Development of Clause Linkage in Narratives: a Comparison of Turkish Children in Australia, France, the Netherlands and Turkey

Jeroen Aarssen[o], Mehmet-Ali Akinci[oo] & Kutlay Yağmur[o]
Tilburg University[o], Université Lumière Lyon 2[oo]

1. Introduction

From very early on, but especially during kindergarten and primary school, children become more and more acquainted with story telling. They hear stories, read to them by parents and teachers, and increasingly they are asked to retell or make up their own stories. Obviously, this growing awareness with narrative texts has consequences for the development of pragmatic and grammatical skills that are needed for handling the complex task of relating events. In this paper we explore one important aspect of narratives: clause linkage, the way speakers connect one sentence to another, in order to form coherent and cohesive texts.

The language we investigate is Turkish, or, should we perhaps say, four varieties of one language: Turkey-Turkish (i.e. the language of monolingual Turks in Turkey), and three varieties in the Turkish diaspora: Australo-Turkish, Batavo-Turkish[1] and Franco-Turkish.

From the perspective of child language acquisition, the factor of language change in contact situations may well be of importance in order to understand both contact and acquisition phenomena. In studies of language behaviour various factors, such as social class, gender and education, have emerged that indeed either delay or accelerate the acquisition process. In fact, these factors are seen as important variables that may explain differences between groups in language behaviour. The study of one particular language (Turkish) in four different settings may shed light on the question whether language contact is another external factor which influences the process of first language acquisition.

From earlier research on language change in contact situations, it has become clear that where one language may be influenced by another, the process of passing on this language from one generation to the next may eventually lead to changes in a language (Thomason & Kaufman 1988). Whether the resulting language variety is the product of incomplete acquisition or a newly emerged variety is also an open question.

The effects of language contact and the resulting mechanisms of language change are not often taken into account, since they are not easy to control for when data are being collected. The Turkish data from four different contexts that

we present in this paper are highly comparable, for several reasons. First of all, in all cases the frog story (Mayer 1969) was used to elicit narratives. Secondly, data were collected in similar age groups. Moreover, the informants from France, the Netherlands and Turkey were all from lower class families. (The Australian Turks are somewhat different in this respect). Before turning to the design of this study, we present some background information on these varieties of Turkish.

2. Varieties of Turkish in the world

In the beginning of the last century, the status of Turkish was boosted under the leadership of Atatürk, at the expense of Arabic and, to a lesser extent, Persian, which had been the two most influential languages in the Ottoman Empire. In the newly formed republic, Turkish was proclaimed as the nation's language, which had to be purified from elements from other languages. Still nowadays, Turks generally take great pride in their language and continue to use the language when they remain abroad for longer periods of time.

Economic motives were the cause of Turks spreading across the world, in various directions, taking their language with them. For some decades now, and especially in the late sixties and early seventies, many Turkish labourers have been traveling to places outside Turkey, not only to western Europe, but also to Australia. In the Netherlands the Turks are the largest minority community (about 250,000). France has the same number of Turkish immigrants (250,000), which is 5.5% of all immigrants. In Australia there are about 90,000 Turkish-born residents.

In the Netherlands and France research has been and is done on the acquisition of Turkish and, to a lesser extent, on structural changes in the particular varieties. See Boeschoten 1990, Schaufeli 1991, Aarssen 1996, Backus 1996, Aarssen & Backus 1999 for the Dutch context, Akinci 1999a and 1999b for the French situation. No acquisition studies have been carried out in Australia, but some information is available on sociolinguistic factors (see Yağmur, De Bot & Korzilius 1999).

3. Reasons for comparison

The most important reason for comparing Turkish in different contexts is that we want to examine which elements of the language are susceptible to language change. Our ultimate goal is to find out where the language is the most "permeable". Is it on the level of the lexicon or syntax? Do, in particular, formulaic expressions and routines from other languages sneak in? Comparing Turkish data of three groups of bilinguals might shed a light on this question. Ultimately, the comparison with the Turkish of Turkish monolinguals will give us a tool to distinguish between those features that are caused by language contact and those that are caused by the acquisition process.

