REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

THE CORRELATION OF METALINGUISTIC AWARENESS OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS WITH LEARNING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2019

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

THE CORRELATION OF METALINGUISTIC AWARENESS OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS WITH LEARNING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Türkay BULUT

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ebru ŞİRE KAYA

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA / 2019

To Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences;

We certifiy that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of MASTERS OF ARTS in the Department of English Language Teaching.

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU

Member of the Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Türkay BULUT

Member of the Examining Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ebru ŞİRE KAYA

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences. …/…/2019

Prof. Dr. Serap ÇABUK
Director of Institute

P.S. The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources, is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thoughts No: 5846.

NOT: Bu tezde kullanılan ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildirişlerin, çizelge, şekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabidir.

ETİK BEYANI

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında;

- Tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,
- Tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- Tez çalışmasında yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi,
- Kullanılan verilerde ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlarda herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı,
- Bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu,

bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim. …. / …. / 2019

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

ÖZET

İKİDİLLİ ÖĞRENCİLERİN ÜSTDİL FARKINDALIKLARININ YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENİMİ İLE İLİŞKİSİ

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU
Nisan 2019, 97 sayfa

Bu çalışmada iki dilli ortaokul öğrencilerinin üstdil farkındalıklarının İngilizce öğrenimiyle olan ilişkisi incelenmektedir. Üstdil farkındalığının erken çocukluk dönemlerinden itibaren anlama, düşünme ve çeşitli dil becerileri gibi bir çok alanda oldukça etkili olduğu farklı çalışmalarda ele alınmıştır (Bialystok, 2001; Cenoz & Valencia, 1994; Lasagabaster, 1998). Özellikle dil öğrenim süreçleri ve birden fazla dil öğrenme süreci arasındaki ilişki son dönemde çeşitli alanlardan araştırmacıların dikkatini çekmiştir. Cenoz (2003) birden fazla dil edinimi esnasında üstdil farkındalığının arabulucu bir rol oynadığını belirtmiştir. Cummins (1976) üstdil farkındalık ve becerilerinin öğrencilerde bir eşik oluşturduğu yönündeki hipotezini Eşik Kuramı Teorisi olarak açıklamış ve bu durumun öğrenme sürecindeki etkilerine değinmiştir.

Bu çalışmada aile içinde öğrenilen farklı bir dil ile birlikte Türkçe bilen ikidilli öğrencilerin ve sadece Türkçe bilen tek dilli öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenimleri ve hem Türkçe hem İngilizce dillerindeki üst dil farkındalıkları karşılaştırılmıştır. Üstdil farkındalıkları ile İngilizce öğrenimleri arasındaki ilişki her iki gruptan elde edilen verilere göre analiz edilmiştir. İki grup arasında istatiksel açıdan farklılıklar olduğu ve her iki grup verilerine göre uygulanmış olan testler yoluyla üstdil farkındalıkları ile yabancı dil edinimleri arasında yüksek korelasyon bulunduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Son olarak, iki dilli öğrencilerden seçilen bir grupla dil becerileri ve farkındalıkları üzerine gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ve değerlendirmeler sonucu yüksek başarı gösteren öğrencilerin farkındalıklarının daha belirgin olduğu ortaya konulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Üstdil farkındalığı, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenimi, İki dillilik

ABSTRACT

THE CORRELATION OF METALINGUISTIC AWARENESS OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS WITH LEARNING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

Master Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU
April 2019, 97 pages

It has been aimed to investigate the correlation of metalinguistic awareness of heritage bilingual students who have different linguistic backgrounds with learning English as a foreign language. There have been several numbers of studies which have emphasized the role of metalinguistic awareness in some research areas such as comprehension, creative thinking, and some linguistic skills; stating that metalinguistic awareness and skills have been found as developing in early childhood ages. Especially, first language acquisition and learning more than two languages have been lately investigated in certain studies (Bialystok, 2001; Cenoz &Valencia 1994; Lasagabaster, 1998). As one of the distinctive studies, Cenoz (2003) have claimed that metalinguistic awareness has been noted as having the role of mediating factor while learning additional languages. Furthermore, Cummins (1976) has explained the Threshold Level Hypothesis as having linguistic awareness and skills can be accepted as a threshold which is needed to be gained while learning additional languages.

In this present study, the difference between heritage bilingual students and monolingual students in terms of metalinguistic awareness in both Turkish and English and learning English as a foreign language have been evaluated. It has been found that there has been a statistically significant difference between the results of both groups and a high correlation of metalinguistic awareness with learning a foreign language. Finally, the opinions of heritage bilingual students on the extreme have been discussed in terms of linguistic knowledge and awareness with semi-structured interviews. According to analyses higher metalinguistic awareness has been found related to higher results and scores in tests.

Key Words: Metalinguistic awareness, EFL learning, Heritage bilingualism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU for her motivation and support throughout the research. Words would be meaningless to describe the patience and guidance that she has shown in every step of the research and led me to the right way.

I also wish to thank the members of the examining committee Prof. Dr. Türkay BULUT and Asst. Prof. Dr. Ebru ŞİRE KAYA for their invaluable feedback and comments. I also thank all lecturers in the MA program in ELT department, in Çukurova University for contributions that they have presented in various ways.

I also express my sincere thanks to my friends, Eda KARABACAK, Pınar ÇİNAR, A. Ceyhun MÜFTÜOĞLU and Narin BAŞEĞMEZ EMİROĞLU who have helped and guided me in many significant ways during this period.

I would like to thank my beloved family; my parents, my dear sisters and people who are like family to me for their support and love.

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to my dearest one that I share my life and everything, Gürhan ÖZPOLAT who has always been there for me with endless love and motivation.

Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT

Adana / 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ÖZET.....**iv**
ABSTRACT.....**v**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....**vi**
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... **xi**
LIST OF TABLES.....**xii**
LIST OF APPENDICES.....**xiii**

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction 1
1.1. Background of the Study.....2
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....3
1.3. Research Questions 4
1.4. Significance of the Study 4
1.5. Limitations of the Study.....5
1.6. Operational Definition.....5

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0. A Conceptual Introduction.....7
2.1. What is Bilingualism?.....7
2.1.1. Types of Bilingualism.....8
2.1.2. Effects of Bilingualism.....10
2.1.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of Bilingualism.....12
2.2. Bilingualism and Related Theories.....13
2.2.1. Threshold Level Hypothesis.....14
2.2.2. Developmental and Linguistic Interdependence Hypotheses.....15
2.3. Bilingualism and Linguistic Abilities.....16
2.3.1. Linguistic Competence.....16

2.3.2. Linguistic Awareness.....17
2.3.3. The Cross-Linguistic Influence.....18
2.4. Metalinguistic Awareness.....18
2.4.1. Defining Characteristics and Evaluation of Metalinguistic Awareness.....19
2.4.2. Effects of Metalinguistic Awareness.....21
2.5. The Third Language Learning.....22
2.5.1. English as a Second Language and English as a Third Language.....23
2.5.2. The Role of Bilingualism on the Third Language Learning.....25
2.5.3. The Role of Metalinguistic Awareness on the Third Language.....28

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction.....31
3.1. Research Design.....31
3.2. Research Questions of the Study.....31
3.3. Participants.....32
3.4. Data Collection Tools.....33
3.4.1. Background Information of Participants.....33
3.4.2. Consent Forms.....33
3.4.3. Metalinguistic Tests.....34
3.4.4. End of the Term Grades.....34
3.4.5. Student Interviews.....35
3.5. The Pilot Study.....35
3.6. Data Analysis.....35

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS

4.0. Introduction.....37
4.1. The Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Students' Metalinguistic Awareness in Turkish.....37
4.1.1. The Results of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Tests.....37
4.1.2. The Normality Test Result of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test.....39

4.1.3. The Results of Bilingual and Monolingual Groups' Metalinguistic Awareness Tests in Turkish.....40
4.2. The Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Students' Metalinguistic Awareness in English.....41
4.2.1. The Results of English Metalinguistic Awareness Tests.....42
4.2.2. The Normality Test Result of English Metalinguistic Awareness Test.....43
4.2.3. The Results of Bilingual and Monolingual Groups' Metalinguistic Awareness Tests in English.....44
4.3. Correlation between English and Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales and English Grades of all Students.....46
4.3.1. The Correlation of Turkish and English Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales with English Grades of Monolingual Students.....48
4.3.2. The Correlation of Turkish and English Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales with English Grades of Bilingual Students.....52
4.4. The Findings of Interviews with the Bilingual Students.....56
4.4.1. The Opinions of the Bilingual Students on the English as a Foreign Language.....57
4.4.2. The Opinions of the Bilingual Students on the Impact of Languages on Each Other.....58

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.0. Introduction.....60
5.1. Discussion.....60
5.1.1. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups on Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness.....61
5.1.2. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups on English Metalinguistic Awareness.....63
5.1.2.1. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups on English Grades.....65
5.1.3. The Correlation between Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades.....66
5.1.4. Analysis of the Interviews with Bilingual Students.....68

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.0. Introduction.....70

6.1. Conclusion.....70

6.2. Implications of the Study.....73

6.3. Suggestions for Further Studies.....73

REFERENCES.....75

APPENDICES.....81

CURRICULUM VITAE.....97

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL English as Foreign Language

MAT Metalinguistic Awareness Test

SES Socio-Economic Status

SLA Second Language Acquisiton

SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences

TLA Third Language Acquisiton

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. The Group Statistics of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and Its Sub Categories (Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax).....38

Table 2. The Normality Test of Turkish Metalinguistic Tests and Its Elements.....39

Table 3.The Mean Scores of Turkish MAT and Its Elements of the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups.....40

Table 4. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test and Its Elements.....41

Table 5. The Group Statistics of English Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and Sub Categories (Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax).....42

Table 6. The Normality Test of English Metalinguistic Tests and Its Elements.....44

Table 7. The Mean Scores of English MAT and Its Elements of the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups.....45

Table 8. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups of English Metalinguistic Awareness Test and Its Elements.....45

Table 9. The Group Statistics of both Tests and English Grades of Students.....47

Table 10. The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness in Turkish, English and English Grades of All Students.....48

Table 11. The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and English Grades of Monolingual Students.....49

Table 12. The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Monolingual Group.....50

Table 13. The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of English Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Monolingual Group.....51

Table 14. The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and English Grades of Bilingual students.....53

Table 15. The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Bilingual Group.....54

Table 16. The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Bilingual Group.....55

LIST OF APPENDICES

Page

Appendix 1. Consent Form.....81
Appendix 2. Background Information Form.....83
Appendix 3. Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test.....87
Appendix 4. English Metalinguistic Awareness Test.....93
Appendix 5. Semi Structured Interview Questions.....96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

Bilingualism as a notion of language education has aroused the attention of many researchers in various regions and fields around the world. The relation between bilingualism and different concepts has been debated due to its diverse nature that varies accordingly the contexts that bilingualism exists or emerges. Among different components of bilingualism, language and its properties have been examined thoroughly with the intention to identify how it affects the learning process in general terms. Particularly, the linguistic competence of learners has been found related to cognition and further learning abilities (Cummins, 1976; Jessner, 2006).

Furthermore, the metalinguistic awareness and its relation with bilingualism and learning process of other languages have become one of the highlighted issues (Ben-Zeez, 1977; Bialystok, 1986, 1987, 2001; Bild and Swain, 1989; Cenoz, 2003). Metalinguistic awareness, in a broad sense, has a role in the general language learning process of children, which already starts in earlier stages of childhood. Besides, it is effective in many areas such as cognition, creative thinking abilities, and linguistic performance.

The classrooms where bilinguals who speak different heritage languages, are the places where students learn a third language. The role of language and its components arouse the attention since the metalinguistic awareness levels of learners can be related to both the process and outcomes of the learning experience. Thus, the new language cannot be isolated from the general linguistic performances of learners (Bild & Swain, 1989; Thomas, 1992)

This study aims to focus on whether there is a correlation between metalinguistic awareness and English as a foreign language success of heritage language speaker bilinguals. Especially in socially different areas, where learners have a home language and Turkish is mostly spoken in the school environment.

1.1. Background of the Study

Bilingualism and multilingualism can be described as knowing two or more languages which can be acquired simultaneously or sequentially. These notions have become popular with the growing population of bilingual and multilingual communities and gained importance in language acquisition. Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) state that "the terms bilingualism and multilingualism have come to be used, respectively, to refer to the knowledge and use of two languages and the knowledge and use of three or more languages" (p. xxi). Alongside the growth of number in people who are bilingual or multilingual, the number of studies and hypothesis dealing with their existence and effects has greatly increased.

The effect of bilingualism of minority language speakers has been mostly stated as a lowering factor in language learning settings until the early 1960s (Cummins, 1976). However, Cummins (1976) states that there have been some theoretical problems with the studies conducted, focusing on an attempt to construct a frame. Cummins (1976) has developed a notion called threshold level hypothesis and has explained as following: "There may be a threshold level of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive deficits and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his cognitive functioning" (1978a, p. 3). Afterward, the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and bilingualism (or multilingualism) which affects language skills in terms of cognition and third language acquisition has been started to be discussed among bilingual studies. For instance, Bialystok (2001) explains the term metalinguistic awareness with its effects on language learning referring to earlier studies.

Furthermore, Cenoz (2003) focuses on studies dealing with the effect of bilingualism on cognitive development and third language acquisition, hence it has been pointed out that metalinguistic awareness can be accepted as a mediator between the concepts of bilingualism and third-language (L3) acquisition. In her study, Jessner (2008) investigates the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and second and/or third language acquisition with respect to the different models. She concludes that metalinguistic awareness and knowledge play a significant role in language acquisition. Several numbers of studies have aroused the interest on metalinguistic studies with the aim of identification its relationship with cognition and language (Ben-Zeev, 1977; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Peal & Lambert, 1962; Jessner, 2006).

In particular, some researchers such as Mesaros (2008) and Ringbom (1987), base their studies on the acquisition of English, yet it is the most common third language in a deal number of communities. Moreover, it has been focused on the metalinguistic awareness with different aspects of language such as reading, writing and/or general skills of the language (Gelderen & Schoonen & Glopper, 2003; Jorda, 2003; Rauch & Nauman & Jude, 2011). These studies have found positive, negative and neutral relation between metalinguistic awareness and other skills in terms of correlation of these skills and language acquisition.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Problems may occur in almost every language class that differ regarding the aspects of the teaching process. Students can be noted as experiencing problems in terms of communication and language not only in the target language (English) but also in common source language (Turkish) in the classroom. It has been noted that as both researcher and a teacher, this study has mainly focused on the problem in terms of language. There might be different reasons for this problem which requires an analysis regarding all components of teaching such as effects of family, environment, classroom, and motivation of learners. In this study, only one of these reasons has been determined as a theme. The role of the correlation of metalinguistic awareness in Turkish and English languages of participants has been aimed to be evaluated throughout the study.

First of all, the area in which the schools of this study are located, can be called as socially different due to the socio-economic backgrounds of families and the area where they live in as most of them have immigrated from other cities in Turkey. The fact that students have certain heritage languages which are generally spoken at home by parents, requires an analysis in terms of the language skills of students. However; it is possible to focus on several other reasons such as linguistic knowledge and learner motivation which can affect the language learning performances and problems in classrooms. In this present study, metalinguistic awareness of learners has been chosen because rather than the consequences of the language teaching process, it may construct the roots of the problems which have been experienced in similar contexts.

1.3. Research Questions

In this study, it is aimed to investigate the problems that students have experienced in terms of communication and comprehension both in source and target languages in English as Foreign Language (EFL) courses, especially in certain districts where heritage language speaker bilinguals live in. As a component of language, metalinguistic awareness, which is above the language itself, has been chosen as a path for identification of the problem.

Accordingly, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there any difference in terms of Turkish metalinguistic awareness between Turkish monolinguals and bilinguals who have a heritage language spoken at home?

2. Is there any difference between monolinguals and bilinguals in English metalinguistic awareness tests?

3. Does metalinguistic awareness in both Turkish and English languages have a correlation with English as a foreign language success of bilingual students, especially from different social backgrounds?

4. What are the views of the bilingual students on the extreme regarding their success/unsuccess in English classes?

The data had been obtained from metalinguistic tests in both Turkish and English which will be answered by both bilingual and monolingual Secondary School students. English as a foreign language success of students has been judged according to the end of the year grades. The results of each group tests' and English grades have been evaluated and compared according to groups of students and groups of tests.

1.4. Significance of the Study

There have been a number of studies focusing on metalinguistic awareness and other components of language in both English and other languages in terms of second and third language acquisition (Kemp, 2001; Jorda, 2003; Van Gelderen & Schoonen & Glopper, 2003; Rauch & Nauman & Jude, 2011). Hence the results of these studies reflect various relations; it is difficult to claim a certain inference about whether levels of metalinguistic awareness cause advantage or disadvantage for learners. In Turkish contexts, related research on metalinguistic awareness in Turkish language (Beyret, 2015); metalinguistic awareness and its relationship with some aspects of learning English skills of university students (Baytar, 2016; Yeşilyurt, 2005) have been studied. However, there has not been any published studies that focus on the relation between

metalinguistic awareness and EFL of heritage language bilingual secondary school students in Turkey. This study presents a point of view to identify the problems encountered in EFL classrooms in terms of a language with respect to metalinguistic awareness levels of students both in Turkish and English.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

In the present study, there are certain limitations that require to be highlighted and explained. This study has been conducted with students who study in two different schools in Adana, "80. Yıl Ortaokulu" in Dağlıoğlu province and "Kılıçarslan Ortaokulu" in Yüreğir province, in Adana. However; although socioeconomic status (SES) of students are similar, they have some certain differences in terms of social and cultural backgrounds which can be accepted as the limitations of this study.

1.6. Operational Definitions

Monolingualism: In this study, the term monolingualism refers to the speakers who have one language at home, at school or in other places. Turkish monolinguals are selected as the participants to identify the specific role of bilingualism exists. (Baker & Jones, 1998).

Bilingualism: In this study, bilingualism refers to speakers who have more than one language at home and/or at school. In the literature review chapter, detailed information will be explained. (Baker & Jones, 1998).

Heritage Bilingualism: It is a type of bilingualism in circumstances where one of the languages is acquired as a non-dominant language; it is spoken at smaller communities (only at home), learned from elder relatives of families. Sometimes it is spoken and understood but not written and read by the members of a certain community. (Kelleher, 2010).

