Errors and repairs in French language use of Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers

Mehmet-Ali Akinci

ERRORS AND REPAIRS IN FRENCH OF TURKISH-FRENCH BILINGUAL CHILDREN AND TEENAGERS

Mehmet-Ali Akinci[1]
Laboratoire Dynamiques Sociolangagières 'DYALANG'
(*UMR 6065 CNRS Université de Rouen*)[2]

1. Introduction

This study explores the relationship between bilingualism, errors, self-repairs and language development. It aims to provide evidence for the ways both errors and repairs develop and show the progressive mastery of French acquired by Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers living in the Turkish immigrant community in France. The data is composed of narratives elicited by using a picture book task *Frog, where are you?* (Mayer, 1969).

Errors and self-repairs were subject of many studies from a developmental perspective (Clark & Andersen, 1979; Clark, 1985; Ochs, 1985; Levelt, 1983; Karmiloff-Smith *et al*., 1993). Ochs (1985: 785) defines the error as "a) a deviation from either a socially variable or a categorial norm and b) warrant negative feed-back." Like Blanche-Benveniste (1997), Wigglesworth (1990: 121) says that repairs can "occur (…) as a result of the speaker's own monitoring of his or her speech… and examination of these types of speech correction can provide important insights into speech processes". Clark & Andersen (1979) divide repairs into two groups: those concerning the code and those intended for the interlocutor, to make the message understood. The first one "do not seem to be motivated by attempts to make oneself intelligible but rather seem to be repairs to those parts of the system when the children notice that their own productions do not match their stored representations" and the second one "are motivated by the need to make oneself understood". Self repair is not easy for the speaker in so far as it implies the interaction between perception and

---

production processes. In other terms, in order to make a repair, the speaker must first notice a problem in his production and then interrupt the flow of speech and second create a new utterance, which repairs the form and its potential consequences for the listener.

From these definitions it can be assumed that errors precede repairs. Adopting the hypothesis according to which children monitor and check just those parts of the system that they are in the process of acquiring (Clark & Andersen, 1979), we will consider self repairs as indications of a change taking place in the language system of the learners.

Levelt in his model of production, attributes two main functions to the process of monitoring: "a matching function, which compares parsed aspects of inner and outer speech with (i) the intentions and the message sent to the formulator and (ii) criteria or standards of production" (Levelt, 1983: 50). Which amounts to saying that the monitor verifies if what is said corresponds well to what the speaker intended to say but also if the production corresponds well to the standard of production, as well as the syntactical errors and prosodic aspects of the speech.

Clark & Andersen's studies (1979) concerning the functions of self-repairs support those of Levelt. But this last one adds a second function to the monitor, which is "create instructions for adjustment. If some mismatch is detected which purpasses certain criteria, the monitor makes the speaker aware of this" (Levelt, 1983: 50). According to Levelt, the monitor sends an alarm signal to the memory, which must correct the erroneous utterance by a new corresponding utterance.

A qualitative but also quantitative study of these two phenomena can shed some light on the developmental process of the mastery of the language to the bilingual children (Ochs, 1985). Indeed, the errors are indications of an incomplete knowledge of the considered domain; their analysis, a means to know the parts of the system which are not still completely automated, while the repairs can help to understand the processes and the current stage of acquisition.

Such a study turned out to be relevant because, on the one hand, differences appeared in the other domains; in bilingual children, for example, we already observed a delay compared to monolingual children which tends to disappear with age in the study of the macrostructure (Akinci, Jisa & Kern, 2001) or in temporality (Akinci &

Kern, 1998; Akinci, 2001). On the other hand, certain theories on bilingualism place the children stemming from the immigration in the category of "semilinguals" (Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976), who not only confuse and mix both languages but also share common points with the learners of a second language among which one of the most important would be the instability of the knowledge.

Starting cut from this theoretical background, we make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis (1): as far as the acquisition of a language is made in a progressive way, going from a stage where the child begins his acquisition until it reaches the target system (that of the adult), we predict a decrease with the age not only of the number of errors, but also of their variety. As for the repairs, we think that repairs are going to increase. If we consider self-repairs as the indication of the active treatment of a particular domain, we can easily think of finding in the youngest subjects a number of self-repairs lower than that in the oldest.

