RESEARCH IN CHILDREN'S AND YOUTH MULTILINGUALISM

Uurimusi laste ja noorte mitmekeelsusest

Toimetaja/Editor Anna Verschik

SISUKORD

SISSEJUHATUS

Anna Verschik

Tallinna Ülikool

Artiklikogumik käsitleb laste ja noorte mitmekeelsust. Kuigi mitmekeelsusest üldiselt ning konkreetselt laste ja noorte mitme-keelsusest on juba ilmunud hulgaliselt kirjandust ja ilmub ka edas-pidi, tundub, et mitmekeelsuse eri tahud on ammendamatu teema, mis on jätkuvalt oluline nii keeleteaduse teooria kui rakenduslike uurimuste jaoks. Nõnda juhtub osaliselt sellepärast, et kogu aeg tekib uusi sotsiolingvistilisi olukordi ja uute keelte kombinatsioone (nagu näiteks türgi-vene varajane kakskeelsus); aga ka sellepärast, et juba tuntud mudeleid ja meetodeid rakendatakse uutes keelesituat-sioonides, nagu näiteks hiljuti alustatud Eesti noorte keele uurin-gud. Samuti loovad uus meedia ja suhtlus interneti vahendusel uusi keelekasutuse võimalusi ja mustreid, mida on oluline arvestada mitmekeelsuse uurimisel.

Kogumiku artiklid keskenduvad niisugustele teemadele nagu varajane ja noorte mitmekeelsus, teise keele omandamine, pere-konna keelepoliitika, mitmekeelne suhtlus YouTube'is ja TikTokis ja sotsiaalmeedias, etnolektide kasutus. Metodoloogia poolest on nii eksperimentaalseid kui ka etnograafilisi kirjutisi.

Elena Antonova-Ünlü ja Çiğdem Sağın-Şimşek võrdlevad türgi-vene ja türgi-inglise varajaste kakskeelsete ning türgi üks-keelsete laste narratiiviloomet. Leiti, et temporaalsete konnektiivide kasutus on mitmekeelsetel kõnelejatel teistsugune, mis kinnitab varasemate uuringute tulemusi. Üks põhjusi võib olla türgi keele kasutuse piiratud võimalus.

Piret Baird, Reili Argus ja Merilyn Meristo uurisid eesti keele oskustaset muu (enamasti vene) kodukeelega koolilastel. Võr-reldi eesti keele omandamist kahes rühmas: ühe rühma lastel oli juba mõningane eesti keele oskus varasemast ajast ja teistel mitte.

Leiti, et kooliaasta lõpuks kahe rühma eesti keele oskus ei erinenud oluliselt.

Piret Baird vaatleb kaheaastase lapse inglise-eesti koodivahetust, kusjuures sisend mõlemas keeles on tasakaalus. Erinevalt tavapärastest perekonna keelepoliitika mudelitest („üks vanem, üks keel" või „üks keskkond, üks keel"), kasutab pere „üks päev, üks keel" mudelit, kuna vanemad valdavad teineteise keelt. Tasakaalus sisend avaldub ka lapse väljundis mõlemas keeles: on üsna palju koodivahetusega ütlusi, mis on ükskeelsetest ütlustest keerukamad.

Vlada Baranova ja Kapitolina Fedorova tutvustavad eri aktsentidega vene keelt, mida kasutavad eri etnolingvistilise taustaga noored esinejad YouTube'is ja TikTokis. Aktsentide kasutus on suunatud ükskeelsete silmaklappide ja etniliste stereotüüpide vastu ning püüab kindlustada esinejate agentsust.

Inga Hilbig kirjeldab leedu-saksa kakskeelse poisi juhtumit ja leiab, et vastupidiselt laialt levinud arvamustele ei pruugi „üks vanem, üks keel" põhimõte olla piisav. Ta rõhutab lapse agentsuse olulisust ja näitab, et ka passiivset keelt saab hõlpsasti aktiveerida.

