



Relative clauses in the written texts of French and Turkish bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers

Mehmet-Ali Akinci

► To cite this version:

Mehmet-Ali Akinci. Relative clauses in the written texts of French and Turkish bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers. Mehmet-Ali Akinci; Kutlay Yagmur. The Rouen Meeting. Studies on Turkic Structures and Language Contact, 114, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp.217-230, 2018, Turcologica, 978-3-447-11050-1. hal-02366083

HAL Id: hal-02366083

<https://hal.science/hal-02366083>

Submitted on 15 Nov 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Relative clauses in the written texts of French and Turkish bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers

Mehmet-Ali AKINCI

Rouen Normandy University, Research center Dynamique du Langage in Situ (France)

Abstract

This paper aims to investigate the relative clauses in French and Turkish written discourse productions of Turkish-French bilingual and Turkish and French monolingual children and teenagers. It particularly aims to describe the use of relative clause by the means of comparison between bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers' text production. Spoken and written texts were collected from bilinguals and monolinguals in three groups (primary school; secondary school and high school). Bilingual population of our study was selected from a community living in France with an immigration background. The conceptual and methodological basis for this study is derived from an international research project on the development of text production abilities as a critical indicator of literacy across ages (Berman & Verhoeven, 2002). In our study, the main unit of the linguistic analysis is "the clause" which is defined by Berman and Slobin (1994) as a unified predicate describing a single situation (an activity, event, or state). The results show that bilingual primary school students use more relative clauses in French written texts than their monolingual counterparts contrary to bilingual high school students which use fewer relative clauses. Moreover, Turkish-French bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals present similar use of relative clauses by invalidating the intuitive idea that bilinguals would present inferior linguistic ability in either language.

Theoretical Focus

One of the important aspects of constructing texts is to be cohesive and coherent from the beginning to the end. If a text is well formed, that's because it establishes a local relationships between propositions and a well-organized information about characters or events into a globally defined unit (Bamberg & Marchman 1990). It is crucial for the text producer to mention clearly characters, events, and other concepts in order to allow the reader to understand the story through cohesive ties. Therefore, the competence to specify referents in the discourse permits to create a coherent oral or written discourse (Lautamatti, 1990; Enkvist, 1978).

In the last few decades there has been an increase in the number of studies on the use of particular grammatical structures in discourse. Especially those that contribute organization of sequentially related events in both temporally linearized level and in thematic level has received a considerable amount of focus. In this body of research, many scholars have been concerned with the functional analysis of relative clauses in contributing connectivity between events by establishing a hierarchical relationship between two clauses. For example, Aksu-Koç & Erguvanli-Taylan (1994) look at the functions of relative clauses in oral narratives and find correlations between the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of relative clauses, their information status and their functions in narrative discourse. Another original work is Dasinger & Toupin's (1994) crosslinguistic study which considers both formal and functional complexity of relative clauses. According to Dasinger & Toupin (1994) increasing competence in the expression of narrative organization influences the use of relative clauses varying with referential context across ages. Since relative clauses as one of the structural options for introducing and maintaining referents across clauses create referential cohesion in clause combining, the developmental use of relative clauses both in form and in function indicates increasing levels of discourse competence and textual organizations underscoring the cognitive and pragmatic proficiency at different ages (Dasinger & Toupin, 1994; Jisa & Kern, 1998).

Although the studies mentioned above provide a thorough comparative analysis of relative clause in the texts produced by both children and adults in different languages, all of the subjects recruited in these studies are monolinguals. Our aim, in this study, is to include a young bilingual population in order to understand the relation between development of linguistic forms and textual coherence by means of comparison between bilingual and monolingual children across ages. In this manner, we also hope to shed light on their ways to produce coherent texts as being bilinguals. In this study, we recruited French-Turkish bilinguals in addition to French and Turkish monolinguals and asked them to write one narrative text and one expository text successively. Our bilingual

population write first in their home language which is Turkish and then in French which is considered as their dominant productive language by the age of ten (Akinci, 1999).