Hypothesis (2): the comparison of our results with those of monolingual French children (Clark, 1985; Bange & Kern, 1996) is going to inform us, at first, on specific errors and repairs of bilingual subjects, because of their membership to a double linguistic system, and, then, it is going to show the decrease, with age of the distance which one can observe between both populations.

2. Method

2.1. Informants

The informants are grouped into six groups: one group of nursery school children (5-year-olds), two groups of primary school students (7 and 10 years of age), two groups of secondary school adolescents (12-13 and 14-15 years of age) and one group of high school students (16-18 year-old). Each group consists of at least 10 subjects.

The informants for this study were selected from the Turkish immigrant community living in Lyon and Grenoble. In order to control for the factor "gender", we tried to include equal numbers of males and females. Grouping was made on the basis of age and education: all groups include second generation students from nursery, primary, secondary to high school in the age range of 05;00-18;08. These informants are

sons and daughters of the first generation immigrants in France. They were all born in France, only 3 of the 12 high school students are born in Turkey but they came to France before the age of 2.

School	Nursery school	Primary school		Secondary school		High school
Group	Group A	Group B (CE2)	Group C (CM2)	Group D (6è & 5è)	Group E (4è & 3è)	Group F
Number	14	16	15	11	11	12
Mean age	5;04	7;06	10;06	12;01	14;06	17;05
Range	5;00-5;11	7;00-7;11	10;00-10;11	11;05-13;02	13;05-15;08	16;02-18;08

Table 1. Age, number, mean age, range of the informants.

Up to the age of 7, the children acquire Turkish exclusively within the family. From the age of 7, some of these children have the possibility of attending the LCO classes (Heritage Language and Culture), up to the end of secondary school. Only 38% of the subjects attend these classes. The children also have the possibility of practicing Turkish in religious instruction classes (58% of the subjects) or group activities (35%) organized by Turkish-speaking associations. French, which will become their dominant language, is acquired essentially at nursery school starting at the age of 2;6 or 3. Our investigation shows that 77% of the parents report that Turkish is the exclusive language at home. 68% of the children report that they speak French to one another.

90.5% of the fathers are factory or unskilled workers; the other 9.5% are free-lance masons. All of the mothers are at home. 65% of the fathers quit their studies after primary school in Turkey, 27% completed secondary school. 8% of the fathers are illiterate. 62% of the mothers completed primary school in Turkey, 12% completed secondary school and 26% are illiterate.

2.2. Material and procedure

Narrative texts were elicited using the picture book without words, *Frog, where are you*? (Mercer Mayer, 1969). This book, which contains 24 pictures, represents a typical children's story with a hero (the little boy and his dog), a problem (the boy has a pet frog which runs away) a set of actions which follow from the problem (the boy and the dog search for the missing frog), and a happy ending (the boy finds his frog, or gets another one in exchange).

The recordings were made during the autumn of 1993 for nursery and primary schools subjects and during the autumn of 1999 for the secondary and high school subjects. The same procedures were followed for all age groups in the two languages. Each subject was interviewed individually, and s/he received the same instructions following Berman & Slobin (1994: 22). All subjects were given instructions in either language prior to each separate recording session. In order not to influence the subject and to allow him/her to retell the same story, two different researchers made the recordings for the two languages: a Turkish-French bilingual and a native speaker of Turkish. The interviews took place on different days. All bilingual subjects were first recorded in Turkish and then in French, but there was no particular motivation for recording Turkish first. As the time interval between the two interviews was one month for most of the children, we believe to have minimized the chance of any influence of the Turkish session on the French session.

A uniform format was applied across the sample in order to transcribe the texts. The basic unit of analysis is the *clause*, defined for this study as "any unit that contains a *unified* predicate. By *unified* we mean a predicate that expresses a *single* situation (activity, event or state), including finite and nonfinite verbs as well as predicate adjectives. In general clauses will be comprised of a single verbal element; however, infinitives and particles which functions as complements of modal or aspectual verbs are included with the matrix verb as single clause" (Berman & Slobin, 1986: 7).

