per category and age group for Turkish-French bilinguals in Turkish written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
	A		B		A		B		A		B	
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
Nb. of subject	14		11		11		10		12		8	
Text type	Nar	Exp	Nar	Exp	Nar	Exp	Nar	Exp	Nar	Exp	Nar	Exp
Orthography	83	75.5	81.5	72.5	81	81.5	71.5	72	74.5	78	76	74
Influence of oral language	7	13.5	5	6	1.5	6.5	12	15.5	8	5.5	11	8
Lexicon	1.5	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	1.5	4	3	2	2	0	0
Cohesion	2.75	5	4	7.5	4	5	5	8	4.5	5.5	2	5
Case and voice suffixes	1.25	2	2	5.5	1	4	5	1.25	6.5	3.5	5.5	5
Others	4	1	3	4	8	1.5	2.5	1.25	4.5	5.5	5.5	8

<sup>6</sup> ANOVA tests results for "Total Number of Error" are: Primary school; Group A Error WN:  $F(1,23) = 5.33$ ,  $p < .03$ ; Group B Error WN:  $F(1,21) = 5.74$ ,  $p < .02$ ; Error WE:  $F(1,21) = 15.43$ ,  $p < .0008$ ; Secondary school; Group A Error WN:  $F(1,18) = 10.90$ ,  $p < .0040$ ; Error WE:  $F(1,18) = 9.24$ ,  $p < .0070$ .

**Table 9. Percentage of errors per category and age group for Turkish monolinguals in written texts**

School type	Primary				Secondary				High			
	A		B		A		B		A		B	
Group	11		12		10		12		10		10	
No. of subject												
Text type	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.	Nar.	Exp.
Orthography	69	59	54.5	33.5	55	57.5	70	60	69	45	58	55
Influence of oral language	8	15	14.5	3	16	11.5	13	8.5	6.5	7.5	19.5	10
Lexicon	0	0.7	3.8	5.7	3.1	1.9	0.8	3.1	1	4.3	0.8	0
Cohesion	12.5	9.5	16.5	29	17	23	14	11	14.5	17.5	9	20
Case and voice suffixes	3	5	6.5	7	4.5	4	1	7	3	6.5	3.5	4
Others	6	9.5	4	19	3	0	1	7	4	6.5	1	10

It is evident in Table (8) that Turkish-French bilinguals made a lot of mistakes in orthography. If we compare the Table (8) and Table (9), it appears that Turkish monolinguals made fewer orthographical errors than bilinguals, since bilinguals tend to borrow some characteristics of French orthography when they write in Turkish. As Ravid & Kubi (2003) indicates spelling acquisition interacts with the language, therefore the spelling errors of bilingual subjects when they write in Turkish is under the influence of French which is the language practiced in schools. In early years of schooling spelling errors which are derived from the influence of French orthography is abundant. However, as the Turkish-French bilingual students continue HLI classes their orthographical errors diminish at high school. To demonstrate the influence of continuing Turkish instruction for bilingual children in schools, one example case of a bilingual child will follow with her 2 texts produced at secondary school and one year later.

- (12) TB-S08A-WN at secondary school  
 Token: "bir sabah bir kizi şarınıya outoume okula keldi dedi niye beni şarınadır ben de dedi ben de dedin ounoutoum sona bana kuştı"  
 Target: "Bir sabah bir kızı çağırmanı unuttum. Okula geldiğinde bana "beni niye çağırmadın?" dedi. Ben de ona "unuttum" dedim. Bu yüzden bana küştü."
- (13) TB-S08A-WN one year later  
 Token: Baştan sabirsizlikle tatilleri bekliyordum çünkü 23 Nisan'ı kutlayacaktık ama 25 Nisan kutladık. Herkes güzel elbiselerini giymişlerdi, herkes çok güzeldi. Canım bir şeye sikildi ama gesti, iyi

oyunlar vardı ve theatrolar çok güzeldi, herkes eğleniyordu. 23 Nisan'ın sonunda bir çekiliş vardı kim bilet alana ve şansı bolsa Televizyon, teyip kazanıyordu. Ama ben 23 Nisan'ın sonuna kadar durmadım çünkü tezemin çocukları durmuyordu ağlıyorlardı. Tezem bizi eve bıraktıktan sonra annem beni mazaya yolladı oradan ekmek ve 2 kartonşu aldık, şuları taşıyamadık iyi ki Tayfun vardı bize yardım etti. Bana göre 15 tatil yetti.