Metalinguistic Awareness: In this study, metalinguistic awareness of learners means their competence of language beyond itself. It is basically referred to four different abilities as follows; phonological, morphological, semantical and syntax knowledge of learners. (Bialystok, 2001; Cenoz, 2003)

English as a Foreign Language: In this study, this term refers to the competence of participants who study English as a foreign language subject at their schools. Their academic success in English is taken into account according to the groups they create.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. A Conceptual Introduction

In this chapter, first of all, a brief definition and different types of bilingualism have been introduced. Secondly, as mostly referred theories in multilingual studies which have been dealing with metalinguistic concepts; threshold level and interdependence hypotheses have been presented. Then the importance of certain aspects of linguistics related to additional learning has been mentioned as a function of language. Afterward, metalinguistic awareness has been explained regarding its effects on language learning in general. In the last part, learning English as a third language process of bilinguals have been explained focusing mainly on the effects of bilingualism and aspects of metalinguistic awareness of learners in the existing literature.

2.1. What is Bilingualism?

Bilingualism, in other words, multilingualism, can be described as knowing two or more languages acquired concurrently or consecutively. While monolingualism basically refers to knowledge of one certain language, bilingualism is not easy to define. In an earlier and a general sense, Bloomfield (1933) defines bilingualism as "native-like control of two languages" (p.56). The notion has become popular with the growing population of bilingual and multilingual communities and gained importance in language acquisition and learning. Thereby the world has changed and the understanding of the language concept has improved; the definition of bilingualism has evolved. While Bloomfield emphasizes the degree of knowledge of success, the point of view on the proficiency of languages has been started to be discussed. Hamers and Blanc (1989) try to determine the bilingualism by considering several factors such as psychological, cognitive, psycholinguistic, socio-psychological, social, sociological, and social linguistic, socio-cultural and linguistic factors. Baker and Jones (1998) and Bialystok (2001) ask questions to figure out how to identify someone as bilingual because there are various reasons behind the notion. It is not easy to accept 'native-like control' ability to be called as bilingual in the modern world of these days.

Meanwhile, the effort on trying to define bilingualism may have caused discussions in the academic fields of language learning. However, it seems possible to accept bilingualism as "an umbrella term" rather than focusing on certain competencies and performances (Hoff & McCardle, 2006). A wider perspective on bilingualism may sustain various opportunities to concentrate on dealing with problems such as communication and comprehension that bilinguals encounter every day.

More recently, Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) state that "the terms bilingualism and multilingualism have come to be used, respectively, to refer to the knowledge and use of two languages and the knowledge and use of three or more languages" (p. xxi). Thus, it is understood that there is not a certain definition but there are some definitions with the increasing number of bilingual people. Alongside the growth of number in people who are bilingual or multilingual, the number of studies and hypotheses dealing with their existence and effects has greatly increased. As it is hard to state a single definition, it is meaningful to focus on types of bilingualism which propose a more comprehensive approach on related studies.

2.1.1. Types of Bilingualism

Bilingualism, a single word, is not enough to define the meaning that it carries due to its various types. The reason behind the types of bilingualism lies in the nature of it, which causes it to be called with diverse fore-words and adjectives. Baker and Jones (1998) explain bilingualism types in detail according to the contexts they have emerged. Furthermore, almost all definitions of the types of bilingualism are stated as follows:

- Achieved [Successive] Bilingualism: The acquisition of bilingualism later than childhood.
- Additive Bilingualism: A situation where a second language is learnt by an individual or a group without detracting from the maintenance and development of the first language.
- Ascribed Bilingualism: The acquisition of bilingualism early in childhood.
- Balanced Bilingualism: Approximately equal competence in two languages.
- Compound Bilingualism: One language is learnt at the same time as another, often in the same context.
- Diagonal Bilingualism: Situations where a 'non-standard' language or a dialect co-exists with an unrelated 'standard' language.
- Horizontal Bilingualism: Situations where two languages have similar or equal status.

- Passive Bilingualism: Being able to understand in a second language without speaking or writing in that language.
- Primary Bilingualism: Where two languages have learnt naturally.
- Receptive Bilingualism: Understanding and reading a second language without speaking and or writing in that language.
- Secondary Bilingualism: The second language has been formally learnt.
- Sequential Bilingualism: Bilingualism achieved via learning a second language later than the first language.
- Simultaneous Bilingualism: Bilingualism achieved via acquiring a first and a second language concurrently.
- Subtractive Bilingualism: A situation in which a second language is learnt at the expense of the first language, and gradually replaces the first language (Baker & Jones, 1998, pp. 698-706).

Furthermore, the relation between family and bilingualism is also another reason for some sub-categories of bilingualism since the family is one of the places where the languages have been acquired. The degree and/or existence of bilingualism of children may be based on the dominance of languages, knowledge and usage of parents at home. According to Baker and Jones (1998), heritage language can be accepted as an indigenous language or ancestral language. Furthermore, Kelleher (2010) explains that heritage language simply refers to language (or languages) other than dominant language in a given context. If the language has been spoken generally by elder relatives of the community and young members can either write and read or understand and answer, it is still accepted as the heritage language. So, it can be referred that when there is a heritage notion, heritage bilingualism term emerges with the dominant language already exists. Thus, whether they are dominant or heritage, the levels of both languages can affect the language properties of people. In these types of situations, bilingualism can also be named as subtractive bilingualism and/or negative bilingualism.

Moreover, Baker and Jones (1989) defined additive and subtractive types of bilingualism; these two terms have gained a spectacular place in additional learning studies. Lambert (1981) also examines these terms and explains that additive bilingualism occurs when two languages nourish each other according to the results of the positive effects of bilingualism in studies. Lambert (1981) stated that “in the subtractive case, one’s degree of bilinguality at any time would likely reflect a stage in the disuse of the ethnic home language”, thus this situation may have ended with negative results in

additional learning performances (p. 12). Therefore, the effect of languages on each other is also another factor that influences the types of bilingualism is observed in a certain community. The subtractive bilingualism is often seen in environments where there is a dominant language and a minority language on certain occasions that the latter one is generally suppressed by the former one.

The concept of what type of bilingualism has been dealt with generally has taken into consideration during studies conducted, because the effects of each type can be varied in both quantity and/or quality in language related performances. In this study, the province where Kurdish is spoken as the heritage language and Turkish is the dominant language in school and social environments have been determined. As for bilinguals, both Turkish and their heritage languages are acquired simultaneously, however they are literate only in Turkish. Moreover, monolinguals have acquired Turkish both at home and school environment. Regarding the position of Turkish and their home language, the subtractive bilingualism and heritage bilingualism can be accepted as the types of bilingualism they have. It has been observed that both languages influence each other in a negative way, as one of them is generally used in the home environment (Meijers, 1992; Sanders & Meijers, 1995).

2.1.2. Effects of Bilingualism

There are various studies that deal with the positive and negative effects of bilingualism in language related issues such as cognition, competence, and production of language. Until the later period of the 1930s, there has been a tendency dealing with the language learning performances of bilingual immigrants in terms of English; generally, these opinions have come to the conclusions such that there may be a negative effect of bilingualism. However, Leopold (1949) accomplished a study with his own daughter, rather than labeling effects, bilingualism and its results on linguistic performances of his daughter were emphasized. Afterward, Peal and Lambert (1962) have conducted a study in Canada in a more detailed context than earlier studies. They refer that the link between bilingualism and cognition is positive due to the fact that the existence of two languages provides bilinguals a more flexible understanding of the world. Their study has become a milestone for further studies oncoming.

Therefore, with reference to the study of Peal and Lambert (1962) researchers have started to focus on features in detail. Pointing out the results of the study, Ianco-

Worall (1972) focused on the semantics and phonetic success of bilinguals over the unilinguals giving reference to Leopold's (1949) study. Afterward, Cummins (1976) focused on the linguistic competence of bilinguals referring to the cognitive superiority of bilingual participants. Ben-Zeev (1977) also attempted to investigate the effectiveness of cognitive strategy and development of bilinguals dealing with vocabulary knowledge of participants. Diaz (1985) mentions cognition and strategies used by bilinguals to provide a wider perspective in terms of the effects of bilingualism. All these and similar studies have opened a window to understand the language and language related concepts of bilinguals. On the base of these claims, both the causes and effects of bilingualism have been argued due to its fruitful nature, as it may be effective in positive or negative ways in learning and life experiences of bilingual people.

Primarily, influences of bilingualism on cognitive abilities of language have aroused the attention in the research areas. More recently, the studies comparing cognitive abilities of bilingual and monolingual participants have mainly reported that bilinguals have performed higher scores and results than monolinguals. In such studies, the conclusion that bilingualism takes advantages of cognitive advantages in conceptual, creative and analogical language performances has been commonly indicated (Diaz & Klinger, 1991; Ianco-Worall, 1972). Later on, Cook (1995) mentions that having two languages can be seen as a sharpening factor in language awareness while discussing the competence of bilinguals in terms of both languages.

Furthermore, metalinguistic knowledge and ability have been associated with bilingualism and this relation has been accepted as a positive influence for bilinguals (Bialystok, 1987; Cenoz, 2003). The metalinguistic abilities are related to controlling the language processing which helps learners to build better understanding and performance for bilinguals. Thus, metalinguistic awareness can be seen as a cause of being bilingual that helps to develop other skills in the language. It is also accepted that being bilingual may influence metalinguistic awareness of people.

In recent years, there are some researchers who have focused on the relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness. For example, Tellier and Roehr-Brackin (2013) studied how bilinguals develop metalinguistic awareness while learning Esperanto and French. They found that metalinguistic awareness of children has improved while they are becoming bilinguals. In Turkey, Beceren (2010) investigated performances of bilingual and monolingual participants on their metalinguistic development. There have been found different results that have been obtained from

different tasks, especially the bilingual student performed higher scores in word segmentation and symbol substitution tasks of metalinguistic abilities than the monolingual participant. In the Netherlands, Verhoeven et al. (2012) have also studied the performances of Turkish and Dutch bilinguals and compared with Dutch monolinguals, concluding that higher results in L1 have been found to be related to L2 accuracy in certain tasks. On the grounds that the Turkish-Dutch bilinguals have been accepted as having linguistic impairmants, the effects of bilingualism in that context have also been discussed. It is understood that the degree of bilingualism and the context of studies may be effective on the influences of the causes and effects of the problems bilingualism can be effective in all or in some tasks of metalinguistic awareness and abilities of language learners (Brohy, 2001; Greissler, 2001; Thomas, 1988).

Additionally, to these types of effects, bilingualism also influences the third language acquisition and learning in certain aspects. The categorization of its influence on third language and related studies are surveyed in further chapters with more detailed explanations.

2.1.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of Bilingualism

Over the time surveys related to influences of bilingualism have evolved from negative to positive. Thanks to the contexts of research; questions such as where with whom and when the studies conducted have started to be asked. These types of questions have played a great role in the identification of the results of studies as portraying the frame of the bilingualism as advantageous or disadvantageous.

Baker and Jones (1998) explain both the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism in detail from a contextual perspective. According to their study, the advantages can be listed in three groups; social, cultural and cognitive. Bilingual people in case there are elderly relatives and/or marriage of different language speakers have taken place, communicate in different languages in the family than other areas. This helps them to communicate with a wider scope of people both in family or community they belong to. Other than family relations, traveling across or transnational interactions are thought to be easier thanks to being bilingual. Gaining language sensitivity and self-monitoring are accepted as the tools for more useful during having communications. Cultural advantages of bilingualism culminate more experience, economic advantages and lifting barriers easily. Due to being bilingual, adopting differences of other cultures

and trades occurs with relative ease. Moreover, creative thinking and thinking in a more flexible way are accepted as the cognitive advantages of bilingualism. It is mostly stated that bilingual people have creative thinking abilities and perform higher results at problem-solving tasks (Bialystok, 2001).

There is a line between some certain linguistic disadvantages and the problems which are seen as the disadvantages of bilingualism in particular. Baker and Jones (1998) state that "delayed speech, personality problems, low self-esteem and concerns about self-identity" are thought as based on bilingualism without a certain explanation (p. 8). However, it is suggested that these can be results of failures gained during acquisition and education of the second language. Even so, there are certain disadvantages which can be seen as either temporary or permanent. Due to the bicultural environment of bilinguals, crisis and conflict of identity emerge as a consequence of not being able to adopt two identities at the same time. Therefore, it can be understood that identity problems may be one of the reasons for the language problems that bilinguals encounter. The outcomes of all these conflicts can also be accepted as some of the reasons of subtractive bilingualism.

It can be inferred that both the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism are personal and social. It is mainly about how people react against bilingualism they already have or acquire. In a social and cultural context, the position of language as a minority or majority language can be effective in creating a perspective on bilingualism. Especially, for the disadvantageous effects of bilingualism, personal and social reasons seem to be intervened.

2.2. Bilingualism and Related Theories

The popularity of studies on bilingualism has been continually increased in accordance with the perspectives of research have varied according to contexts and communities. Variety of studies may have caused various results, thus, making generalizations has become harder. However, Cummins (1976, 1979) conducting research and surveys, pointed out two main hypotheses related to bilingualism and language learning/acquisition processes. In order to explain the success and failure of learning, additional learning through the levels of threshold that learners have gained has been emphasized by Cummins (1976, 1979). In further studies, he has focused more on linguistic phases of individual learners as developed and related to linguistic

performances. In the following sections, these main hypotheses; threshold level and interdependence hypotheses have been explained.

2.2.1 Threshold Level Hypothesis

Regarding the studies related to bilingualism, Cummins (1976) has developed a notion called threshold level hypothesis and explains as following: “There may be a threshold level of L2 competence which pupils must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence their cognitive functioning” (p.23). Threshold levels of learners are accepted as the reason behind their performances on language related issues. For bilinguals, it is understood that when a learner has already reached this level, higher results are expected. On the other hand, it is referred that the failure of language performances is based on poor levels at the threshold in two or more languages.

In following years, Cummins (1979) reviews and evaluates the methods of studies on bilingualism grouping them according to both factors taken into consideration and results obtained from these studies. Subsequently, it is referred that while “positive” resulted studies are from the areas where both languages are prestigious, “negative” resulted studies are conducted in areas where L1s are the minority languages and L2s are the dominant ones (Cummins, 1979). Therefore, it is understood that as it is stated in earlier studies (Cummins 1976, 1978a), the threshold level competence attainment can provide higher cognitive development results.

Just after the release of the threshold level hypothesis as a concept, discussions on the roles of the hypothesis have emerged. Lambert (1981) gives reference to the hypothesis in terms of explaining the benefits of bilinguality. In a theoretical study, Cenoz and Genesee (1998) mentions the usefulness of the threshold hypothesis in determining the different results of language performances of bilinguals. It is explained that higher degrees of threshold level are related to higher degrees of cognitive abilities. Later on, Jessner (2006) describes the threshold hypothesis as a critical point for learners to obtain higher benefits from cognitive and linguistic competences of bilingualism with giving reference to Cummins.

Lasagabaster (1998) is one of the primary researchers who have tested the threshold level hypothesis in a multilingual context rather than a second language environment. It is understood that higher levels of threshold are related to higher

competences of both first and second languages in the circumstances where a third language has been learned. In the analysis part of the study, it is concluded that threshold levels are accelerating in accordance with the numbers of languages involved.

2.2.2. Developmental and Linguistic Interdependence Hypotheses

In addition to threshold hypothesis, Cummins (1979) explains the role of the Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis in terms of L1 and L2 competence pointing out that the already gained competence of L1 is related to developing competence of L2. According to status of L1 as a minority or a dominant language, L1 proficiency of learners ceases or develops while L2 is being acquired or learned in school environment. Briefly, Cummins (1979) states that "the hypothesis proposes that there is an interaction between the language of instruction and the type of competence the child has developed in his L1 prior to school" (p. 223). Thus, the languages in contact have an interaction regarding the competence in linguistic abilities of each language.

In further studies, Cummins (1991) evaluates the results of studies dealing with interdependence theory affecting L1 and L2 learning in different circumstances. He concludes that linguistic interdependence is mainly the common outcome of bilingualism and multilingualism concepts. It is also understood that L1 competence and performance is related to L2 of individuals.

Jessner (2006) explains linguistic interdependence hypothesis by depending on the role of linguistic ability of bilinguals when L1 and L2 (and also other languages) are involved with interaction. It is inferred that knowledge of linguistic is similar on certain grounds and accepted as general for both languages. The mutual interaction between languages creates a new understanding of linguistics. Therefore, these theories and studies can be seen as a path to a more specific research area; focusing on linguistics as an aspect in bilingual and trilingual studies.

2.3. Bilingualism and Linguistic Abilities

Bilingualism researchers turned their path into specific sub-categories rather than investigating bilingual matters as a whole which has already become inadequate to identify both causes and effects of bilingualism. Along with the improvements on language studies in general, the scope of bilingualism has expanded. The language itself is bound with linguistics; neither monolingualism nor bilingualism excludes linguistics as a concept. In fact, the rising number of languages involved raises the questions about linguistic notions. In this chapter, linguistic competence has been explained and the relation of linguistic awareness and bilingualism has been presented (Cummins, 1976; Sinclair, 1978).

2.3.1. Linguistic Competence

Having the knowledge of one language is a combined concept that contains different linguistic and cognitive competences. Languages are generally accepted as composed of different skills and components such as reading, writing, listening speaking, pragmatic, grammar and linguistic. As one of them, linguistic competence has been discussed in certain research areas such as linguistics and psychology regarding the development of language of human kind. Chomsky (2006) describes the linguistic competence as an ability to "operate on the data of sense and produce knowledge of language" (p. 20). In further parts of his book, "linguistic competence," has been stated as related to language knowledge, as a tool which "involves a mastery of grammatical processes" (Chomsky, 2006, p. 27).

The role of linguistic competence which has been tested through grammatical knowledge of a certain language has been emphasized in some studies. For instance, Klein (1995), takes Universal Grammar (UG) which has been developed by Chomsky, as a starting point in her study investigating acquisition of the second and the third language. UG is located on the base of the study to explain the usage of grammaticality judgement tests that evaluate learners skills in terms of linguistic and metalinguistic abilities. Furthermore, Cook (1995) focuses on linguistic competences of language learners and coins the term "multi competence" in order to refer the ability of having competences of different languages at the same time (p. 94).

2.3.2. Linguistic Awareness

According to the types of bilingualism, whether it is a substractive or an additive bilingualism; factors that affect learners and their performances may have changed the results of related studies (Meijers, 1992; Thomas, 1988). With an attempt to figure out inconsistency between earlier studies, Cummins (1976) tries to frame an outline, focusing on linguistic abilities. He refers that the linguistic competence levels may mediate the cognition of bilingual children. Linguistic competences of bilinguals differ according to social, educational and cognitional reasons.