2.3. Coding procedures

In this paper, we will study errors and self-repairs in terms of quantity and type according to age. Each type of error or repair was coded following categories from Levelt (1983), Bange & Kern (1997), Akinci (2000). The following examples from the data illustrate the various types.

2.3.1. Errors coding
2.3.1.1. Gender

Determiner

    (1) F05;07b 1-   001   **un** fois y avait un petit enfant
                                "once there was a little child "
                    002   y avait un gros truc
                                  "there was a big thing"
                    003   et dedans y avait **un** gronouille

"and inside there was a frog"

Subject clitic

(2) F15;00e   7-   027   les abeilles ils commencent à le courser
                              "the bees they begin to chase it"

Adjective

(3) F11;11a   14b   047   ils ont vu des petits grenouilles aussi
                              "they saw small frogs also"

Object clitic

(4) F07;08d   3a   009   et le petit garçon il le (=la grenouille) cherche
                              "and the little boy he looks for him (=the frog)"

2.3.1.2. Noun phrases (missing or contraction)

Missing determiner

(5) F05;11m   12b   036   […] garçon il rigole   (missing "le")
                              "[…] boy he laughs"

Subject missing

(6) F05;01f   14b   052   et puis il a aussi trouvé des grenouilles
                              "and then he also found frogs"
                      053   […] est content   (missing "il")
                              "[…] is happy"

Object missing

(7) F13;04e   11-   030   il […] jette dans l'eau   (missing "les")
                              "it throws "[…] in the water"

Relative missing

(8) F05;05q   7-   027   après chien qui [regarde] regardait là
                              "then dog who [looks] looked there"
                      028   après souris qui parte
                              "then mouse who leaves"

Contraction

(9) F07;01i   12a   032   le chien est monté sur la tête de le garçon
                              "the dog rose on the head of the boy"

2.3.1.3. Verbs

Agreement

(10) F12;07i 8-   022   les abeilles sort
                              "bees go out"

Auxiliary choice

(11) F07;05k 13b   087   le garçon il a monté sur la branche
                              "the boy he rose on the branch"

Present tense

(12) F07;01j 1-   006   et le garçon il s'assit
                              "and the boy he sits down"

Existential il a (il y a)

  (13) F05;10d 4b   027   après elle est une pierre (instead of il y a)
                                     "then there is a stone"

Reflexive missing

  (14) F07;05e 2a   018   la grenouille est en train de […] sauver
                                     (missing "se")
                                     "the frog is saving"

Overgeneralization of the past participle of Passé composé

  (15) F07;11h 6b   018   et après une souris a mordé son nez
                                     "and then a mouse bit his nose"

Overgeneralization of Imparfait

  (16) F07;06b 14a   063   ils sontaient là
                                       "they were there"

Overgeneralization of Passé simple

  (17) F11;06g 8-   016   [et] et sorta un hibou
                                       "[and] and an owl went out"

Infinitive

  (18) F05;08n 3a   008   la petite prendre une chapeau
                                       "the little girl to take one hat"

Copula missing

  (19) F05;08n 2b   006   la petite fille [il] il […] debout
                                       (missing word "est")
                                     "the little girl [he] he stands"

Past participle missing

  (20) F05;07b 6a   026   et le petit garçon il avait […] un petit trou
                                       (missing "trouvé")
                                     "and the little boy he had […] a small hole"

2.3.1.4. Prepositions

  (21) F10;11o 6a   024   il regarde [dessous] dedans le trou
                                       (instead of dans)
                                     " he looks [under] inside the hole"

2.3.2. Repairs

For the coding of self-repairs, we referred, on the one hand, to the experimental study of Levelt (1983 and 1989) and, on the other hand, to the application in French by Bange & Kern (1996) in a comparative perspective.

