EDITED BY
C. B. DABELSTEEN & J. N. JØRGENSEN

LANGUAGING AND LANGUAGE PRACTICES

COPENHAGEN STUDIES IN BILINGUALISM
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
COPENHAGEN 2004

VOL. 36

CONTENTS

THE STRUCTURE AND THE ROLE OF CODE-SWITCHING IN TURKISH-FRENCH CONVERSATIONS

Mehmet-Ali Akıncı & Ad Backus

Introduction

This paper will introduce codeswitching data from a bilingual context hitherto unexplored: the Turkish immigrant community in France. The data will be compared to what we know from other immigration contexts involving the Turkish language, particularly in the Netherlands. The reason for undertaking this comparison is that we know relatively little about what influences CS patterns. We know by and large that all kinds of social factors are responsible for the patterns of language mixing one will find, along with typological characteristics of the languages involved. However, we know much less about the influence of subtle variations in the circumstances of speakers on how they use their bilingual repertoire. This can be investigated in a quasi-experimental way by comparing two groups that are very similar, but not identical. One can, for instance, compare two subgroups within the same community, cf. Kallmeyer & Keim (2003), or one can compare the same immigrant group in two different countries. This paper is an attempt to do the latter.

We will first introduce the Turkish immigrant community in France. The main body of the text analyzes contact phenomena in French Turkish data, loosely comparing them to similar data from Holland. We will end with a summary and explanatory suggestions.

Turkish immigration to Western Europe

The circumstances that led to the presence of Turks in most Western European countries and their socio-economical characteristics are probably well-known by most readers of this volume. Similarly, we know quite a bit about bilingual CS in these communities, especially about CS between Turkish and Dutch, German and Norwegian. However, some other countries with sizable Turkish minorities are not represented very much in the literature, certainly not in CS studies. France is one of them, as are Switzerland, Austria, Belgium and, to a lesser extent, Sweden. We will try to fill this gap by looking at the structure and functions of Turkish-French CS.

The Turkish community in France

Turkish immigration to France is a relatively recent phenomenon. Shortly after World War II, only 7,770 Turks lived in France. The first bilateral immigration agreement between France and Turkey was signed in 1965, but massive Turkish migration only started at the beginning of the 70s and continued in the 80s. Between 1968 and 1972, the Turkish population

increased to 50,860; and between 1972 and 1982, it rose further to 123,540. Today, the Turkish population in France is estimated to be 350,000. The largest proportion can be found in the region of Île de France (20% of all the Turks live in this region). The second region is Rhône-Alpes (17%), followed by Alsace (15%; cf. Villanova (1997). The majority of immigrants are blue-collar workers, cf. Echardour & Maurin (1993) for statistics, though the last decade has seen an increase in import-export shops to feed the needs of the community, as well as building firms, and döner-kebab fast food places.

The population increase is not only due to labor migration but primarily to family reunification for those immigrants whose families had remained in the home country. In 1990, half of the Turkish population was younger than twenty. Thus, as opposed to less-educated first generation Turkish immigrants, the young generations have been through the French school system and their educational and vocational profiles are much better than the previous generations. A first generation deprived of educational possibilities, very often illiterate, is succeeded by a young generation born and schooled in France with a much better future perspective. Children tend to be bilingual, speaking Turkish with the parents and French among themselves, cf. Akinci (1996). In the late 90's, the majority of families chose to become established definitively in France and, according to Villanova (1997), a third of them acquired their own flat or single-family dwelling. This shows that the dream of an eventual return to Turkey has weakened, that families see their future in France. They keep up their contact with the homeland, going there for holidays at least once a year.

However, for all the convergence towards statistics more in line with the general population in France, there is no strong desire to completely integrate. This is shown by several very visible facts, the most important of which are summarized below.