Sinclair (1978) refers to linguistic awareness as both the cause and the effect of language learning process and claims that it emerges when more than one language contact with each other. Where bilingualism starts, one's linguistic awareness plays a role in the learning process of a language. In her study, Clark (1978) focuses on how children utilise linguistic awareness while acquiring language. Depending on the surveying earlier studies, Clark (1978) mentions the development of language in children is related to linguistic awareness with the revelation of language structure, lexical and morphological systems as well as the function of it. Additionally, it is stated that there is a link between language awareness and metacognitive skills of learnes as the participants in the study. It can be understood that evaluating the linguistic awareness and its meaning can be related to the role played by linguistics and metacognitive knowledge.

On the other hand, in more recent years, a discussion on the distinction between language awareness and linguistic awareness has aroused the attention. Whereas these two concepts are not separated from each other in some studies (Cummins, 1979; Ianco-Worall, 1972), it is also accepted that these are distinctive in a deeper sense. Masny (1997) discusses the differences between language awareness and linguistic awareness based on in which order language knowledge and linguistic knowledge have been acquired.

2.3.3. The Cross-Linguistic Influence

Languages are unique entities that have various characteristics that help them to differ or resemble other ones. As one of them, linguistic features have been debated in certain language related research areas. Both mother tongue learning and foreign language(s) learning research include linguistic studies. Especially, in second language or third (also fourth, fifth ...) language learning cross-linguistic influence has been discussed (Mesaros, 2008).

The effect of languages on each other has been studied according to the context and participants of the research areas. There are some studies focusing on two languages in contact and in some other studies the existence and relation between three languages have been debated. In Turkish context, Sofu (2009) investigates language shift and maintenance of Turkish and Arabic languages through interviews with three generations in order to identify the way and role of the shift between two languages in contact. From the other perspective, involving three languages, Mesaros (2008) reports the possible outcomes and results of learning a third language (English) focusing on the theoretical background of cross-linguistic influence. In the study, learning English of Spanish monolinguals and Spanish-Romanian bilinguals who immigrated to Spain has been outlined in terms of linguistic features of all three languages involved. It is stated that all three languages are close to each other, however, Romanian and English have more common linguistic notions which can help bilinguals to learn English more easily than Spanish monolinguals.

2.4. Metalinguistic Awareness

In recent years, along with the development on the research area on bilingual issues, a more specific notion has mainly been discussed to investigate the relationship between multilingualism and linguistics in a more detailed perspective, which is Metalinguistic Awareness of language learners. Diaz and Klinger (1991) state that the achievement of researchers enlightened the relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic performance of bilingual children with giving reference to earlier studies of Vygotsky (1962) and Leopold (1949). Briefly Thomas (1992), in her study, attempts to make a definition of metalinguistic awareness “as an individual's ability to focus attention on language as an object in and of itself, to reflect upon language, and to evaluate it” (p. 531).

Metalinguistic as a debated concept is above the language and it is in the base of language related functions. It is composed of certain elements that help the learners to talk about language. Chaudron (1983) refers to that language is accepted as an object regarding metalinguistic awareness after surveying earlier studies on metalinguistic. In this sense, the language is used with the aim of speaking of language in a deeper sense such as evaluating, compensating, and performing itself. These are aspects of language which are gained by learners to perform certain linguistic abilities. Bialystok (1986)

discusses the concept of metalinguistic awareness as "as a reflection of the growth of two skill components involved in language process" which are the abilities to analyze and control the language by using it (p. 498). These two skills of language are related to metalinguistic abilities thus may lead an outcome of awareness of metalinguistic.

Furthermore, Bialystok (2001) mentions that metalinguistic differ from linguistic performance by this statement:

> Hence, metalinguistic skills separate from linguistic skills by virtue of some characteristic property or demand, for example, attention to form rather than meaning; metalinguistic knowledge is identifiable from linguistic knowledge because of its representational form, for example, it is more explicit; and metalinguistic tasks are those that assess metalinguistic rather than linguistic performance, for example, talking about language rather than simply using it (p.129).

These reasons explain the need of metalinguistic when the matter comes to talk about language rather than ability to use a language. Thus, the significance of metalinguistic awareness has been highlighted in terms of capacity of learners to represent their knowledge.

Moreover, Jessner (2006) evaluates metalinguistic awareness as changing the attention from language in general to being able to "think abstractly", objectively and manipulatively about a language. It is stated that these abilities are performed in a better way by multilinguals than monolinguals (p.42). Metalinguistic awareness and abilities are used as the tools to evaluate language performances of monolinguals, bilinguals, trilinguals and multilinguals in various contexts.

2.4.1. Defining Characteristics and Evaluation of Metalinguistic Awareness

Definition of metalinguistic, as being more than language itself, requires further explanations on characteristics of language in a more detailed way. In the research area, different characteristics such as abilities on controlling and thinking about language are matched with metalinguistic abilities. Furthermore, the identification of characteristics of metalinguistic awareness is related to figuring out how to evaluate performances of language learners. Bialystok (1986) referring to earlier studies, focuses on the analysis and control skills on language which are accepted as the two main features of metalinguistic achievements. It is also emphasized that to evaluate metalinguistic

awareness through these abilities is commonly conducted with a set of tasks rather than one single task.

From a different perspective, there are some sub-categories, which constitute the features of metalinguistic awareness that are listed differently by various researchers. Especially, Tunmer et al. (1988) construct a certain categorization of metalinguistic awareness in a basic perspective. According to them, there are four main elements that construct metalinguistic awareness as "phonology, word, syntax and pragmatic awareness" (p. 136). According to Tunmer et al., these components play significant roles in different metalinguistic abilities of learners. These metalinguistic abilities are listed as certain roles in some aspects such as competences in spoken language, performance in mental operations on sentence and context levels.

On the other hand, the evaluation of metalinguistic awareness has been one of hot debates in the field. There are different tests which are composed and used by various researchers around the world as listed following. First of all, Pinto et al (cited in Jessner, 2006) have created a certain set of tasks which is grouped according to ages of learners from early childhood to adulthood. Besides, there are some tests which evaluate the metalinguistic in terms of grammaticality (Bialystok, 1986; Chaudron, 1983; Klein 1995; Sorace, 1985; Zobl, 1992). Furthermore, it has been observed that some individual investigators may have adapted from other studies and prepared various metalinguistic tests basing on components of language such as phonology, morphology, semantics, syntax, word formation and translation (Baytar, 2016; Beyret, 2015; Kemp, 2001; Yeşilyurt, 2005).

In Chaudron's (1983) study, grammaticality judgment has been seen as one of the methods related to "the elicitation of metalinguistic", especially considering second language involved circumstances (pp. 343-344). According to the earlier studies mentioned which are grouped in terms of the number of language used (L1 and/or L2), there is a common tendency to evaluate the metalinguistic abilities on focusing the language performances of learners. These performances are about how learners comprehend the text, give meaning to examples, identify errors, develop their performances, and correct sentences and phonemes (Chaudron, 1983). It can be inferred that testing through grammaticality has been accepted as an appropriate way of evaluation of metalinguistic skills.

Following the path of grammaticality tests, Zobl (1992) and Klein (1995) uses different sets of questions in their studies with referring metalinguistic and linguistic

abilities. Zobl (1992), conducts a cloze test and interviews with the aim of evaluating grammar formulation ability of learners and their previous linguistic knowledge. In addition, Klein (1995) investigates learners' lexical and syntactic learning by applying a set of grammar tests. In both studies, metalinguistic knowledge and awareness of learners are evaluated through these tests because the aims of these tests were about abilities of participants on reflecting language rather than simply proficiencies.

As another issue of evaluation of metalinguistic, the language of metalinguistic tasks differs according to the contexts of studies. Bialystok (1986) states that the common language, which is English in her study, of monolinguals and bilinguals "a more comparable" way has been followed (p. 505). In addition, there are studies (Kemp, 2001; Klein, 1995; Mägiste, 1984) which use the target languages as the languages of tasks in order to see the improvement of learners in the second language learning and the third language learning. Especially, where more than one home language is involved or illiteracy of minority language is observed, the common and the target languages are chosen by the researchers (Brohy, 2001; Ringbom, 1987)

2.4.2. Effects of Metalinguistic Awareness

As a fundamental notion, metalinguistic awareness has been investigated in different research areas related to language along with the emergence of the term. According to Jessner (2006) linguistics, developmental psycholinguistics and educational psycholinguistics focus on the concept of metalinguistic and its effect on various perspectives such as effects on linguistic, cognitive and creative skills of language learners.

One of the debates on the effect of metalinguistic awareness is also related to bilingualism. It has been referred that there is a mutual effect between bilingualism and metalinguistic. Bialystok (1987) explains that bilingualism is effective in developing metalinguistic skills and metalinguistic helps to obtain more successful bilingualism performances (p. 154). After that, Galambos and Hakuta (1988) investigate the effects of metalinguistic in bilingual children educational setting by drawing a frame within the subject and task features. Different results have been gained and the existence of the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and bilingualism has been observed in older children. Similarly, giving reference to this mutual effect, Kemp (2001) also focuses

on the relation between bilingualism and metalinguistic achievement of different language learners.

Afterward, Bild and Swain (1989) surveying earlier studies on the effect of knowing more than one language such as Cummins (1976) and Peal and Lambert (1962), has emphasized a crucial point which is metalinguistic awareness and its role is explained as the facilitator of additional language learning (p. 258). Having high levels of metalinguistic awareness is found to be related to higher degrees of language learning performances when it comes to learning third or more languages.

In her study, Cook (1995) compares the awareness of metalinguistic of people having more than one language and having only one language. It can be inferred that former ones have a different level of awareness than the latter ones. Afterward, Jessner (1997) explains the difference on metalinguistic awareness of multilingual speakers in terms of their ability on thinking, translation, communication and metapragmatic skills. It is understood that metalinguistic awareness, especially, is found to have an important role in certain aspects regarding language and related skills.

Furthermore, Cenoz (2003) focuses on studies dealing with the effects of bilingualism on cognitive development and the third language acquisition, there, it is pointed out that metalinguistic awareness can be accepted as a mediator between the concepts of bilingualism and third-language (L3) acquisition. In her study, Jessner (2008) investigates the relation between metalinguistic awareness and the second and/or the third language acquisition with respect to the Dynamic System Theory model which briefly means an existing dynamic relation between languages and learning environments. She concludes that metalinguistic awareness and knowledge play a significant role in language acquisition.

After all, it can be referred that the role of metalinguistic awareness in language learning, especially in a third language, can be accepted as a significant effect. The high levels of metalinguistic awareness is seen as parallel to the higher degress of the third language acquisiton.

2.5. The Third Language Learning

All these discussions on bilingualism, linguistics and metalinguistics have relation with a third language at certain perspectives. The globalization and emergence of bilingualism, knowledge or acquisition of a third language have become inevitable in

many parts of the world. The status of English as a third language, and its relations with bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness are one of the topics in existing research areas such as linguistic and language teaching.

Generally, investigation of the third language notion has been conducted just after identification of the condition and relation of other two languages which are already had been known. Contexts of the studiesmay have also varied according to proficiency of languages of individuals and age of participants, thanks to differences such as in immersion programmes or conducted with languages that belongs to different backgrounds. Especially, whether bilingualism is additive or substractive has been debated. In additive contexts two of the languages are attained at a higher degree, whereas in subctractive cases one or both of the languages are influenced negatively because of social, education or personal reasons.

Additionaly, how home language language is used whether passive or active is also emphasized as an important factor by some researchers in their studies (Cenoz & Valencia, 1994; Mägiste, 1984). It is also debated that usage of all languages involved may lead to effective results as positive or negative in the third language learning environments.

Furthermore, the language proficiency levels of different participants can be seen as another aspect which defines the limits of trilingualism. In some contexts where participants are literate in two languages, it is easier to asses their knowledge of former languages. However, in some studies in which immigrants, socially different comunites and heritage or home language bilinguals have participated, it is commonly difficult to assess the knowledge of former language proficiencies of participants. These can be seen as other significant factors that affects the third language learning or acquisition settings.

2.5.1. English as a Second Language and English as a Third Language

It is widely known that English is one of the most spoken languages, and also one of the most learned and/or acquired languages around the world. Thanks to globalization of the world and other reasons related to this notion, the number of people who speak English has been continually increasing. English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) are accepted as the same notion by some research areas. In a general sense, the process of acquiring English as a foreign language happens

in circumstances where people learn English, as another language different than their native one(s), in formal and/or informal ways (Baker & Jones, 1998).

As in the example of English, other languages are also learned or acquired by monolinguals or bilinguals in various contexts. Thus, research areas dealing with language studies use the term of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) to discuss all languages involved. On the other hand, as another concept the Third Language Acquisition (TLA) has been taken into account while dealing with situations where a third language has been learned or acquired. Consecutively and/or subsequently, there can be fourth, fifth and so on languages; the term multilingualism is also used in the meaning of both two and more languages.

In the related research areas, much has been debated about knowing more than one language until recently. In her book, Jessner (2006) summarizes and states her final inferences focusing on all perspectives. In general, it is stated that there are two main approaches about the identification and categorization of TLA. Firstly, TLA is accepted as a sub-category of SLA which identifies people knowing other language(s) other than native one as being bilingual. Secondly, TLA is another category which is equal to SLA because of the fact that it has different aspects such as requires the knowledge of other languages more than two. Meanwhile, according to Jessner (2006), there is also another debate on the relation between TLA and multilinguality as significant factors. The Third Language Acquisition which is also called as trilingualism creates a question on how to identify fourth and other languages. At this point, it is stated that the discussion between TLA and SLA starts from a similar point; whether TLA is a branch of multilingualism or they are different topics as equal to each other which need to be held separately.

Alongside the increasing number of studies related to bilingualism, multilingualism and their relation with various concepts, as mentioned in previous chapters, it is understood that being bilingual may differ than being monolingual. However, a certain agreement has not been found regarding how to call each phenomenon. It may be rational that rather than naming the concepts, contexts of the studies conducted can be seen as determinant factors of surveys (Baker &Jones, 1998; Jessner, 2006)

2.5.2. The Role of Bilingualism on the Third Language Learning

It has been already mentioned in the previous chapters, the difference between bilingualism and trilingualism has opened a new direction on related studies. Jessner (2006) comments on the change of the perspectives of these terms with this statement:

> For a long time linguists have treated third language learning as a by-product of research on second language learning and acquisition. But nowadays it is known that learning a second language differs in many respects from learning a third language (p. 13).

Considering these two concepts as separate notions have led some researchers to focus on the role of bilingualism on third language acquisition and learning. Since it is accepted that bilingualism has an effect on being trilingual, there are two main groups of researchers who claim it has influence in a positive or negative way of acquiring a third language.

There are certain amounts of studies focusing on the revelation of the relationship between bilingualism and the third language confirmed the superiority of bilinguals on monolinguals. These studies are from different parts of the world with different contexts. For example, Ringbom (1987) investigates the learning process of English as a foreign language at school environment by comparing the results of Finnish and Swedish-Finnish people in Finland. In the study, the focus has been on the cross-linguistic effect of mother tongues on English as a second language; hence second language acquisition notion has been accepted as a general term for all languages acquired even forth or more. Even though the bilinguality of Swedish-Finnish has not been highlighted, it is stated that in some parts, Swedish and Finnish are used as mediums of instruction in some schools. The reason behind the absence of a certain focus on the role of bilingualism may be related to the date of the study conducted. The emphasis on the effectiveness of bilingualism on trilingualism is relatively a more recent concept. According to the results of tests conducted in the study, Swedish-Finnish outperformed Finnish in learning English, especially in earlier levels of learning. Similarly, Mesaros (2008) studies the cross-linguistic influence of languages with each other in a third language learning environment at the theoretical level. Relying on the earlier research evidence, Mesaros (2008) tries to explain the possible advantages of Romanian-Spanish bilinguals over Spanish monolinguals while learning English at school environment. It is stated that cross-

linguistic influence may be advantageous since English and Romanian have more common features other than sharing English and Spanish.

Thomas (1988) carried out research with English monolinguals and English-Spanish bilinguals on their learning process of French as a second and a third language, in Texas, the USA. The participants are college students as monolinguals and bilinguals, the latter ones were also divided into two groups according to their learning process of Spanish whether it is formally or informally. It has been stated that bilinguals outperformed monolinguals in both grammar tests and writing tasks. This result is explained with the superiority of bilinguals which they gained through learning the second language. Thomas (1988) states that "bilinguals learning a third language seem to have developed sensitivity to language as a system which helps them perform higher scores on those activities usually associated with formal language learning than monolinguals learning a foreign language for the first time" (1988, p. 240). In another region, the Basque country in Spain, Cenoz and Valencia (1994) did research on the effect of bilingualism on third language learning with Spanish and Basque-Spanish speaking students. The participants are chosen from immersion programs conducting schools, thus the concept of immersion is emphasized in the study since it is already accepted that this program provides the additive bilingual effect. In their study, the influence of bilingualism is evaluated through tests on English and also other aspects are taken into accounts such as age, socioeconomic status, and motivation of students. The study represents the positive effect of bilingualism on the third language alongside with some other variables. Afterward, Cenoz and Valencia (1994) have stated that "bilingualism has a positive mediating effect on third language learning" (, p. 204).

As a part of a longitudinal study, Brohy (2001) presents the position of bilingualism as being advantageous or disadvantageous in Samedan, Switzerland. There is a highly multilingual community where Rumansch, German, Italian are spoken. The influence of bilingualism on learning the third language (French) of Rumansch-German bilinguals comparing with German monolinguals is investigated in the study via various tests and opinions of students and teachers. According to the results, bilinguals outperformed monolinguals, especially in receptive skills. Brohy (2001) explains this situation as "the result of a more relaxed attitude toward using a foreign language" because they already have two other languages in their repertoire which can help them to build confidence while learning both new languages and new subjects (p. 47).

From a quite different point, though still related to bilingualism and trilingualism, Greissler (2001) investigates the effect of third language learning on second language proficiency in Austria. At the beginning of the study, the main idea is to evaluate the English learning process of students by comparing the circumstances of monolinguals and immersion program of bilinguals. Later on, the emergence of multilingualism all over the world, the circumstance of learning French as a third language is added to the investigation in additional learning settings studies. According to the results of the study of Greissler (2001), German-English bilinguals performed higher scores than German monolinguals and trilinguals who are learning French as L3. However, it can be inferred that trilinguals outperformed monolinguals in English performances due to their learning experience. The already gained experience on learning a language may have influenced second, third and so in language learning performances and language proficiencies (Greissler, 2001).

