

LAS Linguistic results

Aydin Durgunoğlu

LAS Conference, 2011 Potsdam

Wonderful, thorough study

Strengths

- Analyzing language and literacy within its rich school contexts, both micro and macro-level data
- L1 and L2 both analyzed
- School ethnographies very rich and textured
- Both qualitative and quantitative methods
- longitudinal

As with any good research, generating
new questions and ideas....

From a cognitive psychology perspective, two
points:

1- expanding the definition of literacy and
hence

2-analyzing other components of literacy

orate -←-----→literate

Categorizing the linguistic structures present in
each domain (tense, connectives...) as O or L

very systematic delineation

POINT 1 Challenges for this approach

(as the research team also acknowledged)

- Orate –literate continuum, boundaries are hard to draw, especially in languages where such inventories are in early stages
- Linguistic structures used to define the O-L boundary are very context- and meaning-dependent, qualified by task demands, style, etc.

- New literacies blur the O-L distinction further. e.g. email content closer to oral than written language norms
- Some linguistic dimensions are closely tied to linguistic proficiency, so hard to separate oral language development from literacy development [61, 68]
- On the flip side, adult beginning reader example: Literate structures present in orate language
“Derse gelmeden yemeğimi pişirdim.”

Looking at comprehension rather than production:

- Listening comprehension \sim Reading comprehension (especially as readers become more proficient) [Catts et al; Gernsbacher...]
- Therefore similar higher-order comprehension processes are found in both types of comprehension, regardless of modality.

POINT 2 Additional components of literacy development

- Linguistic facilitators of literacy development (for both monolinguals and bilinguals) not only syntax, but also vocabulary, semantics
- Including comprehension in addition to production
- The classroom observations include very good descriptions of vocabulary and comprehension issues in the classroom—those can be tied to student performance on vocabulary and comprehension (both oral and written)

Conclusion

Digging even deeper into this very rich data set.

Thank you for the invitation to discuss this exciting and very informative project.

LAS comparison of linguistic results

Aydin Y. Durgunoğlu

LAS Conference, 2011, Potsdam

LAS comparison of linguistic results

- Very impressive study
- My focus:
 - Comparison of monolinguals and bilinguals across the two countries
 - Despite differences in the national educational systems: Some common patterns
 - How they match the data from other countries

Several themes

- Bilingual and monolingual students have overlapping distributions of proficiency, rather than completely distinct profiles, despite the mixed response of the schools to their linguistic backgrounds
- SES and parental education matters more than language status [274, 292]
- Poor teaching hurts especially lower proficiency students of all language backgrounds
- These patterns match results from US and Canada (Proctor, Siegel, Lesaux, Carlo..)

- L1 affects L2 processing especially in borrowing words, and even some constructs
- This transfer depends on how developed L1 is, especially in terms of some formal instruction [180, 271, 338, 373, 494]
- In formal writing tasks, L2 is stronger, [German influencing L1 (Turkish, e.g. Osman); Turkish influencing Kurdish (e.g. Damla)]

- Bilinguals do just as well or even better than monolinguals on orthographic tasks, pseudoword spelling, mechanics of writing [285, 479, 480]

- In Turkey, the teacher is (consciously or unconsciously) doing several things right:
- Songs, poems, rhymes-->developing phonological awareness
- Teaching letter sounds (not names) especially in syllables
- Keeping a close eye on the pupils' development
- Decoding progresses rapidly in Turkish [232]

Pseudoword test

- Especially for first graders, this is a difficult test, many uncommon phonotactic patterns and difficult constructs (just consider how many neighbors **tuğ** or **kâş** have)
- Despite this difficulty, both monolinguals and bilinguals did well on this task [331, 332]

- LAS and other studies also show that bilingual students can reach or even surpass monolingual levels of decoding , pseudoword spelling and using the writing conventions (upper case, punctuation etc...).[152, 173, 174]
- Where bilinguals fall behind compared to monolinguals is on **vocabulary** and **reading comprehension**. (Lesaux, Kieffer, Pearson...)

If I may repeat a suggestion:

- It would really enrich the contribution of this study , if vocabulary and comprehension skills are also analyzed and linked to classroom factors.

Thank you.