First, most second-generation members have double French and Turkish nationality, cf. Akinci, De Ruiter & Sanagustin (2004). Second, Turkish immigrants in France enjoy many resources, domains and facilities for first language use and maintenance. They are able to visit their homeland at least once every year. Turkish language media are readily accessible in France. Most of the major Turkish newspapers have rather high-circulation European editions, and there are weekly magazines and journals, as well as bookshops, theaters, and cultural events. Major Turkish TV channels can be received by cable or satellite-dish, and 97% of homes are equipped with satellites. The Internet, too, has a rich variety of Turkish-medium resources. Third, as in many other European countries, the Turkish government sends teachers from Turkey to teach the Turkish language, history and geography in French schools with many Turkish pupils. These factors may all be presumed to contribute to high maintenance levels of the Turkish language.

However, the single most important factor is no doubt the fact that in-group marriage is very widespread. According to the Institut National de la

Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE) (1997), 98% of the females and 92% of the males marry a person from Turkey, so the migration process renews itself continuously. Turkey-born young immigrants who arrive in France through family reunification also contribute to language maintenance. Language choice within the family tends to be Turkish as long as parents are involved in the conversation. According to INSEE, in Turkish families, 17% of the fathers and 3% of the mothers talk to their children in French (as compared to, for example, 69% and 52% of the Algerians).

Turkish competence in France

As indicated earlier, in most cases Turkish persons born in France and Western Europe marry persons born in Turkey, thus providing a constant inflow of first-generation immigrants. In this way, Turkish never loses its dominant role in the domestic domain, and children who are born into those families acquire Turkish as their first language till they begin the nursery schools at the age of 2, cf. Akinci (1998). Furthermore, the concentration patterns of Turkish migrants (Tribalat, 1995) provide them with a strong community network where Turkish can be used for day-to-day communication without having contact with French. Akinci (1998) observed, however, that the mastery of French continues gradually between 5 and 10 years and that French becomes the dominant language of Turkish-French children at 7 years of age.

Studies have shown that until the age of 14, the young teenagers speak their mother tongue like their parents do, cf. Akinci (2001), which, in turn, is similar to that of low-educated monolingual Turkish adults. After that, they start to diverge and speak a language closer to that of Turkish monolinguals with a high educational level. In this case, we think that schooling in the mother tongue is a very important factor in the development and the use of Turkish by the teenagers of the second generation. This is a somewhat surprising finding, given that primary school children showed considerable delay in using the full range of devices available in Turkish for, for example, syntactic packaging of story content, cf. Akinci & Jisa (2001), or the use of subordinate clauses. The fossilization of the mother tongue that seems to be setting in at the end of the primary school exists only until the age of 14, however, since starting from this age, development continues.

Codeswitching data

Because the data used in Akıncı's earlier studies do not allow analysis of everyday language use, we complemented them with spontaneous in-group conversations. All informants were from the second generation.

We recorded three conversations. The circumstances differed somewhat between them. The first was made with teenagers (12-14 years) in a Turkish language and culture lesson in the junior school, in the presence of the teacher from Turkey. These circumstances led to a strong dominance of

Turkish, though there were also some private conversations in French among informants. The second recording was also made in the classroom, but this time the teacher was not present. Presumably as a result of this, there was some more codeswitching, though still mainly in asides between students. Most of the talk is between the researcher and the group of students, and this is predominantly in Turkish. The third recording where made with six young second generation adults (16-20 years old) in circumstances that should be more amenable to the occurrence of language alternation. It features a social network of young bilinguals, and the researcher was not present. Surprisingly, this conversation didn't yield much codeswitching or monolingual French talk either. Most of the talk is still monolingual Turkish.

Turkish-French contact data

The rest of the paper will present the results of our analysis of the French codeswitching data. We will address three aspects: the selection of French words that are used, the communicative functions of codeswitching, and possible structural changes in the Turkish that the informants speak. Throughout, we will compare the data with other Turkish immigrant varieties, particularly in Holland. Information on Dutch data can be found in Backus (1996, 2004).