However, there are some studies claiming that bilinguals do not always perform higher than monolinguals when third language learning involved (e.g. Meijers 1992; Sanders & Meijers 1995; Schoonen et al. 2002). The results of bilinguals and monolinguals may not differ at all, this situation is explained with certain reasons. As one of them, Meijers (1992) state that the positive influence of bilingualism is mostly observed in studies of balanced bilinguals. Based on this study, Meijers (1992) investigates the English learning performances of Dutch monolinguals and Turkish-Dutch and Arabic-Dutch bilingual students, by applying some tests in Dutch and in English. According to the results, the study shows that "tests indicated that none of the differences were significant" of monolinguals and bilinguals in both languages (Meijers, 1992, p. 153). In a similar context, ten years later, Schoonen et al. (2002) carry out a study with native speakers and non-native speakers of Dutch to investigate especially their writing skills both in Dutch and in English. Likewise, "no essential differences" of Dutch and EFL were found in the writing results between native and non-native speakers of Dutch.

The main argument on the role of bilingualism that causes positive results or negative outcomes while learning the third language can be related to types of bilingualism. Since, it has been argued that additive or subtractive position of bilingualism can be effective in additional language learning situations (Cenoz and Genesee, 1998; Lambert, 1981). These types, such as additive and subtractive, have been

identified according to the context of bilingualism and third language acquisition emerges in people lives and societal environments.

2.5.3. The Role of Metalinguistic Awareness on the Third Language

Bialystok (2001) relates the knowledge of metalinguistic with the success in any other language gained. The mediating effect of metalinguistic has been emphasized in terms of second and especially third language acquisition. In most studies, English is seen as the third language acquired or learned (Cenoz and Valencia, 1994; Greissler, 2001; Lasagabaster, 1998; Ringbom, 1987). Additionally, there are also some studies in which the French language is seen as the third language acquired and/or learned (Bild & Swain, 1989; Brohy, 2001; Thomas, 1988, 1992).

Furthermore, Thomas (1988) conducts a study with monolinguals and bilinguals on learning French aiming to answer two main questions; first, the influence of bilingualism and second, the role of metalinguistic awareness of learners. The answer of the second question is found related to formally acquisition of the second language. The "conscious knowledge of the rules and forms of language" which is gained by students through formal instruction may increase the metalinguistic awareness of learners. Hereby, the performance of the third language "is facilitated by metalinguistic awareness" (Thomas, 1988, p. 236). In another study, Thomas (1992) reviews the role of metalinguistic awareness in language learning strategies in an environment where Spanish-English bilinguals and English monolinguals learn French as a third language. Especially, the role of communication while learning a foreign language has been investigated. It is concluded that bilinguals pay more attention and show awareness of the importance of communication strategies rather than monolinguals do.

Additionally, Bild and Swain (1989), focus on the effectiveness of metalinguistic awareness as a facilitator of language learning performances in immersion programs. The aim of their study is to investigate whether there is a difference between English speaking "Anglophone" monolinguals and the minority language bilinguals on learning French in immersion programs. The results showed that bilinguals showed "superiority" than monolinguals. In this case, it is explained with the metalinguistic awareness of bilinguals which is assumed that they have gained learning two other languages before learning French as their third one (Bild & Swain, 1989, p. 271).

There are some studies especially emphasized the significance of being literate in languages in terms of having metalinguistic awareness. For example, Bialystok (1987) discusses the role of bi-literacy of participants on the metalinguistic development they have. Moreover, in her doctoral thesis, Kemp (2001) studies the role of metalinguistic awareness of multilingual adults in learning another language via grammatical metalinguistic tasks in terms of implicit and explicit learning. Kemp (2001) refers that there is a mutual effect between metalinguistic awareness and language learning situations. In the study of Kemp (2001), it can be clearly understood that learning to read and write in other languages increases metalinguistic awareness while metalinguistic awareness helps to learn additional languages (p. 293).

Moreover, Jessner (2006) states that "due to the increased linguistic contact the trilingual learner develops skills and abilities such as enhanced metalinguistic awareness and metacognitive strategies" pointing out the limited or non-presence of these abilities in second language learners (p.61). It is also pointed out that management and learning of different languages are the skills gained through the help of metalinguistic awareness that learners already have had. Additionally, the development of a meta-system of third language learners has been emphasized in the related study.

In different periods of times and various regions in the world, the relation between metalinguistic awareness and language learning has been investigated from different point of views. Accepting the notions mentioned above, metalinguistic awareness and abilities taken into account with its components and additional language learning circumstances. As one of them, Klein (1995) claims that multilinguals perform over unilinguals in lexical and syntactic learning performances in a study used grammatically judgment tests referring to metalinguistic knowledge. In a more recent study, Huang (2018) conducts a study in Taiwan, learning Japanese as a third language of two different bilingual groups in terms of metalinguistic awareness. Especially, in the study, morphosyntactic and metamorphological elements were evaluated with different sets of tasks to identify metalinguistic awareness of the participants. It is concluded that bilinguals who showed higher scores on the metalinguistic awareness performances are the more successful learners of an L3. Later on, Andreou (2007) investigated the difference between bilingual and monolingual groups on phonological awareness in English as a foreign language; third for the bilinguals and the second for the monolinguals. According to the results, it has been stated that the bilingual group outperformed the monolingual group on phonological tasks. On the base of all these

studies, the bilinguals have been found advantageous because of having more languages in their repertoires.

It has been worthy to note that the evaluation of metalinguistic awareness and additional learning performances of language learners have presented various cause and effect relations. It has been understood that results may have changed according to the types of bilingualism, setting of studies, using testing methods and languages involved. According to the related literature, it can be referred that these differences and resemblances of conducted research may provide a vast perspective to study the relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness. In further chapters, the specific information about this study has been presented in the help of the review of the related literature.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction

In this chapter, the research methodology of the study is presented. Firstly, research design and participants of the study are given. Then, data collection tools; forms and tests applied are explained. Finally, the process of analyzing the data obtained through tests and grades of students have been briefly mentioned.

3.1. Research Design

In the present study, correlational and descriptive research designs have been implemented with the aim of identification of any correlation between metalinguistic awareness and English success of bilinguals. In order to figure out the correlation, the bilingual and monolingual participants have been included and their results have been compared. According to the difference and/or similarity between the results of both groups, performances of bilinguals have been investigated. The results of tests and grades that all participants acquired have been evaluated regarding bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness relationship and correlation. Both quantitative and qualitative research methods are utilized in the process of collecting and analyzing data. Quantitative research technique has been applied to find out the performances of students in the metalinguistic test and learning English for both groups of participants. Furthermore, as for the qualitative part of the study, interviews with the participants were conducted with the aim of describing thoughts of the students on their achievements and failure in terms of metalinguistic tests and English as a foreign language.

3.2. Research Questions of the Study

In order to evaluate the existence of the relation between metalinguistic awareness and English success of bilinguals, the performances of monolinguals are also taken into consideration. With the aim of testing this relation, the difference or similarity between results of the monolingual and bilingual groups have been pointed out. The following research questions are listed to answer the problems about Turkish and English metalinguistic awareness, and English grades.

1. Is there any difference in terms of Turkish metalinguistic awareness between Turkish monolinguals and bilinguals who have a heritage language spoken at home?

2. Is there any difference between monolinguals and bilinguals in English metalinguistic awareness tests?

3. Does metalinguistic awareness in both Turkish and English languages have a correlation with English as a foreign language success of bilingual students, especially from different social backgrounds?

4. What are the views of the bilingual students on the extreme regarding their success/unsuccess in English classes?

In order to answer these research questions, the procedure and tools which have been conducted and applied have been presented in the following sections.

3.3. Participants

The research is carried out with seventh-grade students from two different secondary schools in Seyhan and Yüreğir districts, Adana. In the beginning, 70 students from the heritage language bilinguals' school and 70 students from Turkish monolinguals' school were randomly selected. Because parents of two monolingual students have not signed the consent form, 68 students from the monolingual group attended the research. The tests were conducted during the first term, for each group, the process of application of both Turkish and English metalinguistic tests lasted two weeks. Since the English results were provided at the end of the term, four students in both groups were extracted because they have changed their schools or moved to another city. At the end it has been determined that there are 68 students in the bilingual group and 66 students in the monolingual group; in total 134 students have attended the study. Seventh-grade students were selected because they are the most appropriate group which represents the characteristics of being secondary school students. the participant students in both groups have been chosen from different classes, and have had English courses from different teachers.

The bilingual group consists of Kurdish-Turkish bilingual students who can communicate both in Kurdish, especially with their family members, and Turkish mostly in the school environment. It can be noted that the bilingual group has a lower socio-economic background, comes from a society which has differences in terms of economic

and social relations. On the other hand, the monolingual group has been selected from a social group which has a similar socio-economic background to the bilinguals.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

First of all, a background information form and a family consent form were handed out to the students. In order to find answers to the relevant research questions, the data has been collected by metalinguistic tests in Turkish which is an adapted form of the instrument that is conducted by Beyret (2015) in her research study, and in English metalinguistic awareness test has been prepared through translation of Turkish metalinguistic test. There have been interviews with students who have extreme results in the bilingual group to clarify the results and effects of their knowledge in terms of language.

3.4.1. Background Information of Participants

Students were asked to fill a form by themselves or with their family before the tests carried out (see Appendix I). After requiring some personal questions about students, revenues of the parents were asked to determine a similar economic profile of the participants in the study. Also, existence and knowledge of heritage and/or home languages were questioned to identify bilingualism or monolingualism in groups of students. According to the information gained, the economic statuses of groups are found to be similar. Bilinguals identified the Kurdish language as their heritage and home language. While some bilingual students claimed the existence of Kurdish as the language they know other than Turkish, some of them stated that they can speak and/or understand Kurdish. It is also stated by some heritage bilingual students that Kurdish is the only language they communicate with certain members of their families.

3.4.2. Consent Forms

As the participants were secondary school students, approval of their parents were asked to participate in the research (see Appendix II). Furthermore, before the study has been started to conduct, the required official approval has been provided from Adana Directorate of National Education.

3.4.3. Metalinguistic Tests

Metalinguistic awareness of students has been evaluated through the tests which involve four sub-chapters; phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax as these are the representations of metalinguistic in general (see Appendix III). As for the Turkish metalinguistic abilities, the test was adapted from the study of Beyret (2015), general outline of the test was preserved; however, since the test consists of 136 questions, only 100 questions were chosen in order to get participants motivated to answer and not to be bored by the questions. It is a test claimed to have an evaluated content validity. Some of the words and sentences of the tests were updated according to the text book of the curriculum because it had been changed by the Ministry of Education in the beginning of the term. Students have been given two hours to complete the test.

The English metalinguistic awareness test was also constructed in parallel with Turkish metalinguistic test (see Appendix IV). It has been prepared as an English adaptation of Turkish metalinguistic test and content validity has been evaluated by the experts in the research field of ELT. Opinions of the different experts in the field have been taken to form the structure of the tests. It also contains the same four sub-chapters: phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax. It consists of 50 questions in total, because English is the second language of monolinguals and third language of bilinguals which is learned in school, numbers of questions have been reduced by half. Students answered the test in two hours of time as in Turkish metalinguistic awareness test. Both of the tests have been applied during school time as the directories of schools have designated with the aim of not restraining usual courses of lessons.

3.4.4. End of the Term Grades

Since the study was conducted in 2017-2018 education year, as to make a correlation with metalinguistic tests, grades of English lesson of the year that both groups of students were taken into account. The grades represent their learning performance of English in the whole term and exams made in different times of the year. As the groups are chosen randomly, teachers of English of both groups are different teachers. For the sake of the study, any kind of interruptions has not been made on evaluation of teachers and examinations.

3.4.5. Student Interviews

Students have been determined on the base of the results of metalinguistic tests and English grades of students who have gotten the higher and lower scores have been interviewed by the researcher. Since the aim of the study is to investigate performances of the bilingual group, a semi-structured questionnaire has been carried out with the identified a representative group of heritage bilingual students by the researcher (see Appendix V).

3.5. The Pilot Study

The pilot study for metalinguistic tests has been conducted with thirty monolingual and bilingual students who are not included in the main study. According to the observations during the application process and feedbacks gained from volunteer participants a few changes have been applied. As students spent more time to understand to what they are going to do with the questions instructions were simplified, example activities for each section has been added to the both Turkish and English metalinguistic tests. Furthermore, application time for each sub-section has been adjusted by the directories of both schools, and different sections of the tests have been handed out in different days and lessons in order to help students to concentrate on the tests.

3.6. Data Analysis

In the present study, quantitative data have been obtained through the tests of metalinguistic in Turkish and English, and the English end of the term grades while the qualitative data have been obtained through semi-structured interviews with a group within bilingual students.

As for the quantitative item analysis of tests scores, SPSS v.23 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used. In order to answer first, second and third research questions respectively Mann Whitney U tests and Spearman correlation analyses have been conducted.

Semi-structured interviews have been analyzed according to the data gained from the students through the questions about their opinions of language and awareness in metalinguistics. The responses of students have been categorized and discussed in order to answer the last research question of the study. Afterward, at the end, a content analysis

has been applied according to the data which has been obtained from the interviews with the representative group of bilingual students.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.0. Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis and results obtained through the metalinguistic tests and end of the term grades of both bilingual and monolingual groups. According to the results of metalinguistic awareness tests, Man Whitney U Test results of both groups and Spearman correlation between Metalinguistic Awareness Tests (MATs) and English Grades have been investigated, respectively. Man Whitney U analysis has been applied to see the statistical differences between groups on Turkish MAT and English MAT scores. Spearman Correlation has been applied to investigate the relation between metalinguistic awareness and English language success of the participants. Finally, in the last part, the qualitative data that has been provided through semi-structured interviews with bilingual students has been interpreted.

4.1. The Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Students' Metalinguistic Awareness in Turkish

Turkish metalinguistic awareness has been seen as significant in determining the abilities of students in the common language students from both groups share. In order to test the awareness of metalinguistic in Turkish of the bilinguals and the monolinguals the Turkish MAT has been applied, according to the test scores differences have been evaluated. First of all, test scores of Turkish metalinguistic and its sub-categories of all students have been examined with the aim of figuring out general success of students who have similar SES backgrounds. Then, the normality test has been applied to see the distribution of the scores. Finally, as one of the main concerns of the study, the statistical differences on Turkish MATs between the both groups have been analyzed.

4.1.1. The Results of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Tests

Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test which contains four sub-sections such as phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax parts have been answered by all students participated. These components of metalinguistic awareness are evaluated from 100

points in total; phonology 30, Morphology 25, Semantics 30 and Syntax 15 points. According to the results of both groups, as shown in Table 1, in Turkish Morphology and Turkish Syntax minimum points are 0, which means there is at least one student who has not answered any of the questions in these sections.

Table 1

The Group Statistics of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and Its Sub-Categories (Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	134	15,00	100,00	80,3134	17,21881
Turkish Phonology	134	4,00	30,00	23,5299	5,65112
Turkish Morphology	134	,00	25,00	16,0821	6,48080
Turkish Semantics	134	10,00	30,00	28,1269	4,08817
Turkish Syntax	134	,00	15,00	12,5746	3,57808

It is shown in Table 1, in Turkish Phonology part, all students are expected to answer six different exercises, in total 30 points. The phonology part is composed of six different exercises which have been answered. In these activities, three main abilities such as identifying sounds, arranging words and organizing words according to sounds given have been measured. In Turkish Morphology part, one main exercise is expected to be answered, in total 25 points. In order to test morphological awareness, students are required to find and add appropriate morphemes of the words given. In Turkish Semantics part, there are four main activities, in total 30 points. These four activities are grouped; synonyms and antonyms of words, figurative meanings of words and categorization of given words are expected to be determined by the students. In order to test awareness of metalinguistic of students at the semantic level, the meanings of words are mainly emphasized. In the last part, Turkish Syntax, there have been two activities, 15 points in total. In this part, students are expected to put the words in correct order and make meaningful sentences with given phrases according to the context. Thus, it has been aimed to evaluate comprehension of students of sentence order knowledge in Turkish.

4.1.2. The Normality Test Result of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test

The monolingual group consists of 66 and the bilingual group consists of 68 students, all 134 students have answered the metalinguistic awareness tests. The distribution of the results can be identified as normal or not normal among students in two groups; accordingly the essential statistics analysis can be detected. Thus, with the aim of evaluating the normality of results, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to see whether there is a balanced distribution in Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness of both groups. The equation of balanced distribution is required to be p > ,05 in Sig. of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Can, 2016). As it is shown in Table 2, Sig. is under the ,05 value of all results, it can be inferred that there is not a balanced distribution in all of them.

Table 2

The Normality Test of Turkish Metalinguistic Tests and Its Elements

	Languages	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	,111	66	,044
	Bilingual	,179	68	,000
Turkish Phonology	Monolingual	,132	66	,006
	Bilingual	,160	68	,000
Turkish Morphology	Monolingual	,135	66	,004
	Bilingual	,167	68	,000
Turkish Semantics	Monolingual	,476	66	,000
	Bilingual	,257	68	,000
Turkish Syntax	Monolingual	,247	66	,000
	Bilingual	,274	68	,000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to the normality results in Table 2, non parametric tests are required to be applied in order to identify the difference between groups (Can, 2016). Therefore, Mann Whitney U test has been used in SPSS v.23 program with the aim of determining the difference between monolingual and bilingual group scores in Turkish MAT in total and categories separately.

4.1.3. The Results of Bilingual and Monolingual Groups' Metalinguistic Awareness Tests in Turkish

A more specific analysis of Turkish metalinguistic awareness of both monolinguals and bilinguals has been examined. Items that construct Turkish MAT are listed in previous chapters as phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax. The difference between these elements of both groups has been taken into account. In Table 3, the mean values of total Turkish MAT, Turkish Phonology, Turkish Morphology, Turkish Semantics and Turkish Syntax has been demonstrated. As it is seen the bilingual group has lower mean scores in overall Turkish tests than the monolingual group in Table 3.