Levelt (1983) made study at 959 self-repairs produced by Dutch subjects, who had to describe configurations of color to a partner who should be able to reproduce them from the verbal information. From the collected self-repairs, Levelt made a classification by distinguishing 3 phases:

- Original utterance with a trouble spot or reparendum,
- Editing phase or without any editing term
- Repair

and 2 main types of repairs:

1) Covert repairs: it is about hesitations, repeats and pauses. Levelt did not consider it useful to analyze this type, but listed it however without counting.

2) Overt repairs. They consist of three types:

a) Different repairs (D-repairs) serves for controlling the order of presentation of the units of information (*do I want to say this now*?).

b) Appropriateness repairs (A-repairs) their function is to control the equivalence of the linguistic means used to build the units of information (*do I want to say it in this way*?).

c) Error repairs (E-repairs) which aim at correcting the utterances including the errors of code (*am I making an error*?).

These self-repairs can concern the lexicon (EL-repairs), the grammar (ES-repairs) and the phonology (EP-repairs).

In the present study we have not chosen to focus on pauses, hesitations as repeats, false starts. Our data were analyzed using Levelt's (1983) definition and categorization of self repairs. However, we simplified this coding and adapted it to our data by retaining only types: A- and E-repairs.

2.3.2.1. Appropriation repairs

Lexical repairs

    (23) F10;00h 6b   022   et le chien [il s'est accroché] il s'est mis à l'arbre

                                       "and the dog [it stuck] it put itself in the tree"

Slip of the tongue

    (24) F07;10m 4b   013   [le chien a attrapé euh:] le garçon a attrapé le chien

                                         "[the dog caught euh:] the boy caught the dog"

Referent repairs

    (25) F14;09i 2b   008   y a plus [le chien euh] la grenouille

                                       "there was no more [the dog euh] the frog"

In these examples, we often find the unfilled pause marker euh, which signals the beginning of the repair.

2.3.2.2. Error repairs

Gender repairs

    (26) F13;04e 2b   005   et il voit que

                                         "and he sees that"

006   y a plus [le:] la grenouille
        "there was no more [the:] the frog

Verb repairs
   (27) F05;05k 4b   017   et après [il a] il était fâché
                                 "and after [he has] he was angry"

3. Results

3.1. Texts lengths

Before presenting the results concerning errors and repairs, the length of the texts produced will be discussed. Table (2) gives the length with total number of clauses, mean number of clauses per subject for each group and the range of clauses.

School	Nursery school	Primary school		Secondary school		High school
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F
Age Nb. of subject	5 years N= 14	7 years N=16	10 years N = 15	12-13 years N=11	14-15 years N=11	16-18 years N=12
Total clauses	885	817	679	504	514	622
Mean cl./subj.	63	51	45	46	47	52
Range clauses	32-153	27-92	17-77	32-113	33-63	31-85

Table 2. Clause lengths of the informants per age group for French Frog stories.

Table (2) shows that nursery school subjects produced longer texts than other age groups. Groups C, D and E subjects produced shorter texts than the other groups (A, B and F). However, the differences are statistically not significant. We observed differences between boys' and girls' texts, though the difference is only significant for the group E (F $_{(1,9)}$ = 10.05, p < .01); where boys have longer narratives than girls. If the mean number of clauses per subject seems to be homogeneous for all groups (except group A), the range for clauses shows clearly big differences between each subject.

3.2. Study of the errors

3.1. Quantitative analysis of errors

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Total errors	531	218	100	58	47	37
Mean nb. of errors by subject	**38**	**13,5**	**6,5**	**5,5**	**4,5**	**3**
Range errors	17-90	3-41	1-18	12-1	7-1	7-0
Index of frequency	60	26,5	15	11,5	9	6

Table 3. Total number of sentence level errors per age group.

Table (3) confirms our hypothesis concerning the decrease of the number of errors with age. We can observe a very clear gradual decrease with age of the total number of errors. This decrease also holds for the mean number of errors by subject and for the index of frequency.

3.2. Qualitative analysis of errors

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Gender	**52,5**	**49,5**	**34**	**34,5**	**40,5**	**38**
Noun phrase	17	12,5	18	20,5	10,5	8
Verb	22,5	17	14	17,25	19	16,25
Preposition	3,5	14,5	15	10,5	13	21,5
Word order	0,5	1	2	0	4	0
Other	4	5,5	17	17,25	13	6,25

Table 4. Percentage of sentence level errors per category and age group.

Table (4) shows that the category of gender dominates for all 6 age groups, with however a decrease from the 5 years to the 12-13 years. Both 14-15 and 16-18 years adolescents realize a similar score. The results concerning the other categories do not differ significantly for all groups. For the young bilinguals, it's the verb and the noun phrase that put most problem, while for the older groups, even if these categories do not disappear, it's the verb and the preposition which are the object of an erroneous use.

3.2.1. Errors on gender

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Determiner	41,5	33,5	29,5	25	21	7,5
Subject clitic	**42,5**	**50**	**41**	**40**	31,5	35,5
Adjective	14	9	12	5	5,5	0
Object clitic	2	7,5	17,5	30	**42**	**57**
Total % and number	100 (278)	100 (108)	100(34)	100 (20)	100 (19)	100 (14)

Table 5. Percentage of the types of errors on **GENDER** per age group.

Table (5) shows that gender errors on the determiner for the Turkish-French bilingual children are frequent for the 5-year-olds and steadily decrease with age. Nevertheless, Turkish-French bilingual adolescents continue to make a gender error on the determiner until the age of 14-15. All these types of errors on gender of the bilinguals are corresponding to those made by monolingual French children studied by Clark (1985) and Kern (1997). Clark (1985) observes about the errors on gender, that "the acquisition of gender in a language like French would appear to pose certain problems since there is no consistent semantic basis to gender assignments" (Clark, 1985: 705). Furthermore, like many languages of the world, Turkish language doesn't know gender. This point increases the chances of the Turkish-French bilingual subjects to make an error on gender.

3.2.2. Errors in noun phrase

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Missing determiner	**51**	7,5	**33,5**	8,5	0	0
Subject missing	8	15	5,5	0	20	33,33
Object missing	9	18,5	27,75	33,5	**40**	33,33
Relative missing	30	26	5,5	16,5	20	33,33
Contraction	2	**33**	27,75	**41,5**	20	0
Total % and number	100 (90)	100 (27)	100(18)	100 (12)	100 (5)	100 (3)

Table 6. Percentage of the types of errors in noun phrase per age group.

Table (6) shows very clearly the border between the young subjects and those older. The number of errors concerning noun phrases is 5 times more for the 5 year-olds with regard to the other age groups, which show a certain homogeneity. The missing determiner is a frequent error observed in our young Turkish-French children. Moreover this problem is not resolved after 7 years, because the 10 year-olds realize a very high error score (33,5%). These results are a sign of the difficulty which the 5 years old bilingual subjects feel in employing a determiner which should precede a noun.

3.2.3. Errors with verbs

Group Age Number of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Agreement	16,5	**32,5**	**64**	20	**33,5**	**33,5**
Auxiliary choice	19	30	14,5			
Present tense	1,5	8	7			
Existential	11	5,5				
Reflexive missing	9	13,5	14,5		11	
Overgen. of the past participle of Passé Composé	8,5	5,5			11	
Overgen. of Imparfait		2,5				
Overgen. of Passé simple		2,5		**60**	11	**50**
Infinitive	5					
Copula missing	24					
Past participle missing	1,5					
Others	4			20	33,5	16,5
Total (and number)	100 (121)	100 (37)	100 (14)	100 (10)	100 (9)	100 (6)

Table 7. Percentage of the types of errors with verbs per age group.

Table (7) shows once again the difference between the 5 year-olds and the older groups. The number of errors of the young subjects is three times higher that that of the 7 year-olds and twenty times higher than that of 16-18 year-olds. This is a sign of a still very imperfect mastery of the French verbal system. It's difficult to say if there is a real influence of Turkish on the production of the bilingual since we find the same type of errors with the monolinguals (Akinci & Kern, 1998).

