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LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN TURKISH-DUTCH CHILDREN

**phonology**
- Vowels
  - ± Turkish (8)< Dutch (16)
  - Difference long and short vowels
  - ± vowel hight
- Consonants
  - ± Turkish Dutch
- = phoneme awareness *(Janssen et al., 2013)*

**semantics**
- ↓ Vocabulary *(Boerma et al., 2016)*
- Passive vocabulary ↑ from 4y *(Leseman, 2000)*
- Delay ↑ primary school *(Bialystok, 2010)*

**morphosyntax**
- Omissions/overgeneralisation of articles *(Aissati et al., 2005)*
- Difficulties with conjugation of verbs *(Blom et al., 2013)*
- ↓ complex sentences *(Yilmaz, 2011)*

**pragmatics**
- Influenced by sociocultural environment *(Kecskes, 2015)*
- Narrative skills
  - = monolingual children *(Boerma et al., 2016)*
PURPOSE

1

To investigate the language skills of 25 9-year-old Turkish-Dutch bilinguals compared to 25 age and gender matched monolingual Dutch children.

2

Secondly, in 9 Turkish Dutch bilinguals and 13 monolingual Dutch children longitudinal data of three years (at the age of 6 years and at the age of 9 years) were collected and compared.
SUBJECTS

Turkish-Dutch children

NUMBER: 25 children
GENDER: ♀: 14 – ♂:11
AGE: mean. 9;6 y [8;11 - 9;10]
HOME LANGUAGE: Turkish-Dutch: 16 (64%)
Turkish: 9 (36%)
GENERATION: 1 9; 2 12; 3-4 4

INCLUSION CRITERIA
- Turkish mother tongue
- Dutch exposure > 2 y
- Home language Turkish
- ° 2007

Dutch children

NUMBER: 25 children
GENDER: ♀: 14 – ♂:11
AGE: mean. 9;6 y [9;1 - 10;1]
HOME LANGUAGE: Dutch: 25 (100%)

INCLUSION CRITERIA
- Dutch (Flemish) mother tongue
- monolingual
- ° 2007

match
LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Anamnesis
- Sociodemographic info
- Language development
- Medical history

Language battery
- CELF-4-NL
- Core language index
- Receptive and expressive index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 bilinguals</td>
<td>25 bilinguals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 monolinguals</td>
<td>25 monolinguals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of the language scores between mono- and bilinguals
- Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks
- McNemar test

Comparison of the evolution of language scores between mono- and bilinguals.
- Difference between 2014-2017
  - Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks
  - McNemar test

Impact of home language, SES, language at school, birth order, generation, gender
- Kruskal-Wallis test
**DUTCH LANGUAGE SKILLS MONO- AND BILINGUAL CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELF-4-NL Percentile scores</th>
<th>Bilingual children (Turkish-Dutch)</th>
<th>Monolingual children (Dutch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core language (CL)</td>
<td>Med. 4,8, Pc25-75 1,6-12,9</td>
<td>Med. 80,7, Pc25-75 60,5-89,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive language index (RTI)</td>
<td>6,3, 2,7-10,3</td>
<td>74,8, 52,7-90,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive language index (ETI)</td>
<td>5,5, 0,8-15,9</td>
<td>78,8, 65,5-89,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentile Scores**

- **Core language (CL)**: 4.8 (1.6-12.9) for Bilingual children and 80.7 (60.5-89.7) for Monolingual children.
- **Receptive language index (RTI)**: 6.3 (2.7-10.3) for Bilingual children and 74.8 (52.7-90.9) for Monolingual children.
- **Expressive language index (ETI)**: 5.5 (0.8-15.9) for Bilingual children and 78.8 (65.5-89.7) for Monolingual children.
**EVOLUTION DUTCH LANGUAGE SKILLS**

Evolution median percentile scores KS CELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>P-waarde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLI</td>
<td>0,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLI</td>
<td>0,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>0,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = 2014, 2 = 2017

**Graph:**
- Bilingual children
- Monolingual children
EVOLUTIE TAALVAARDIGHEDEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p-waarde</th>
<th>CLI</th>
<th>RLI</th>
<th>ELI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,186</td>
<td>0,060</td>
<td>0,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receptive Language skills

Evolution median percentile scores RTI

Expressive Language skills

Evolution median percentile scores ETI
INFLUENCING FACTORS

Does home language, SES, language at school between the lessons, birth order, generation and gender have an impact on the language scores in the bilingual Turkish-Dutch children.