Table 3

The Mean Scores of Turkish MAT and Its Elements of the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups

	Languages	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	66	86,7879	7,99522
	Bilingual	68	74,0294	21,09889
Turkish Phonology	Monolingual	66	25,2576	3,13448
	Bilingual	68	21,8529	6,93308
Turkish Morphology	Monolingual	66	18,5606	4,15888
	Bilingual	68	13,6765	7,39391
Turkish Semantics	Monolingual	66	29,7121	1,00407
	Bilingual	68	26,5882	5,22690
Turkish Syntax	Monolingual	66	13,2576	2,32254
	Bilingual	68	11,9118	4,39041

In Table 3, the meaningful differences between monolingual and bilingual groups are seen in Phonology, Morphology and Semantics parts of the Turkish metalinguistic tests. Since the Sig. value is $p < ,05$ (Can, 2016), that is explained with difference between groups because of the variable of being monolingual and bilingual. In order to evaluate the statistical difference between the groups Table 4 can be investigated.

Table 4

Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test and Its Elements

	Sig.	**Values**
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	,001	p < ,05
Turkish Phonology	,013	p < ,05
Turkish Morphology	,000	p < ,05
Turkish Semantics	,000	p < ,05
Turkish Syntax	,205	p > ,05

It is shown in Table 4, Turkish MAT, Phonology, Morphology and Semantics represent Sig. values under ,05, which means there is a statistically difference between the scores of groups. However, Turkish Syntax awareness of both groups does not present any difference, as the Sig. value is ,205 which is p > ,05. It is understood that according to mean scores of both groups being monolingual or bilingual does not create any difference between the results regarding the abilities of syntax awareness in Turkish. As it is seen in Table 3, there is a slight difference between the mean scores of both groups in Turkish syntax task. To conclude, in other categories, according to the mean scores, the monolingual group outscored the bilingual group of students.

4.2. The Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Students' Metalinguistic Awareness in English

English is the common foreign language which is learned through formal school education by both the bilingual and the monolingual groups. In order to test the awareness of English metalinguistic of the bilinguals and the monolinguals, the English MAT has been applied, according to the test scores, statistical differences have been evaluated. First of all, test scores of metalinguistic awareness in English and its sub-categories of all students have been examined with the aim of figuring out general success of students who

have similar SES backgrounds. Then, the normality test has been applied to see the distribution of the results. Finally, as one of the main concerns of the study, the differences between the both groups on English MATs and its elements have been investigated.

4.2.1. The Results of English Metalinguistic Awareness Tests

English Metalinguistic Awareness Test which contains four sub-sections such as phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax parts have been answered by all students. These components of metalinguistic awareness are evaluated from 100 points in total; phonology 12, Morphology 30, Semantics 28 and Syntax 30 points. According to the results of both groups, as shown in Table 4, there is at least one student who has not answered any of the questions in all sub categories. All sections are answered correctly by some of the students.

Table 5

The Group Statistics of English Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and Sub Categories (Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	134	6,00	100,00	57,6567	24,92036
English Phonology	134	,00	12,00	10,4030	3,17679
English Morphology	134	,00	30,00	12,9701	8,18851
English Semantics	134	,00	28,00	16,5672	9,00664
English Syntax	134	,00	30,00	17,7164	9,13772

In

It is presented in Table 5, the English Metalinguistic Awareness test; four sections are categorized in terms of metalinguistic components. In English Phonology part, similar sounds are expected to be matched in given words set, in total 12 points gained. In order to test the phonological awareness of students, the sounds of words are needed to be distinguished by students as in Turkish phonological test. In English Morphology part, as in Turkish morphology, morphemes are expected to be written by students to test their morphological awareness, 30 points in total. In Semantics part, two main activities are given, 28 points in total; antonyms and grouping words according to the meanings are questioned as in the Turkish one. In Syntax part, as the last section of the test, there are two different activities to test word and sentence order as in the Turkish syntax test, in 30 points total. All students are expected to put the words in correct order and complete sentences with given phrases in this part of the test.

4.2.2. The Normality Test Result of English Metalinguistic Awareness Test

The monolingual group consists of 66 and the bilingual group consists of 68 students, all 134 students have answered the metalinguistic awareness tests in English. According to the distribution of the results, in Table 6, which can be or cannot be normal among students in two groups the required statistics analysis can be detected. Thus, with the aim of evaluating the normality of results, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to see whether there is a balanced distribution in English Metalinguistic Awareness of both groups. The equation of balanced distribution is required to be $p > ,05$ in Sig. of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Can, 2016).

It is shown in Table 6, Sig. is under the ,05 value of Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax tests for both groups. It can be inferred that there is not a balanced distribution in these results. It is also seen that in the English MAT results of the bilingual group Sig. is over the ,05 value, which shows a normal distribution, however, the same test results of the monolingual group is under the ,05 value, refers to abnormal distribution among students.

Table 6

The Normality Test of English Metalinguistic Tests and Its Elements

	Languages	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	,119	66	,021
	Bilingual	,069	68	,200
English Phonology	Monolingual	,488	66	,000
	Bilingual	,433	68	,000
English Morphology	Monolingual	,143	66	,002
	Bilingual	,131	68	,006
English Semantics	Monolingual	,170	66	,000
	Bilingual	,145	68	,001
English Syntax	Monolingual	,171	66	,000
	Bilingual	,137	68	,003

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Therefore, the results are not distributed in a normal way; a non parametric analysis has been required, as it shown in Table 6. The differences between the groups regarding their performances on metalinguistic tasks have been investigated. In order to evaluate the differences between the monolingual and the bilingual groups, because the distribution is not demonstrated in a normal way, Mann Whitney U Test has been applied through SPSS v.23 program.

4.2.3. The Results of Bilingual and Monolingual Groups' Metalinguistic Awareness Tests in English

Similar to the Turkish MAT, a more specific analysis of English metalinguistic awareness of both monolinguals and bilinguals has been examined. Items that construct English MAT are listed in previous chapters as phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax as in the Turkish MAT.

Table 7

The Mean Scores of English MAT and Its Elements of the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups

	Languages	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	66	67,6667	23,38068
	Bilingual	68	47,9412	22,53745
English Phonology	Monolingual	66	10,6364	3,10154
	Bilingual	68	10,1765	3,25504
English Morphology	Monolingual	66	15,7576	8,56120
	Bilingual	68	10,2647	6,84938
English Semantics	Monolingual	66	19,6364	8,02235
	Bilingual	68	13,5882	8,96134
English Syntax	Monolingual	66	21,6364	8,41178
	Bilingual	68	13,9118	8,20218

In Table 7, the mean scores of total English MAT, English Phonology, English Morphology, English Semantics and English Syntax have been demonstrated. As it is seen the bilingual group has lower mean scores in overall English tests.

Table 8

Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups of English Metalinguistic Awareness Test and Its Elements

	Sig.	**Values**
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	,000	p < ,05
English Phonology	,243	p > ,05
English Morphology	,000	p < ,05
English Semantics	,000	p < ,05
English Syntax	,000	p < ,05

There is a meaningful difference between monolingual and bilingual groups; which has been observed in Morphology, Semantics and Syntax parts. Hence the Sig. value is p < ,05 means there is a statistically meaningful difference between the scores of two groups (Can, 2016).

In Table 8, it is shown that English MAT, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax are below the ,05 value. It can be referred that being monolingual or bilingual has an effect on the scores of students in these tests. However, English Phonology awareness of both groups does not present any difference in mean scores and Mann Whitney U test analysis, as the Sig. value is ,243 which is p >,05. It is understood that English Phonology results are not affected being monolingual or bilingual in terms of difference in that part of the MAT in English. To summarize, except the phonology awareness in English, there has been observed a statistically significant difference between the scores of both groups in other parts of the metalinguistic awareness tests in English.

4.3. Correlation between English and Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales and English Grades of all Students

The main focus of this study is to test correlation values between metalinguistic awareness of bilingual students with learning English success and perfromances during in the school settings. In this part of the chapter correlations of all students, monolingual and bilingual groups are evaluated. Correlation values range from +1 to -1, as the pozitive and negative correlation between the values. The values between ,10 and ,29 show the low correlation; ,30 and ,49 mean medium significant correlation; whereas values above ,50 explain the large significant correlation between dependents (Pallant, 2016: p. 137).

Firstly, a general comparison can be made between mean scores of Turkish MATs, English MATs and English Grades of both groups in Table 9. According to the Table 9, the monolingual group has got higher mean scores 86,78 for Turkish MAT, 67,66 for English MAT and 77,28 for English Grades. On the other hand, the bilingual group consists of 68 students, obtained lower mean scores in all three results; 74,02 for Turkish MAT and 71,22 for English Grades. Especially, English Metalinguistic Awareness of bilinguals, as being 47,94 has the lowest mean score of all results gained.

Table 9

The Group Statistics of both Tests and English Grades of Students

	Languages	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	66	**86,7879**	7,99522
	Bilingual	68	**74,0294**	21,09889
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Monolingual	66	**67,6667**	23,38068
	Bilingual	68	**47,9412**	22,53745
English Grades	Monolingual	66	**77,2879**	18,14197
	Bilingual	68	**71,2206**	16,94666

It is seen in Table 9, in all scores and grades of English courses of both groups, the monolingual group has obtained higher mean scores. The least difference can be seen in English grades between the both groups.

Table 10 has been obtained from SPSS program with the aim of presenting the general matrices between the variables of metalinguistic awareness tests and English grades of all students. These results can be evaluated by giving reference to the mean scores and statistical information obtained from the all results of MATs and English grades. A general correlation information table has been shown with all scores and grades of all students in order to reflect the general tendency of students in the given SES background. It is seen that when all participants results have been combined together, in Table 10, correlation values in general matrices between MATs and English grades can be seen.

Table 10

The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness in Turkish, English and English Grades of all students

		Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Grades
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,752**	,697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,000
	N	134	134	134
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	,752**	1,000	,725**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,000
	N	134	134	134
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,697**	,725**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	.
	N	134	134	134

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It is understood from Table 10, there is high significant correlation between Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Metalinguistic Awareness as the correlation coefficient value is ,752. The correlation between English Metalinguistc Awareness and English Grades has the value of ,725 of all students. There is also a large correlation between Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades as the ,697 value of all students. These correlation values mean that a general correlation is expected from students in similar environments. In following sections correlations are evaluated in a detailed way within groups of students.

4.3.1. The Correlation of Turkish and English Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales with English Grades of Monolingual Students

In this study, the monolingual group has been chosen as the representative of the possible correlation while bilingual group performances are being emphasized in order to

answer the research questions of the study. According to the results and grades of monolingual group, it is clearly seen in Table 11, there is a large correlation between all total scores of Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and English Grades. In general, it is understood that English learning performances of the monolingual group is correlated with their metalinguistic awareness in their native language and the foreign language.

Table 11

The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and English Grades of Monolingual students

		Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Grades
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,712**	,687**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,000
	N	66	66	66
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	,712**	1,000	,730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,000
	N	66	66	66
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,687**	,730**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	.
	N	66	66	66

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It is clearly seen that the highest correlation is between English MAT and English grades of the monolingual group (,730). After then, the second highest correlation is seen between Turkish MAT and English MAT of the group (,712). At last, there is also a high correlation between Turkish MAT and English grades of the scores of monolingual students (,687).

Henceforth, in Turkish and in English, the metalinguistic awareness of both groups has been evaluated through four sub-categories; phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax. In Table 12, from a specific perspective, as Turkish their only

native language, the correlation between every sub-category of Turkish metalinguistic awareness results and English grades are shown.

Table 12

The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Monolingual Group

		Turkish Phonology	Turkish Morpholog..	Turkish Semantics	Turkish Syntax	English Grades
Turkish Phonology	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,669**	,267*	,400**	**,483****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,030	,001	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
Turkish Morphology	Correlation Coefficient	,669**	1,000	,345**	,404**	**,631****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,005	,001	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
Turkish Semantics	Correlation Coefficient	,267*	,345**	1,000	,158	**,351****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,030	,005	.	,204	**,004**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
Turkish Syntax	Correlation Coefficient	,400**	,404**	,158	1,000	**,555****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,001	,204	.	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,483**	,631**	,351**	,555**	**1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,004	,000	**.**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 12, it is seen that there is a medium and large correlation between all sub-categories and English grades. There are difference correlation values between categories and English grades. As to evaluate English learning performances, the correlation of each category and English grades has been examined. The highest correlation with English grades belongs to Turkish Morphology, the value is ,631; secondly, Turkish Syntax as the value is ,555, these two parts have shown large

correlation. There is a medium correlation of English Grades with Turkish Phonology as it is ,483; and then, with Turkish Semantics as it is ,351.

Table 13

The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of English Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Monolingual Group

		English Phonology	English Morphology	English Semantics	English Syntax	English Grades
English Phonology	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,140	,311*	,220	**,151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,262	,011	,076	**,227**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
English Morphology	Correlation Coefficient	,140	1,000	,686**	,737**	**,658****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,262	.	,000	,000	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
English Semantics	Correlation Coefficient	,311*	,686**	1,000	,647**	**,616****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,011	,000	.	,000	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
English Syntax	Correlation Coefficient	,220	,737**	,647**	1,000	**,733****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,076	,000	,000	.	**,000**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,151	,658**	,616**	,733**	**1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,227	,000	,000	,000	**.**
	N	66	66	66	66	**66**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Furthermore, for the monolingual group, the correlation between English grades and elements of English metalinguistic awareness has been surveyed, similar to the Turkish metalinguistic awareness in Table 13. There have been obtained various correlation values within categories and English Grades.

In Table 13, the correlation of English grades with every element has been highlighted. It is seen that English Phonology the value ,151 has the lowest correlation whereas other elements of metalinguistic awareness show large correlation with English grades. With the aim of a detailed explanation, from highest to lowest correlation with English grades have been seen, respectively, in English Syntax (,733), in English Morphology (,658) and in English Semantics (,616).

4.3.2. The Correlation of Turkish and English Metalinguistic Awareness Test Scales with English Grades of Bilingual Students

The main concern of the present study has been to evaluate the existence of a correlation between metalinguistic awareness and English language performances of the heritage bilingual students. In Table 14, general correlation matrices between metalinguistic awareness tests and English grades of the bilingual students have been shown. In order to evaluate this situation, due to the fact that these are the nonparametric tests, Spearman Correlation has been applied to the results of both Turkish and English metalinguistic awareness test results and English grades of the bilingual group.

It is seen in Table 14 that the largest correlation is between English metalinguistic awareness and Turkish metalinguistic awareness with the ,765 value of bilingual students. There is also large correlation between Turkish metalinguistic awareness and English grades of the same students has large significance as the value is ,700. In addition, there is a large correlation between English metalinguistic awareness and English grades with the value at ,688 of bilingual students' performances. It is obvious that the correlation presents the relation between general metalinguistic awareness in total scores and English grades of students.

Table 14

The Correlation Matrices of Metalinguistic Awareness Tests and English Grades of Bilingual students

		Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	English Grades
Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,765**	,700**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,000
	N	68	68	68
English Metalinguistic Awareness Test	Correlation Coefficient	,765**	1,000	,688**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,000
	N	68	68	68
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,700**	,688**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	.
	N	68	68	68

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Furthermore, a specific correlation analysis has been conducted with the elements of metalinguistic awareness and English grades of the group. In Table 15, the matrices between each sub-category of metalinguistic awareness and English grades, has been statistically presented with the Sig. values. As it can be seen below, The Table 15 presents all correlations within elements of Turkish metalinguistic awareness and English grades of the group. As the main concern is to evaluate the correlation of English language performances of bilingual students with metalinguistic awareness, the last column of the Table 15 is highlighted. According to the values, all elements have large correlation with English grades. Turkish phonology and English grades correlation has the highest value as ,720, the rest of the elements have similar correlation values with English grades as following; Morphology: ,553, Semantics: ,582, Syntax: ,623.

Table 15

The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Bilingual Group

		Turkish Phonology	Turkish Morphology	Turkish Semantics	Turkish Syntax	English Grades
Turkish Phonology	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,774**	,623**	,714**	**,720****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,000	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
Turkish Morphology	Correlation Coefficient	,774**	1,000	,618**	,664**	**,553****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,000	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
Turkish Semantics	Correlation Coefficient	,623**	,618**	1,000	,651**	**,582****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	.	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
Turkish Syntax	Correlation Coefficient	,714**	,664**	,651**	1,000	**,623****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	.	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,720**	,553**	,582**	,623**	**1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	**.**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Similar to the Turkish metalinguistic awareness and English grades relation, with the aim of surveying the correlation of English grades with metalinguistic awareness of the heritage bilingual group, a more specific correlation evaluation has been done with the elements that construct metalinguistic awareness. These elements are phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax which are used as the sub-categories of Turkish

metalinguistic awareness. In Table 16, the values of Sig. of each sub-category of metalinguistic awareness with English grades matrices has been shown.

Table 16

The Correlation Matrices between Sub Categories of Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades of Bilingual Group

		English Phonology	English Morphology	English Semantics	English Syntax	English Grades
English Phonology	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,551**	,528**	,416**	**,427****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,000	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
English Morphology	Correlation Coefficient	,551**	1,000	,620**	,509**	**,452****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,000	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
English Semantics	Correlation Coefficient	,528**	,620**	1,000	,643**	**,698****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	.	,000	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
English Syntax	Correlation Coefficient	,416**	,509**	,643**	1,000	**,565****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	.	**,000**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**
English Grades	Correlation Coefficient	,427**	,452**	,698**	,565**	**1,000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	**.**
	N	68	68	68	68	**68**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Finally, similar to the Turkish metalinguistic awareness of the heritage bilingual students, the correlation between English grades and elements of English metalinguistic awareness has been surveyed. Various correlation values are presented in the Table 16 within categories and English Grades. Since the aim is related to English language performances of bilingual students, in the Table 16, the correlation of English grades with every element has been highlighted. It is seen that English Phonology, the correlation

with English grades with ,427 value has a medium correlation. English grades and English Morphology have also medium correlation as the values is ,452. It is seen that English Syntax with ,565 values of correlation with English grades present large correlation. English Semantics and English grades have the correlation value of ,698 which shows the largest correlation in terms of results of metalinguistic awareness elements of bilingual students.