Another line of developmental research on child language has focused on the relative clause formation as being one of the most complex structures acquired by children with difficulty. Some of these studies have particularly directed their attention to the relation between the relativized head nouns in relative clause and their grammatical function in respective clause. For example, according to parallel function hypothesis (Sheldon, 1974; Clancy, Hyeonijin & Myeong-Han, 1986; MacWhinney & Pleh, 1988), relative clause sentences in which the head noun plays the same role in the relative clause and the main clause will be easier to understand for young children than sentences in which the roles differ. In our study, we will also investigate if there is any difference for the use of parallel function in relative clause sentences in Turkish written texts by bilinguals and monolinguals. To the best of our knowledge, this analysis has not been done in Turkish written texts.

Our particular concern is to depict a developmental path of the acquisition of relative clauses as a mean of subordination in comparison to monolinguals versus bilinguals. The relative clauses used in Turkish-French bilinguals' texts compared to those of Turkish monolinguals and French ones across age groups are categorized in terms of the morphosyntactic properties of relative clauses to understand whether the children's production of relativized constituent is influenced by their grammatical function in the clause it immediately belongs to. In this analysis we attempt to figure out whether, and to what extent it plays a role in bilingual population. Before going into details of our analysis presented in this study, a small review of relative constructions in French and in Turkish is needed.

Relative constructions in French

There are two types of relativizers in French. Simple relativizers (*qui, que, quoi, dont, où*) and compound relativizers (*lequel, duquel...*). These vary according to genre and number.

Noun subject relativizer: *qui*

Qui is the more frequent and simplest relativizer as its use does not imply change in constituents' order. Similar to English relative constructions, French subject relativizer "*qui*" preserves the canonical subject-verb-(object) word order in relative clause. *Qui* has no genre neither number its form remains the same whether it may relativises a plural or a singular subject. Therefore, its use is quiet simple for children, who use them in oral texts very frequently.

- (1) j'ai frappe une fille *qui* s'appelle Léa (Pri Mono WN)
(I beat a girl who is called Léa)

Notice that the verb of the relative clause agrees with the antecedent (in this case 'une fille') when it acts as the subject.

Noun object relativizer: *que*

Que is less frequently used than *qui*. This can be explained because *que* implies constituents' order change. Indeed the object relativizer *que* is removed in front of the verb's subject.

- (2) Un élève *que* je ne connais pas m'a poussé dans les buissons (Sec. Bi WN)
(A pupil (that) I don't know pushed me in the bush)

According to Arrivé, Gadet & Galmisch, "the more forms change the canonical order of sentences' words, the less they are used in oral practices and, also in written texts of children and less educated adults" (1986: 605). Relative clauses are early acquired structures in French but their functional diversity increases with development (Jisa & Kern, 1998).

Relative constructions in Turkish

Turkish relative clauses are pronominal, that is the relative clause is positioned before the relativized noun. There are two basic relative clause types in Turkish; namely subject relative, and non-subject relative differed in the suffixes attached to the participial form of the verb preceding the head noun. Where the target of relativization is a subject or part of a subject, -An suffix gets attached to the verb. The target of the relativization is phonologically unexpressed and subject-verb order is reversed.

- (3) a. Adam koşuyor.
man run-PROG&3SG
"The man is running."
b. koş-an adam
run-SUBJECT RELATIVIZER man
"the man who is running"

Where the target of relativization is an object, -DIK suffix is attached to the verb. Similar to subject relative, the target is phonologically silent. The participial form of the verb of the relative clause is followed by agreement for the subject of the modifier clause. As in other embeddings, that subject receives Genitive Case.

- (4) a. (Ben) para aldım.
 (I) money get-PAST-1SG
 “I got money.”
- b. (benim) aldığım para
 (my) get-OBJECT RELATIVIZER-POSS money
 “the money that I got”

There are other relativizer suffixes in Turkish as well such as *-(y)EcEK*, *-mİş* or aorist suffixes, but they are used relatively rare. They can function as subject or non-subject relatives. Turkish has also headless relative clauses where the head noun of the relative clause is phonologically unexpressed. And the morphology of the head noun which is missing in the relative construction gets attached to the participial form of the relative clause.

- (5) a. Koşan adamı gördüm.
 run-SUBJECT RELATIVIZER man-ACC see-PAST-1SG
 “I saw the man who is running.”
- b. Koşanı gördüm.
 run-SUBJECT RELATIVIZER-ACC see-PAST-1SG
 “I saw the man who is running.”