HOME LANGUAGE

![Bar chart showing language scores comparison between Turkish and Turkish-Dutch groups.](image)

- CLI: p = 0.019
- RLI: p = 0.061
- ELI: p = 0.011
INFLUENCING FACTORS

Does home language, SES, language at school between the lessons, birth order, generation and gender have an impact on the language scores in the bilingual Turkish-Dutch children.

SES
- Profession mother
- Profession father
- Education mother
- Education father

![Graph showing percentiles of different professions with statistically significant differences for ELI (p=0.016) and non-significant differences for CLI (p=0.080) and RLI (p=0.710).]

CLI: p= 0.080
RLI: p= 0.710
ELI: p= 0.016
INFLUENCING FACTORS

Does home language, SES, language at school between the lessons, birth order, generation, and gender have an impact on the language scores in the bilingual Turkish-Dutch children.

LANGUAGE SCHOOL

BIRTH ORDER

GENERATION

GENDER

No significant differences
DISCUSSION

- ± difference in Dutch language proficiency between Turkish-Dutch bilingual children compared to monolingual Dutch children

- Clinical and subclinical scores
  - DD normal – LI

- Delay
  - Receptive and expressive language skills
  - Content and form
EVOLUTION

HYPOTHESIS
- Normal developing bilingual children catch up with monolinguals
  - ↑ exposure to Dutch
  - Dutch education

CONCLUSION STUDY
- Difference in language proficiency remains/increases
- // literature (Driessen et al., 2002)
- Alarming low scores
  - ~ school success?
  - ~ career opportunities?
INFLUENCING FACTORS

SES
- Significant impact on language skills
- // literature

HOME LANGUAGE
- Bilinguals with Turkish and Dutch as home language have better language skills in Dutch
  ~ Dutch language proficiency
  ~ Dutch language proficiency of the parents

MOTHER TONGUE
- Decreased language skills in mother tongue (Altinkamış et al., 2018, Mieszkowska et al., 2017)
- Risk for semi-lingualism
Crevits genuanceerd over gebruik van thuistaal op school

Minister van Onderwijs Hilde Crevits is niet helemaal gelukkig met de richtlijnen van het gemeenschapsonderwijs die stellen dat kinderen op school in sommige situaties hun thuistaal mogen gebruiken op de speelplaats en in de klas. De meerderheidspartijen zitten over het onderwerp duidelijk op een andere lijn.

Door respect te hebben voor de moedertaal van kinderen, zullen ze uiteindelijk andere talen zoals het Nederlands beter leren. Dat zegt Jacky Goris, algemeen directeur van Scholengroep Brussel, die de GO!-scholen in Brussel verenigt. In Brussel is het Nederlands voor de meeste leerlingen pas de derde taal, waardoor de Brusselse Vlaamse scholen al veel langer aandacht schenken aan de meertaligheid van de leerlingen.
IMPORTANCE OF HOME LANGUAGE AND MOTHER TONGUE

MOTHER LANGUAGE

- Affective function, part of identity
  - Respect home language $\Rightarrow$ ↑ second language

- Interdependence-hypothesis (Cummins, 2000)
  - level of mothertongue $\Rightarrow$ level of the second language
  - project training of Turkish $\Rightarrow$ ↑ well-being (Bultynck, et al., 2008)

- Importance of communication

STIMULATION OF MOTHER TONGUE!
LIMITATIONS STUDY

- Small sample size
- No information about language proficiency of the mother tongue
- Language use - pragmatic skills
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