4.4. The Findings of Interviews with the Bilingual Students

The completion of metalinguistic tasks have been carried out in both Turkish and English by all students participated; at the end of the term English grades are gained from the directories of the both schools. Following, since the main focus of the study is on performances of the bilingual group, total scores of the MATs and English grades of the bilingual group have been examined in detail. The students on the extreme; the most successful and the least successful students who obtained higher and lower marks have been identified to have interviews. From the bilingual group, six students who have gained higher marks and six students who have lower marks have been chosen randomly, considering the consistency in both of the MATs and English end of the term grades. In total, the semi-structured interviews with 12 students have been carried out with the aim of identification of the opinions of the students; two main notions have been emphasized. First, the students have been asked their ideas about their success and failures on English as a foreign language. Second, they were expected to state their opinions on their heritage language; Kurdish, and its relation with Turkish and English in particular. In this section, the data obtained from the semi-structured interviews with six higher scored and six lower scored participants will be presented.

The bilingual group consists of students who have gained various scores and results in terms of the metalinguistic awareness tasks and English grades of the end of the term. It is mainly observed that among all these students, most of them have shown consistency in three marks which are metalinguistic awareness in Turkish and English, and also English grades that they have gotten during the period that the study have been conducted. During the interviews, it is realized that while highly scored students have been found to be more enthusiastic to state their opinions than the low scored students. However, it is required to be noticed that most of the interviewees have not said much; it

has been observed that they have been reluctant to share; this may have been due to the fact that they are secondary school students.

4.4.1. The Opinions of the Bilingual Students on the English as a Foreign Language

In this study it is aimed that how heritage bilingual students interact with English as a third language. In the first part of the semi-structured interview, the focus is mainly on figuring out the bilingual students' opinions of their success and failure on English as a foreign language. Since two groups of students have been interviewed; six of them have gained higher scores and grades and the other six of them have gained lower scores and grades from the tasks. According to the given responses of all students, it is clear that they are mostly aware of their success and failure in general English courses. Higher scored and graded students have mainly stated that they think they are successful, and also four out of six students have stated they like English language and courses. Afterward, higher scored and graded students explained the reasons behind their success with these statements; enjoying English language courses, learning new vocabulary easily, finding the themes interesting and focusing on the details during the English lessons. The have stated as:

S2: "English is one of my favourite areas of interest. It (English language) is pulling me towards itself."

S4: "I'm successful because I love topics (in English courses)."

S6: "I keep the words in my mind more easily."

On the other hand, all of the lower scored and graded students used the words either "difficult" or "hard" while defining their relation with English courses during the interviews. There are some example statements:

S10: "It is difficult to remember the words."

S12: "I find learning English difficult. It is hard."

Following these explanations, they explained the reasons behind their failure in English courses with these statements that they do not understand the courses, cannot remember new words, and cannot focus on the themes and courses generally in English courses. In addition, one out of six students of lower graded and scored group identified its success as good in English courses. However, in further parts of the interview, it has been stated that some topics and activities during English courses can be difficult to understand by the same student.

To sum up, it can be referred that the most of the higher scored and graded in MATs and English lessons have been found more aware of their performances such as their favour of English courses. Most of the higher scored and graded group have defined themselves as having positive relations with learning English language process. It can also be understood that lower scored and graded group of students in MATs and English lessons, have been found that they are aware of their level of achievement in general for the English courses since they are aware of their failures during the tests and English courses. Additionally, most of the lower scored and graded group have also stated some types of problems they have encountered with English language and courses.

4.4.2. The Opinions of the Bilingual Students on the Impact of Languages on Each Other

It has also been aimed in this study to draw an outline on how heritage bilingual students are aware of and affected by three languages involved into their life and education. These three languages are listed as following: first one is home language which is spoken generally by the members of the family most, Kurdish; second one is dominant and school language which is spoken both at home and school and the language of literacy, Turkish; and the third one is English which has being learned in the school as a foreign language as a subject by the students participated in this study.

In the second part of the interview, the main purpose has been to reveal any type of awareness of the relation among languages they have acquired and learned. First of all, their knowledge of home language, Kurdish of all 12 students, has been questioned. According to the students, home language is spoken with their parents and grandparents and eleven out of twelve students stated that they can also speak well in Kurdish; one of the students has defined the level of Kurdish as medium. Especially, two of the students have claimed that they have experienced some problems with Turkish while learning in the primary school and then explained the reasons as not knowing Turkish before attending the school and Turkish has not been spoken at home during that time. Other two students have claimed that the home language has a different accent than Turkish and English.

Furthermore, the opinions of the twelve students participated on the relation between languages and impact on each other has been questioned during the interviews. 10 of the 12 students have claimed that there is not any kind of relationship and/or impact

between Kurdish and other two languages namely Turkish and English. However, two of the students who also have got higher scores and grades in tests and English courses, stated that they think there is a kind of connection between Kurdish and English, especially they have realized while learning new vocabulary in English courses. As they have stated:

> *S2: "There are some words that can be difficult to pronounce in Kurdish; sometimes there are some words which are also difficult to pronounce in English."*
>
> *S5: "While I am learning a new word in English, I also think the word in Kurdish language."*

To summarize, according to the heritage bilingual participants of the study, Kurdish is the home language which is used within the family and it has been perceived as a different language. It can be referred that they are aware that all three languages are in their lives and they are somehow affected by these languages. In this part of the interview, a significant difference between the statements of the groups as higher and lower scored and graded students has not been deduced. However, even they are less in number, two of the students are highly aware of how they can relate on languages with each other in certain circumstances.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.0. Introduction

In this chapter the discussion of the study has been presented regarding the results of quantitative and qualitative data with reference to the research questions. Respectively, first and second research questions about difference of the results of monolingual and bilingual groups will be evaluated. Then, the correlation of metalinguistic awareness with learning English will be taken into account in terms of results of both groups for the third research question. Afterward, data of interviews will be analysed according to the last research question with the aim of identification of point of views of heritage bilingual students on metalinguistic awareness and English learning. These evaluations will be discussed in accordance with the example studies and related literature. Statistics results of this study are presented in Findings and Data Analysis Chapter with detailed explanations.

5.1. Discussion

The main aim of the study is to figure out the role of metalinguistic awareness in English language learning achievement of heritage bilingual students in the school environment especially as their third language. A monolingual group of students has been chosen as a reference group to compare while evaluating the performances of bilingual students on metalinguistic awareness and English language. Therefore, the differences on metalinguistic awareness tests and English grades between the groups have been evaluated. Then, the correlation of metalinguistic awareness with English success has been analyzed for both groups because of the fact that metalinguistic awareness has a mediating influence on learning another language has been emphasized in the related research area (Bialystok, 1986; Cenoz, 2003). One of the purposes of the study that has been to determine the metalinguistic awareness' influence on English learning, especially in socially different areas where heritage bilingualism exists, has been investigated. Lastly, the content analysis of interviews with students is discussed in order to figure out opinions of heritage bilingual students. It is important to evaluate whether these students are aware of the metalinguistic in Turkish and English.

5.1.1. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups on Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness

Turkish is the national language, in which all students become literate through primary education whether they are monolingual, bilingual or trilingual in Turkey. In this study, Kurdish-Turkish bilingual students have participated, as the Turkish monolingual students have participated with the aim of constructing a reference in a similar contextual environment. In the beginning of the research, an assumption on the Turkish metalinguistic performances of both groups has been made and the following question has been asked.

Research Question 1: Is there any difference in terms of Turkish metalinguistic awareness between Turkish monolinguals and bilinguals who have a heritage language spoken at home?

In order to answer the first research question, Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness (MAT) test has been used with four sub-sections involving Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax. Both monolingual and bilingual groups have answered these sections of the test. According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, it is seen that there is a difference in distribution between the group results in total Turkish MAT scores.

Furthermore, the mean scores are investigated to see the details of difference between the groups. Since there is a difference, one of the groups is expected to have higher scores. It is seen that monolingual group has higher mean scores while heritage bilingual group has got lower mean scores in both MATs and English grades (see Table 2). Despite the fact that the both groups have got the same educational curriculum in Turkish which is determined by the Ministry of Education in every school. As it is previously stated, the bilingual group may have problems with Turkish because they already have another home language.

There are two main points of views regarding the evaluation of any bilingual group performances, and especially while comparing their performances with monolinguals. One of them is that there are some studies which claim that they have reached the results of higher scores on the performances of bilinguals than the monolinguals while evaluating linguistic and metalinguistic abilities of learners (Beceren, 2010; Galambos & Hakuta, 1998; Ianco-Worall, 1972; Ringbom, 1987). In order to evaluate, metalinguistic knowledge of bilinguals and monolinguals have been compared with focusing on specific abilities.

According to the tendency in the literature, similar sub-elements of metalinguistic have been investigated. For instance Ianco-Worall (1972), in terms of semantics tasks, indicated that the bilingual outperforms monolinguals, however in this study, as the mean scores show that monolingual group had higher results. Even though the difference is not big in mean scores, it is stated that there is a meaningful difference in distribution of the results of both groups. In recent years, it has been found that sequential bilingualism has been found more effective in word segmentation tasks referring the phonological awareness rather than monolingualism (Beceren, 2010). However, in this study it is clearly seen that in phonological tasks in Turkish MATs, the bilingual and the monolingual participants have not performed any difference.

The recent research on bilingualism, trilingualism and multilingualism has showed tendency on the positive effects of bilingualism in certain aspects (Ben-Zeev, 1977; Bialystok, 2001; Cenoz, 2003; Cummins, 1976, 1978a, 1978b; Cook, 1995; Peal and Lambert, 1962 and so on). In this study, according to the mean scores, monolingual group has higher performances than heritage bilingual group. It can be explained with the threshold level hypothesis of Cummins (1976), which supports the idea that there is a level that is required to be attained by learners while learning another language. In this study, heritage bilinguals may not have reached the threshold level both in their home language and in Turkish as the other language they acquired simultaneously. On these grounds of evidence, an assumption can be made that if they had reached the threshold level, they may have similar or higher results as or than monolinguals in awareness tests of metalinguistic in Turkish.

Furthermore, from another point of view, as the second perspective, there are some studies which have revealed the superiority of monolingual learner performances over bilingual ones in some contexts through specific tasks (Paradis, 2005; Chondrogianni & Marinis, 2011). The development of linguistic abilities of bilingual and monolingual children has also been investigated in morphological perspectives. The morphological development of the bilingual children has been compared with different types of monolingual groups such as normally developed children and monolingual children who had language impairments in Canada (Paradis, 2005, 2008). It has been found that the scores of the bilingual group are lower than the scores of the monolingual group in morphological evaluation tasks (Paradis, 2005). In London, a group of Turkish-English bilingual children have participated in a study which aimed to investigate internal and external effects using tense morphology and morpho-syntax tasks to evaluate, a

comparison with an English monolingual group has been made (Chondrogianni & Marinis, 2011). It is clearly seen that bilingual group has showed less accuracy than the monolingual counterparts in morphology related and grammaticality tasks in English language. Having parallel results, in this study, the bilingual group scores are found to be lower than the monolingual group in Turkish MAT tasks, which is the common schooling language of the both groups. Taking account all of these, it has been led to a focus on the idea of the threshold theory of Cummins may have actualised in these contexts.

According to relevant literature, the notion of bilingualism has been investigated through the metalinguistic awareness of children and adults regarding the evaluation of the common language of the bilinguals and monolinguals. The emphasized languages differ according to the context and environments as well as the research questions of the studies. In this study, the common language of both the monolingual and the bilingual group has been the Turkish; participant students have conducted the tasks of metalinguistic awareness in Turkish language. It can be concluded that in Turkish metalinguistic awareness tasks, the bilingual group showed less successful performances than the monolingual group in which participated students have a similar socio-economic status (SES) background to the heritage bilingual students.

5.1.2. Differences between the Monolingual and Bilingual Groups on English Metalinguistic Awareness

English is the foreign language which is learned in the school environment by both groups of students, in the context of this study. English is the second language of Turkish monolinguals, it is the third language of heritage bilingual students of the participants. Performances on English metalinguistic awareness have been also compared to see the difference between groups. English MAT is consisted of four section as Phonology, Morphology, Semantics and Syntax. In order to answer the second research question of the study, the difference between monolingual and bilingual groups in English metalinguistic awareness, the results have been investigated.

Research Question 2: Is there any difference between monolinguals and bilinguals in English metalinguistic awareness tests?

According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, there is a noteworthy difference in distribution of English metalinguistic awareness tests between the results of monolingual and bilingual groups.

The evaluation of awareness through target languages learned is being one of the topics in the reserach area of multlinguality, linguistic and metalinguistic awareness studies. Similar to the common language of the groups, metalinguistic awareness evaluation of people, sub-elements of awareness of metalinguistic in the target language have been popularly used by different researchers (Jorda, 2003; Kemp, 2001; Mady, 2004; Tellier & Roehr-Brackin, 2013). Relevant studies can be grouped under two main perspectives such as positive and negative or neutral effects of bilinguality. It is seen that in some studies bilinguality has been accepted as a favour for learners of the foreign lanaguges while in some studies monolingual groups have had over performences in given tasks.

Tellier & Roehr-Brackin (2013), have carried out a study which has tested the development of metalinguistic awareness and language learning aptitude, it has been concluded that bilingualism has provided participants improvement especially in metalinguistic awareness. On the contrary, in this study, it is seen that bilingual group has obtained lower scores than the monolingual group in metalinguistic awareness tasks in English.

In Turkish context, Baytar (2016) conducted a study to investigate the role of metalinguistic awareness and analytic knowledge by comparing the differences between a monolingual group and a bilingual group. In order to test the metalinguistic awareness, another language that is unfamiliar to all participants has been chosen, and the bilingual group consists of students of English literature and teaching departments while the monolingual group has been acknowledged as the Turkish speakers only. According to the results of the study, bilingual group outperformed monolingual participants in metalinguistic and also analytic tests.

On the other hand, negative or neutral results of bilingual and monolingual students have been observed in metalinguistic awareness tasks the target languages taught, in different contexts. In Canada, Mady (2014) have studied and compared the performances of monolingual, bilingual and minority language bilinguals in various ways using different tasks and tests regarding metalinguistic and additional language learning performances. It has been found that superiority of bilinguals in certain tests have been obtained, however, especially bilinguals who have different social backgrounds, have not showed higher results in metalinguistic awareness than monolinguals and normally developed bilinguals. It can be noted that a parallel finding has been obtained in this

study; the bilingual students have not showed superiority over the monolingual students in metalinguistic tasks in English.

The common foreign language which has been taught at schools in Turkey, English is started to be learned in the primary school. As both of the groups have been educated in the state schools, English lesson curriculum and hours of a weekly program are all the same. However, in this study, the mean scores of both groups are different in total English MATs. It is seen that monolingual group has higher scores than bilingual group does. This situation can be the result of heritage bilingualism of the students. Therefore, the lower mean scores of the bilingual group in Turkish metalinguistic awareness may explain the reason behind the lower mean scores in English metalinguistic awareness; they may have problems in general language awareness degrees. In contexts that native languages of bilinguals are not at the same level, failures in learning the third languages may occur. Regarding the Turkish MAT scores of bilinguals in which they are already behind of monolingual students who have a similar SES background, English metalinguistic awareness of bilinguals is inevitably lower than those that monolinguals have. It is explained with subtractive bilingualism situations in similar environments in some studies (Grosjean, 1985; Lambert, 1981). However, in additive bilingualism contexts bilingualism results in positive results with higher performances (Cenoz &Valencia, 1994; Lasagabaster, 1998). Thus, it can be inferred that heritage bilingualism may have caused subtractive bilingualism in this study that might be the result of the bilingual group shows lower mean scores in most of the tests.

5.1.2.1. Difference between the Monolingual and Bilingual Group on English Grades

The differences in Turkish and English metalinguistic awareness of participants have been questioned and interpreted so far. Other than English metalinguistic awareness, general English language success of students have been taken into consideration to see foreign language learning perfromances of students in general. In different contexts, foreign language learning performances of multilinguals have also been investigated with focusing on general assesments rather than determining metalinguistic awareness (Ghabanchi, 2011).

In the light of the recent literature of multilingual studies that higher metalinguistic awareness has generally been found related with higher additional language learning achievements (Ben-Zeev, 1977; Bialystok, 1986, 1987; Cenoz, 2003). However, in this

study, the bilingual students have lower mean scores than the monolingual group. In spite of the expectation of general tendency, in this study, it is generally observed that monolinguals are found to be more successful than bilinguals in the similar SES background.

On the other hand, in a study which is conducted in Iran, English as a foreign language learning success of monolingual, bilingual and trilingual adult participants have been investigated through general assessment tests (Ghabanchi, 2011). It is concluded that multlingual participants have not showed the superiority of having more than one language background over the monolingual participants. This study can be seen as a parallel study, since Kurdish and Turkish are also the second and third languages of the participants adittional to the Persian. It is important to note here, similarly, in this study bilingual students have not obtained higher grades than the monolingual group regarding the mean scores of all students. Furthermore, it is clearly seen that there is a meaningful difference in distribution on the English grades of students between the groups.

5.1.3. The Correlation between Metalinguistic Awareness and English Grades

The metalinguistic awareness has been accepted as the mediator in language learning process (Cenoz, 2003) and its role has been highlighted in the related literature (Bialystok, 2001). The relation between metalinguistic awareness and language learning has been investigated through various ways. This relation has been used an explanatory factor for causes and effects of the success of learners, in certain cases. In this study, the main aim is to evaluate the possible correlation in order to investigate the role of metalinguistic awareness in language learning. Therefore, the following research question has been asked:

Research Question 3: Does metalinguistic awareness in both Turkish and English languages have a correlation with English as a foreign language success of bilingual students, especially from different social backgrounds?

According to the Spearman Correlation results, a large correlation value has been obtained between metalinguistic awareness test results and English grades of the bilingual group. It is clearly seen that monolingual group has already showed correlation between English success and metalinguistic awareness in both languages (see Table 11). The correlation results of the monolingual group stood as a reference point, bilinguals are also expected to show correlation. In general, it is understood from the correlation that the

students who got higher scores in metalinguistic tests are also successful in English lessons. Accordingly, students who got lower scores in metalinguistic tests also showed lower performances in English lessons.

It is significant to point out that because of certain reasons the correlation of metalinguistic awareness with language learning requires more detailed surveys. First, as it is emphasized in the very beginning of the study a problem in classroom instruction has been observed in heritage bilingual classroom. Since it is explained that as one of the reasons why investigators look into metalinguistic awareness of learners is related to creating a "comprehensible classroom instruction" (Chaudron, 1988:347). Figuring out the relation may help to reduce the problems in instruction during language lessons. Secondly, the successes or failures of language learning are sometimes found as related to metalinguistic skills of learners. At this state, pointing out the correlation can be helpful for identification of cause and effect relationship between awareness and success of learners.