It also seems that Turkish-French bilinguals have fewer errors in terms of coherence of their texts compared to monolinguals, but this does not mean that their texts are better organized. This difference can be explained by the fact that monolinguals produced longer texts than the bilinguals. In addition to text lengths, we should also look at how complex are these texts. We expect that as complexity increases, it becomes difficult for children to organize their narrative and expository texts. However, this study needs further investigation in terms of complexity of texts.

## 6. Conclusion

Our analyses reveal that monolinguals produced longer text than bilinguals. However narrative and expository text production is not consolidated until high school for both groups. Compared to monolinguals, the grade and junior school bilingual children made more spelling mistakes and they relied less on conventional Turkish orthography. Texts of the high school bilingual adolescents are similar to those of monolinguals.

We can also conclude that the mastery of written texts of the Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers is not observed before high school. In terms of frequency, although bilinguals make more errors, most of these errors are also made by the monolinguals. Some of the errors of bilinguals such as using French letters, or lexical borrowing can be explained by the influence of French, which is meanwhile becoming their dominant language after the age of 6 (Akinci, 2001). The most frequent type of error concerns orthographical errors which is also problematic for monolingual children.

After we examined the example case of a bilingual child in (12) and (13) and observed her development in terms of text production skills, we conclude that education is a very important factor in the development of Turkish literacy among the second generation Turkish children and adolescents in France. So we should make the parents and the teachers in France to become aware of how mother tongue education is crucial for bilingual children.

## References

- Akıncı, M.A. (2001). *Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans*. München: LINCOM, Studies in Language Acquisition n°3.
- Akıncı, M.-A. (to appear 2004). Errors and repairs in French language use of Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers. In *Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> University of Vigo International Symposium on Bilingualism: Bilingualism and education, from family to the school*. Vigo: University of Vigo Press.
- Akıncı, M.-A., Jisa, H. & Kern, S. (2001). Influence of L1 Turkish on L2 French narratives. In L. Verhoeven & S. Strömquist (Eds.), *Narrative Development in a Multilingual Context* (pp. 189-208). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aksu-Koc, A. (2004). Role of the home-context in the relations between narrative abilities and literacy practices. To appear in D. Ravid & H. Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot (Eds.), *Perspectives on language and language development*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bange, P. and Kern, S. (1996). La régulation du discours en L1 et L2. In M.B.M. Hansen & G. Skytte (Eds.), *Le discours: Cohérence et cohésion, Etudes Romanes*, 35 (pp.69-103). Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Berman, R. A. and Slobin, D. I. (1994). *Relating events in narrative: a crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Berman, R.A. and Verhoeven, L. (eds) (2002). Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on the Development of Text-Production Abilities in Speech and Writing. *Special issue of Written Language and Literacy*, (5)1, 1-43.
- Clark, E. V. (1985). The Acquisition of Romance, with Special Reference to French. In D.I. Slobin (Ed.), *The Cross-linguistic Study of Child Language, Vol. 1: The Data* (pp. 687-782). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Datta, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and Literacy: Principles and Practice*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman (English Language Series 9).
- Hickmann, M., H. Hendricks, F. Roland and J. Liang (1996). The marking of next information in children's narratives: A comparison of English, French, German, and Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language*, 23, 591-619.
- Karmiloff-Smith, A., Johnson, H., Grant, J. Jones, M.C., Karmiloff, Y.N., Bartrip, J. and Cuckle C., (1993). From sentential to discourse functions: Detection and explanation of speech repairs in children and adults. *Discourse Processes*, 16, 565-589.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, 14, 41-104.

- Martin, J. (2001). Cohesion and texture. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 35-53). Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1985). Variation and Error: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Language Acquisition in Samoa. In D.I. Slobin (Ed.), *The Cross-linguistic Study of Child Language, Vol. 1: The Data* (pp. 783-838). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ravid, D. and Kubi, E. (2003). What is a Spelling Error? The Discrepancy between Perception and Reality. *Faits de Langue*, special issue, (22), 87-98.
- Street, B. (1993). *Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1982a). The Oral/literate Continuum in Discourse. In D.Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy* (pp. 1-16). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1982b). Oral and literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives. *Language* 58(1), 1-21.