Narrative Development in a Multilingual Context

EDITED BY

Ludo Verhoeven and

Sven Strömqvist

STUDIES IN BILINGUALISM

23

This is an offprint from:

Ludo Verhoeven and Sven Strömqvist (eds)
Narrative Development in a Multilingual Context
John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia
2001
(Published as Vol. 23 of the series
STUDIES IN BILINGUALISM,
ISSN 0928-1533)

ISBN 90 272 4134 1 (Hb; Eur.) / 1 58811 098 2 (Hb; US)

Contents

CHAPTER 7

Influence of L1 Turkish on L2 French narratives

Mehmet-Ali Akinci, Harriet Jisa and Sophie Kern

Two distinct, but interrelated levels of analysis have been addressed in research on narrative: cohesion and coherence. Following Hickmann (1995: 201) cohesion refers to the linguistic devices used in the expression of content, while coherence refers to the structure of narrative content. Story grammars, for example, propose representations of underlying narrative structure which it is argued form the cognitive foundations guiding the production and comprehension of narrative texts (cf. Mandler 1978; Mandler and Johnson 1977, 1980; Rumelhart 1975, 1977, 1980; Thorndyke 1977). Despite considerable divergence in the details of story grammars, there is a general consensus that certain elements are essential to a well-formed story: a setting, an initial problem, attempts at a solution to the problem and a resolution (Adam 1985; Labov and Waletsky 1967; Stein 1982; Stein and Trabasso 1981).

There is little consensus, however, concerning how narrative structure and narrative cohesion are related. An important study by Thorndyke (1977) presented narrative texts to two groups of subjects. One group heard stories with canonical story structure and another group heard stories with jumbled story structure. As predicted by story grammars, recall was better for subjects who heard canonical stories. Garnham, Oakhill and Johnson-Laird (1982) however, found that recall for the jumbled stories could be influenced through the modification of cohesive structures. By restoring referential cohesion to the jumbled stories recall for jumbled stories improved.

Some research has proposed that the development of cohesion and coherence are very closely related (Shapiro and Hudson 1991). Other research has argued that cohesion and coherence are not simply parallel developments, but that the development of story grammars is essential to the development of cohesive devices, such as connectives (French and Nelson 1985).

In earlier work on monolingual French children, Jisa and Kern (1995)

concluded that the acquisition of narrative structure and the acquisition of syntactic competence are inextricably related. Narrative structure, in particular episodic structure, has been shown to have ramifications on the use of linguistic forms. For example, changes in children's conceptions of episodic structures can be tracked through the observed changes in relative clause usage in narrative tasks. Relative structures are precocious and frequent in French monolingual children's narrative texts. However, mature *uses* of relative structures in storytelling require chunking of a narrative text into episodes (Jisa and Kern 1998). Children's use of anaphoric pronouns to maintain reference is also related to narrative structure: within episodes anaphoric pronouns are more precocious and more frequent than their use across episodes (Hickmann, Kail and Roland 1995; Jisa 2000). As Hickmann (1995) points out further research is needed to understand the relation between development of linguistic forms and narrative coherence.

The vast majority of narrative research has ignored bilingual populations and yet bilinguals, and children on their ways to becoming bilingual, offer an invaluable source of data. In the study presented in this chapter we have attempted to separate narrative structure and the expression of narrative structure. Turkish–French bilingual children were asked to tell a story in Turkish (their home language) and subsequently in French. This allows us to compare their use of narrative structures in the two languages. The subjects of this study are essentially monolingual in Turkish up to the age of three, when they begin attending monolingual French nursery schools. By the age of ten, most of these children show French as their dominant productive language (Akinci 1999). There are three questions which motivate our study. The first question we will address is the following.

1. Are narrative texts produced in French and in Turkish by the bilingual children comparable, or are the texts in one language more "complete" than in the other?

To examine the first question we will compare the use of macro-structure narrative components (Berman 1988; Berman and Slobin 1994: 46) in Turkish and French texts produced by the bilingual children. We will then compare the bilingual children's French texts to those produced by monolingual French children in order to answer our second question.

2. Are the French texts produced by the bilingual French–Turkish children and by the monolingual children comparable at all three age ranges?

The second question will be addressed by comparing the macro-structure components found in the bilingual children's texts with those found in monolingual French children's texts. We will then turn to a closer examination of the linguistic structures used by the bilingual and monolingual children to encode the macro-structure components. Our third question is as follows.

3. Are the linguistic structures used by the French-Turkish bilingual children to encode the different components the same as those used by the French monolingual children in the French texts?

To answer the third question we will turn to a more qualitative look at the linguistic forms used by the bilingual and monolingual children to encode narrative components in their stories.