This paper is the first step in this process of comparison. A first observation of differences between the Franco- and Batavo-Turkish narrative data was made in 1995 at the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Albuquerque. The French data turned out to be very different from the Dutch-Turkish data, in the sense that the French-Turkish informants used more complex grammatical features than the Dutch-Turkish ones did, but the forms they used were more often non-adult-like. Moreover, whereas the French-Turkish informants inserted a relatively high number of French words into their Turkish narratives, the Dutch-Turkish informants hardly used any Dutch words. We will relate our findings to general characteristics of the narratives, such as length and number of inserted lexical items from the other language.

The specific research questions for this paper are as follows:

1. What syntactic forms of clause linkage do bilingual children use in Turkish?
2. Is the development of Turkish clause linkage by the bilingual children comparable to that of monolingual Turkish children?
3. What are the differences between the bilingual children in the three different countries?

Based on other studies on the topic of clause linking (e.g. Aksu-Koç 1994, Berman & Slobin 1994, Ragnarsdottir 1992, Akinci & Jisa (2000) we may stipulate the following hypotheses about the development of clause linking.

1. Young children (around age 5) seem to treat a picture story as a set of isolated pictures, each not connected to the other (see e.g. Aarssen 1996, Akinci 1999a). They give local descriptions of every single frame and use expressions of deixis to anchor these frames in the here-and-now-context.
2. Stories by young children may well be just an accumulation of sentences, that is, they simply juxtapose one clause after the other without marking the relation syntactically.
3. As soon as children learn to relate events, they start to use devices to mark these relation. First they will resort to coordination.
4. Later on, the number of juxtaposed and coordinated clauses will decrease, and more advanced means of clause linking, such as cosubordination and subordination will be used.

4. Informants and data

As can be seen in Table 1, data were collected from a total of 173 informants in three age groups, 5, 7 and 9-years-old. In the data collected for the Aarssen (1996) and Akinci (1999a) studies, there is a systematic and equal distribution of informants over the three age groups. In the case of the Australian data, there is only data available from a small number of 7 and 9-year-old informants. Despite this difference in number, the Australian data were included in this study.

Table 1. Informants in the present study

	Informants				
	Bilinguals			Monolinguals	
Age	Netherlands (Aarssen 1996) **BI-NL**	France (Akinci 1999) **BI-FR**	Australia (Yağmur 1997) **BI-AU**	Turkey (Aarssen 1996) **MONO-TU**	Total
5	20	14	-	20	54
7	20	16	3	20	59
9	20	17	3	20	60
Total	60	47	6	60	173

Both the Dutch-Turkish bilingual and the monolingual data are described and analyzed more fully in Aarssen (1996).[2] He concludes that "comparison of their (i.e. the bilingual children's) results with those of the monolingual speakers of Turkish and Dutch shows that learning two languages more or less simultaneously may be beneficial in the end: bilingual children have a later start, but are not later finishers than monolingual children." (Aarssen 1996: 170).[3]

The important difference with other monolingual Turkish narrative data sets collected earlier (by Ayhan Aksu-Koç and Aylin Küntay, see Aksu-Koç 1994) is that the monolinguals from the Aarssen corpus have a low SES background quite comparable to that of the bilinguals from the Netherlands and France.

The French-Turkish data come from Akinci (1999a). He concludes that "nous espérons que cette étude a pu démontrer aux uns et aux autres qu'à l'arrivée (...) les enfants bilingues ne sont absolument pas les derniers" (Akinci 1999a: 402). The data for the Australian-Turkish bilinguals have not yet been fully analyzed.

All informants told stories based upon a picture book "*Frog where are you?*" (Mayer, 1969) following the procedures outlined in Berman and Slobin (1994). Each subject was shown the picture-book, which is composed of 24 pictures without text. The pictures relate a story about a little boy, his dog and a frog that the boy had caught and put in a jar in his room. During the night, while the boy and the dog are asleep, the frog escapes from the jar. The different episodes in the story relate the adventures of the boy and the dog during their search for their missing frog. In the end, they find a frog and return home with this frog.

The informants were instructed that the pictures in the book tell a story and that they should first look carefully through the book. Then they were asked to tell the story. They had the pictures in front of them while telling the story.

Beside this uniformity in the procedure, there were small differences between the four groups of informants as well. The Turkish data in the Netherlands were collected by a native speaker research assistant, who also made the initial transcriptions. These were checked by the Dutch researcher, who also collected the Dutch data. In France, a native speaker of Turkish collected both the Turkish and French data; in Australia a native speaker of Turkish took care of the data collection in Turkish and English.

The monolingual data were collected both by the Dutch Turkish-speaking researcher and a native Turkish research assistant.

5. Connectivity

The recorded data were transcribed according to the CHAT format (see MacWhinney 2000). The number of connections (i.e. all cases of juxtaposition, temporal deixis, coordination, cosubordination and subordination) were counted. Each clause was coded for one of four types of connectivity: juxtaposition, coordination, co-subordination and subordination, following Foley & Van Valin (1984), Erguvanl□-Taylan (1988) and Watters (1993). In addition, we coded temporal deictic markers. The different categories are illustrated below.

Foley and Van Valin (1984) offer a way of description for different types of connections between sentences. There is a range from simple juxtaposition to far more advanced levels. Schematically, the following connection types can be distinguished:

1. Simple connections
a. **juxtaposition**
b. **deixis**
2. Nexus relations
a. **coordination**
b. **cosubordination**
c. **subordination**

Below in the discussion of these different types we will give some Turkish examples from our own data.

The easiest way of adding one sentence to a following one is simply to put the one sentence after the other without any grammatical marking. This is called **juxtaposition** (see [1]).

[1] *gurba çıkıyo. köpek yatıyo. adam yatıyo.*
frog get-out-PROG.3sg dog sleep-PROG.3sg man sleep-PROG.3sg
the frog is getting out. the dog is sleeping. the man is sleeping.
BI-FR-9[4]

Not included in Foley and Van Valin (1984) are utterances in which a **temporal deictic** elements,[5] such as “now, that night, then” (or in Turkish □*imdi* ‘now’,

sabahleyin ‘in the mornings’, *o zaman* ‘then’, etc.) is used. Temporal deixis is included in our analysis, since it is used in narratives to link sentences (see [2]):

[2] ***o zaman*** *da dog düştü.* ***o zaman*** *da oğlan düştü.*
that time too dog[english] fall-PAST.3sg. that time too boy fall-PAST.3sg.
and then the dog fell. and then the boy fell too.
BI-AU-7

Narrators can also make use of overt grammatical markers in order to connect sentences. Grammatical marking of connection is called a nexus relation. The first type of nexus relation is **coordination**: two successive clauses are conjoined using a particle, as in [3], a temporal adverb, as in [4], or a coordinate or subordinate conjunction, as in [5] and [6].

[3] *oğlan da yattı. köpek* ***de****.*
boy too sleep-PAST.3sg. dog too.
and the boy was sleeping. the dog as well.
BI-NL-5

[4] ***ondan sonra*** *taşın üstüne çıkıyor. ondan sonra bir tane reindeer geliyor.*
it-ABL after stone-GEN top-POSS-DAT emerge-PRES.3sg. it-ABL after one piece reindeer[english] come-PRES.3sg.
and then he emerged on top of the stone. and then this reindeer came.
BI-AU-9

[5] *köpek gidiyor* ***ve*** *oğlan da oturuyor.*
dog go-PRES.3sg and boy too sit-PRES.3sg.
the dog is going and the boy is sitting.
BI-NL-5

[6] *oğlan kızdı* ***çünkü*** *o şey <kapot yapmıştı> [//] kırmıştı.*
boy get.angry-PAST.3sg because that thing <broken[dutch] make-PAST.PERF.3sg> [//] break-PAST.PERF.3sg
the boy became angry because <he made that thing go to pieces> [//] he smashed it.
BI-NL-5

The second nexus relation is **cosubordination**: two clauses are related through a relation of dependence. The non-final clause is dependent upon the final clause for the expression of grammatical categories (such as tense, mood or an argument) which are part of its interpretation. In the case of cosubordination, the dependent clause is not embedded. Cosubordination in Turkish typically involves the use of converbs (*-ince* ‘as soon as’ *-erken* ‘while’ *-erek* ‘by V-ing’ *-ip* ‘and’ or ‘and then’ see [8] through [11]), but also devices that mean “so that” (*diye* or *ki*, see [7]).

[7] *köpek te üstüne binmiş ıslanmasın diye.*
dog too on-POSS-DAT climb-PAST3sg get.wet-NEG-OPT diye.
the dog climbs on him, so that he doesn't get wet
MONO-7

[8] *köpek bal yerine [//] evine gidince bal [//] arılar hep çıkıyor*
dog honey place-POSS-DAT [//] house-POSS-DAT go-INCE honey [//] bee-PLUR all come.out.PROG.3pl
as soon as the dog goes to the honey place [//] house, all the honey [//] bees come out.
BI-NL-9

[9] *çocuk uyurken kurbak içinden çıkıyor.*
child sleep-ER-KEN frog inside-POSS-ABL get.out.PROG.3sg
while the child is sleeping, the frog gets out from the inside
BI-NL-5

[10] *oğlan da bağırarak çıkmış.*
boy too scream-EREK get.out-PAST.3sg
the boy too came out screaming
BI-NL-7

[11] *çocuk kalkıp kurbağayı aramaya başladı.*
boy get.up-IP frog-ACC search-INF-DAT begin-PAST.3sg
the boy got up and started to look for the frog
BI-NL-9

Finally, narrators may use **subordination**: two clauses are related through a relation of dependence and the subordinate clause is embedded (i.e. it functions as an argument). Turkish uses infinitival forms for this purpose, as well as forms in which the participle *-dik* appears. Examples of the former are [12] and [13]; [14] through [16] are illustrations of the latter.

[12] *sonra köpek de buraya çıkmaya çalışıyo.*
later dog too here-DAT emerge try-PROG.3sg
later the dog also tries to come up there
BI-FR-5

[13] *kurbağayı aramak için oraya bakıyor.*
frog-ACC search-INF for there-DAT look-PRES.3sg.
in order to search the frog he looks there.
MONO-9

[14] *bu köpeğine bakıyo indiğini*

this dog-POSS-DAT look-PROG.3sg descend-DIK-POSS-ACC
this one here (=the boy) is looking at his dog. That he is descending.
BI-NL-5

[15] *çocukunan köpek uyandığı zaman kurba euh: şişenin içinde yoktu.*
child-WITH dog wake.up-DIK-POSS time frog euh bottle-GEN in-POSS-LOC there.is.not-PAST.3sg
when the child and the dog woke up the frog euh wasn't in the bottle.
BI-FR-9

[16] *oğlan da kızmış çok # yüzünü yaladığı için*
boy too be.angry.PAST.3sg much. Face-POSS-ACC lick-DIK-POSS for
the boy was very angry # because he licked his face.
BI-NL-9

6. Results

Table 2 presents general information on connectivity of the narratives in the different groups of informants. The second column (number of clauses) refers to the total number of clauses by the informant in a particular age group. The third column represents the total number of connections the informants in a particular group made. In some cases the number of connections is higher than the number of clauses, since more than one type of connection can be used. It is, for instance, possible to use both deixis and cosubordination when combining two clauses.

The fourth column in Table 2 gives the mean number of connections per informant, and the final column the range, the minimum and maximum number of connections within a particular group. These last two columns show that there are not only large differences between groups, but also within.

In general, the youngest French bilinguals produce the longest stories. This is partly the reason why they also have the highest number of connections per informant, with one outlier up to 224. The older French bilinguals, however, produce shorter stories than the 5-year-olds: the mean number of connections dramatically drops from 75 at age 5 to 53 at age 7 and 39 at age 9. In comparison, the mean number of connections used by the monolinguals remains constant (63, 64 and 61 respectively).

It is not the case that the older the children become, the longer stories they tell. On the contrary, the picture that emerges here is the opposite for the French and Australian Turks. The 9-year-olds produce the shortest stories.

Table 2. Connectivity in Turkish per group of informants (by country and age group)

	Number of clauses	Number of connections	Mean number of connections per informant	Range
Bilinguals the Netherlands				
Age 5	582	620	31	21-44
Age 7	791	875	44	24-77
Age 9	844	878	44	23-74
Bilinguals France				
Age 5	1012	1047	75	32-224
Age 7	825	844	53	23-83
Age 9	858	668	39	28-57
Bilinguals Australia				
Age 7	184	115	38	31-114
Age 9	136	69	23	36-62
Monolinguals Turkey				
Age 5	1343	1261	63	32-125
Age 7	1347	1283	64	36-103
Age 9	1199	1212	61	32-97

For the Dutch Turks and the monolinguals from Turkey, no difference at all in length was seen. Length is not necessarily a sign of development. As was illustrated in earlier research (e.g., Berman & Slobin 1994, Aarssen 1996), young children generally give elaborate descriptions of single pictures, without creating cohesive and coherent texts. Older children develop the skills to analyse situations into components and, hence, to relate events into a narrative. They are able to encode these events into multiclausal constructions, creating compact, and thus shorter, stories.

Table 3. Numbers and proportions (of total number of connections) of different forms of connectivity (by country and age)

	Juxta-position		Deixis		Co-ordination		Cosub-ordination		Sub-ordination	
Bilinguals the Netherlands										
Age 5	360	58%	42	7%	205	33%	4	1%	9	1%
Age 7	368	42%	91	10%	383	44%	32	4%	-	-
Age 9	427	49%	41	5%	368	41%	38	4%	4	1%
Bilinguals France										
Age 5	483	46%	34	3%	506	48%	15	1%	9	1%
Age 7	408	48%	6	1%	408	39%	18	2 %	4	1%
Age 9	320	48%	8	1%	314	47%	20	3%	6	1%
Bilinguals Australia										
Age 7	-	-	3	3%	84	73%	3	3%	25	21%
Age 9	-	-	4	6%	47	68%	14	20%	4	6%
Monolinguals Turkey										
Age 5	683	54%	13	1%	471	37%	54	4%	40	3%
Age 7	778	61%	11	1%	412	32%	42	3%	40	3%
Age 9	581	48%	3	1%	497	41%	73	6%	58	4%

Table 3 presents the different forms of connectivity in the respective groups. It also gives the proportions of the total number of connections.

Overall, about 50% of all connections are simple juxtaposed sentences. The Australian bilinguals, however, always mark their connections: they either use temporal deixis to ground the story in a temporal framework, or they use explicit means for clause linking. In order to be able to compare the Australian with the other groups, the juxtaposed sentences were excluded from the analysis (see Table 4).

Table 4. Proportions of total number of connections minus juxtaposition (by country and age)

	Deixis	Coordination	Cosubordination	Subordination
Bilinguals The Netherlands				
Age 5	16	79	1	3
Age 7	18	76	6	-
Age 9	9	82	8	1
Bilinguals France				
Age 5	6	90	2	2
Age 7	1	94	4	1
Age 9	2	90	6	2
Bilinguals Australia				
Age 7	3	73	3	21
Age 9	6	68	20	6
Monolinguals Turkey				
Age 5	2	81	9	7
Age 7	2	72	8	8
Age 9	1	79	11	9

The monolingual informants use all available types of sentence connections, in all age groups. If they mark the connection by syntactic means, they mainly use coordination (around 75% of the marked connections). The monolinguals also use cosubordination and subordination from age 5 on, and the proportion of these syntactically rather complex means increases with age.

The three bilingual groups show patterns that are not only different from those of the monolinguals, but also different from each other. The Australian-Turkish bilinguals use coordination in about 71% of the connections between clauses, which comes close to what the monolinguals do. Moreover, they use more instances of cosubordination and subordination than the other two bilingual groups. They don't seem to have any problems in using these advanced grammatical means. On the other hand, the Australian-Turkish bilinguals resort to deictic means more frequently than the monolinguals do.

The French-Turkish bilinguals use a somewhat surprisingly high amount of coordination: more than 90% of their grammatically marked connections. Only at age 5 does the use of temporal deixis play a significant role. However, the French-Turkish bilinguals use the more complex clause linking devices far less often than their monolingual peers.

Finally, the Dutch-Turkish bilinguals make use of coordinating devices (in nearly 80% of the connections they make). They hardly use more advanced means. Of the four groups, the Dutch-Turkish informants resorted most frequently to deictic expressions, even at age 9.

7. Conclusion & discussion

7.1. Deictic expressions for anchoring the narrative.

In the narratives of the monolingual Turkish children, only a marginal use of temporal deictic expressions in order to relate subsequent pictures was found. The three groups of bilingual children used deixis more often, especially those from the Netherlands. As the use of deictic means can thus be attributed to stagnation or delay in development, we may conclude that the ability to use grammatical means for relating events is not yet fully developed. In comparison to monolingual Turkish informants, more bilingual informants seem to treat the pictures of the frog story as isolated pictures, not as one story. By giving local descriptions of single pictures and by accordingly using deictic expressions to anchor these frames in the here-and-now-context, they are not yet fully capable of handling the task of a narrative.

7.2. Juxtaposition of clauses

Informants in all age groups use juxtaposition, i.e. they merely put one clause after the other without marking the relation syntactically. There is one exception, though: the Australian data show that the Australian-Turkish informants always use some device (either temporal deixis or complex grammatical means) to mark the relation. We are aware of the fact that the group of Australian-Turkish informants consists of just six informants. The result found here may well be attributed to individual characteristics of these six informants. More research has to be done here.

