**1: children / "specific cases" / L1-L2 comparability and terminology**

- more (or many more) "specific cases" to be expected in the sample than the ones named in the report (e.g. the Macedonian-Polish child raised in German), as this specifity (extensive use of German in multilingual families) has in the last years become quite usual;

- cases to be assumed as "specific" not only in regard to extensive use of German in the families, but also in regard to family languages other than Turkish (Kurdish, Arabic etc.);

- especially in LAS Germany, this could/should be considered in terms of terminology (given LAS Turkey in the background where this *has* been considered, in order to avoid a specific bias between LAS Turkey and LAS Germany): maybe better to use "home language" instead of an all too self-confident "L1 Turkish" terminology, or: an explicit, clarifying remark in the report;

- furthermore, the "L1-L2" concept throughout the report might give the impression of far-reaching comparability of "Turkish-German" on the one hand, and "Kurdish-Turkish" on the other. And although there *is* comparability to a large extent (mainly *linguistically*), it should be considered that this might change when regarded from a *sociological* point of view, where e.g.
- German in Germany could be positioned as +lit /+ed (in regard to availability of literate products *AND* amount of population used to reading and writing in German),
- Turkish in Germany as +lit /-ed (in regard to availability of literate products but (in the immigrant situation!) *LESS* population used to reading and writing in Turkish), and
- Kurdish as -lit /-ed (in regard to interrupted development & availability of literate products in Turkey *AND* people very rarely being used to reading and writing in Kurdish).

- Such a kind of "*labelling linguistic phenomena in a more sociological way*" might also bring along the possibility of closer connecting linguistic and sociological results to each other (e.g. behind the background of Turkish as +lit /-ed and of Kurdish as -lit /-ed, the finding of "L1 (Turkish) being less restricted in Germany than L1 (Kurdish) in Turkey" can be understood as quite consistent.

**2: parents / amount of information / reasons and coherences**

- not very much on the parents in the report. Suggestion: *If* more data and/or analyses available, this should be added, given that the findings say that parents *do* play their part in literacy acquisition / school success, without the school balancing out such background differences.

- it should be considered - more than this seems to be done in the report so far - that at home, societal (de)valuation is almost equally present as it is at school. Bringing in more information on parental language attitudes / language transmission could thus be helpful to again connect linguistic and sociological data (see above),
given that in terms of literacy acquisition
- it is meaningful whether or not parents make their linguistic "capital" fully accessible to their children, e.g. if there are oral narrations and the like, providing the child a concept of how a narration works;
- it is meaningful whether a child writes a LAS-Germany-test in L1 Turkish, in the own L1 but the parents' L2 Turkish, or in an L1 Turkish adapted only recently by the family (which is often the case at school enrolment, where parents shift e.g. from Kurdish to Turkish *because of their concept of literacy enhancement*);
- it could be helpful to be careful in regard to implicitly or explicitly assumed reasons for the parents' activities. E.g., parents often turn out to not involve that much into school affairs in the first grade, not only because of a lack of experience, means etc., but just because they consciously or unconsciously restrict themselves, considering their own activities / themselves as not literacy-relevant, or even as literacy-hindering and therefore as an obstacle to school success; this seems to be the case above all when parents are illiterate and/or speak a language where no literate products are available to them (Kurdish).

- in sum, to address the issue of parental contributions to literacy acquisition more intensely could be helpful
- in order to avoid too common hypotheses about why parents are (not) doing something,
- in order to the question what is meaningful for literacy acquisition *apart from school and teaching*,
- and, again, in order to bring linguistic and sociological results together more easily, see above.

**3: general suggestions: bringing together linguistic and sociological data**

- suggestion 1: merging and putting into chronological order
one selected case pupil's results (linguistic data, background info and dense description)
*AND* all relevant information from the lesson analyses;
i.e. reconstruct as much as possible the whole year, that is: what did the pupil make of it?,
even if / aware of the fact that such a reconstruction has at least partly to be based on hypotheses;

- suggestion 2: putting the emerging hypotheses together into an (at least basic) socio-linguistic theoretical model of literacy acquisition, with the aim of giving each investigated position (parents, teacher, child) and all the collected data (linguistic phenomena, background information etc) *functional* weight, thus getting away from description to focusing on relations.

- suggestion 3: within the hypotheses thus having emerged, give the concepts (i.e. the *linguistic* results, too) a *sociological* "name"
(to give a rather simplifying example: a "++literate connector" would then be called e.g. "something the teacher has supported/ encouraged several times";
or see above the example of  "+lit / -ed").
This suggestion is made with regard to sociological relevance hardly being achieved *without* a theoretical model as basement and frame.

- suggestion (general): This would then mean to "rely" on the fact that school inequality is being maintained anyway, without having to be proved by the LAS data. Rather, the LAS data is in the "luxury" position of being able to follow the "*how*" and "*why*" of (in)equality - with the linguistic data probably showing above all the *equality*, the sociological data showing above all the *IN*equality part of it.