Oleksandr Kapranov käsitleb inglise frikatiivi /z/ omandamist Norra kõrgema kesktaseme inglise keele õppijate seas. Katsed näitasid, et konsonant on õppijatele problemaatiline ja et enamasti asendati /z/ /s/-iga, mis on oluline teave keelepedagoogika jaoks.

Victoria Kazakovskaya analüüsib vene käändsõnatuletust vene ükskeelsete ja simultaansete vene-saksa kakskeelsete laste hulgas. Uurimus kinnitab varasemaid tulemusi, et kakskeelsete areng kummaski keeles võib mõnevõrra maha jääda, kuid kumulatiivses keelearengus on nad ükskeelsetest ees.

Geidi Kilp keskendub pragmaatiliselt tingitud erinevustele isikuviidete kasutuses eesti-inglise-jaapani Facebooki-suhtluses. Keelte kombinatsioon on haruldane ja seetõttu on niisuguste kolmkeelsete keelekasutajate arv üsna piiratud. Kuigi osalejate jaapani keele oskus on erinev, tajuvad kõik erinevust kolme keele pragmaatiliste vahendite vahel ning kasutavad jaapani isikuviiteid nagu *senpai* ja *sensei* ka eesti- ja ingliskeelsetes ütlustes.

Eglė Krivickaitė-Leišienė ja Ineta Dabašinskienė osutavad kakskeelsete laste edule väljamõeldud sõnade kordamise testis. Kaht eri keelekombinatsiooniga kakskeelsete laste rühma ja üht leedu ükskeelsete laste rühma võrreldi ning selgus, et kakskeelsete tulemused on paremad ilmselt sellepärast, et nad valdavad kaht erinevat fonoloogilist süsteemi.

Kristiina Praakli, Mari-Liis Korkus, Aive Mandel, Elisabeth Kaukonen, Annika Kängsepp, Triin Aasa, Kristel Algvere, Helen Eriksoo, Marion Mägi, Getri Tomson ja Liina Lindström uurisid inglise keele kasutust eesti noorte juutuuberite hulgas just noorte keele uurimise perspektiivist. Kuigi eesti noored juutuuberid kasutavad inglise keelt üsna sageli, ilmnesid kaheksa esineja vahel olulised individuaalsed erinevused.

Virve-Anneli Vihman, Kristiina Praakli, Maarja-Liis Pilvik ja Mari-Liis Korkus lõid kaks eesti noortekeele korpust, nimelt *online*-keelekasutuse ja suulise keelekasutuse korpuse. Nad uurisid ingliskeelse sõnavara kasutuse mustreid. Selgus, et ingliskeelsete lekseemide arvu on võimatu ennustada vanuse või soo põhjal, samas on vanus ja sugu olulised tegurid kõige sagedamate inglise sõnade puhul.

Anna Verschik on üldkeeleteaduse professor, ta uurib mitmekeelsust ja keelekontakte.
anna.verschik@tlu.ee

INTRODUCTION

Anna Verschik

Tallinn University

The focus of the article collection is child and youth multilingualism. While the body of literature on multilingualism in general and child and youth multilingualism in particular is huge and steadily growing all the time, it appears that multilingualism and various aspects thereof are and always will be relevant both for linguistic theory and applied topics.

This happens partly because new sociolinguistic settings with new combinations of languages emerge (like Turkish-Russian early bilingualism) and partly because some already known models and methods are applied to new situations, like studies on Estonian youth language. Also new media and CMC create new opportunities and patterns of language use that are relevant in multilingualism research.

The studies in this volume address topics in early bilingualism, SLA, family language policy, multilingual communication on YouTube, Tik Tok and other social media platforms, and ethnolectal speech. The papers use different methodologies: some are experimental and some ethnographic in their nature.

Elena Antonova-Ünlü and Çiğdem Sağın-Şimşek compare aspects of Turkish narrative production among Turkish-Russian and Turkish-English early bilinguals on one hand and Turkish monolinguals on the other. They found that the use of temporal connectors in bilinguals differs from that of monolinguals, which is in line with the previous research on bilingual children who have Turkish as one of their languages. The reason may be the scarce use of Turkish in limited context only.