The most eye-catching difference between the recordings is the frequency with which codeswitching occurs. The presence of the Turkish teacher and/or the researcher obviously had an inhibiting effect on the use of French, but it must be emphasized that even in the recording in which only the informants were present, there wasn't as much codeswitching as would be expected on the basis of experiences with informants of very similar background in Holland and Germany.

Selection of French words

Like in Dutch Turkish data, and virtually all other published codeswitching data world-wide, most inserted elements from French are nouns and most nouns are 'obvious', in the sense that they could be expected. They refer to French concepts that cannot easily be translated into Turkish. This does not mean that Turkish doesn't have anything similar to, for instance, *préfecture*, but the connotations of the two words are completely different. Only a few inserted French words cannot easily be explained through lexical need, e.g. *mat* 'pale'. Some French words are clearly established borrowings in French Turkish and perhaps not even recognized as non-Turkish anymore. Turks in France never use *istasyon*, for example, but always say *lagar*. A similarly ubiquitous word is *mairie* 'city hall'.

An interesting difference between the French and Dutch data is that Turks in France tend to make greater use of 'old' French borrowings in Turkish. Turkish has many French-origin words, which were borrowed long ago, in Ottoman times. In the modern contact situation, the use of many of these

words is reinforced, so that they are used more widely than in modern-day Turkey or in Holland. Presumably this is because the speakers' knowledge of French reinforces the degree to which they are entrenched in the lexicon. Some examples are *fiş* 'cable of a microphone', *aktör* 'actor', *orijinallik* 'origin', *dezavantaj* 'disadvantage', *profil* 'profile', and *bonkörlük* 'graciousness'.

An interesting phenomenon concerns compound verbs formed with the Turkish auxiliary verb *yap-* ('make, do'). This word is very frequent in all varieties of Immigrant Turkish because it is used to integrate foreign verbs (e.g. Dutch *lenen yap-*, for 'borrow', with the Dutch infinitive). In Turkey, most compound verbs are formed with *et-* instead of *yap-*. However, in the French data, several established compounds, consisting of a French participle and *et-*, are changed into Noun + *yap-* compounds. Thus, *kamufle et-* has become *kamuflaj yap-* in France. Perhaps these changes occur through analogy with partial loan translations of the type *transition yapmak*, for which the model is French *faire une transition* 'make a transition': the Turkish expression has borrowed the French noun as well as the combination, but translated the verb. The old pattern, with French past participles, is preserved in other cases, for example in *komande yap-* 'to order', except that *et-* is replaced by *yap-* again. This phenomenon is also found in the Dutch data (e.g. *kavga yap-*, 'to fight' instead of *kavga et-*). However, most combinations with *et-* remain unchanged.

Another difference with the Dutch data is that very few French insertions are longer than just one nominal root. French plurals don't appear on French nouns, for example; instead, plural is marked in Turkish: *etranger-ler* (foreigner-pl; 'foreigners'). In the Dutch data, plurals of inserted Dutch nouns are marked with the Dutch plural morpheme in approximately half of the cases. The Dutch data are also full of longer units, such as verb-object collocations or established Adjective-Noun combinations. One rare example of this in the French data is the Noun-Adjective combination *nationalité française* 'French nationality'. This is in contrast with the first generation equivalent *Fransız nationalitesi*, in which the French collocation is reanalyzed using the very different Turkish compound noun structure.

Functions of codeswitching

Functional analyses of CS usually focus on so-called intersentential or alternational CS, in which whole clauses and sentences in the two languages alternate. These are almost absent from the French data, while extremely frequent in Holland. Nevertheless, the first stirrings of communicatively used alternational codeswitching can be observed in the data.