Method

The conceptual and methodological basis for this study is 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, 60 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 participants in two successive sessions. In session I, they 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 types of texts 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.

Research population

The research groups of bilingual and monolingual children 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 Tables 2 and 3 give 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 in Turkish written texts

School type	Primary		Secondary		High	
Nb. Of subject	20		20		20	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	12	8	10	10	8	12
Mean age	11;00		13;00		16;08	
Range ages	09;07-11;11		12;07-13;09		15;00-18;09	

Table 3: Age, number, mean age, range of the ages of Turkish-French bilingual informants in French written texts

School type	Primary		Secondary		High	
Nb. Of subject	22		22		22	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	13	9	9	13	10	12
Mean age	11;00		13;00		16;01	
Range ages	10;00 – 11;11		12;07 – 13;11		14;10 – 18;06	

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 from Turkish monolinguals in a little town of Turkey and in France from French monolinguals. The monolingual subjects are presented in Table 4 and in Table 5. The French monolinguals are raised and educated in French with low educational and socio-economic family backgrounds. They attend the same schools and live in the same neighborhoods as the immigrant children above mentioned. Data from Turkish monolinguals were collected 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. These monolingual groups can be in that in terms of socioeconomic status, compared to our bilingual group.

Table 4: Age, number, mean age, range of the Turkish monolingual informants

School type	Primary		Secondary		High	
Nb. Of subject	20		20		20	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	9	11	9	11	10	10
Mean age	11;00		12;09		15;06	
Range ages	10;04-11;07		12;06-13;04		13;10-16;11	

Table 5: Age, number, mean age, range of the French monolingual informants

School type	Primary		Secondary		High	
Nb. Of subject	22		22		22	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	10	12	11	11	12	10
Mean age	11;01		13;04		16;03	
Range ages	09;09 – 11;09		12;03 – 14;06		15;09 – 17;06	

It seems almost stereotypic, but all the fathers of bilingual informants except one person, are factory employees or unskilled workers and the free-lance masons. These two occupations constitute more than half of the fathers' activity (56/106). They are widely under-represented in contrast to very qualified jobs: technician, trade or office workers)¹. On the other hand, French

¹ According to Echardour & Maurin (1993), 43.7% of Turks are working in production, 28.5% in construction and 23.5% in the services. Although, following the study of Brabant (1992), there has been a slight shift in the occupational

monolinguals' fathers belong much more often to the liberal professions, qualified technician, trade or office workers than the others. As for the Turkish monolinguals' fathers, they often belong to the farmer, craftsmen and storekeepers, teachers and retired.

As far mothers occupation is concerned, we observed that mothers of bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals are much more often housewives than French monolinguals. This situation concerns indeed respectively 72% and 73% of bilingual and Turkish monolinguals' mothers. In contrast, the mothers of French monolinguals are overrepresented in almost all occupations. They more often work as manager than Turkish counterparts do. They also work as office manager or as cleaning ladies.

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

structure from blue-collar (89.9% in 1982, 80% in 1989) to white-collar jobs and self-employment (both, 6.6% in 1982, 18.5% in 1989), the majority of the working Turkish population can still be identified as blue-collar.

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. For our analysis, we summed up all relative clauses in narrative and expository texts in Group A and Group B.

Coding procedures

In this study, the main 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). We first identified the relative clauses produced by our monolingual and bilingual subjects across all age groups.

After the relative clauses occurred in the database were identified, all relative clauses were classified according to the grammatical function of its head noun in the relative clause and in the clause it immediately belongs to. Two clause types which form our analytical framework are:

1. the relativizer is always subject in the RC, the head noun of RC can be subject or non-subject in the broader clause:
 - (6) J’avais une copine *qui* habitait Paris (Sec BIL NW)
I had a girlfriend who lived in Paris
Paris’te yaşayan bir arkadaşım vardı
 - (7) mon copain *qui* était malin n’a pas voulu se battre (Sec BIL NW)
My boyfriend who was intelligent did not wanted to fight
Akıllı olan erkek arkadaşım kavga etmek istemedi
2. the relativizer is always non-subject in the RC, the head noun of RC can be subject or non-subject in the broader clause:
 - (8) je venais d’arriver à un collège *que* je ne connaissais pas (High BIL NW)
I had just arrived to a high school that I did not know
Tanımadığım bir okula yeni gelmişim
 - (9) L’histoire *que* j’ai racontée s’est déroulée au lycée (High BIL NW)
The story that I told was held at high school
Anlattığım hikaye lisede geçti

Results

In this section, it will be presented the number of total clauses as well as the number and percentages of relative clause across every school age. Moreover, we also separated the use of subject relativizers and object relativizers within relative clauses by means of percentages. For every written language, we carried out a X^2 test of independence between bilinguals and monolinguals calculated by the number of clause occurrences. We will mention this analysis only when it reveals to be significant with a 5% error margin. We will particularly look into comparisons between close age groups like primary versus secondary or secondary versus high school students across linguistic category (bilingual, monolingual).

French written texts

Table 6. Distribution of relative clauses for Turkish-French bilinguals in French written texts

	Primary school	Secondary school	High school	Total
Total clauses	393	522	876	1791
Total RC	20	25	40	85
% RC of total clauses	5%	4,7%	4,5%	4,7%
% subject relativizers	72%	60%	52%	
% object relativizers	12%	40%	18%	

Table 7. Distribution of relative clauses for French monolinguals in written texts

	Primary school	Secondary school	High school	Total
Total clauses	318	360	813	1491
Total RC	7	25	82	114
% RC of total clauses	2,2%	7%	10%	7,6%
% subject relativizers	57%	73%	56,5%	
% object relativizers	28,5%	11,5%	22,5%	

Firstly, before going into further details about relative clause use, we have conducted an analysis about total clause distribution. The distribution of total clauses produced by bilinguals and monolinguals in French written texts was significantly different X^2 (df= 2, $N= 3282$) =12.701, $p < .002$, across three school groups. Overall, Turkish-French bilinguals produce more clauses than French monolinguals (1791 versus 1491 clauses). The main difference came from monolingual clause production which is less (360) in secondary school than their bilingual counterparts

production (522) when we test them with high school bilinguals and monolinguals X^2 (df= 1, N= 2571) =12.511, $p<.001$.

The X^2 analysis revealed that relative clause production from bilinguals and monolinguals differ across three school ages X^2 (df=2, N=199) = 16.849, $p<.001$. The difference between monolingual primary (7) and secondary (25) relative clause production versus bilingual primary (20) and secondary (25) relative clause production is significative X^2 (df=1, N=77) = 4.184, $p<.05$. Indeed, bilingual primary school students use more relative clauses than their monolingual counterparts. While this finding looks surprising, it might be linked to the fact that bilingual pupils felt confident with a bilingual researcher with whom they communicated.

However, another significant difference concerns high school subjects: bilinguals have fewer relative clauses (40) than monolinguals (82) when compared to secondary school students in French written texts X^2 (df=1, N= 172)= 4.47, $p<.05$.

It's also worth mentioning that, overall use of relative clause is slightly fewer (4,7%) in bilinguals than monolinguals (7,6%) although this difference does not seem to be statistically significant. Moreover, the use of subject relativizers seems to be more dominant in every category (bilingual or monolingual versus school ages) in French written texts.

Turkish written texts

Table 8 : Distribution of relative clauses for Turkish-French bilinguals in Turkish written texts

Grade	Primary school	Secondary school	High school	Total
Total clauses	292	385	658	1335
Total RC	20	34	61	115
% RC of total clauses	6,8%	8,8%	9,2%	8,6%
% subject relativizers	50%	51%	67%	
% non-subject relativizers	17%	29%	23%	

Table 9 distribution of relative clauses for Turkish monolinguals in written texts

Grade	Primary school	Secondary school	High school	Total
Total clauses	609	851	1418	2878
Total RC	47	68	139	254
% RC of total clauses	7,7%	8%	9,8%	8,8%
% subject relativizers	52%	54%	45%	
% non-subject relativizers	33%	36%	42%	

The X^2 analysis did not revealed any significant results neither in total clause comparison nor relative clause comparison between bilinguals and monolinguals across school ages. Since relative clauses as one of the structural options for introducing and maintaining referents across clauses create referential cohesion in clause combining, both monolingual and bilingual children show a similar developmental course in terms of relative clause constructions.

When we look at the Turkish texts of French-Turkish bilinguals, we observe the tendency to use the relative clause, similar to that of Turkish and French monolinguals. Such a tendency gradually develops after primary school. Quantitative data show that bilinguals and monolinguals use nearly same percentage of relative clauses as their monolingual counterparts in Turkish.

Parallel function analysis in Turkish written texts

According to Sheldon (1974), parallel function hypothesis claims that children will be following a strategy of interpreting the grammatical function of the relative pronoun as being the same as its antecedent. “It follows from this hypothesis that those sentences in which the shared nominals have the same grammatical function in their respective clauses like *The man saw the boy who the girl hit* will be easier to process than sentences in which the co-referential NPs have different grammatical functions, like *The man saw the boy who hit the girl* (pg:275)”. Since 1974, others confirmed this idea by highlighting that is a crosslinguistic effet (for a review about relative clauses in French, see Jisa & Kern, 1998 and Amy & Vion, 1976).

In order to see if this hypothesis applies in Turkish written texts, we also calculated the number of relative clauses with the same grammatical function than their nominals and with different grammatical functions. Moreover, we also wanted to see if there is a difference in the use of parallel functional relatives among Turkish-French bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals. In this analysis, we coded as a parallel relativiser when:

- the head noun of RC have the same grammatical functions in the relative clause and in the broader clause it immediately belongs to (these are the subject of both the broader clause & the relative clause (SS) and the non-subject of both the broader clause & the relative clause (OO)).

and we coded as a non parallel relativiser when:

- the head noun of RC have different grammatical functions in the relative clause and in the broader clause it immediately belongs to (these are the head noun is both the non-subject of the broader clause & the subject of RC (OS) and the head noun is both the subject of the broader clause & the non-subject of RC (SO)).

Table 10. Distributions of SS+OO and SO+OS types of relative clauses across Turkish monolinguals

Type	Monolinguals	SS+OO	SO+OS
Primary		34	13
Secondary		44	30
High		75	58
	Total	153	101

Table 11. Distributions of SS+ OO and SO+OS types of relative clauses in Turkish written texts of Turkish-French bilinguals

Type	Bilinguals	SS+OO	SO+OS
Primary		6	10
Secondary		15	13
High		43	24
	Total	64	47

The X^2 analysis did not revealed any significant results in parallel effect distribution among French-Turkish bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals. This means that, indeed, there is a higher use of parallel functional relativiser in any case (153 versus 101 among monolinguals and 64 versus 47 among bilinguals). It seems that in every linguistic category, children prefer to use parallel functional relativizes without any difference. However, when we look at the Turkish texts of French-Turkish bilinguals, we observe the tendency to use parallel grammatical functions in the relative clause and in the broader clause, similar to that of Turkish monolinguals. However, such a tendency gradually develops after primary school. It seems that for further analyses, we should in our coding take into account the function of the head noun in the broader clause, the diversification of relativizers and the difference between expositive and narrative texts.

Conclusion and discussion

In order to make any discourse easily understandable, we have to present any temporal, spatial and characteristic information in a coherent and integrated way. Relative clauses are, probably, the most solicited grammatical structure to achieve this aim. In language development, this capacity is one of the latest structures acquired by children probably because of its need of more complex cognitive resources (Evans & Green, 2006). This is why, in order to study the complexity of text production between French monolinguals and Turkish-French bilinguals, we chose to investigate the use of relative clauses. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first time an investigation of relative clauses in French monolinguals' text production has been compared to Turkish-French bilinguals living in France across school ages.

According to our results, first of all, our study shows that Turkish-French bilingual young people stemming from Turkish immigration have very similar use of relative clauses compared to those of French and Turkish monolinguals in Turkish produced texts. For instance, X^2 analysis did not revealed any significant results neither in total clause comparison nor relative clause comparison between bilinguals and monolinguals. While an absence of significance does not mean that those two populations have the *same* developmental course, this finding clearly shows that both monolingual and bilingual children show a *similar* developmental course in terms of relative clause constructions.

On the other hand, the X^2 analysis did revealed a significant difference between monolingual primary and secondary relative clause production versus bilingual primary and secondary relative clause production calculated all together. This difference is best explained by higher production of relative clauses in Turkish-French primary school bilinguals' texts than their monolingual counterparts (20 to 7 production). Nevertheless, another significant finding comes again from high school bilinguals: they have fewer relative clauses than monolinguals (40 to 82) in French written texts. This is probably due to the fact that overall use of relative clause is slightly fewer in bilinguals than monolinguals.