They also make errors of agreement, between subject and verb, usually combining a plural subject with a singular verb, rarely the reverse, as we have seen in example (10).

3.2.4. Errors with preposition

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
dedans/dessus/ dessous	**42**	**40,5**	**46,5**	16,5	16,5	**62,5**
Dans	**37**	**56**	20	50	16,5	12,5
Par	5,25		20	0	0	12,5
Sur	5,25	3,5	13,5	0	33,5	0
À	10,5			**33,5**	**33,5**	12,5
Total (and number)	100 (19)	100 (32)	100 (15)	100 (6)	100 (6)	100 (8)

Table 8. Percentage of the types of errors with preposition per age group.

Table (8) shows two big types of errors with the prepositions in French: errors with the prepositions of place (*dedans* / *dessus* / *dessous*) employed with the complement (example 21) and the overgeneralization of the preposition *dans*, which is employed in most of the cases instead of other prepositions such as *par* and *sur*. For the first case, we can suppose that they are caused by a still insufficient knowledge of the syntactic rule which governs these prepositions in French.

3.3. Appropriation and error repairs

Group Age Nb. of subject	A 5 years N= 14	B 7 years N=16	C 10 years N = 15	D 12-13 years N=11	E 14-15 years N=11	F 16-18 years N=12
Index of frequency	**4**	**7,5**	**6**	**5,5**	**3,5**	**3,5**
Appropriation repairs	**75,5**	**81**	**68**	42,75	**84**	34,5
Lexical repairs	40,5	40	24,5	14,25	42	34,5
Slip of the tongue	35	30	39	14,25	10,5	
Referent repairs		11	4,5	14,25	31,5	
Error repairs	24,5	19	32	**57,25**	16	**65,5**
Gender repairs	5,5	8	32	53,5	10,5	48
Repairs on verb	19	11		3,75	5,5	17,5
Total (and number)	100 (37)	100 (63)	100 (41)	100 (28)	100 (19)	100 (23)

Table 9. Appropriation and error repairs per age group.

For lack of a comparative study, we contented ourselves with the study led by Bange & Kern (1996) on French monolingual in L1 and L2 (German). The index of frequency found by these authors for both speakers' types is **1** for the first ones and **23** for the second. The results of all our bilingual age groups are between these two numbers, and widely below from those of French monolinguals in German. That's why, we can not consider the bilingual children as being second language learners.

Concerning self-repairs, from 7 years on, we attend even a light decrease of the appropriation repairs and conversely an increase of the error repairs. We can also observe that the percentage of the appropriation repairs on the lexicon is identical between 5, 7 and 14-15 year-olds. It's the slips of the tongue which clearly dominate appropriation repairs for 10 year-olds.

Bange & Kern (1996), found 60,5 % of self-repairs in the production of their subjects in L2: they concerned gender of the words, the verbal morphology, the syntax and the phonology. Even if we have both first categories in our results, they are rather rare for the bilingual subjects, because the percentage of self-repairs varies between 16% for the 14-15 year-olds and 32 % for the 10 year-olds (except groups D and F). which is for below the result observed for L2 by Bange & Kern (1996). This can be due to the difference between both types of education which the subjects receive. However, groups D and F subjects scores are similar to those of monolinguals French in their L2 in terms of percentage but varies clearly in terms of number. Bange & Kern (1996) explain moreover these results of monolingual learning German, as "the reflection of the guided learning and the overestimation of these domains in the education and so in the consciousness of the learners".

4. Conclusion

We can conclude from this study that the mastery of French of the Turkish-French bilingual children and teenagers continues gradually between 5 and 10 years. It's necessary to observe that the majority of the bilingual subjects began their acquisition of French only at the age of 3, with the entrance to nursery school. This necessarily influences the results for very young bilinguals. Even if in term of frequency they make more errors, most of these errors are also made by the young French monolingual subjects (Clark, 1985; Kern, 1997). Some of the errors (determiner, copula

and subject missing, gender) can be explained by the influence of their mother tongue, which meanwhile become their weaker language after the age of 6 (Akinci, 2001). However these errors, frequent in the young subjects, tend to disappear or to decrease very sharply after the age of 7. The most frequent type of error concerns gender which is also problematic for every foreign learner of French. So, we can not explain the origin of errors on gender by the influence of Turkish only.