Minimal responses in French occur at various points, though they occur in Turkish, too. Special mention may be made of 'oui' and 'non'. Like their Dutch equivalents in Holland, these seem to be much more popular than Turkish 'evet' and 'hayır', which are not used much, not in the data, and not

in the community in general. Both French words occurs in the following excerpt:

(1)
Zehra: hem de o kağatnan hem de bütün dünyayı gezebiliriz bedava ('and with that piece of paper you can even travel the whole world free of charge')
Meltem: **non** Avrupayı ('no, Europe')
Zehra: tamam Avrupa bedava Türkiye'de bile o kartnan gidebiliriz ('OK, free of charge in Europe, but you can even use it in Turkey')
Şule: ama Türkiye kartınnan sanırım gezemiyoruz Fransa'yı falan
('but I think you cannot travel in France, for instance, with the Turkish card')
Researcher: başka ülkelere gitmek daha zor oluyor diyorsunuz öyle mi Türk pasaportuyla ('you're saying that it'll be harder to go to other countries, right, with a Turkish passport?')
Meltem: **ben oui** ('I think so')

Familiar functions of CS are in evidence in individual occurrences, e.g. switching to French for the conclusion of a discussion, for conversational commands (e.g. *mais arrêtes toi*, 'but wait a minute'), insults (e.g. *tu vas fermer ta gueule* 'shut your mouth'), metalingual comments (e.g. *ben je n'sais pas comment on dit* 'I don't know how you say it'), repetition of what was just said, and flagging topic change, but especially for side remarks to friends, which are kind of off the record. An example is the following excerpt, in which Zehra turns to another girl during a discussion of what they want to be when they grow up:

(2)
Researcher: tamam ordakileri de alır o ('OK, she takes the ones there')
Gülten: ah cevap versenize ('oh, answer him you guys')
Zehra: **l'autre jour tu disais toi** ('The other day I told you')
Elif: ben öğretmen ('me, teacher')

Occasionally, a French sentence seems to have been triggered by the use of one specific word. In the next example, the concept that the word '*défilés*' stands for (something like English 'strut'), was probably inaccessible in Turkish. For some reason, Hatice didn't choose the usual way of dealing with this problem, inserting the French word in a Turkish sentence, but switched to French completely.

(3)
Researcher: mankenler de mi insanlara... ('models too, have uhm...')
Meltem: hayır menkenlerden insanlara fayda yok ki ('no, models hold no use for people')
Researcher: fayda yok mu? ('they have no use?')

Zehra: kendilerine fayda var da başkalarına yok ('there's a use for themselves, but not for others')
Hatice: **pourquoi ils font des défilés c'est tout hé** (why, they just strut, that's all, isn't it')

Structure

In general, the Turkish of the French data is very close to Turkish as spoken in Turkey. There is very little indication of language loss or language change. Ungrammatical constructions are rare, and the lexicon seems rich, including idiomatic expressions. This extends to the discourse level. The discourse structure is very Turkish, with its typical cyclical pattern full of repetitions.

A general point, though, is that sentences tend to be short and simple. Informants make rather limited use of clause combining patterns. Without comparative evidence from monolinguals in Turkey it is hard to know whether this is a result of language change or not.

Lexical deviations

Sometimes, words are used in ways that are not encountered in Turkey. An example is the use of *önemi* 'importance' instead of *gereği* ('necessity') in (4).

(4)
Özkan: şu anda **önemini** mi görmüyorsun yani ('so right now you don't see the need for it?')
Ramazan: şimdilik yok ('not for the moment')
Hüseyin: hiç göremiyor musun yani ('you don't see the need at all?')

In addition to content words with slightly changed meanings, function words can also be used in deviant ways. One example is the frequent use of the discourse marker *yani*, 'that is, so'. First of all, it is very frequent (in our data we observed 40 occurrences of 'yani'). Second, it is not always used the same way as in Turkey. The use of this discourse marker seems to be modeled on the French markers *c'est-à-dire* and *donc*, and many of its occurrences do not seem really necessary from the point of view of standard Turkish. In addition, it is used sometimes as a more general discourse marker, sort of like English *y'know*. This use is not known in Turkey.

Loan translation

Where the transcripts contain 'strange' idiomatic use of lexemes or unconventional word combinations, these often turn out to be loan translations from French. An example is the use of the postposition *üstünde* 'on' with *bilgisayar* 'computer' in (5). Later on in the conversation, *ordinateur üstünde*, with the French word for 'computer' occurs as well.

(5) bilgisayarların üstünde çalışmak istiyorum veya çocuk bakıcısı 'I want to work at computers or as a babysitter'

Another example is the word *ev kadını* for 'housewife', instead of *ev hanımı*. French uses *femme* here, and this may have led to the Turkish form, because *kadın* is the most common translation of *femme*, while *hanım* is best translated as 'lady'. A possible loan translation is the future tense in *ödeyeceksin* (on the model of *tu vas payer* 'you're going to pay') in the following example.

(6)
şimdi hasta olduğunda / fransız kartın olmazsa / yabancı olsan da hastaneye gidersin / veya doktora gidersin / bi sürü para **ödeyeceksin** / bi de bakmazlar sana ('now when you're ill / if you don't have a French card / if you're a foreigner and you go to the hospital / or you go to a doctor / you're going to pay a lot of money / they won't take care of you')

One should be careful, however, with such interpretations. Speakers may also simply be creative, whether by choice or forced by momentary lack of access to the right word or expression. In the following example, the Turkish expression that is used, may not be conventional, but note that the French equivalent is closer to the Turkish conventional idiom than to the deviation in the data

(7)
adam bir ayak hemen **geri çek-il-iyor**
Man one foot immediately back draw-PASS-PROG.3sg
'He is changing his mind'
Standard Turkish: *adam bir adım geri at-ıyor* (man one step back hit-PROG.3sg)
French: *il fait un pas en arrière* (he makes one step in back)

Derivational morphology

Language contact often weakens the productive use of derivational morphology (because 'new' words are generally taken from the other language rather than coined from native material). However, French nouns are often integrated into Turkish morphological structure. A French noun may be accompanied by a Turkish derivational marker, specifically the suffix for forming abstract nouns *-lIk*. For instance, where Turks in Holland just insert the Dutch word *politie*, in France, *-lIk* is added to *préfecture*, to give *préfecturelük*. This may be because the Turkish equivalent 'valilik' includes the word formation suffix. Presumably, this has provided the model for its use on the French word.

In Holland, Turkish derivational markers are almost never used on Dutch words. Where Dutch Turks insert Dutch **words**, French Turks insert French **roots**. This fits in with the general pattern of greater Turkish dominance in the French data.

Structural deviations

There are few recurrent cases of structural deviation in the French data, and therefore there is little reason to suspect that there is widespread contact-induced language change. Apart from two aspects to be discussed below, we only found the occasional use of an 'incorrect' case marker and various other incidental deviations.

Pro-drop

One of the few structural domains that may be undergoing change is the system of subject expression. While in French subject pronouns tend to be obligatory, Turkish often leaves them out, relying on verb inflection for the identification of the subject. Pronouns are optionally used to achieve a certain pragmatic effect, such as emphasis or contrast. There are quite a few cases of 'redundant' subject pronouns in the data, where the use of the pronoun does not seem to serve any of the pragmatic functions that govern its use in monolingual Turkish. In the following example, 'ben' seems redundant

(8)
tamam şimdi sen diyorsun ki **ben** fransız kartımı çıkarttığım koyduğum zaman / karşıdaki insan zaten benim yabancı olduğumu görüyor diyorsun
'OK, you're saying that when I whip out my French ID, the guy across from me will still see that I'm a foreigner'

Overuse of conjunctions?

Another domain that is likely to be undergoing change is clause combination. It was already mentioned that relatively little use is made of subordination. Perhaps to compensate for this, increased use seems to be made of conjunctions (recall also the frequent use of *yani*, which seems to be developing from a discourse marker into a coordinate conjunction). An example of 'excessive' conjunction usage is found in (9).