7.3. Advanced clause linking

Coordination is used most frequently in all groups to relate events. The monolinguals show a development in that they increasingly use the more advanced means of cosubordination and subordination as well. This development is also found in the data of the Australian-Turkish informants, but is not yet seen in the bilinguals from France and the Netherlands.

The length of the monolinguals' narratives is in general the highest and rather stable over the three age groups. If we compare their narratives to those of the Turkish informants in the Netherlands, we see that the latter tell relatively short stories. The length of their stories, however, increases with age. Of the four groups analysed here they have the lowest number of connections per informant (partly caused by the fact that their stories are indeed shorter). They mainly seem to resort to temporal deixis, thereby taking into account the data collection situation where informant and researcher share knowledge about the story. It is striking that whereas their narratives may be considered to be poor from a grammatical point of view, the lexicon is still almost completely Turkish. Only in a small number of cases do they use a Dutch word.

The Turkish informants in Australia, on the other hand, frequently switch to English, especially for concrete nouns (even some frequent ones). In all cases they seem to use some form of grammatical marking to connect two sentences, mainly by means of coordination. That means that whereas their narratives are grammatically advanced Turkish, the lexicon is partly English.

The Turkish informants in France tell relatively long stories, especially when compared to the Dutch-Turkish ones. The number of connections decreases with age, but the quality of the connections is improving: the 9-year-olds use more cosubordination. In the French-Turkish stories there is a limited amount of switching to French.

7.4. Turkish as home language and as school language

Given the similar background characteristics such as regional variation, socioeconomic status of the parents and so on, the linguistic differences between the three groups are intriguing. Most informants from the three countries outside Turkey come from Turkish-dominant families: Turkish is the language used most frequently at home in daily interaction. There is a difference, however, in the opportunities to receive mother tongue instruction. Turkish background children in the Netherlands and in France have this opportunity; in the Australian context (with the exception of the state of Victoria), however, this is not possible.

The Turkish-Australian children in this study come from Sydney (New South Wales) and they have not received any mother tongue instruction throughout their schooling. Moreover, both in France and the Netherlands, the amount of Turkish language input (in the form of TV and radio broadcasting, availability of daily Turkish newspapers and magazines, and also the demographic factors, and contact with the homeland, etc.) should contribute more to first language development in the European context than in the Australian context.

7.5. Register variation

On the given points of investigation, the findings do not suggest such strong differences. Nevertheless, Turkish-Australian children seem to be inserting a large number of English words in their Turkish discourse. Informants in the Australian context seem to have a lot of difficulty in finding the 'right' word for the objects encountered in the process of picture story telling. They either used a general category name for given entity, e.g. 'bird' for the 'owl' or 'tree' for the 'log'; or they simply used an English word instead of a Turkish word. On the basis of these findings, one can easily suggest that infrequent and specific nouns seem not to be available in the lexicon of Turkish-Australian children. This finding can be contrasted to Turkish children in the Dutch context in that, in general, they do not use any Dutch words in their Turkish discourse.

This, however, does not answer the question why the Turkish children in France (who do have mother tongue instruction, and who do use more advanced grammatical means for clause linking) still insert French lexical material in their Turkish stories. We may suggest here that the difference between the Turkish-Australian and Turkish-French bilinguals on the one hand and the Turkish-Dutch on the other, is in fact an artefact of the methodology used. The data in France (both French and Turkish), were collected by one and the same person, a bilingual, as was the case for the Australian data. The Dutch data, however, were collected by different native speakers for each language[6]. Hence, the Dutch data would presumably be more representative of a monolingual context (or, rather, two monolingual contexts), while the French and Australian data would be more representative of a bilingual context. In the latter case, insertion of lexical items from the other language can be seen as a bilingual strategy, and should, therefore, not be interpreted negatively (Grosjean 1998). The bilinguals seem capable of evoking and using a particular bilingual register, taking into account their interlocutor's perceived ability to use two languages.

7.6. Recommendations

On the basis of these findings, it is recommended that further comparisons with respect to lexical development and textual coherence need to be done, preferably using identical methods for eliciting data in different contexts. Sociolinguistic background factors and the context of immigration (such as the policies concerning the teaching of immigrant languages, facilities available, amount of first language input and so on) seem to have an effect on the acquisition processes of both first and second languages. If such factors are identified, it will be easier to comment on the apparent language change taking place in these three different contexts.