Design of the study

The subjects

Narrative texts were collected from 5-, 7- and 10-year-old bilingual and monolingual children. Table 1 gives the number of subjects in each group and their mean ages. Four of the bilingual children were born in Turkey and came to France before the age of one year. The remaining subjects were born in France in Turkish-speaking families. The parents of these children were all born in Turkey. None of the mothers work. Sixty percent of the fathers are either unemployed or workers in the construction industry. One fourth of the mothers and 10 per cent of the fathers are illiterate. Sixty percent of the parents received a primary school education. Eleven percent of the mothers and 25 per cent of the fathers have some secondary education. In contrast to

Table 1. Turkish–French bilingual and French monolingual subjects.

	French–Turkish bilinguals						French monolinguals		
	French			Turkish					
Age Group	5	7	10	5	7	10	5	7	10
N	13[a]	16	14	14	16	15	20	20	20
Mean Age	5;6	7;6	10;6	5;6	7;6	10;6	5;5	7;5	10;8
Age Range	5;1–5;11	7;0–7;11	10;0–10;11	5;1–5;11	7;0–7;11	10;0–10;11	5;0–5;11	7;1–7;10	10;2–11;3

[a] One 5-year-old refused to tell the story in French

the Turkish–French bilinguals, the French monolinguals are from middle class families. The parents' education level includes from some secondary education to some post-secondary.

Data collection

A children's picture book, *Frog, where are you?* (Mayer 1969) was used to collect the data. The frog story book consists of twenty-four pages of pictures with no text. The story relates the adventures of a boy and his dog in their search for a runaway frog. During the search, the boy and the dog meet up with a variety of different characters. Their encounters with these other characters yield a series of episodes which make up the story. Following the procedures outlined in Berman and Slobin (1994), narrative texts were collected from bilingual Turkish–French children and monolingual French children.

The bilingual children's Frog stories were collected in Turkish and subsequently in French. A Turkish bilingual researcher (Akinci) showed the children the book. Then, a second Turkish speaker (known to the child) was asked to listen to the child's story. The children habitually speak Turkish to both adults. The majority of recordings were made in a Turkish cultural center. Some Turkish stories were collected in the children's homes. Approximately one week later, the children were again shown the book by a researcher (Akinci) and asked to tell the story to a monolingual French speaker. The French monolingual children were recorded for the most part in their homes by a variety of native-speaking French assistants. The children told the story, either to another assistant, or in some cases, to their mother.

Data analysis

Error analysis

Before presenting the study of narrative components in the Frog story, we will briefly summarise the results of an error analysis of the French texts (Akinci 1999). The appendix lists the types and frequency of errors observed in the bilingual French stories. The error analysis was undertaken to show that the bilingual children master sentence level grammar rather quickly. The majority of the error types observed in the bilingual children are also observed in much younger French monolingual children (Clark 1985; Kern 1997). Some errors may possibly be explained by interference. Among these are the absence of a determiner, a copula and a subject, as well as problems in word order placement

of the object. However, these "interference" errors are not frequent and tend to disappear after the age of five. The most frequent error type concerns gender, which is problematic for French second language speakers, regardless of language background. Gender errors, then, cannot be specifically attributed to Turkish. The rapid attainment of sentence level grammar among our Turkish immigrant children is consistent with results reported for other second language learning children (Cummins 1984, 1991; Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle 1978).

Narrative components

Four narrative components were coded in all of the texts, following the procedures given in Berman (1988) and Berman and Slobin (1994: 46). Definitions of the components, as well as examples, are given in Table 2.

Texts are coded as containing Component 1 (ONSET OF THE PLOT) when there is explicit mention of the boy realising that the frog is gone. The realisation that the frog is missing triggers the search. To be coded as having Component 2 (UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT), the texts must make explicit mention of the search at least three times. Explicit mention of Component 2 expresses the common goal (the search for the frog) which establishes coherence between the various episodes. Verbs, characterised as having a high degree of "control" on the part of the subject (Comrie 1981) such as *chercher* ('to search for') and *appeler* ('to call for') were counted as explicit mentions. *Regarder* ('to look in or at') or *voir* ('to see'), however, were not considered as explicit. At the end of the story the boy finds a family of frogs and takes one small frog with him. Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT) is counted in texts where the narrator describes the frog as being the same or as substituting for the frog shown escaping at the beginning of the story. Component 4 (ENCAPSULATIONS refers to mentions of a summary of the search, either prospective or retrospective. Prospective encapsulations summarize the episodes to be related, while retrospective encapsulations summarize the episodes that have been told.

Results

Bilingual narrative components

Table 3 compares the narrative components used in the French and Turkish texts produced by the bilingual children. Across the three age groups the use of Component 1 remains relatively constant. The only divergence is observed

Table 2. Components of the Frog Story

COMPONENT 1: ONSET OF THE PLOT
Explicit mention must be made of the boy's noticing that the frog is missing. *le lendemain matin quand l' garçon i s'réveille sur son lit i voit qu' la grenouille est partie* (F10;7k)[a] ('the next morning when the little boy wakes up on his bed he sees that the frog is gone')
COMPONENT 2: UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT
Explicit mention must be made of the search for the frog at least three times. *euh Pierre cherche dans ses bottes. Rouki dans le bocal. ..... Pierre va à la fenêtre et appelle Zizi! Zizi!..... Ils continuent. Ils appellent Zizi! Zizi! .... Pierre cherche dans un trou. .... Pendant ce temps Pierre est monté dans un arbre et regarde dans un trou. .... Pierre monte sur un gros caillou et continue d'appeler.* (F10;6o) (Peter searches in his boots. Rouki in the jar. ..... Peter goes to the window and calls Zizi! Zizi! ..... They continue. They call Zizi! Zizi! ..... Peter looks in a hole. .... During this time Pierre climbed up a tree and looks in a hole. ..... Peter climbs up on a rock and continues to call')
COMPONENT 3: RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT
The frog taken home at the end of the story must be explicitly described as being the same or as substituting for the frog that the boy lost in the beginning of the story. *Pierre et Rouki repartent avec Zizi la grenouille* (F10;6o) ('Peter and Rouki return with Zizi the frog.')
COMPONENT 4: ENCAPSULATIONS
Summarizing (prospective or retrospective) of the ongoing search. *maintenant le petit garçon poursuit ses recherches* (F10;2b) ('now the little boy pursues his search') *ils la cherchèrent partout* (F11;5c) ('they looked for her everywhere')

Source: Berman 1988; Berman and Slobin 1994: 46

[a]The numbers following the examples identify the subjects. F refers to French monolinguals, TF refers to Turkish–French bilinguals. The children's ages are given in years and months. The letter following the age indicates the individual child in the age group.

in the 5-year-olds, who show slightly more encodings of the onset of the plot in French than in Turkish. For Components 2–4, performance in French slightly surpasses performance in Turkish. There are possibly two reasons for this. The first is methodological. As mentioned above, all of the children told the story first in Turkish. It may be that familiarity with the task provides a slightly better grasp of the story for the French production. The second possible reason is that the children have had more experience with this kind of exercise in French than in Turkish, given that all the children go to French

Table 3. Proportion of Turkish–French bilingual narrators making explicit mention to each of the four components in their Turkish and French texts

	Turkish bilingual			French bilingual		
Age Group	5	7	10	5	7	10
N	14	16	15	13	16	15
Component 1: ONSET OF THE PLOT	.21	.81	.93	.36	.81	.93
Component 2: UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT	.07	.25	.53	.14	.44	.66
Component 3: RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT	.07	.31	.33	.00	.25	.27
Component 4: ENCAPSULATIONS	.07	.06	.20	.07	.25	.27

school where storytelling and story reading by the teacher are regular activities.

The difference between the French and Turkish texts are greater for the 5- and 7-year-olds than for the 10-year-olds. There is, however, no significant difference between the total number of components mentioned in the Turkish and the French texts (5-year-olds, W=7.5, 5df, NS; 7-year-olds, W=12, 7df, NS; 10-year-olds, W=10.5, 8df, NS).

Narrative components in L1 vs L2 French

Table 4 compares the bilingual French texts with the monolingual French texts. The figures for the bilingual children are repeated in Table 4 for convenience of comparison. Both the bilinguals and monolinguals show development toward the encoding of more narrative components. The interaction of age and total number of components was significant for both the bilingual group (F (2,39)=14.40, $p<00.001$) and the monolingual group (F (2,57)= 25.64, $p<00.001$).

While the Turkish 5-year-olds perform slightly poorer on Component 1 (ONSET OF THE PLOT), the Turkish 7- and 10-year-olds actually "outperform" the French monolinguals. This bilingual advantage, however, is not seen in the remaining components. The French monolingual 10-year-olds, in particular, show a higher percentage of usage of the different components in comparison to the bilingual 10-year-olds. A comparison of monolingual and bilinguals for the total number of components mentioned per subject shows a slight monolingual advantage for the 5-year-olds (t=1.6, 33df, $p<00.10$) and no significant difference at seven years of age (t=.83, 34df, NS). There is a significant difference, however, at ten years of age (10-year-olds, t=3.59, 33df, $p<00.001$). The 10-year-old monolinguals encode more macro-structure components than the 10-year-old bilinguals.

Separate comparisons for each component reveals the following results. There is no significant quantitative difference between bilingual and monolingual subjects at any age for the mention of Component 1 (ONSET OF THE PLOT). For Component 2 (UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT) there is no significant difference between the monolingual and bilingual 5- and 7-year-olds. However, the difference is significant at ten year of age: more monolingual children encoded Component 2 than bilingual children ($\chi^2=4.82$, 1df, $p<00.05$). There is no significant difference between the bilingual and monolingual 5- and 7-year-olds in their encoding of Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT). However, again at ten years of age there is a significant difference. The monolingual 10-year-olds encode Component 3 significantly more than the bilingual children ($\chi^2=5.02$, 1df, $p<00.05$). There is no significant quantitative difference between the monolingual and bilingual groups in the mentions of Component 4 (ENCAPSULATIONS), although there is a slight trend toward a monolingual advantage at ten years of age ($\chi^2=2.80$, 1 df, $p<00.10$).

Table 4. Narrative components in French texts of bilingual French–Turkish children and monolingual French children. Percentage of narrators making explicit mention to each of the four components

	French bilingual			French monolingual		
Age Group	5	7	10	5	7	10
N	13	16	15	20	20	20
Component 1: ONSET OF THE PLOT	.36	.81	.93	.55	.75	.90
Component 2: UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT	.14	.44	.66	.40	.65	.95
Component 3: RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT	.00	.25	.27	.05	.50	.65
Component 4: ENCAPSULATIONS	.07	.25	.27	.05	.15	.55

Linguistic structures in L1 vs L2 French

As we have seen in the previous section there are few significant differences between the 5- and 7-year old monolingual and bilingual children in terms of total number of components mentioned. Taking each component separately revealed a significant difference only Component 2 (UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT) and for Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT) between the bilingual and monolingual 10-year-olds. Our aim in this section is to examine the linguistic forms used to encode the four components. Do the bilingual and monolingual subjects differ in the structures used, or in the range of structures used to encode each component?

Component 1: Onset of the plot

The structures expressing Component 1 were divided into three categories, illustrated in Table 5. JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATION is considered the least syntactically sophisticated way of recounting the two propositions — the boy looking in the jar, the boy realising that the frog has disappeared. A second way of encoding this episode is through SUBORDINATION the use of a subordinated complement clause with *que* ('that'). JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATION and SUBORDINATION are mutually exclusive categories. A third category, STATE OF MIND, can be added to either category. STATE OF MIND refers to attributing a mental state to the boy (and/or the dog) upon the discovery of the missing frog. This implies not just relating two events but imposing a mental state on the boy because of the events in the story. It should be noted that in the French monolingual adult recountings of this story, 64 per cent of the adult narrators included a STATE OF MIND clause.

Table 5. Structural alternatives for encoding Component 1: ONSET OF THE PLOT

JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATION
le lendermain matin, le petit garçon la chercha de partout. elle n'était plus dans son bocal (F10;5v) ('the next morning the little boy looked for her everywhere. she wasn't in her jar anymore') *il regarda le bocal et ne vit pas la petite grenouille dans son bocal* (F10;6f) ('he looked in the jar and didn't see the little frog in its jar')
SUBORDINATION
le lendemain matin quand l' garçon i s'réveille sur son lit i voit qu' la grenouille est partie (F10;7k) ('the next morning when the little boy wakes up on his bed he sees that the frog is gone')
STATE OF MIND
ils ne trouvent plus la grenouille dans le bocal. ils sont peinés (F10;6o) ('they don't find the frog in the jar anymore. they are hurt)

Table 6 shows the distribution of the various structural alternatives. JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATIONis the preferred structure for all the children. Few SUBORDINATION structures are found. The French texts of the 5-year-old bilingual children show no SUBORDINATION at all. The texts of the monolingual children show 3 attempts, but two of the three attempts result in errors. In terms of structures used, JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATION VS. SUBORDINA-

Table 6. Structures for encoding Component 1: ONSET OF THE PLOT

	French bilingual			French monolingual		
Age Group	5	7	10	5	7	10
N encoding Component 1/ Total N in Age Group	4/13	13/16	13/15	11/20	15/20	18/20
JUXTAPOSITION/COORDINATION	4	11	10	8	12	13
SUBORDINATION		2	3[a]	3	3	5
STATE OF MIND	0	0	0	1	2	4

[a]Including two errors

TION the bilingual children use the same range of structures as the monolingual children after the age of five. STATE OF MIND is absent from the bilingual texts entirely. Some cases of STATE OF MIND clauses are noted in the French monolingual children. The bilingual children are consistent in not encoding STATE OF MIND clauses in either their French or their Turkish texts. The monolingual children are beginning to attribute a STATE OF MIND to the principal character(s).

Component 2: Unfolding of the plot

A variety of structures are observed for the encoding of Component 2 as illustrated in Table 7.

On the syntactic level, both SIMPLE and COMPLEX sentences are used. The SIMPLE sentences consist of a single tensed verb and minimally an object, often completed with a locative argument. Also included in the SIMPLE category is direct speech. COMPLEX sentences consist of an independent and a dependent clause. The dependent clauses consist of a goal introduced by *pour* ('for, in order to') and a conditional introduced by *si* ('if'). ASPECTUAL VERBS and ADVERBS are another means of encoding Component 2. ADVERBS, for example, *toujours* ('still'), *même* ('even'), *encore* ('again') were observed to encode Component 2. Verbs such as *se mettre à* ('puts himself to') or *commencer à* ('begins to') were considered as ASPECTUAL VERBS. In addition, the prefix *re-* which indicates reinitiation of an event was considered as attributing reinceptive aspect to a verb.

Table 8 shows the distribution of uses of the various structural possibilities. Across all age groups, SIMPLE sentences dominate for encoding Component 2. There are no COMPLEX sentences in the bilingual 5- and 7-year-olds. By age 10, the bilingual children show considerable use of COMPLEX sentences. The 10-year-old monolingual children show more uses of SIMPLE sentences

Table 7. Structural variations for encoding Component 2: UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT

SIMPLE
et le petit garçon chercha la grenouille dans un arbre (F10;5c)
('and the little boy looked for the frog in a tree')
après le garçon il crie "où tu es grenouille? (TF10;11o)
('after the boy cries "where are you frog? ')

COMPLEX
il s'agrippe à des branches pour voir si la grenouille est là (F11:02b)
('he clings to the branches in order to see is the frog is there')
ensuite il regarde dans un trou pour voir si elle y est (TF10;9m)
('afterwards he looks in a hole to see if she's there')

ASPECTUAL ADVERBS
il appelle toujours la grenouille (F5;0p)
('he still calls the frog')
et encore le petit chien il cherche dans les arbres (TF7;2g)
('and again the little dog he looks in the trees')

ASPECTUAL VERBS
il reappelle la petite grenouille (F5;08q)
('he recalls the little frog')
alors il se mettent à chercher dans la chaussure (F10;10l)
('so they start to look in the shoe')

and aspectual items that the 10-year-old bilingual children. The bilingual 5- and 7-year-old children use ASPECTUAL ADVERBS, while the monolingual children use both ASPECTUAL ADVERBS and ASPECTUAL VERBS across all ages. Aksu-Koç (1994: 342–3) comments that the Turkish monolingual children use aspectual and temporal adverbs in cases where Turkish adults show use of

Table 8. Distribution of structural variations for encoding Component 2: UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT

	French bilingual			French monolingual		
Age group	5	7	7	5	7	10
N encoding Component 2/ Total N in age group	3/13	7/16	8/15	8/20	13/20	19/20
SIMPLE	11	26	28	35	60	90
COMPLEX			12	9	1	6
ASPECTUAL ADVERBS	3	2		3	4	4
ASPECTUAL VERBS				3	7	5

aspectual verbs (with an infinitive complement) such as *basla* ('to start'), *çik* ('to set out'), and *dwam* ('to continue') to express instantiations, reinstantiations and continuation of the search. It should be noted that the bilingual children's Turkish texts also show an absence of aspectual verbs but considerable use of aspectual adverbs (Akinci 1999). In summary, across all ages it appears that the bilingual subjects use a more restricted range of structures than the monolingual children.

Component 3: Resolution of the plot

Three alternative structures were noted as encoding Component 3. (1) and (2), below, illustrate how the reiterative prefix *re-* and a possessive determiner are used to identify the frog as being the same as at the beginning of the story. An alternate way of reidentifying the frog is by attributing a proper name to the frog at the beginning of the story and maintaining it throughout. (3) illustrates this strategy, as well as, the use of *re-*.

(1) *il retrouve sa grenouille* (F10;3t)
'he refinds his frog'

(2) *il voit une famille de grenouille et récupère sa grenouille* (TF10;11o)
'he sees a family of frogs and recuperates his frog'

(3) *Pierre et Rouki repartent avec Zizi la grenouille* (F10;6o)
'Pierre and Rouki releave with Zizi the frog'

Table 9 shows the distribution of various structures for encoding Component 3. There are few bilingual subjects who encode Component 3. However, the structures used are the same as those used by the monolingual subjects. No bilingual subject and only one 10-year-old monolingual subject used a proper name.

Table 9. Structures for encoding Component 3: RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT

	French bilingual			French monolingual		
Age group	5	7	10	5	7	10
N encoding Component 3/ Total N in age group	1/13	4/16	4/15	1/20	10/20	13/20
re-		2	2	1	4	5
Possessive	1	2	3	1	10	10
Proper name						1

Component 4: Encapsulations

Component 4 was divided into two categories. Examples of each category are given on Table 2. The first category consists of the use of *partout* ('everywhere'), a locative expression. The second includes more expanded phrase length alternatives such as the example given on Table 2, *maintenant le petit garçon poursuit ses recherches* (F10;2b) ('now the little boy pursues his search'). Adult versions of this second category (*il leur est arrivé plein d'aventures au cours de cette recherche* (F20g), ('lots of adventures happened to them in the course of this search')) are often found at the beginning of the story and announce the series of episodes to come in the story. Child versions are found at the beginning of episodes and establish links between one episode and the other. Table 10 shows the distribution of the two different categories used to encode Component 4. Only one bilingual 5-year-old encoded Component 4. Both bilingual and monolingual 7- and 10-year-olds used the locative adverb *partout* ('everywhere'). Only monolingual 7- and 10-year-old used more expanded phrase length forms for encoding encapsulations.

Table 10. Structures for encoding Component 4: ENCAPSULATIONS

	French bilingual			French monolingual		
Age group	5	7	10	5	7	10
N encoding Component 4/ Total N in age group	1/13	4/16	4/15		3/20	11/20
Partout ('everywhere')	1	4	4		3	15
Others					2	3

Conclusions and discussion

The first question which motivated our study concerned the macro-structure components encoded by the Turkish–French bilinguals in their two languages. Our analysis revealed no significant difference between the Turkish and French texts in terms of the total number of macro-structures encoded.

Our second research question asked whether or not the bilingual and monolingual subjects differed in the total number of macro-structure components expressed. No significant differences were observed between the 5- and 7-year-old groups. However, the difference between the 10-year-old groups revealed a significant monolingual advantage. A separate analysis of each

component revealed no significant differences between the 5- and 7-year-olds for any component. The 10-year-old bilinguals, however, show a delay compared to monolinguals in the encoding of Component 2 (UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT) and Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT).

Our analysis of the forms used to express the different components revealed the following results. The preferred structure of all the children for encoding Component 1 (ONSET OF THE PLOT) is the juxtaposition or co-ordination of simple clauses. There is a slight delay in the attempted uses of subordinate structures among the 5-year-old bilinguals. While French monolinguals are approaching French adults in the attribution of a STATE OF MIND to the principal character, no bilingual subject expressed a STATE OF MIND. All subjects show a preference for simple constructions in the encoding of Component 2 (UNFOLDING OF THE PLOT). A larger variety of structures, however, is observed among the monolingual children across all ages. For Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT) the monolingual children show considerable more uses of a possessive determiner than the bilingual children. For the expression of Component 4 (ENCAPSULATIONS) monolinguals were observed to use, in addition to the locative adverb *partout* ('everywhere'), other more expanded structures. The bilingual children used only the adverb.

The delay of the bilingual children in comparison to the monolingual children is most marked at tens years of age, the age at which the vast majority of the bilingual children are no longer producing clause level errors. All of the narrative components can be encoded by simple clause constructions. One may ask why the bilingual 10-year-olds do not continue on in development as do the monolingual children.

The error analysis (Appendix) reveals that the Turkish–French bilingual children attain proficiency in clause level grammar of French rather quickly. The study of the structures used by the bilingual and monolingual subjects to encode the different narrative components shows that the monolingual's preferred encoding strategies are available to the bilingual children. We can illustrate this through the example of the possessive determiner used for encoding Component 3 (RESOLUTION OF THE PLOT). When a monolingual child encoded this component, s/he used either the possessive determiner only, or the possessive determiner and a reiterative prefix. The error analysis shows that gender errors on the determiner for the Turkish–French bilingual children are frequent for the 5-year-olds and steadily decreases with age. One of the 10-year-old Turkish–French bilingual children did make a gender error on the determiner in the encoding of Component 3. Nevertheless, we considered

his production as encoding Component 3. The absence of a determiner is an infrequent error observed in our Turkish–French children : two 5-year-old, one 7-year-old and one 10-year-old show this error (Appendix). The majority of the Turkish–French bilingual children use the possessive determiner elsewhere in their texts: over half (7/13) of the 5-year-olds, 69 per cent (11/16) of the 7-year-old and 100 per cent of the 10-year-olds. It would be difficult to conclude, then, that the Turkish–French bilingual children do not encode Component 3 because they do not have access to the preferred structure (the possessive determiner) of the monolingual children.

If there had been a difference in the macro-structures encoded in the two languages, for example if the texts in Turkish had shown more macro-structure components, we might have argued that the difference observed in the French bilingual and monolingual texts could be attributed to language competence. However, the comparison of the Turkish and French texts produced by the bilingual children revealed no significant difference in the number of macro-structure components encoded.

It would appear, then, that the delay observed in French for encoding Component 3 among the bilingual children is not attributable to a lack of linguistic means in French. The fact that the structure (the possessive determiner) is available to them in French, coupled with the fact that there is no difference between their Turkish and French texts, would argue that the delay is attributable to a delay in macro-structure development.

We argue, however, that the bilingual delay observed in French, particularly in the 10-year-olds, should not be attributed to their bilingualism.

We propose that the difference between the bilingual and monolingual subjects is due to differences in the amount of exposure to literacy-related activities. Learning to use a language in narrative contexts requires a certain amount of exposure to those contexts. Children acquire community norms for both the form and the purpose of narratives through their early experience in their communities (Heath 1982, 1984). All of our subjects are exposed to narrative texts in French school. Our monolingual subjects, however, are all middle class children for whom classroom narrative activities are reinforced at home: bedtime stories and storybook reading are reported as being everyday home activities. Our bilingual children have very little experience with this type of activity in their home language, Turkish. Half of the parents report that they never read or tell stories to their children. The other half reports that they only occasionally engage in this kind of activity. Eight percent of the Turkish fathers and 26 per cent of the mothers are illiterate. It would be an error, then, to

attribute the bilingual French–Turkish subjects' weakness in their French narratives solely to their bilingualism. Further research is needed to ascertain the kind of narrative experience our bilingual subjects have in their homes.

Appendix: Errors in French in Turkish–French bilingual Frog Stories

Table 1: Frequency of sentence level errors in the French texts of French–Turkish bilingual Frog stories. Number of children per group in which errors were produced at least two times.

Age Group	5-year-olds	7-year-olds	10-year-olds
N	13	16	15
GENDER – determiner	12	8	3
GENDER – anaphor and subject clitic	7	8	2
GENDER – adjective	7		
GENDER – object clitic		2	
PREPOSITION	5	7	1
OBJECT MISSING	4		1
DETERMINER MISSING	2	1	1
SUBJECT MISSING	2		1
AUXILIARY MISSING	2	3	
AGREEMENT	2	1	1
INFINITIVE	2		
COPULA (ÊTRE) MISSING	1		
WORD ORDER: OBJECT MISPLACED	1		1
EXISTENTIAL: *elle est* → *il y a* ('there is')	1		
PAST PARTICIPLE	1		
REFLEXIVE *SE* MISSING		2	

Types of error: Definitions and examples

Listed below are the clause level errors observed in the French texts of the Turkish–French bilingual children. Italics indicate the form used by the child. '>' indicates the target form. Whenever possible the error types in French were translated into equivalent error types in English.

GENDER

French has two genders, masculine and feminine. Gender is marked on determiners, pronouns, adjectives, and clitics.

Determiner

***le** chaussure* (>la chaussure, 'the shoe'), ***le** chèvre* (>la chèvre, 'the goat'), ***la** garçon* (>le garçon, 'the boy')

Anaphor and subject clitic
*le garçon **elle** va à l'eau. et puis même le chien **elle** va à l'eau* (TF5;10d) (>le garçon il va à l'eau. et puis même le chien il va à l'eau, 'the boy she goes to the water. and then even the dog she goes to the water')

Adjective
*elle est **content*** (TF5;10d) (>elle est contente, 'she is happy')

Object clitic
*il va **le** prendre* (TF7;11h) (> il va la prendre, 'he's going to take it' [= the frog, (*la grenouille*), feminine])

PREPOSITION
The major error consists of overgeneralising the preposition *dans* ('in').
*puis il regarde **dans** la fenêtre* (TF7;6b) (>il regarde par la fenêtre, 'he looks in the window')
*il met **dans** sa tête* (TF5;6h) (>il le met sur sa tête, 'he put (it) in his head')

OBJECT MISSING IN OBLIGATORY TRANSITIVE CONTEXT
et le chien il peut pas enlever (TF5;6h) (>et le chien il peut pas l'enlever, 'and the dog he can't take off')

DETERMINER MISSING
garçon il rigole (TF5;11m) (>le garçon il rigole, 'boy he laughs')
chien il part (TF5;11m) (>le chien il part, 'dog he leaves')

SUBJECT MISSING
il a aussi trouvé des grenouilles. est content (TF5;11f) (>il a aussi trouvé des grenouille. il est content, 'he also found some frogs. is happy')
regarde gurba. après tomb/e/ là. après parti. (TF5;5q) (>il regard la grenouille. après il a tombé là. après il est parti, 'look frog. after fall there. after left.')

AUXILIARY MISSING
The past perfect (passé composé) is formed by the auxiliary (either *avoir* ('have') or *être* ('be')) plus the past participle. The auxiliary carries tense and agrees with the subject.
il pas pris l'autre grenouille (TF5;11f) (>il a pas pris l'autre grenouille, 'he not take the other frog')

AGREEMENT
Agreement in the present tense is rarely audible in spoken French. There are some verbs, however, which make an audible difference between the 3rd person singular and plural.
*le garçon **dorment*** (TF5;6i) (>le garçon dort, 'the boy sleep')
*les mouches elle **suit** le chien* (TF5;6i) (>les mouches elles suivent le chien, 'the flies they follows the boy')

INFINITIVE
The verb in French carries tense and agrees with the subject.
*il **dire** viens viens* (TF5;8n) (>il dit viens viens, 'he say(INF) come come')
*la petite fille **sortir*** (TF5;8n) (>la petite fille sort, 'the little girl leave(INF)')

COPULA (être) MISSING
la petite fille il debout (TF5;8n) (>la petite fille elle est debout, 'the little girl he standing up')
la petite fille là-bas comme ça (TF5;8n) (>la petite fille est là-bas comme ça, 'the little girl over there like that')

WORD ORDER: OBJECT MISPLACED
Object clitics are placed before the verb in French.
il allait piquer ***lui*** (TF5:6a) (>il allais lui piquer, 'he was going him to sting')

EXISTENTIAL
elle est ('she is') used as *il y a* ('there is'). The existential form in French consists of the masculine pronoun *il*, an oblique clitic *y*, and a tensed form of *avoir* ('have').
après ***elle est*** *une pierre* (TF5;10d) (>il y a une pierre, 'after she is a rock',=there is a rock)
après ***elle est*** *une maison* (TF5;10d) (>il y a une maison, 'after she is a house'=there is a house)

PAST PARTICIPLE
The past participle accompanies the auxiliary in the perfect tense (passé composé). The error consists of using the present tense form instead of the past participle.
le chien il a ***prend*** *la ballon* (TF5;6h) (>le chien il a pris le ballon, 'the dog he tooked the ball')

REFLEXIVE MISSING
The reflexive pronoun precedes the verb in French.
la grenouille est en train de sauver (TF7;5°) (>la grenouille est en train de se sauver, 'the frog is saving')

References

Adam, J.-M. (1985). *Le texte narratif: Précis d'analyse textuelle.* Paris: Fernand Nathan.
Akinci, M.-A. (1999). *Dévelopment des competences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans.* Doctoral dissertation. Université Lumière-Lyon 2.
Aksu-Koç, A. (1994). Development of linguistic form: Turkish. In: R. Berman. and D. I. Slobin (eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 329–85.
Berman, R. (1988). On the ability to relate events in narrative. *Discourse Processes.* 11, 469–97.
Berman, R. and D. I. Slobin (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Clark, E. (1985). The acquisition of romance, with special reference to French. In: D. I. Slobin (ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, Volume 1: The data.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum , 687–782.

Comrie, B. (1981). *Language universals and linguistic typology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In: E. Bialystok (ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

French, L. A. and K. Nelson (1985).*Children's acquisition of relational terms: some ifs, ors, and buts.* NY: Springer Verlag.

Garnham, A., J. Oakhill and P. Johnson-Laird (1982). Referential continuity and the coherence of discourse. *Cognition,* 11, 29–46.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Protean shapes in literacy events: Ever-shifting oral and literate traditions. In: D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and written language.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heath, S. B. (1984). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hickmann, M. (1995). Discourse organization and the development of reference to person, space, and time. In: P. Fletcher and B. MacWhinney (eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hickmann, M. M. Kail and F. Roland (1995). Cohesive anaphoric relations in French children's narratives as a function of mutual knowledge. *First Language,* 15, 277–300.

Jisa, H. (2000). Increasing cohesion in narratives: A developmental study of maintaining and introducing subjects in French. *Linguistics,* 38, 591–620.

Jisa, H. and S. Kern (1995) Discourse organization in French children's narratives. In: E. Clark (ed.), *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Child Language Research Forum.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 177–88.

Jisa, H. and Kern, S. 1998. Relative clauses in French children's narratives. *Journal of Child Language,* 25, 623–52.

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

Labov, W. and J. Waletsky (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of person experience. In: J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the verbal and the visual arts.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Mandler, J. M. and N. S. Johnson (1977), Remembrance of things passed: Story structure and recall. *Cognitive Psychology,* 9, 111–51.

Mandler, J. M. and N. S. Johnson (1980). On throwing out the baby with the bathwater: A reply to Black and Wilensky's evaluation of story grammars. *Cognitive Science,* 4, 304–12.

Mandler, J. M. (1978) A code in the node: The use of a story schema in retrieval. *Discourse Processes,* 1, 14–35.

Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, Where are you?* New York: Dial Press.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1975) Notes on a schema for stories. In: D. G. Bobrow and A. M. Collings (eds.), *Representation and understanding: Studies in cognitive science.* New York: Academic Press, 211–36.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977) Understanding and summarizing brief stories. In: D. Laberge and S. J. Samuels (eds.), *Basic processes in reading: Perception and comprehension.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 265–303.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980) On evaluating story grammars. *Cognitive Science*, 4, 313–16.

Shapiro, L. R. and J. A. Hudson (1991). Tell me a make-believe story: Coherence and cohesion in young children's picture elicited narratives. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 960–74.

Snow, D. E. and M. Hoefnagel-Hohle (1978). The critical period for language acquisition: Evidence from second language learning. *Child Development*, 49, 1114–28.

Stein, N. L. (1982) The definition of a story. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 6, 487–507.

Stein, N. L. and T. Trabasso (1981). What's in a story: Critical issues in story comprehension. In: R. Glaser (ed.), *Advances in the psychology of instruction*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 213–67.

Thorndyke, P. W. (1977) Cognitive structures in comprehension and memory of narrative discourse. *Cognitive Psychology*, 9, 77–110.