(9)
çünkü benim bildiğim bu vatandaşlık olayı çifte vatandaşlık olayı oluyo **ama** Türkiye'deki vatandaşlığın da devam ediyor
('**because** what I know is, this citizenship status, dual citizenship status is possible, **but** your citizenship in Turkey is unchanged')

Conclusions

The analyses carried out so far have focused on three aspects: the lexical-semantic characteristics of French elements used in speakers' Turkish discourse, the communicative functions of longer (sentence-length) switches to French, and the grammatical structure of the Turkish employed by the informants. Glossing over the many similarities and some minor differences with comparable data from Holland, we find one major difference between the two settings: the second generational French data are much more Turkish-dominant than second generational Dutch data. The French conversational data rather look like Dutch first generational speech, with its very limited and rather predictable use of Dutch words and phrases and its largely intact 'monolingual' Turkish grammar, i.e. the absence of much evidence that the language is undergoing structural change, whether due to direct French influence or general attrition of grammatical knowledge.

The first part of the paper described the Turkish immigrant community in France and concluded that it has many features that make high language maintenance figures likely, such as the tradition to search for future spouses in Turkey. Supporting evidence is found in the Lyon language survey, which showed that Turkish had the highest ethnolinguistic vitality index of all minority languages, cf. Yağmur & Akinci (2003); Akinci, De Ruiter & Sanagustin (2004). Perhaps an explanation for the difference with Holland is that segregation is a bigger problem in France. Some French towns have districts almost completely inhabited by Turks, a phenomenon unknown in Holland. Geographic segregation reinforces Turkish language choice patterns, leading to more maintenance.

REFERENCES

Akinci, M.-A. & Jisa, H. (2001) "Développement de la narration en langue faible et forte: le cas des connecteurs". AILE (Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère) n°14, 87-110.
Akinci, M.-A. (1996) "Les pratiques langagières chez les immigrés turcs en France". Écarts d'Identité, Vol. 76, 14-17.
Akinci, M.-A. (1998) "Développement de la temporalité en turc chez les enfants bilingues turc-français en France". LINX (Linguistique Institut Nanterre Paris X) Vol. 38, 19-34.
Akinci, M.-A. (2001) Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans. Préface du Professeur D.I. Slobin. München : LINCOM Studies in Language Acquisition 03 (Allemagne, ISBN 3 89586 437 4).
Akinci, M.-A., de Ruiter, J.J. & Sanagustin, F. (2004) Plurilinguisme à Lyon: Le statut des langues à la maison et à l'école. Paris : L'Harmattan.
Backus, A. (1996) Studies in Multilingualism (Vol. 1). Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
Backus, A. (2004) "Turkish as an Immigrant Language in Europe". In Bhatia T.K. & Ritchie W.C (eds.), The Handbook of Bilingualism. Oxford : Blackwell Publishing, 689-724.
Echardour, A. & E. Maurin (1993) "La main d'oeuvre étrangère". Données sociales, 504-13.
Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE) (1997). Les Immigrés en France. Paris: INSEE.

Kallmeyer, W. & Keim, I. (2003) "Linguistic variation and the construction of social identity in a German-Turkish setting. A case study of an immigrant youth-group in Mannheim/ Germany". In J. Androutsopoulos, & A. Georgapoulou (eds.). Discourse constructions of youth identities. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 29-46.

Tribalat, M. (1998) Populations originaires de Turquie en France. In: Toute la France, Histoire de l'immigration en France au XX siècle, L. Gervereau, P. Milza, and E. Temine (eds.), Paris: Somogy.

Villanova de, R. (1997) Turkish housing conditions in France: from tenant to owner. In: Turks in European cities: housing and urban segregation. Comparative Studies in Migration and Ethnic Relations 4, ERCOMER, S. Özüekren & R. Van Kempen (eds.), pp. 98-121. Utrecht, Utrecht University.

Yağmur, K. & Akinci, M.-A. (2003) "Language use, choice, maintenance and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences". International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 164. Berlin/New York : Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 107-128.