Endnotes

1. The term "Batavo" refers to the Batavians, a Germanic tribe migrating to the Netherlands as early as 300 BC, where they came into contact with other tribes.

Rik Boeschoten, who first coined this term in his dissertation (Boeschoten, 1990:190), pointed at the "qualitatively very little interindividual variation between the informants" (p.187) in a number of patterns typical for Turkish children in the Netherlands. Other names of this variety include Dutch-Turkish and Netherturkish.

2. The Aarssen data are available through the CHILDES database (MacWhinney 2000). See http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/ (go to "The database", then "bilingual corpora" and then to the aarsen_bos data (aarsen_bos.zip for Windows, or aarsen_bos.sit for Macintosh).

3. Aarssen (1996) not only found that the acquisition of both Turkish and Dutch in bilinguals at age 4 was delayed, as compared to that of monolingual peers, but also that the bilinguals were able to bridge this gap at the age of 10, when acquisitional differences seem to have been minimized.

4. All examples are tagged for their database: BI-NL = Dutch-Turkish, BI-FR = French-Turkish, BI-AU = Australian-Turkish, MONO = monolingual Turkish. The numbers refer to the age group (age 5, 7 or 9).

5. Only temporal deixis is included here, since spatial deixis can in fact be regarded as being outside the scope of the narratives; it refers to the physical environment: "here " means "here, in this picture".

6. In fact, the Dutch data were collected by the Dutch researcher and the Turkish data by Turkish research assistants. All of them were able to communicate in both Dutch and Turkish, but were instructed to use only their native language during the data collection session (see Aarssen 1996:23). The aim was to have monolingual Dutch and Turkish data sets.

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.

Aarssen, J. & Backus, A. (1999) "Turkish in the Netherlands", *TASG NEWS Newsletter of the Turkish Area Study Group* 49, 19-27.

Akinci, M.-A. (1999a) *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. (1999b) "Turkish Spoken by Bilingual Children in France: Mother Tongue and Weak Language?", *TASG NEWS Newsletter of the Turkish Area Study Group* 49, 40-46.

Akinci, M.-A. & Jisa, H. (2000)"Development of Turkish Clause Linkage in the Narrative texts of Turkish-French bilingual children in France" in A. Göksel & C. Kerslake (eds) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*. Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 317-324.

Aksu-Koç, A (1994) "Development of Linguistic Forms: Turkish" in R.A. Berman & D.I. Slobin (Eds.) *Relating Events in Narrative: A*

Crosslinguistic Developmental Study Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 329-385.

Backus, A. (1996) *Two in One: Bilingual Speech among Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands* (= Studies in Multilingualism 1), Tilburg University Press, Tilburg.

Berman, R.A. & Slobin, D.I. (1994) *Relating Events in Narrative: A Crosslinguistic Developmental Study*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

Boeschoten, H.E. (1990) *Acquisition of Turkish by Immigrant Children. A Multiple Case Study of Turkish Children in the Netherlands Aged 4 to 6.* (= Turkologica 6), Otto Harrassowitz, Weisbaden.

Erguvanl□-Taylan, E. (1988) "The Expression of Temporal Reference in Embedded Sentences in Turkish" in S. Koç (Ed.) *Studies on Turkish Linguistics*, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 333-350.

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

Grosjean, F. (1998) "Studying Bilinguals: Methodological and Conceptual Issues", *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1 (2), 131-149.

MacWhinney, B. (2000) *The CHILDES Project. Tools for Analyzing Talk*, 3rd Edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.

Mayer, M. (1969) *Frog, Where Are You?*, Dial Books for Young Readers, Dial Press, New York.

Ragnarsdóttir, H. (1992) "Episodic Structure and Interclausal Connectives in Icelandic Children's Narratives", *Child Language Research Institute Paper* 8, Dept. of Linguistics, Lund University, 33-45.

Schaufeli, A. (1991) *Turkish in an Immigrant Setting. A Comparative Study of the First Language of Monolingual and Bilingual Turkish Children*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Thomason, S. & T. Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Watters, J.K. (1993) "An Investigation of Turkish Clause Linkage" in R.D. Van Valin (Ed.) *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 535-560.

Yağmur, K., De Bot, K. & Korzilius, H. (1999) "Language Attrition, Language Shift and Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Turkish in Australia", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20 (1), 51-69.