Piret Baird, Reili Argus and Merilyn Meristo investigated the development of Estonian proficiency in children with another

first language (mostly Russian). The proficiency in Estonian among two groups of learners was compared: children who had had some command in Estonian prior to the instruction and children without prior exposure to the language. It was discovered that at the end of the school year the command of Estonian did not differ much among the two groups.

Piret Baird discusses English-Estonian code-mixing in a two-year old child with balanced input in both languages. Differently from usual models ("one parent, one language" or "one environment, one language"), the model used in the family is "one day, one language", since both parents are fluent in each other's language. The balanced input reflected in the child's proportional output in the two languages; many code-mixed utterances were produced, and these utterances were more complex than monolingual ones.

Vlada Baranova and Kapitolina Fedorova introduce a novel topic of the performative use of accented Russian in young TikTok and YouTube performers of a different ethnolinguistic origin. Performance of accents is aimed against monolingual bias and ethnic stereotypes and seeks to reclaim the performers' agency.

In the contribution by **Inga Hilbig**, a case of Lithuanian-German bilingual boy is discussed, and it is suggested that, contrary to popular opinions, the OPOL policy may be insufficient. She emphasises the significance of a child's agency and shows that passive languages may easily become activated.

Oleksandr Kapranov looks into the acquisition of the English fricative consonant /z/ among Norwegian higher intermediate learners of EFL. The experiments demonstrated that the consonant poses a challenge for the learners, as they mostly substituted /z/ with /s/, which has implications for language pedagogy.

Victoria Kazakovskaya analyses acquisition of Russian nominal derivation in Russian monolingual and Russian-German simultaneous bilingual children. The study confirms previous findings that bilinguals may lag in each of their languages behind their

monolingual peers but are superior in the cumulative language development.

The topic of the study by **Geidi Kilp** is the insertion of person references motivated by pragmatic differences in trilingual Estonian-English-Japanese Facebook communication. The combination of languages is rare and the number of such trilingual users is rather limited. The users' competence in Japanese may differ, but all of them perceive differences in pragmatic devices across the language and insert Japanese person references *senpai* and *sensei* in their Estonian and English utterances.

Eglė Krivickaitė-Leišienė and Ineta Dabašinskienė describe the bilingual advantage in non-word performance tests. Two groups of bilingual children with different languages and monolingual Lithuanian-speaking children were compared, and bilinguals demonstrated better results, possibly because of their command of two different phonological systems.

Kristiina Praakli, Mari-Liis Korkus, Aive Mandel, Elisabeth Kaukonen, Annika Kängsepp, Triin Aasa, Kristel Algvere, Helen Eriksoo, Marion Mägi, Getri Tomson, and Liina Lindström investigated the use of English among Estonian YouTubers from the perspective of youth language research. While English is widely used by Estonian YouTubers, the analysis of eight YouTubers exhibited significant individual differences.

Virve-Anneli Vihman, Kristiina Praakli, Maarja-Liis Pilvik, and Mari-Liis Korkus built two corpora of Estonian youth speech, those of spoken and online usage, and investigated patterns in the use of English lexical items. The amount of English items is not predicted by age or gender; however, age and gender do matter as far as the most frequently used English-language items are concerned.

Anna Verschik is professor of general linguistics at Tallinn University. Her field of research is language contacts and multilingualism. anna.verschik@tlu.ee

CONNECTIVITY IN NARRATIVES OF TURKISH-ENGLISH AND TURKISH-RUSSIAN BILINGUALS

Elena Antonova-Ünlü
Hacettepe University

Çiğdem Sağın-Şimşek
Middle East Technical University

Abstract. The present study draws on the narrative production of the Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian bilingual children in an attempt to examine whether the use of connectivity elements in the oral narratives of the bilingual children diverges from that of monolingual Turkish children. In particular, the study aimed to examine the use of temporal connectivity elements in the oral narratives of the Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian bilingual children in comparison to Turkish monolingual children focusing on the use of tense/aspect markers utilized to anchor narratives, temporal converbs used to link clauses in narratives, and also temporal connectors used to link clauses. The data were collected from two bilingual groups, Turkish-Russian (Group 1) and Turkish-English (Group 2), consisting of five children each and the control group consisting of seven monolingual Turkish children. The analysis of the data revealed that the Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian bilingual children performed differently than their Turkish monolingual counterparts in how consistently they used tense/aspect markers to anchor their narratives and in how they used converbial markers to indicate the sequentiality of the events in their narratives. The results are discussed in relation to prior research and the typological peculiarities of the languages.

Keywords: bilingual language acquisition**,** Russian-Turkish, Turkish-English, connectivity, narratives

1. Introduction

The present study draws on the narrative production of two groups of bilingual children (Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian) in an attempt to examine whether the use of connectivity elements in the oral narratives of the bilingual children diverges from that of monolingual Turkish children. Narrative abilities of children have often been studied to assess linguistic, cognitive, and pragmatic skills as they provide rich data regarding children's expressive language, including the knowledge of vocabulary, grammatical constructions, and story structure (Botting 2002; Iluz-Cohen, Walters 2012; Squires *et al.* 2014). As described by Labov (1972), a narrative is "a method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred". Thus, in order to effectively narrate a coherent story, children need to link the sequence of events temporally and causally in their minds and verbalize the events by making use of relevant connectivity elements (Berman, Slobin 1994; Öger-Balaban, Aksu-Koç 2020). Temporality markers are basic connectivity elements in narratives as they indicate the flow of the timeline of narratives. Temporal connectivity is established through the appropriate use of linguistic devices, such as verbal temporal elements (tense/aspect markers) used to anchor a tense and to link clauses in narratives, and temporal connectors (time adverbials and other temporal connectives) used to link clauses.

The phenomenon of connectivity in the narrative abilities of mono-/bilingual children has been widely investigated in the context of language acquisition (Aarssen 2001; Berman, Slobin 1994; Bohnacker 2016; Montanari 2004; Uccelli, Páez 2007; Roch, Florit, Levorato 2016) for the following reasons. First, narratives allow researchers to examine multiple linguistic aspects in a single task, ranging from lexical and morpho-syntactic elements to discourse structure (Hickmann 2003). Second, narratives provide a baseline for literacy development (Dickinson, Tabors 2001), and exploring

narrative abilities of children allows scholars to reveal language development problems in children (Bishop, Donlan 2005; Norbury, Bishop 2002). Finally, peculiar to bilingual children, narratives allow eliciting phenomena that are unique to bilingual language use, such as code-switching and cross-linguistic influences (Iluz-Cohen, Walters 2012). Yet, the phenomenon of connectivity in the narrative abilities of bilinguals has received relatively less attention from a typological and comparative perspective.

Given the substantial role of narratives in bilingual children's language development (Chang 2004), this study, adopting a typological and comparative perspective, aims to examine whether the use of temporal connectivity elements in oral narratives of Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian bilingual children diverges from that of the monolingual Turkish control group with a focus on tense/aspect markers used to anchor the narrative and on temporal converbials used to link clauses in narratives, as well as on temporal connectors such as time adverbials used to link clauses. The language combinations of Turkish-English and Turkish-Russian were selected for the following reasons. First, while in Turkish and English narratives, consistent use of a tense/aspect marker is required to anchor a narrative, in Russian, tense shifts within a narrative are common. Second, all the three languages use language-specific means to link clauses due to their typological features, which may, in turn, result in the use of unique bilingual strategies to achieve connectivity in narratives.

The organization of the paper is as follows. First, we briefly describe the temporal connectivity markers in Turkish, Russian, and English. Then, we present previous studies on connectivity elements in Turkish narratives. Following the methodology and results, we discuss the findings.