Our results show an important decrease of self repairs with age. The distribution of self-repairs differed according to age: The A-repair category is the most represented category in young groups production, except for group E. For the older groups, on the contrary, there were more E-repairs. These results are evident for the fact that repairs are the indication of a consciousness of the language during the process of acquisition.

The development of the mastery of French of Turkish bilinguals is at the same moment in keeping with that of the results reported on the learners of a second language (Cummins, 1991; Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle, 1978) and with the acquisition of monolingual French children. The bilingual children are situated actually between learners of a second language and the monolingual at about 5 years and they attain proficiency in clause level grammar of French rather quickly at the age of 10.

Bibliographical references

Akinci, M.-A. & S. Kern (1998). "Développement de la temporalité chez des enfants monolingues et bilingues". In S. Vogeler *et al.* (éds), *Temps et discours. BCILL 99*, Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters, 237-55.

Akinci, M.-A. (2000). "Erreurs, autocorrections et autoreformulations en français chez des enfants bilingues (turc-français) issus de l'immigration en France". In *Actes du colloque bilinguisme*: *Enrichissements et conflits*. Presses Universitaires de la Faculté des Lettres de Toulon et du Var, collection Babeliana n°2, Paris: Honoré Champion, 275-301.

Akinci, M.-A. (2001). *Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans*. Préface du Professeur D.I. Slobin. München: LINCOM Studies in Language Acquisition 03 (*Allemagne,* ISBN 3 89586 437 4).

Akinci, M.-A., H. Jisa & S. Kern (2001). "Influence of L1 Turkish on L2 French narratives". In L. Verhoeven & S. Strömqvist (eds), *Narrative development in a multilingual context*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 189-208.

Bange, P. & S. Kern (1996). "La régulation du discours en L1 et L2". In M.B.M. Hansen & G. Skytte (éds.), *Le discours*: *Cohérence et cohésion*. Copenhague: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Berman, R.A. & D.I. Slobin (1994). *Relating events in narrative*: *A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Berman, R.A. & D.I. Slobin (1986). *Frog story procedures in coding manual*: *Temporality in discourse*. Institute of Human Development, University of California at Berkeley.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. (1997). *Approches de la langue parlée en français*. Paris: Ophrys.

Clark, E.V. & E.S. Andersen (1979). "Spontaneous repairs: Awareness in the process of acquiring language". In *Symposium on reflections on metacognition*, the Bienal Meeting of The Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, March, 15-19.

Clark, E.V. (1985). "The acquisition of romance, with special reference to French". In D.I. Slobin (ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of child language, Vol. I. The Data*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 687-782.

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, 70-89.

Karmiloff-Smith, A., H. Johnson, J. Grant, M.C. Jones, Y.N. Karmiloff, J. Bartrip & C. Cuckle (1993). "From sentential to discourse functions: Detection and explanation of speech rpairs by children and adults". *Discourse Processes* 16, 565-89.

Kern, S. (1997). *Comment les enfants jonglent avec les contraintes communicationnelles, discursives et linguistiques dans la production d'une narration*. Thèse de Doctorat, Université Lumière Lyon 2.

Levelt, W.J.M. (1983). "Monitoring and self-repair in speech". *Cognition* 14, 41-104.

Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, where are you?* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

Ochs, E. (1985). "Variation and error: A sociolinguistic approach to language acquisition in Samoa". In D.I. Slobin (ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of child language*. *Vol. I*: *The Data*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 783-838.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & P. Toukomaa (1976). *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki: Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Snow, D.E. & M. Hoefnagel-Hohle (1978). "The critical period for language acquisition: evidence from second language learning". *Child Development* 49, 1114-128.

Wigglesworth, G. (1990). "Children's narrative acquisition: A study of some aspects of reference and anaphora". *First Language* 10, 105-25.