Furthermore, in related research areas, mainly findings of the existence of correlation of metalinguistic awareness with language learning of participants have been emphasized in various contexts in different parts of the world. Rauch et al. (2011) studied the concept of learning English as a foreign language of Turkish-German bilinguals and German monolinguals in referring their metalinguistic awareness in Germany. In recent years, Woll (2016) focused on the metalinguistic awareness and third language learning circumstances in Canada, involving speakers and learners of French- English-German in contact.

In a more recent study, the bilinguals who have high morphological awareness performed high achievement in third language tasks in Taiwan (Huang, 2018). It has been inferred that there is a correlation between morphological awareness and additional language learning in certain contexts. Similarly in this study, according to the correlation results of the bilingual group, there is a large correlation between both Turkish and English morphology tests and English grades. In fact, the correlation between morphology tests and English grades of the monolingual group is slightly higher than the bilingual group. However, this difference between the correlation coefficient values is not significant, thus for both groups, the morphological awareness can be seen effective in language learning performances of learners.

In the Turkish context, the correlations of metalinguistic knowledge with English as a second language (Yeşilyurt, 2005); metalinguistic awareness with Turkish writing

skills (Beyret, 2015); and metalinguistic awareness with analytic knowledge (Baytar, 2016) have been investigated. Yeşilyurt (2005) stated that there is not a significant correlation of metalinguistic knowledge with English proficiency of university students. However, Beyret (2015) pointed out that metalinguistic awareness of secondary school students has shown correlation with their writing skills. Similarly, Baytar (2016) stated that there has been a correlation of metalinguistic awareness with analytic knowledge of results of English language and literature department students at university level.

In conclusion, in this study, both the heritage bilingual group and the monolingual group have been observed that the existence of correlation between metalinguistic awareness and English success in similar backgrounds. Additionally, it has been clearly seen that there is a correlation between Turkish and English metalinguistic awareness task results of both groups. Even though in some sub-categories and English grades correlation have been found relatively less significant, it is seen that in total there is a high tendency in correlation coefficient values. Especially, the heritage bilingual group, since the main focus of the study, has performed correlation within all total results of MATs and English grades.

5.1.4. Analysis of the Interviews with Bilingual Students

In the last part of the research, semi-structured interviews have been conducted with a representative group of heritage bilingual students who are on the extreme according to their success and failure. Intervies have been conducted in order to obtain information about opinions of the bilingual students who have been identified as having problems with learning English as a foreign language. As metalinguistic awareness of both Turkish and English, and end of the term English grades have been evaluated, in the light of the results, 12 interview students have been determined randomly according to higher and lower scores and grades from the tasks and language courses which they have obtained to answer the following research question:

Research Question 4: What are the views of students on the extreme regarding their success/unsuccess in English classes?

According to the content analysis of the semi structured interviews a few points can be noted in order to categorize what representative part of the heritage bilinguals state about the related concepts. First of all, it can be stated that they are mainly aware of their success or failure in English language, however, mostly higher graded and scored

bilinguals could talk about the English language itself by giving reference to difference topics. On the other hand, lower graded and scored group of students have not been inclined to talk much about the language itself; it has been observed that they are asked more specific questions to help them state their opinions. Secondly, all of them have stated Kurdish is mostly used with family members and eleven out of twelve students have claimed that they are good at Kurdish language. As the third main concept, most of the students have not stated any relation between languages they already acquired or have been learning. However, two of twelve students have claimed that they found English and Turkish may show resemblance. Additionally other two students identified the role of Kurdish while learning English as a foreign and a third language in school environment.

To sum up, the discussion on the opinions of the heritage bilingual students have shown that both the higher and lower graded in English and scored in metalinguistic awareness tests claim the Kurdish as their home language. Whereas, it can be noted that only a few of them, especially from the higher graded and scored group, could talk about the language, some components of linguistics knowledge of languages, and the relation among languages involved to the current study.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.0. Introduction

In this chapter, a general conclusion has been presented in terms of the analyses of the results which have been obtained through the quantitative and qualitative data. After then, the general implications of the present study and further suggestions for related research areas have been proposed.

6.1. Conclusion

The main aim of the study had been to investigate the metalinguistic awareness and performances of learning English of heritage bilingual secondary school students by comparing a monolingual group from a similar background. Then it has been aimed to evaluate the correlation between variables of both groups, and finally questioning the opinions of the bilingual participants have been conducted. The secondary school students have been selected as participants from two different schools; as noted to have similar economic backgrounds; and differ according to being monolingual or heritage bilingual students. The metalinguistic awareness of all students has been evaluated with tests which are formed of four elements such as phonology, morphology, semantics, and syntax in both Turkish and English languages. English learning performances have been determined by the end of the term grades which have been obtained from teachers and administrations of both schools. In the end, semi-structured interviews have been accomplished with a representative part of the heritage bilingual students who are on the extreme according to the scores of tests and grades of English.

First of all, the differences between the monolingual and bilingual groups' metalinguistic tests in both Turkish and English have been investigated in order to obtain a certain comprehension of how bilingual students have performed in metalinguistic tasks rather than monolinguals. In both metalinguistic awareness tests, in Turkish and English, the bilingual group showed lower results in scores of overall tests than the monolingual group of participants. In particular, the obtained statistical data has shown that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of both groups in three out of

four metalinguistic awareness tests, which are phonology, morphology, semantics, and syntax in Turkish. Even though the mean scores are close to each other for each category, according to the Mann-Whitney U analysis, this difference is meaningful. It has been understood that the significance value has been revealed as below ,05 for phonology, morphology and semantics parts; explaining the monolingual group is more successful than the bilingual group. Furthermore, it has been interpreted according to the data of SPSS outputs that there is a statistical difference between the mean scores in metalinguistic awareness tests in English. Although there is a slight difference in mean score values between the groups, Mann-Whitney U analysis has shown that it is significant in morphology, semantics and syntax parts of the test in English. Hence the significance values are below the ,05 in these three parts, it is seen that English phonology has been found as above the ,05; three out of four parts claims that monolingual group has shown higher results in English metalinguistic awareness. It has also been noted that there is a statistical difference between the groups in terms of English grades.

Briefly, the first and the second research questions of the study can be summed up in order to summarize the differences between the bilingual and monolingual groups. In a detailed evaluation regarding each category of metalinguistic awareness, in Turkish syntax part and in English phonology part, the bilingual and the monolingual have not shown any difference and the mean scores of both groups have been found close to each other. However, in total, it has been clearly understood that there is a statistically significant difference between the results of both groups. In the end, it can be summarized that the bilingual students have not shown any superiority over the monolingual participants.

The correlation of the metalinguistic awareness and English success of all the participants have been investigated, the performances of bilingual students have been emphasized on the grounds of taking the monolingual groups as a reference point while evaluating the general results. There has been observed a significant correlation of metalinguistic awareness in both languages and English grades of all participants. In total it has been interpreted that metalinguistic awareness tests have shown the highest correlation with the Sig. value ,752.

In particular, the correlation of metalinguistic awareness tests between Turkish MAT and English MAT and also separately with English grades of the monolingual group have been categorized at the high-level values according to overall results. According to the correlation matrices, which have been given in the data analysis chapter, the values

can be stated as Sig. ,730, Sig. ,712 and Sig. ,687. The highest correlation has been determined with the English MAT and English grades in the results of the monolingual group.

Similarly, as for the bilingual group of participants, the same conclusion, as in Turkish MATs, has been obtained from the correlation values of metalinguistic awareness scores in both languages and English grades. The high correlation has been obtained from the values of tests results and grades of the bilingual students, such as Sig. ,765, Sig. 700 and Sig. 688. It is worthy to be noted that the highest correlation of all values has been obtained from the Turkish MAT and English MAT of the bilingual group. It can be interpreted that bilingual students have shown higher correlation significance values than the monolingual students have shown. This may lead to the conclusion that the number of students who had shown consistency in all three results has been more in the bilingual group than the monolingual group. It can be explained that students who have obtained higher metalinguistic awareness tests also graded higher degrees in English lessons and vice versa for the lower scored and graded ones.

Finally, with the aim of determining the opinions of the heritage bilingual students about the metalinguistic awareness and relation among languages of home, school, and the additional foreign language, they have different types of interactions such as within family and within the classroom; the semi-structured interviews have been conducted with a representative group of bilinguals. During the semi-structured interviews, the heritage bilingual group of students has been asked to state their opinions regarding three languages in their lives. It has been observed that, in general, most of them have not been eager to state their opinions or seemed like they do not want to share much, this may be explained of their being secondary school students. However, it can be concluded that they are mostly aware of their success and failure in language courses and home languages because they could talk about languages. Furthermore, as it is expected, higher graded students in metalinguistic tests and English grades are found to be aware of certain linguistic components of the languages such as speaking, writing skills. Especially, there are two of them who have stated that there is a relation among languages in certain ways and they have referred their heritage language and dominant language while learning English as a foreign language.

6.2. Implications of the Study

In this study, it has been planned to investigate the correlation of metalinguistic awareness with English as a foreign language of heritage bilingual students through comparing their performances with a monolingual group of similar SES background

In addition to the results of both the difference and correlation analyses, it is also possible to have certain implications regarding the fact that the heritage bilingual group has shown a lower performance than the monolingual group. In order to explain the results, two main implications can be assumed while interpreting the discussion of this study and related literature. Firstly, it can be ascribed that heritage bilingual students may have not developed metalinguistic awareness skills as good as the monolingual group has performed. This result of the bilingual group can be assumed as associated with having a minority language as the heritage language. Secondly, the curriculum and courses in both Turkish and English have been conducted in both of the schools are identical. The lower performance of the bilingual group has been evaluated through the same tests; however, there may be a certain necessity for a different curriculum and types of tests than the monolingual group already have had. A certain requirement for a different type of curriculum for foreign language courses can be debated in EFL language classrooms.

Above all these implications, this study has also provided awareness about metalinguistic awareness to three main actors which are students, teachers and also the researcher of this study in every possible language teaching situation.

6.3. Suggestions for Further Studies

This study has tried to investigate the relation between metalinguistic awareness and EFL of heritage bilingual students giving references to the various studies conducted both in Turkey and different parts of the world. It can be clearly seen that the issues of being bilingual and having metalinguistic awareness can be investigated from different perspectives in various contexts. Bearing in mind the related literature and the results of this study, some suggestions can be made as follows.

First of all, further studies could be conducted with more participants both in secondary school students and language learners from various ages in order to compare the results of studies and have more accurate conclusions. Secondly, a similar study could be investigated in different contexts with the aim of identification of other problems

which occur in language classrooms, especially in Turkey, there are other regions where different types of bilingualism have already existed and both students and teachers could provide another perspective through those studies. As a third suggestion to identify the problems more accurately and find solutions to problems in similar classrooms, a more specific task awareness of metalinguistic should be applied and a deeper interviews should be made with participants as they can be both young and adult learners of a foreign language. As a fourth suggestion, observations in the classroom can be conducted to have deeper understanding of problems. As a last suggestion, interviews with teachers, students, and family triangle can be done and all the data obtained can be evaluated.

REFERENCES

Andreou, G. (2007). Phonological Awareness in Bilingual and Trilingual School children, *The Linguistics Journal*, 3, 8-15.

Baker, C. & Jones, S.P. (1998). *Encylopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education.* Philedelphia, USA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Balke-Aurell, G. and Lindblad, T. (1982). *Immigrant students and their languages*. *Report No.23,* Department of Educational Research, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

Bayram, N. (2017). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS İle Veri Analizi.* Ezgi Kitabevi, Bursa.

Baytar, B. (2016). The Relationship Between Analytic Language and Metalinguistic Awareness: A Comparison Between Monolingual and Sequential Bilingual Tertiary Level Students, Erciyes University, Kayseri (Unpublished Thesis)

Beceren, S. (2010). Comparison of Metalinguistic Development in Sequential Bilinguals and Monolinguals. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 1(1), 28-40.

Ben-Zeev, S. (1977). The influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Development and Cognitive Strategy. *Child Development*, vol. 48, 1009–1018

Beyret, T. N. (2015). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Üstdil Farkındalık Becerileri ile Yazma Becerileri ile İlişkisi, Uşak Üniversitesi, Uşak (Unpublished Thesis)

Bhatia, T. K. &Ritchie, W. C. (2013). *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. West Sussex, UK: Black Well Publishing

Bialystok, E. (1986). Factors in the Growth of Linguistic Awareness. *Child Development*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (Apr., 1986), 498-510

Bialystok, E. (1987). Influences of bilingualism on Metalinguistic Development. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (December 1987), 154-166

Bialystok, E. (1991). Metalinguistic Dimensions of Bilingual Language Proficiency. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children,* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 113–140.

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in Development-Language, Literacy and Cognition.* Cambridge, UK- Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*, the United States of America, Berne Convention.

Brohy, C. (2001). 'Generic and/or specific advantages of bilingualism in a dynamic plurilingual situation: the case of French as official L 3 in the school of Samedan

(Switzerland)', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 1, 38–49.

Can, A. (2016). *SPSS ile Bilimsel Araştırma Sürecinde Veri Analizi*. Pegem Akademi, Ankara

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* vol.7, 71–87

Cenoz, J. & F. Genesee (Ed.) (1998). *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J. & J. Valencia (1994). 'Additive trilingualism: evidence from the Basque Country', *Applied Psycholinguistics* , 15 , 197– 209 .

Chaudron, C. (1983). 'Research on metalinguistic judgments: a review of theory, methods and results', *Language Learning*, 33 , 3 , 345– 77 .

Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and Mind*. (Third Ed.) Cambridge University Press.

Chondrogianni, V. & Marinis, T. (2011). 'Differential effects of internal and external factors on the development of vocabulary, tense morphology and morpho-syntax in successive bilingual children' *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 1:3 John Benjamins Publishing Company, 318–345.

Clark, E. (1978). 'Awareness of language: some evidence from what children say and do', in A. Sinclair, R. Jarvella and W. Levelt (Ed.), *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 17– 44.

Cook, V. (1995). 'Multi-competence and learning of many languages', Language, *Culture and Curriculum*, 8, 2, 93– 8.

Cummins, J. (1976). The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth; A Synthesi of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypothesis. Working Papers on Bilingualism. *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education,* Ontario, Canada.

Cummins, J. (1978a). Educational implications of mother tongue maintenance in minority-language children. In S. T. Carey (Ed.) *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, vol. 34, 395-416

Cummins, J. (1978b). Bilingualism and the development of metalinguistic awareness. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology*, 1978, vol. 9, 131-149

Cummins, J. (1991). 'Interdependence of first- and second language proficiency', in E. Bialystok (ed.), *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70– 89.

Diaz, R. M., & Klinger, C. (1991).. Towards an explanatory model of the interaction between bilingualism and cognitive development. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*, 113–140. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press

Galambos, S. J. & Hakuta, K (1988). "Subject-specific and Task-specific Characteristics of Metalinguistic Awareness in Bilingual Children" *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 9, 141-162.

Ghabanchi, Z. (2011). Trilingualism and Foreign Language Proficieny. *World Journal of Education* Vol. 1, No. 2.

Gonz´alez, P.(1998). 'Learning a second language in a third language environment', *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* , 59 , 31– 9 .

Griessler, M. (2001). 'The effects of third language learning on second language proficiency: an Austrian example', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4, 1, 50– 60.

Hakuta, K., & Diaz, R. M. (1985). The relationship between degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability: A critical discussion and some new longitudinal data. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's language Vol. 5*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erbaum,, 319–344.

Hamers, J. , & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. (2nd Ed.) Cambridge, UK- Cambridge University Press.

Herdina, P. , & Jessner, U. (2002). *.A dynamic model of multilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Hoff, E., & McCardle, P. D. (2006). *Childhood Bilingualism: Research on infancy through school age.* Clevedon England: Multilingual Matters.

Huang, K. J. (2018). On Bilinguals' Development of Metalinguistic Awareness and Its Transfer to Learning: The Role of Language Characteristics, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 22(3), 330-349.

Ianco-Worrall, A. (1972). Bilingualism and Cognitive Development. *Child Development*, 43, 1390–1400.

Jessner, U. (1997). Towards a Dynamic View of Multilingualism. In M. Pütz (ed.) *Language Choices. Conditions, Constraints and Consequences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press

Jessner, U. (2008). A DST Model of Multilingualism and the Role of Metalinguistic Awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 92, no. 2, 270-283

Jorda, M. P.S. (2003). Metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic production of third language learners of English: A focus on request acts realizations. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, vol.7, 43-69.

Kelleher, A. (2010). Heritage Briefs, available at: http://www.cal.org/heritage/research/briefs/html. (01.10.2018)

Kemp, C. (2001). Metalinguistic Awareness in Multilinguals Implicit and Explicit Grammatical Awareness and its Relationship with Language Experience and Language Attainment, University of Edinburgh, (Unpublished Thesis)

Klein, E. (1995). 'Second vs. third language acquisition: is there a difference?', *Language Learning* , 45 , 3, 419– 65.

Lambert, W. E. (1981). Bilingualism and Language Acquisition. Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition

Lasagabaster, D. (1998). 'The threshold hypothesis applied to three languages in contact at school', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1, 119–33.

Leopold, W. (1949). *Speech development of a bilingual child: a linguist's record* (4 vols.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Mady, C. (2014). Immigrant Status as an Influential Factor in Additional Language Learning: A Comparison of French Language Achievement of Canadian-born Monolinguals, Bilinguals and Bilingual Immigrants. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 12-20

Masny, D. (1997). 'Linguistic awareness and writing: Exploring the relationship with language awareness', *Language Awareness*, 6, 2 & 3, 105–18.

Mägiste, E. (1984) 'Learning a Third Language'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 5, 415-421.

Meijers, G. (1992). 'The foreign language vocabulary acquisition of mono- and bilingual children and teachers' evaluation ability', in P. Arnaud and H. L´ejoint (eds), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. London: Macmillan, 146–55.

Mesaros, B. T. (2008). 'Learning English as a Third Language: The Case of Romanian Community in Spain" *Jornades de Foment de la Investigació.* Universitat Jaume.

Pallat, J. (2016). *SPSS Survival Manual A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS*, Open University Press.

Paradis, J. (2005). Grammatical morphology in children learning English as a second language: Implications of similarities with Specific Language Impairment. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in the Schools, 36*, 172–187.

Paradis, J. (2008). Tense as a clinical marker in English L2 acquisition with language delay/impairment. In E. Gavruseva & B. Haznedar (Eds.), *Current trends in child second language acquisition: a generative perspective,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 337–356.