2. Connectivity in Turkish

Turkish, belonging to the Turkic language family, is an agglutinating language in which verbs and nouns are richly inflected with suffixes. While the canonical order is SOV, Turkish allows flexibility depending on pragmatic constraints. Turkish does not have a formal article system and lacks grammatical marking for gender (Göksel, Kerslake 2005; Kornfilt 1997). Regarding its narrative structure, an important peculiarity of Turkish is described by Aksu-Koç as "one of the criteria for the well-formedness of a narrative is the choice of a consistent favored tense" (1994: 333) throughout the narrative (Akıncı 1999). Johanson (2007a, 2007b) suggests that aspectotemporal elements are realized depending on the discourse type in Turkish narratives. While *–DI*-based past narrative is described as the most differentiated discourse type, *-mIş*-based evidential (indirect) past narrative is used in traditional story-telling. In addition to past narrative markers, it is also possible to use *–(I)yor* and *–(I)r*-based narratives to describe events simultaneous to the speech event.

Expressing simultaneity and sequentiality of events in narratives is based on clause linkage. Turkish clause linkage relies predominantly on non-finite subordination and less on finite subordination, coordination, and use of temporal connectors. While in finite subordination the predicate may be verbal or nominal and marked in the same way as the predicate of a main clause, in non-finite subordination the predicate is verbal and marked by distinctive subordinating morphology (Göksel, Kerslake 2005; Kornfilt 1997; Kerslake 2007). In Turkish narratives, the converbial markers *–(y)IncA* (when, since, as), *-(y)ken* (while, when) and *–(y)Ip* (then) are used to establish temporal connectivity.

Turkish also uses adverbials such as *sonra* (later) and its various forms, *ondan sonra* (after that), *daha sonra* (later) and two-word combinations such as *o zaman* (that time), *o an* (that moment), which is a combination of a demonstrative/determiner and a noun (Karahan 2007; Özsoy 2021), to connect clauses as connectivity elements.

In this study, we will name such connectivity elements as temporal connectors.

3. Connectivity in Russian

Russian narratives do not require the consistent use of tenses, and native speakers of Russian commonly use tense shifts in their narratives (Bondarko 2005; Paducheva 2011). Bondarko (2005) and Paducheva (2011) distinguish several reasons for tense shifts in Russian, such as distinguishing between the foreground and background as well as between the topic and the focus, marking the consequence of actions in the narrative, and emotional-expressive actualization. Example 1 illustrates a typical tense shift taken from Rekemchuk (1962):

(1) *Сплю (PRE) я сегодня ночью и приснилось (PAST) мне…*
      Sleep (PRE) I today at night and dreamt (PAST) me…
      "Today I was sleeping at night and saw in my dream…"

Russian clause linkage relies predominantly on finite subordination and coordination and less on non-finite subordination. Among non-finite subordination, converbs, which are also known as deepričastie, are used to establish temporal connectivity. Russian converbs have two forms, perfective, expressed by the morphemes *-в(ши),* and imperfective, expressed by the morpheme *-я.* The perfective converbial form indicates the action expressed by the converbs that precedes the one expressed with the finite form in the main clause. While the imperfective form indicates that the two actions are simultaneous, Example 2 and Example 3 illustrate the use of perfective and imperfective converbs in Russian, respectively.

(2) ***Сделав*** *домашнее задание, Ник пошел играть с друзьями.*
      Having done his homework Nick went to play with his friends.

(3) *Ребенок шел по улице, **напевая** песню.*
    A child was walking down the street singing a song.

Russian also uses adverbs such as *потом* (then)*, затем* (then), *позже* (later) and two-word combinations such as *после этого* (after that), which is a combination of a preposition and a demonstrative pronoun, to connect clauses as connectivity elements.

4. Connectivity in English

Similar to Turkish, English requires a linear presentation of events and does not allow tense shifts within narratives (Kornfilt 1997). The English language does not have converbial forms but utilizes participles to fulfill a converbial function of marking adverbial subordination as in Example 4. The same forms are also used as participles or verbal nouns in English. As for the connectivity elements, adverbs *then, later* and two-word combinations such as *after that* are also used in English.

(4) *The child walked down the streets eating an apple.*

5. Research on the development of connectivity in Turkish

The development of connectivity in Turkish narratives has been examined in the monolingual and bilingual acquisition contexts. Research on acquisition of the converbials in Turkish shows that the converbial markers appear early in monolingual Turkish (Aksu-Koç 1994; Topbaş *et al.* 2012). In a recent and extensive study, Ögel-Balaban and Aksu-Koç (2020) examined the development of clause chains formed with converbial clauses. The study used narratives of 40 Turkish-speaking four- to eleven-year-olds and six adults elicited by a wordless picture book. The study demonstrated that there is a gradual increase by age in the variety of clauses combined, the length of the complex sentences, and their frequency of use.

Converbial clauses emerge as the earliest and most frequent type of clauses. Regarding the development of narrative organization, the study reported that children first establish aspectual-temporal continuity and then temporal-causal continuity in Turkish.

On the other hand, research on acquisition and use of temporal connectivity elements in Turkish as a heritage language demonstrates that in bilingual contexts, such as in German, Swedish, French, and Dutch contexts, temporal connectivity elements are used differently (Aarsen 2001; Bohnacker, Karakoç 2020; Boetschoten and Verhoeeven 1986, Rehbein and Herkenrath 2015).

Rehbein and Karakoç (2004) reported that Turkish–German bilingual children in the German context use aspectotemporal elements in their narratives differently from their monolingual counterparts. The study concluded that the bilinguals shifted between aspectotemporal elements –DI, -mIş and –(I)yor, which was not observed in the Turkish monolingual data. Similarly, Karakoç (2007) studied connectivity by means of finite elements in Turkish–German bilingual children in Germany. The researcher reported that while all forms were used by Turkish monolingual children, the bilingual children used -(I)yor (present imperfective) and -DI (past perfective) forms in their narratives to maintain connectivity and refrained from using -mIş (perfective aspect/evidential modality) forms. In addition to aspectotemporal elements of connectivity the study highlighted a highly frequent use of temporal-deictic expressions, such as *o zaman* (at that time), *sonra* (than), *ondan sonra* (after that) by the bilingual children.

Based on the data obtained from Turkish-French children in France, Akıncı (1998) reported that children between the ages of 5 and 10, born to immigrant parents in France, revealed no clear and consistent "anchor tense". The researcher, however, reported that the children at the age of 9–10 began anchoring either the present or past tense as the favoured one. In another study, based on the data gathered from first- and second-generation Turkish immigrants in France, Akıncı (2003: 296) reported that the majority of

the first-generation immigrants shifted tenses while the second-generation bilingual participants "used tense just as the monolingual high-educated participants do" after the age of 14 . The researcher presented social class attitude and the level of literacy as two important factors that had an impact on the development of tense usage of the bilinguals.

In another study, Schroeder (2016) examined the clause-combining strategies of Turkish-German bilinguals in a German context to interpret the dynamics of language shift. The study reported that the shift to using more finite clauses, clause initials, and semantic connectors in Turkish in Germany could be explained by two factors: first, the limited access to the structures of the formal register of Turkish that results in "generalization of structural elements of spoken Turkish", and, second, to the "generalization of structures with a structural and functional correspondence in the contact language German" (2016: 97).

Akkuş (2019) investigated the converbial constructions in heritage Turkish in the Netherlands from a language contact perspective. Based on the data obtained from the first and second generations of Dutch-Turkish speakers, the study reported a gradual decrease in the frequency of converb use and unconventional usages of converbs in non-finite constructions of the second-generation speakers. The study suggested that the participants' perception and production of the converbial constructions indicated a linguistic change regarding the frequency and pattern of use.

Turan *et al.* (2020) examined the perception and use of the converbs –*Ip* and –*IncA* in heritage Turkish in Germany. Based on the analysis of the data obtained through a grammaticality judgment task and a picture-story description task, the study revealed that the bilinguals' perception of the grammatical constructions with –*IncA* and of the ungrammatical constructions with –*Ip* and –*IncA* differed significantly from that of the monolinguals, while the perception of the grammatical constructions with –*Ip* was reported to be similar. As for the production of the converbs, the bilingual participants