Another novelty of our work is that for the first time we investigated parallel function analysis in Turkish written texts by comparing monolinguals and bilinguals. The parallel function hypothesis (Sheldon, 1974) was also observed in French written texts (Jisa & Kern, 1998; Amy & Vion, 1976) but only within monolingual children. As expected, we find that there is higher production of parallel relativisers than non-parallel relativisers in any case which means that there is no difference between Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-French bilinguals for their preference to use parallel relativisers. This gives us an additional idea of the similarity between Turkish monolinguals' and Turkish-French bilinguals' text production's complexity level.

In conclusion, our work seems to indicate that if there is a difference between Turkish monolinguals' and Turkish-French bilinguals' text complexity, this is more likely to manifest itself in French written texts. Moreover, this difference tends to show itself only among high school pupils. Further studies comparing monolinguals and bilinguals should investigate this matter by counting not only relative clauses but also by counting lexical richness index which is another determiner of language complexity.

References

- Akinci, M.-A. (1996), « Les pratiques langagières chez les immigrés turcs en France », *Écart d'Identité* n° 76 : 14-17.
- Akinci, M.-A. (2002), *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.
- Aksu-Koç, A.A. & Erguvali-Taylan, E.E. (1998), "The functions of relative clauses in narrative discourse". In L. Johanson (ed) *The Mainz meeting: Proceedings of the seventh international conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Germany: Harrasowitz Verlag, pp. 271-285.
- Amy, G. & Vion, M. (1976), Stratégies de traitement des phrases relatives: quelques considérations d'ordre génétique. *Bulletin de Psychologie, spécial La mémoire sémantique*, 295-303
- Bamberg, M. & Marchman, V. (1990), "What holds a narrative together? The linguistic encoding of episodic boundaries". *Paper in Pragmatics*, 4, 58-121.
- Berman, R.A. & Slobin, D.I. (1994), *Relating events in narrative: a crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Berman, R.A. & Verhoeven, L. (2002), *Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on the Development of Text-Production Abilities in Speech and Writing*. Part 1 & Part 2. *Special issue of Written Language and Literacy*, n°5:1 & n°5.2.
- Clancy, P, Hyeonijin L., & Myeong-Han Z. (1986), "Processing strategies in the acquisition of relative clauses: Universal principles and language-specific realizations". *Cognition*, 24, 225-262.
- Comrie, B. (2002), "Typology and language acquisition: The case of relative clauses". In A. Giacalone Ramat (Ed.) *Typology and second language acquisition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dasinger, L. & Toupin, C. (1994), "The development of relative clause functions in narrative". In R. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Ed.) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study* (457-514). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Diessel, H. & Tomasello, M. (2000), "The development of relative clauses in spontaneous child speech". *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11, 131-151.
- Enkvist, N.E. (1978), "Coherence, pseudo-coherence, and non-coherence". In J.O. Östman (Ed.) *Semantics and Cohesion* (109-128). Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi.
- Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006), *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Irtis-Dabbagh, V. (2003), *Les jeunes issus de l'immigration de Turquie en France : état des lieux, analyses et perspectives*. Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Gautier-Kizilyürek, (2002), *Les enseignements de langue et culture d'origine en France : chronique d'une mort annoncée ? Le cas de la langue turque*. Mémoire de DEA non publié. Paris, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.
- Jisa, H. & Kern, S. (1998), "Relative clauses in French children's narrative texts", *Journal of Child Language*, 25, 623-652.
- Lautamatti, L. (1990), "Coherence in Spoken Discourse" in *Coherence in writing: research and pedagogical perspectives*. U. Connor, & A.M. Johns (eds.) Alexandria, Va.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1990.
- MacWhinney, B. & Csaba P. (1988), "The processing of restrictive relative clauses in Hungarian". *Cognition*, 29, 95-141.
- Patureau (1992), *Les pratiques culturelles des jeunes*, Paris : La Documentation française.
- Sheldon, A. (1974), "The parallel function in the acquisition of relative clauses in English". *JVLVB*, 13, 272-281.
- Yağmur, K. & Akinci, M.-A. (2003), "Language use, choice, maintenance and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 164: 107-128.