Peal, E. , & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, vol.76, 1– 23.

Rauch, D. P. , Nauman, J & Jude, N. (2011) Metalinguistic awareness mediates effects of full biliteracy on third-language reading proficiency in Turkish–German bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, vol.16, 402-418.

Ringbom, H. (1987). The Role of First Language in Foreign Language Learning. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters*.

Sofu, H. (2009). Language shift or maintenance within three generations: examples from three Turkish–Arabic-speaking families, International Journal of Multilingualism, 6:3, 246-257, DOI: 10.1080/14790710902878684

Sorace, A. (1985). 'Metalinguistic knowledge and use in acquisition-poor environments', *Applied Linguistics*, 6 , 239– 54 .

Tellier, A. & Roehr-Brackin, K. (2013). The Development of Language Learning Aptitude and Metalinguistic Awareness in Primary-School Children: A Classroom Study, *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics*, 62, 1

Thomas, J. (1988). *'The role played by metalinguistic awareness in second and third language learning',* Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 9, 235– 46.

Thomas, J. (1992). *'Metalinguistic awareness in second- and third-language learning'*, in R. Harris (ed.), Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals. Amsterdam: North Holland, 531– 45.

Van Gelderen, A. & Schoonen, R. & de Glopper, K. (2003). Roles of linguistic knowledge,metacognitive knowledge and processing speed in L3, L2 and L1 reading comprehension: A structural equation modeling approach. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, vol.7, 7-25.

Verhoeven, L., Steenge, J., & Van Balkom, H. (2012). Linguistic transfer in bilingual children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of Language &*

Communication Disorders / Royal College of Speech & Language Therapists, *47*(2), 176–83

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and Language.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.

Woll, N. (2016). The role of metalinguistic awareness and of L2 proficiency in positive lexical transfer from English (L2) to German (L3) by French-speaking Quebeckers. PhD Dissertation, Quebec, Canada

Yeşilyurt, S. (2005). The Relationship Between Metalinguistic Knowledge and Foreign Language Proficiency, Atatürk University, Erzurum (Unpublished thesis)

Zobl, H.(1992). 'Grammaticality intuitions of unilingual and multilingual nonprimary language learners', in S. Gass and L. Selinker (eds), *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 176– 82 .

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Consent Form

Dear Madam/Sir,

We would like to ask your permission for the application of a master thesis study which is being conducted about the relation between language awareness of students and learning a foreign language, by our master student, Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT. The obtained data will only be used for academic purposes and the personal information of students will be kept as unknown. Official consents have been taken from the authorities. We would like to note that participation of your child would provide a significant contribution to our study. In case of your approval, please send this form with your signature. We would like to thank for your contribution.

With our best regards

Name of the researcher
Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT
MA Student

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU
Çukurova University
English Language Teaching

Name of the Parent:
Signature:

Consent Form in Turkish
İzin Belgesi

Sayın Veli,
Danışmanı olduğum yüksek lisans öğrencisi Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT'ın öğrencilerin dil farkındalıklarının yabancı dil öğretimi ile ilişkisi konusunda yürütmekte olduğu yüksek lisans tezi için yapacağı uygulama için izninize ihitycamız vardır. Toplanan veri yalnızca bilimsel amaçlı kullanılacaktır. Öğrencilerin kimlik bilgileri kesinlikle açıklanmayacaktır. Uygulama hakkında gerekli resmi izinler alınmıştır. Çocuğunuzun bu uygulamaya katılımı çalışmamız için önemli katkı sağlayacaktır. Onay vermeniz durumunda bu belgeyi imzalayıp göndermenizi rica ederiz. Katkınız için çok teşekkür ederiz.

Saygılarımızla

Araştırmacının Adı
Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Danışman
Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU
Çukurova Üniversitesi
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Velinin Adı Soyadı:
İmzası:

Appendix 2. Background Information Form

General Information

Name -Surname	
Name of the School	
Class and Number	
Birth Place and Date	
Name of the father	
Name of the mother	
Home adress	
Phone number	

Family Information

Required Information of Your Father

His occupation		
Avarage Monthly Revenue	**Amount:**	**High ( ) Middle ( ) Low ( )**
Education Background		

Required Information of Your Mother

Her occupation		
Avarage Monthly Revenue	**Amount:**	**High ( ) Middle ( ) Low ( )**
Education Background		

Educational Background and Other Information

Write the names of your favourite subjects.	
Write the names of subjects that you least favourite.	
Do you join any kind of facilities in the school? If yes, which one or ones?	
How dou you enjoy spending your leisure or free time?	
Have you ever worked in a part time or full time job?	
Is another language spoken in your family other than Turkish? What language is it?	
In what language do you communicate with your parent and/or parents?	
Can you understand any other languages when it şs spoken by someone around you? Can you answer them in that language?	
What is your dream job? Why?	
Dou you have any problems during studying at home? If yes, what kind of proeblems do you have?	
Do you expreience any difficulties while undertaning the subjects during courses? If yes, what dou you think about the reasons?	

Background Information in Turkish

ÖĞRENCİ TANIMA FORMU

Adı-Soyadı	
Okulu	
Sınıf ve No	
Doğum Yeri -Tarihi	
Baba adı	
Anne adı	
Ev Adresi	
Telefon No	

AİLE DURUMU

BABANIZ:

İşi		
Ortalama aylık gelir	**Miktar:**	**Yüksek ( ) Orta ( ) Düşük ( )**
Öğrenim durumu		

ANNENİZ:

İşi		
Ortalama aylık gelir	**Miktar:**	**Yüksek ( ) Orta ( ) Düşük ( )**
Öğrenim durumu		

ÖĞRENİM DURUMUNUZ VE DİĞER BİLGİLER:

Okul hayatınızda en çok sevdiğiniz derslerin adını yazınız.	
Okul hayatınızda en az sevdiğiniz veya hiç sevmediğiniz derslerin adını yazınız.	
Okul hayatınızda ders dışı etkinliklere katılır mısınız? Hangilerine?	
Boş zamanlarda nelerle uğraşmayı seversiniz:	
Boş zamanlarınızda herhangi bir işte çalıştınız mı?	
Aile içinde başka dil konuşuluyor mu? Nedir?	
Anneniz ve babanızla hangi dilde konuşuyorsunuz?	
Farklı dillerde konuşulanları anlayabiliyor musunuz? Cevap verebiliyor musunuz?	
İleride hangi mesleği seçmek istersiniz? Niçin?	
Evde ders çalışmakta güçlük çekiyor musunuz? Neden?	
Sınıfta dersleri anlamakta güçlük çekiyor musunuz? Neden?	

Appendix 3. Turkish Metalinguistic Awareness Test

Türkçe Üst Dil Farkındalık Testi (Beyret, 2015)

A. Fonolojik Test (Phonology Part)

1. Aşağıda verilen kelimeleri hecelerine ayırınız.

Örn.: De/ne/me

- Sosyal
- Kütüphane
- Önemli
- Rahatsızlık
- Birikim

2.Aşağıdaki kelimelerin ilk sesini ve son sesini yuvarlak içine alınız.

Örn.: (Y)alnı(z)

- Merhamet
- Saygı
- Apartman
- Kırıntı
- İhtiyar

3.Aşağıda verilen sözcüklerin bir sesini değiştirerek yeni bir kelime oluşturunuz.

Örn.: Masal → Yasal

- İlan →
- Yavaş →
- Boğuk →
- Adım →
- Ufuk →

4.Aşağıdaki kelimeleri seslerine ayırınız.

Örn.: **F/ı/r/t/ı/n/a**

- Merdiven
- Düşünce
- Kaplumbağa
- Efsane
- Gökyüzü

5.Aşağıdaki kelimelerden bir ses çıkararak anlamlı yeni kelimeler oluşturunuz.

Örn.: Boya → Oya

- Anı →
- Cisim →
- Hasır →
- Kazan →
- Gözlem →

6.Aşağıda karışık halde verilen seslerin tamamını kullanarak anlamlı kelimeler oluşturunuz.

c-r-i-i-n → **incir**

r-k-ı-a-f →

k-l-ü-z-ö-g →

a-ı-v-l-z-a-l →

p-a-c-v-e →

n-t-e-k →

B. Morfolojik Test (Morphology Part)

Aşağıdaki cümlelerin akışına uygun olarak, parantez içine alınan kelimelere uygun ekler getiriniz.

1. Ayşe Matematik ve Türkçe ders (kitap) ……..…. evde unutmuş.
2. Yolculuğa çıkarken mutlaka yanıma birkaç kitap (almak) …….. .
3. Caminin giriş (kapı) ……..…….. işlemeler Selçuklu dönemine ait.
4. Oturduğumuz evin (bitişik) ……..……..…….. tek katlı bir iş yeri vardı.
5. Her sabah (okul) ……. geç kalmamak için acele ederdi.
6. Galileo küçükken edindiği gözlemleme (alışkanlık)…….. deneylerle desteklemeyi öğrenmişti.
7. Akşam eve (gitmek) …….. ilk önce ödevlerini yapar.
8. Kardeşimle yeni kayıt olduğumuz okul (ev) …… çok yakın.

9. Matematik en sevdiğim (ders) …… .

10. Dünyada hiçbir dost insana (kitap) ……. daha yakın değildir.

11. İnsanın yardım etmeye gönlü (olmamak) ……. bahaneler uydurur.

12. Babaanne elmaları torunları arasında (iki-iki) …….. paylaştırdı.

13. Gülmek (beraber) ……. neşe, huzur ve sevgi getirir.

14. Derslerime planlı çalıştığım için hiçbir derste (zorlanmamak) ……

15. Ömer Seyfettin'in "Pembe İncili Kaftan" adlı (hikaye)……. okudunuz mu?

16. Ahmet lafını bölünce Hakan ne (söylemek) ……. unuttu.

17. Bu (mevsim)…….. buraları çöl sıcağı olur.

18. Öğretmen ufkumuza güneş gibi (doğmak) …….. hiç hüznümüz kalmaz.

19. Yarın bizimle sinemaya (gelmek) …….. misin?

20. Evde hiç meyve sebze (kalmamak) …… .

21. Öğrenciler hem (eğlenmek) ……... hem öğreniyorlar.

22. Pazar günleri (baba) ……. ve ağabeyimle balık tutmaya gideriz.

23. Yaklaşan fırtınayı öncesinde (hissetmek) ……. herkese haber vermesi büyük bir felaketi önledi.

24. Cem'in (ayak) …… kırılınca bir ay okula gidemedi.

25. Yaşlı tilki ormandan çıkmak için erkenden (yol) ……. koyuldu.

C.Semantik Test (Semantics Part)

1.Aşağıda verilen kelimeleri eş veya yakın anlamlılarıyla eşleştiriniz.

~~1. Yüzyıl~~	a. Küçük
2.Zaman	b. Armağan
3. Okul	c. Vakit
4. Ufak	d. Uyarı
5. Sözcük	e. Görev
6. Vatan	~~f. Asır~~
7. Hediye	g. Mektep
8. Güçlü	h. Yurt
9. Vazife	i. Kelime
10. İkaz	j. Kuvvetli

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
f									

2. Aşağıda verilen kelimeleri zıt anlamlılarıyla eşleştiriniz.

~~1.Aşağı~~	a. Ceza
2. Erken	b. Çirkin
3.Neşeli	~~c. Yukarı~~
4. Zengin	d. Yumuşak
5. Pahalı	e. Geç
6. Katı	f. Üzgün
7. Uzak	g. Fakir
8. Acemi	h. Usta
9. Güzel	i. Yakın
10. Ödül	j. Ucuz

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
c									

3.Aşağıda bazı cümleler verilmiştir. Bu cümlelerde altı çizili kelimelerin gerçek anlamlı mı mecaz anlamlı mı olduğunu bulunuz.

1. Oraya ilk gittiğimde beni çok sıcak karşıladılar.	A)Gerçek	**(B)Mecaz**
2. Taşınırken hazırladığı koliler çok ağırdı.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
3. Bayramda gelenlere ikram etmek için biraz tatlı aldım.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
4. Derin düşüncelere dalar başka âlemlerde gibi davranırdı.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
5. Bütün acı biberleri yemeğe koydu.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
6. Anne baba olacaklarını öğrenince sevinçten havalara uçtular.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
7. Pencere açık kalınca içeriye kuş girmiş.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
8. Babam sinirlenince küplere bindi.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
9. Hızla koşarken elindekileri düşürdü.	A)Gerçek	B)Mecaz
10. Son yaptıklarından sonra iyice herkesin gözünden düştü.	A) Gerçek	B)Mecaz

4. Aşağıdaki kutucuklarda verilen kelimeleri çağrıştırdığını düşündüğünüz başlığın altına yazınız.

Şarkı	Doktor	Ritim	Hasta	Bilgisayar

Keman	Bilişim	İnternet	Tedavi

Sağlık	**Müzik**	**Teknoloji**
1.	**1.**	**1.**
2.	**2.**	**2.**
3.	**3.**	**3.**

D. Sözdizim Test (Syntax Part)

1. Aşağıda karışık olarak verilen kelimelerden anlamlı cümleler oluşturup altlarına yeniden yazınız.

- doğum / kardeşime / düşünüyorum / kitap / gününde / almayı / bir /.
-
- mevsim / sevdiğim / sonbahardır /en /.
-
- vaktimizde / gerekir / boş / gazete / okumamız /.
-
- izin / okulda / alıp / gitti / hastalanınca / eve / Ahmet / .
-
- buraya / seni / öğrenebilir / getiren / miyim / nedeni / ?
-
- yetişen / Adana'da / dokuma / pamuk / kullanılır / sanayisinde /.
-
- birlikte / oynayalım / bahçede / mı / oyun / ?
-
- işten / bir / sonra / saat / gelecek / annem / .

2.Aşağıdaki kelime ve kelime gruplarını kullanarak cümleler oluşturunuz.

- İstasyon ⟶
- Bayram ⟶
- Gece gündüz ⟶
- Hızlı ⟶
- Yola Çıkmak ⟶
- Kibar ⟶
- Susmak ⟶

Appendix 4. English Metalinguistic Awareness Test

A. Phonology Part

1. Match the words which have similar sounds to each other. (Kutu içinde verilen kelimeleri aşağıdaki tabloda yer alan kelimelerden benzer seslere sahip olanlarla eşleştiriniz.)

tired	boot	physics	they	
cake	~~watch~~	short		

cheap	phone	selfish	food	like	candy	there

watch

B. Morphology Part

1. Rewrite words given in the brackets in the correct form to complete sentences. (Aşağıda verilen örnektekiler gibi, parantez içinde verilen kelimelere cümledeki anlama uygun olacak şekilde ek getirin ve boşluklara yeniden yazınız.)

Ex. There are seven __*apples*__ (apple) in the basket. // A dog is ___*smaller*__(small) than an elephant. // She __*cleaned*__ (clean) the house yesterday. // We are _*going* __(go) to school now.

1. There are five _____ (book) on the table.
2. My father always eats lots of _____ (olive) during breakfast.
3. There are thirty _____ (student) in the garden now.
4. Jack _____ (climb) mountains in Pozantı last weekend.
5. Susan and Melisa _____ (play) basketball yesterday.
6. The Browns _____ (travel) across Europe last summer
7. Ağrı Mountain is _____ (high) than Erciyes Mountain.
8. Adana is usually _____ (hot) than Erzurum.
9. A turtle is _____ (slow) than a cheetah.
10. Alison _____ (like) Maths and Social Sciences.
11. She always _____ (do) her homework.
12. My mother sometimes _____ (watch) TV-serials in the evenings.
13. They are _____ (play) soccer at the moment.

14. She is _____ (listen) to the radio right now.

15. I am _____ (study) English now.

C. Semantics Part

1. Match the words with opposite meanings. (Aşağıda verilen kelimeleri zıt anlamlılarıyla örnekteki gibi eşleştiriniz.)

~~1. big~~ a. clean

2. short b. late

3. fast c. expensive

4. cheap ~~d. small~~

5. happy e. easy

6. dirty f. beautiful

7. difficult g. slow

8. fat h. sad

9. hardworking i. tall

10. early j. slim

11. ugly k. lazy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
d										

2. Write words under groups with related topic. (Aşağıdaki kutucuklarda verilen kelimeleri alakalı olan grupların altına yazınız.)

Pink	Twelve	Doctor	Horse	White	Hundred

Teacher	Bird	Green	Farmer	Seven	Cat

1. Numbers	**2. Animals**	**3. Colours**	**4. Jobs**
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-

D. Syntax Part

1. Put the words into correct order to make meaningful sentences. (Aşağıda karışık olarak verilen kelimeleri anlamlı cümleler oluşturup altlarına yeniden yazınız.)

- have / I / every / breakfast / morning /.
- old / you / how / are / ?
- like / soccer / you / playing / do / ?
- was / in 2005 / I / born / .
- favourite / is / your / sport / what / ?
- are / from / where / you /?
- your / is /name /what / ?
- can't / a bike / Tim / ride /.
- like / I / to the cinema /going /.
- makes / a tailor / dresses / skirts / and / .

2. Fill in the blanks with words given below to make meaningful sentences. (Aşağıda verilen kelimeleri anlamlı cümleler oluşturmak için uygun boşluklara yazarak cümleleri tamamlayınız.)

every day	**what**	**my mother**	**but**	**watch TV**

- **We sometimes _____ in the evenings.**
- **_____ is your dream job?**
- **He goes to school _____.**
- **_____ was at the hospital yesterday.**
- **I can ride a bike _____ I can't drive a car.**

Appendix 5. Semi Structured Interview Questions

1. How do you find your success in English?

2. Can you explain your success / failure in English class? If yes, what are the reasons / reasons?

3. What do you think about the other language you speak / know?

4. Can you tell us about the impact on Turkish and / or English of the language?

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name & Surname: Eda AKGÜN ÖZPOLAT
Date / Place of Birth: 15.09.1989 - Çaycuma
E-mail: eda.akgn@gmail.com

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

2015 - 2019: MA, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences,
English Language Teaching Department

2007 - 2011: BA, Ege University, Faculty of Letters,
English Language and Literature Department

WORK EXPERIENCE

2018 - : English Language Teacher, Sezai Karakoç Religious Vocational High School, Izmir

2015 - 2018: English Language Teacher, 80. Yıl Secondary School, Adana

2014 - 2015: Lecturer / Instructor, Yeni Yüzyıl University, Istanbul

2012 - 2014: Lecturer / Instructor (Part-Time), Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir